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Abstract

This thesis examines Ontario elementary teachers perceptions of their teaching of the performing arts (i.e., music, drama, and dance), through responses to an online survey. Participants (N = 138) described multiple aspects of their training and experiences in the performing arts, their comfort in teaching the performing arts, and the degree to which they thought they were teaching the expectations in the curriculum document. The document “The Arts, Grades 1-8, 2009” clearly describes (a) many benefits of performing arts practice, (b) elements of practice and instruction in each performing arts area, (c) how the creative process is a part of and enhanced by participation in these activities, and (d) guidelines for assessment of and through the arts, in addition to (e) describing the many mandated specific expectations for each subject and Grade level. However, few studies have addressed the training and experience of the teachers of the performing arts, and there is a pressing need for baseline data about performing arts instruction to inform hiring, certification, and professional development policies. Descriptive statistics are presented which detail many varied elements of performing arts instruction in Ontario schools, and ANOVAs are used to compare the differences between training groups on teachers perceptions of their comfort, the frequency and duration of their instruction, and their adherence to the curricular expectations. Analyses revealed that participant teachers with high levels of training and experience reported significantly higher levels of comfort and effectiveness in their performing arts instruction than teachers with low or no training in the performing arts. Analyses also showed that participants with low amounts of formal training and limited experiences in the art form can perceive themselves as comfortable and effective at teaching the performing arts. These participants rated themselves significantly higher than participants with no training or experience. Structural conditions and broad baseline data are also presented.
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Preface

“I would teach children music, physics, and philosophy; but most importantly music, for in the patterns of music and all the arts are the keys of learning.”

~ Plato ~

I have always been a drummer. As long as I remember, I’ve been tapping on things and annoying those around me with rhythmic eruptions that just won’t stay below the surface. As I’ve grown older I have learned techniques to minimize the impact of this “gift” on those around me, like drumming with my fingers on my legs, but the rhythms in my head won’t stop. They need to come out somehow.

My mother, having placed me in ‘Kindermusic’ rhythm and movement programs from age 2, recognized my continued obsession with rhythm and noise. One Saturday afternoon when I was nine years old she asked me to come out to the car to help her with something. When she opened the trunk to reveal a dilapidated drum set, I was hypnotized. I brought it inside and made what I’m sure was an awful racket, but it was an amazing feeling. With this $20 garage sale gem, I began my journey to become something special. At first I didn’t know what to do, but fortunately my school had an instrumental music program that started in Grade 4, and the music teacher noticed my enthusiasm and offered some tips. With his encouragement, I went to the music room at lunch hours to play around on the drums, loving the feeling it gave me.

Before I knew it I wasn’t just a kid hitting stuff anymore: I was a drummer. That identity has been with me ever since. Through playing music I have made friends, had many experiences that I would never have otherwise had, and explored worlds of rhythm and melody in ways that I could never have imagined. Rhythmic exploration has remained one of my life’s main obsessions.
In addition to the Kindermusic classes from age 2 to 5, my parents also put me through dance classes from age 5 to 7, where I learned ballet, jazz, tap and finally that new breakdancing thing that was happening in 1984. In retrospect, I think that my full-body kinaesthetic rhythmic experiences as a child helped to instill in me a powerful sense of rhythm, and a love of the aesthetic experience of music which went far beyond auditory stimulation. As a teenager I played in a few school bands at my excellent high school music program under a dedicated teacher, and I played in bands in my friends’ basements with some good lifelong friends under their very understanding parents. After some wonderful years in the punk and hardcore music scene, I discovered the rave scene, where rhythm and movement are united in a blissful sublime unity. I became a DJ (with real records!), something I still enjoy doing. I love dancing, and I love playing amazing music that makes people dance. That’s part of why I love drumming so much, and putting down the groove that everyone is moving to. I still play drums in a few projects, and it’s something I’ve done continuously for almost 30 years.

After completing my undergraduate degree, I found that working in the film industry combined all elements of artistic activity, and that every day that I worked in the art department I used creative problem-solving skills to produce work that crossed disciplinary boundaries. On set I facilitated actors and directors in their task of storytelling, a dramatic form that in film is captured by a camera and edited into a transdisciplinary product that includes elements of music, drama, dance, and visual art. It is a mixed media, and the elements of these different art forms don’t seem different when they’re part of a larger whole, part of a creative vision of something meaningful and important.

My reluctance to pursue a career in a single aspect of film production (i.e., props, construction, art direction, set decoration) or type of film production (i.e., commercials, television, feature films) was inspired by my love of learning and of variety in experience, and informed by my undergraduate degree in cultural studies and post-colonial theory: I knew that I had to take bits and
pieces from all areas to construct meaning and not be constrained by existing categories or structures. My love of all the arts as a vehicle for meaningful aesthetic experiences that transcend disciplinary boundaries has driven me professionally and personally, helped me to challenge myself to constantly learn and take risks, forced me to embrace change and ambiguity, and allowed me to deeply experience the richness of life through self-expression and connecting with others.

Each of the three branches of the performing arts has impacted me in some meaningful way, and they have been especially effective when combined together. Music education is very important to me because of the central role that music practice and experience has played in my life ever since I can remember. Drama education is important to me because of my experiences with it in high school, and as an adult in improv classes I saw the benefits to my self-confidence that dramatic activities provided. Dance education is important to me because of the strong personal impact it has made on me, and the benefits I have felt in self-concept and confidence, and having fun dancing with friends. It is because of my personal involvement in these art forms that I became interested in research showing the many benefits of music practice and of musical experiences.

When we interact with people in the world we are performing our experiences. When we tell stories to each other and make narratives about our experiences, we are performing something. When we speak these stories, and feel the cadence and the rhythm of the words, we connect with each other. When we dance, when we move to the beat together, we are connecting with each other. When we do all of these things, we are learning how to be in the world, what it means to exist, and who we are. In all of these art forms we are expressing and performing our stories, our emotions, and our experience.

Music, theatre, and dance can blend together in schools, as they do in the performative acts of everyday life. Drama is a collection of deliberate movements performed with other people in a composed, choreographed, or scripted manner. Drama includes elements of composition and
improvisation, usually including background music, and often directly includes elements of music and dance performance within the structure of the dramatic performance. Music making requires rhythmic movement of the body, and a connection between audio, visual, and proprioceptive senses. Music and rhythmic movement are intrinsically linked, especially in early childhood (Dalcroze, 1930, 1976; Weiss & Kodaly Institute of Canada, 1977).

I am sure that my passion for teaching the arts to young people and spreading the joy that I have found in these activities is due, in part, to my early experiences immersed in acts of artistic creation. The extensive research evidence on performing arts education supports my personal conviction that if it were not for my early experiences in music and dance, and the mentorship of my musical parents and some great music teachers, I would have had a different approach to how I have used creativity and the skills derived from practice in these creative arts in my daily life.

When leading young children and students of all ages in performing arts activities, I see joy on the faces of my students, and I remember those moments in my own life. I am lucky to have had these experiences, and I want every child in Ontario to have the opportunity to have artistic experiences with a teacher or mentor who has a deep and genuine passion for music, drama, and dance, so that they may learn and grow through the arts.
CHAPTER 1: WHY STUDY THE PERFORMING ARTS?

There is plentiful evidence of the many benefits of quality music, drama, and dance experiences, and the role they play in peoples’ lives. The performing arts (i.e., music, drama, and dance) have been linked to significant social, cognitive, and emotional benefits (Berry, 1990; Miksza, 2010; Reynolds, 1995; Roberts, 2008; Ruismäki & Tereska, 2006; Schellenberg, 2004, 2011). For example, engaging in the dramatic arts has been shown to improve leadership, metacognitive, and social skills, and enhance literacy skills including comprehension, reading achievement, and writing (Andersen, 2002, 2004; Joronen et al, 2012; Podlozny, 2000). Music practice has been correlated with improved performance in spatial and linguistic tasks (Anvari et al, 2002; Rauscher & Hinton, 2011; Zafranas, 2004), and additional benefits are identified by new evidence of bidirectionality between the domains of music and language processing (Bidelman, Hutka & Moreno, 2013). Dance training has been shown to improve critical thinking and analytical reasoning, and leverage principles of embodied and kinesthetic learning to improve a range of performance outcomes (Gault, 2005; Green, 2002; Hanna, 2008; Lobo, 2006; Moffett, 2012; Zimmerman, 2002). The arts are a powerful mode for expression and self-actualization (Berry, 1990; Reynolds, 1995; Roberts, 2008), and have been shown to help improve a wide variety of cognitive, social, and emotional skills (Rauscher and Hinton, 2011; Schellenberg, 2011).

The performing arts are a part of the elementary school curricula in all provinces, and analyses of the curricular documents reveal mandatory instruction in the performing arts across regions and grade levels. The Ontario Ministry of Education recognizes the benefits of engaging in the arts, as evidenced by the comprehensive mandated instruction in the arts in the curriculum document “The Ontario Curriculum: Grades 1-8, The Arts, 2009,” and the support for artistic engagement and cross-curricular integrated instruction described in other curricular documents (e.g.,

Other policy, support, and research mobilization documents support teaching about and through the arts, including a 2011 document released by the Ontario Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat “What works? Research into practice research monograph #33: Engaging students through the arts” (Upitis, 2011). In this monograph, several intrinsic and “bonus” benefits of engaging in the arts are described, and teachers are encouraged to spend time teaching the arts, to integrate the arts into their teaching of other subjects, and to leverage community “volunteer support” if they are uncomfortable with teaching the arts (Upitis, 2011, p. 3). The curricular document “The Ontario Curriculum: The Arts, Grades 1–8, 2009” also clearly describes: (a) many benefits of engaging in the arts, (b) specific learning expectations, and (c) strategies for integrating the arts with other subjects (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2009). There appears to be strong support for the arts in official Ministry of Education policy documents.

Unfortunately, little research has been conducted on the degree to which these policies are enacted in classrooms by teachers in the Ontario context. Data on average instructional time, infrastructural constraints, and teacher training are scarce. Existing data in this area demonstrate concerning trends regarding one relatively consistently measured indicator: the number of schools with specialist music teachers. Non-profit education research organization People for Education are one of the few organizations presenting information which is useful to researchers in this area. Recent data from People for Education indicate that 44% of Ontario schools have a specialist music teacher, 40% of whom are itinerant or part-time (People for Education, 2013). This is similar to their 2004 report showing that the number of schools with full- or part-time specialized music teachers had quite suddenly declined to 40% from the 1997 rate of 58% (People for Education, 2004).
Previous data from a 1993 study indicate that 92% of music instruction in Ontario was conducted by specialists (Shand & Bartel, 1993). While this is a different indicator which may be only measuring schools which have some music instruction, the continuing decrease reported by these data is an indicator of a reduction in highly-trained expertise in music education, in part an effect of a complex series of policy and funding changes in Ontario in the 1990s (People for Education, 2008; Pinto, 2012). By comparison, data for public schools in the United States show that in 2010, 91% of students receiving music instruction were taught by specialist teachers, 57% of students receiving dance instruction were taught by specialist teachers, and 42% of students receiving drama instruction were taught by specialist teachers (Parsad & Spiegelman, 2012).

In Ontario we do not have data about the number of students receiving instruction from specialist teachers in drama or dance. Monitors of arts education policy do not ask questions about the number of drama or dance specialists in the schools (People for Education, 2013) and no data are available to show the number of schools with a drama or dance specialist, or the number of schools with a combined arts specialist (People for Education 2008, 2011, 2012, 2013).

These data of declining music specialists suggest that the task of teaching the performing arts often may fall to the generalist classroom teacher, or whomever in the school feels most qualified to teach these subjects. There is a longstanding debate in education about the importance of specialist teachers for the performing arts, most notably music (Holden & Button, 2006). Many studies have shown that when the classroom teacher is responsible for implementing these areas of the curriculum “the arts are not taught consistently or effectively in primary schools” (Russell-Bowie, 2009a, p. 11). Many international education researchers have shown that generalist teachers often lack confidence and are often reluctant to teach these subjects (Hallam et al., 2009; Hennessy, Rolfe, and Chedzoy, 2001; Melchior, 2005; Mills, 1989). Generalist teachers often perceive themselves to
be unprepared and under-qualified to teach these subjects (Russell-Bowie, 2009a), leading to a decreased sense of self-efficacy and perceived effectiveness.

It is important to note that students may benefit from receiving instruction in other subject areas (i.e., math, science, literacy, physical education) from specialists and teachers with special interest in these other subjects. It is possible that similar findings would occur in these other subject areas. The scope of the current study does not extend to investigating specialists of all subjects, but will instead investigate phenomena surrounding performing arts education.

To be considered a specialist by the Ontario Ministry of Education, special formal training must be completed. Certified teachers in Ontario are qualified as specialists to teach music, drama, or dance by taking 3 Additional Qualification (AQ) courses through the Ministry of Education (Ontario Regulation 176/10, 1996). The first AQ can be taken immediately after certification, the second AQ requires teachers to have one year of teaching experience and the third AQ requires teachers to have two years of teaching experience in order to be allowed to take the course.

However, a teacher does not have to have formal certification as a specialist to be employed as a specialist teacher of the performing arts (People for Education, 2011), which leads to some confusion about the terms specialist and non-specialist. Research regarding specialist teachers does not capture the experience of non-specialist teachers teaching the performing arts to their students, and little research considers teachers’ attitudes towards these subjects, their preparedness to teach these subjects, and their ability to guide students through specialized process and content knowledge. Non-specialist teachers who did not take the AQ courses required to achieve the specialist designation may nevertheless have rich backgrounds in the arts in both formal and informal learning environments. Regardless of designation, research shows that experience in the performing arts can help to improve attitudes towards performing arts instruction and improves feelings of confidence (Russell-Bowie, 2009a; Upitis, 2005).
Teacher attitudes surrounding performing arts instruction is linked to their previous experiences and training in the performing arts, and this may include informal experiences in addition to formal training. Russell-Bowie (2009a) identified six key challenges to effective instruction in music based on an international study of the perceptions of almost 1000 preservice teachers from five Asia-Pacific countries: (a) the teachers’ lack of musical experience, (b) the low priority given to music in schools (c) inadequate resources, (d) inadequate time to teach music, (e) inadequate subject knowledge, and (f) inadequate preparation time.

Through this study I will investigate the qualities those non-specialist teachers feel they have, their perception of their experiences and effectiveness in the classroom, and the challenges they face. I will also be comparing the approach of these teachers with highly trained and experienced teachers of the performing arts, in an attempt to illuminate potential ways to improve students’ experiences of the performing arts in Ontario elementary schools.

Purpose

All of the arts are an important part of a complete education, but in this study I specifically examine the three subject strands of music, drama, and dance as inextricably linked artistic practices: the performing arts. The Ontario provincial education policy for the performing arts mandates a thorough program of instruction in these subjects, as outlined in “The Ontario Curriculum: The Arts, Grades 1–8, 2009.” However, very little is known about how this curriculum is being enacted by teachers. The broad purpose of this study is to gather data on the conditions for performing arts education in Ontario elementary schools related to (a) the amount and nature of instruction; (b) teacher qualifications, backgrounds, and attitudes; and (c) teacher efficacy.

The following research questions guide this study:
1. What are the conditions (i.e., the curriculum, teacher training and experience, structural considerations) surrounding performing arts education in Ontario public schools?

2. Does previous training and experience in the performing arts influence teachers’ comfort and perceived ability to teach the performing arts curriculum?

3. Does previous training and experience in the performing arts impact the frequency or duration of teachers’ performing arts instruction in elementary schools?

4. To what extent do elementary teachers perceive that they are teaching the expectations of the Ontario performing arts curriculum?
CHAPTER 2: PERFORMING ARTS EDUCATION IN ONTARIO

Since this study examines teachers’ perceptions of their performing arts instruction and the conditions surrounding their instruction, it is important to look at both the current policy and curricular context as well as the historical conditions for performing arts education in Ontario. While the available historical information has a focus on music education policy, many of the issues described here also impact the dance and drama strands.

Early Years of Music Education in Ontario

Before the beginning of the formal school system with the appointment of the first Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada, Ontario’s education system consisted of church-related groups in informal settings. Egerton Ryerson was appointed to this position in 1844, and his contributions to education in Ontario were substantial, though not without controversy; on several occasions students and Native rights groups have protested to have his name and likeness removed from Ryerson University due to his attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples and religious colonialism (Tromsness, 2012; Brown, 2010). Music was of great personal interest to Ryerson because he considered it to be a “powerful agent of moral culture,” which encouraged religious participation and strong Christian moral values (Green & Vogan, 1991). He ensured that it was a part of the first curriculum, and music has been a part of the curriculum to some degree ever since.

Historically, pedagogical styles of music instruction have differed greatly between the urban and rural areas. In rural areas, it was harder to recruit specialists and harder to pay them due to a lower population density. By 1934, music teaching was still confined mainly to public schools of the 5 largest cities, and a few small urban centres. In these urban centres there were more students and more specialists, and usually more resources to pay for supplies. There were very few textbooks at first, and they all came from the United States. One enterprising rural music educator, Henry Frost, made his own textbook series of lessons, sometime between 1835 and 1850. His textbook is kept at
the archives of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in Toronto and is available online. It was written with a primarily traditional approach to music instruction and notation but blended some components of the newer solfege system. Rural instructors tended to use a more traditional approach using traditional notation and teaching methods, and urban instructors tended to use a blended program, including elements of traditional instruction blended with elements of solfege. (Green & Vogan, 1991).

In 1887, boys were exempted from taking music classes in senior school so they could take mental arithmetic classes, an early example of math and ‘the basics’ taking priority over music. Music teachers were faced with funding challenges and questions about their importance from the very beginning of the school system, and advocacy has always been a component of the arts educator’s job description. In 1891, at the urging of music teachers, the Ministry granted schools permission to form school choirs “as long as they were optional and of no expense to the boards” (minutes of Public School Board Ministry, 1891 as cited in Green & Vogan, 1991, p. 11). These choirs were organized and run primarily by music teachers, and they performed at Empire Day celebrations and other community events. Public performances such as these helped to increase the visibility of school music programs and public support for arts education, by portraying an image of moral propriety to justify its cultural importance and return on investment.

In Ontario, the initial reasons given to justify the inclusion of music in the curriculum was its contribution as a purveyor of religious and nationalistic moral values. These extrinsic benefits not only informed the content, repertoire, and methods of instruction, they also justified funding. Subject-specific funding for music programs was part of the funding formula since the 1880s, and it continued to be separately funded until 1945 (Green & Vogan, 1991).

These extrinsic justifications for music programs continue to this day, but in the 1920s the focus was shifting towards a more student-centered approach to education. The progressive ideas of
John Dewey and others opened the door to an emphasis on the intrinsic value of music by encouraging the holistic growth of the whole child.

**Progressive Education**

The progressive education movement has contained many different elements in its various iterations, but four things are usually central to the definition: (a) student-centered, (b) inquiry-based, (c) adaptable to meet the needs of the students, and (d) rooted in student experience in authentic activities (Kliebard, 1992). These progressive approaches to education were most famously expressed by John Dewey (1932), and are a natural fit with the performing arts strands, because of their focus on experience, expression, and engagement. Dewey, writing in 1915 on some of his philosophies of education that were reflected in the Ontario education system 1975–1995, was a strong proponent of active learning:

> The need that the more ordinary, direct, and personal experience of the child shall furnish problems, motives, and interests that necessitate recourse to books for their solution, satisfaction, and pursuit. Otherwise, the child approaches the book without intellectual hunger, without alertness, without a questioning attitude, and the result is the one so deplorably common: such abject dependence upon books as weakens and cripples vigor of thought and inquiry. (Dewey, 1943, p. 112)

Music education, while naturally an active process, is not always approached according to progressive principles. Music educators often work to strike a balanced approach between exploration and practice (Green & Vogan, 1991; Wasiak, 2013).

Dr. G. Roy Fenwick, Director of Music Education for Ontario in 1951, summarized his belief in a balanced approach, that “music requires both inspiration and drill” (Fenwick, 1951). The first chapter of his 1951 book on music education focuses on the reasons for music education programs, and most of the chapter is spent discussing the intrinsic value of music for enjoyment and
character development, which was a popular approach at the time with the entrenchment of a ‘whole child’ approach to education. The tension between student-centred and subject-centred curriculum development is reflected in his approach (Marsh & Willis, 2000).

The 1967 Hall/Dennis report expressed other competing ideological priorities of curriculum development, between student-centred and society-centred (Marsh & Willis, 2000), by addressing “the needs of both the student as an individual and of society as a whole,” (Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, 1994). Crittenden (1969) saw this “as an attempt to counterbalance two possible tendencies in education: the reflection of a collectivist view of man [sic], and the imposition of a single pattern of schooling (in manner and content) on all children, regardless of individual differences” (as cited by Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, 1994, p. 43). This report and the Ontario curricula 1975-1995 supported an approach to education that appreciated the value of expression and inquiry through the arts, and the importance of giving teachers freedom to facilitate classroom experiences that were focused on the needs of their individual students.

Education policy continued this bias towards the tenets of progressive education throughout the 1960s, 70s, and 80s. During this time the education system reflected “liberal policy trends,” and the curriculum was “steeped in philosophies of student-centered learning, active learning, and individualization according to student learning styles, developmental and academic progress, and interests” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1975a, 1975b, as cited in Anderson and Ben Jafaar, 2003, p. 5). The 1975 elementary curriculum centered around three main subject areas: math, communication, and the arts, and was a collaborative endeavor between the teacher and the student. “Both the teacher and child should be involved in choosing content … the children’s involvement is important because content that they have chosen themselves is most likely to motivate learning” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1975). Inquiry was a key part of the system, and the specific content was not clearly defined. Teachers were given a broad mandate of instruction which allowed them to
crate a program of study tailored to their own particular students, based on strategies that worked for themselves and for their students. While dance was not part of the curriculum at this time, physical education was listed as part of the arts curriculum (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1975).

This curriculum built on progressive theories of experiential and inquiry learning allowed teachers the freedom to foster an ‘emergent’ curriculum within their classrooms, driven by the current interests of the students, which can be fostered through artistic expression (Marshall & Donahue, 2010). Indeed, Reggio Emilia, an arts-based approach to education, has principles of emergent curriculum at the heart of its approach to allow students to define the path of their own learning (Schiller, 1995; Wright, 1997).

Curriculum documents in Ontario from 1975-95 were a guide to curricular practice, both content and method; the loose expectations and freedom at the classroom level made possible this active and ever-changing enacted curriculum, conducive to both performing arts instruction and cross-curricular practices.

It was upon this theoretical background, and a respectful attitude towards teachers, students, and educational research that led to the development of the 1993 “Common Curriculum.” This new curriculum was created by the Ministry of Education in response to the 1987 Radwanski report under the NDP government of Bob Rae, and attempted to address the concerns of the 1987 Radwanski report on education and integrate it with the existing student-centred practice and curricula which were based on the previous 1965 Hall/Dennis Report. In this way, Ontario curricula were based on a thorough review of academic research, practitioner consultation, and commissioned reports until the election of Mike Harris and the Conservative government in 1995.
Common Sense Education

After Mike Harris’ Conservative government was elected in 1995 to implement their “Common Sense Revolution,” it quickly became a priority for them to replace the newly implemented Common Curriculum (Gidney, 1999; Pinto, 2012).

In 1997, Minister of Education John Snobelen discussed the government’s new priorities for education in the Ontario Legislature:

The hallmarks of Ontario’s new education system will be high standards and accountability. Our standards will be clear, measurable and comprehensive in all Grades … this rigorous and demanding new curriculum, focusing on language, math, science and technology … provides a solid foundation in the basics. (as cited in Pinto, 2012, p. 55)

Since arts programming is not regarded as one of ‘the basics’ (Pinto, 2012), and achievement in the arts is difficult to quantify, a strong arts curriculum was not a priority for the Conservative Harris government. This is evident in government education policy content and the implementation process, comments from key ministers, policy documents, and the observed decline in the number of arts specialists and available arts programming in schools (People for Education, 2004, 2007, 2011).

During these years the government completely overhauled the Ontario curriculum in all areas, in addition to many other drastic changes to education: they changed the funding formula, amalgamated school boards, reduced operating grants and told school boards to “absorb the reductions without increasing the tax burden on local ratepayers” (Gidney, 1999). Through these and other measures, the Harris government succeeded in creating the crisis in education as they had planned (Gidney, 1999; Pinto 2012). The impact of the ideological ‘war on teachers’, and the feelings of mistrust and antagonism that developed during these years between the provincial government, education scholars and teachers continue to impact education policy today (Pinto, 2012). The arts in
Ontario elementary schools have never recovered to their former levels (People for Education, 2011), and the animosity of the ‘Harris years’ which characterized the relations between teachers, policymakers, and politicians were the context into which the new versions of the curriculum were born.

**Current Context of Performing Arts Education in Ontario**

Today, statements about the importance of ‘the basics’ (i.e., literacy and numeracy) continue to resonate with voters, and support for education in these subjects remains strong (Silva, 2009). Progressive education methods are common in faculties of education, but the complex curricula and focus on standardized testing make progressive instruction difficult to implement. Ostensibly, these changes are to make our students more competitive in a global marketplace (Giese & Alphonso, 2013). However, many business leaders have questioned the appropriateness of this focus on traditional rote instruction in literacy, math, and science in the new creative economy (Florida, 2002), and some jurisdictions are now overhauling their standardized testing programs to reflect this change (Giese & Alphonso, 2013).

Since the late 1990s, many supporters of the arts and arts education have accepted the need to justify their existence to voters and the business community, and to defend arts Education on the basis of transferrable skills, as shown by the rise in research highlighting these aspects of the arts (Gullatt, 2007). The cuts to arts programming during the Harris years illustrate the high cost of ignoring the power of the economic paradigm of education policy debates in the public sphere (Pinto, 2012).

Although educational researchers and business leaders agree that arts education is critical to building 21st century skills, the funding cuts and ‘back to basics’ ideological priorities of the Conservative governments of Mike Harris and Ernie Eves continue to impact arts education in Ontario classrooms (Pinto, 2012; People for Education, 2012). The economic paradigm continues to
be a major factor informing political discussions in public policy, and the ‘bottom line’ is an omnipresent and dominant policy actor. In today’s climate of economic austerity and worldwide financial insecurity any program requiring public finances will need to justify its economic value and return on investment.

Accordingly, the editorial board that designed the 2009 arts curriculum considered the Conference Board of Canada’s criteria for effective workers when writing the policy (Phillips, 2011), and there has been a large volume of research over the past 30 years attempting to justify the arts on the basis of economic value and transferable skills. There are many reasons why education in music, drama, and dance are valuable in education, including encouraging development of critical thinking skills, engaging students on multiple levels, and enhancing creativity and risk-taking, all of which are desired by employers in today’s workplace (Conference Board of Canada, 2000). More recently, essential “21st century” competencies are described as by research advisory organization Canadians for 21st Century Learning and Innovation: (a) Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship, (b) Critical Thinking, (c) Collaboration, (d) Communication, (e) Character, (f) Culture and Ethical Citizenship, and (g) Computer and Digital Technologies. Enhancement of all of these characteristics have been correlated with participation in performing arts activities (Gullatt, 2007; Rauscher & Hinton, 2011; Schellenberg, 2011).

The economic value of arts education does seem to have been accepted by many sectors of society, even some sectors that have traditionally been unsupportive of arts spending in education. Richard Florida’s 2002 book “Rise of the Creative Class” signaled the emerging prevalence in the business community of attitudes recognizing the economic value of creativity (Mihai-Yiannaki & Savvides, 2012), and many in the business community seem to have embraced the inclusion of creative elements in business school curricula (Grenci, 2012; Reilly, 2011). The new curriculum discusses many transferable benefits of arts education valued by the business community, including
creativity, critical thinking, communication, cultural understanding, and collaboration (Ontario, 2009; Conference Board of Canada, 2000).

In addition to its utility in business and economic sectors, the intrinsic value of music and the arts is somehow more difficult to express in words; indeed, the ability of the arts to express ideas and feelings in non-linguistic ways is one of its core strengths. Eisner (2002), discusses the ways that the arts affect consciousness:

They refine our senses so that our ability to experience the world is made more complex and subtle; they promote the use of our imaginative capacities so that we can envision what we cannot actually see, taste, touch, hear, and smell; they provide models through which we can experience the world in new ways … and provide the means through which meanings that are ineffable, but feelingful, can be expressed (p. 19).

The intrinsic value of the arts is difficult to quantify, but they are an important part of the human experience (Dissanayake, 1995). The current arts curriculum in Ontario reflects the curriculum writers’ belief in the intrinsic value of the arts, while addressing concerns about its overall utility and economic value.

**The Current Arts Curriculum in Ontario**

The current arts curriculum in Ontario, “The Arts: The Ontario Curriculum Grades 1–8, 2009,” is based on the previous curriculum document released in 1998. The 1998 document was very different from its predecessor (the 1995 Common Curriculum), and was created with much political interference and a lack of evidence-based policy making (Pinto, 2012). Bedard and Lawton (1998) describe some of the changes in the late 1990s: “Bill 160 thus marked a fundamental shift from the consensus model that characterized not only the development of education policy in Ontario, but public policy formulation and change more broadly in the postwar era” (p. 51).
The editors of the 2009 arts curriculum document knew that even though the government had changed, they still felt the resonance of the end of this consensus and evidence-based policymaking approach (Phillips, 2011). To address the lingering suspicion of teachers in the policy process, great pains were taken to be consultative and accountable (Phillips, 2011). The editors of the document knew that the implementation would still be challenging, as even methodologically sound, research-based changes to instructional techniques have historically been very difficult to implement (Puk, 1998). The structure of the previous 1998 document is still retained in the current documents, although the curriculum has shifted substantially in tone and content.

The current document includes four subject strands: dance, drama, music, and visual art. Within each subject, three “Overall Expectations” within each separate subject area give structure to the underlying specific expectations: (a) Creating and Presenting; (b) Reflecting, Responding and Analyzing; and (c) Exploring Forms and Cultural Contexts.

The ‘front matter’ of the document, the 57 pages of text that precede the detailed descriptions of the strands and specific expectations, contain information about the importance of the arts and the ways in which they can be used in the instruction of other subjects, along with a description of approaches to assessment and program planning in the arts. The writers created a document that: (a) is reflective of current research on arts education; (b) is responsive to business community’s requests for workers with skills in creativity, innovation, and critical thinking; (c) provides a clear outline of expectations while allowing for regional/teacher creativity in designing specific activities; (d) is useful and useable to/by teachers; (e) is inclusive of many policy documents and PPM’s, including Aboriginal and special education; and (f) outlines expectations and deliver clear guidelines for arts education in Ontario public schools, including how to best teach the arts and the skills enhanced by art-making (Phillips, 2011).
The ‘front matter’ fulfills the following objectives: (a) to clearly articulate the new arts curriculum to Ontario’s education community, (b) to embed the creative process and the critical analysis process throughout the arts curriculum, (c) to allow teachers the flexibility to create meaningful activities within their classrooms to meet the curricular and critical skill-building goals. Clearly described in this section is information regarding: (a) advocacy and the importance of the arts; (b) roles and responsibilities of partners/actors; (c) specific curriculum expectations by subject and grade (i.e., dance, music, drama, visual art, 1-8); (d) assessment and evaluation expectations and strategies; (e) instructional approaches and teaching strategies; (f) cross-curricular/integrated strategies; (g) special needs considerations; (h) ELL considerations; (i) environmental education; (j) antidiscrimination elements; (k) literacy, numeracy and inquiry in the arts; (l) critical thinking and critical literacy; (m) multiple literacies; (n) the role of the school library; (o) information and communications technology; (p) guidance; and (q) health and safety. These objectives illustrate an attempt to follow the strands and expectations in a style that aligned with the approach of the 1998 document, while subtly integrating a number of progressive approaches found in the 1995 Common Curriculum. They include many ‘advocacy’ elements, describe benefits of engaging in performing arts activities and their importance in the curriculum, and include a detailed glossary of specialty terms for each subject.

The body of the document describes the overall and specific expectations, organized by Grade level. The overall expectations articulated in the curriculum document form a categorical structure for the organization of the specific expectations for each Grade level. These overall expectations are similar but slightly different for each art form. For Dance, the overall expectations are:
“A1. Creating and Presenting: apply the creative process (see pages 19–22) to the composition of simple dance phrases, using the elements of dance to communicate feelings and ideas;

A2. Reflecting, Responding, and Analysing: apply the critical analysis process (see pages 23–28) to communicate their feelings, ideas, and understandings in response to a variety of dance pieces and experiences;

A3. Exploring Forms and Cultural Contexts: demonstrate an understanding of a variety of dance forms and styles from the past and present, and their social and/or community contexts.”

The overall Drama expectations are very similar:

“B1. Creating and Presenting: apply the creative process (see pages 19–22) to dramatic play and process drama, using the elements and conventions of drama to communicate feelings, ideas, and stories;

B2. Reflecting, Responding, and Analysing: apply the critical analysis process (see pages 23–28) to communicate feelings, ideas, and understandings in response to a variety of drama works and experiences;

B3. Exploring Forms and Cultural Contexts: demonstrate an understanding of a variety of drama and theatre forms and styles from the past and present, and their social and/or community contexts.”

The Music expectations follow the same format:

“C1. Creating and Performing: apply the creative process (see pages 19–22) to create and perform music for a variety of purposes, using the elements and techniques of music;
C2. Reflecting, Responding, and Analysing: apply the critical analysis process (see pages 23–28) to communicate their feelings, ideas, and understandings in response to a variety of music and musical experiences;

C3. Exploring Forms and Cultural Contexts: demonstrate an understanding of a variety of musical genres and styles from the past and present, and their social and/or community contexts.”

In each category of broad expectations, the specific expectations are described separately for each subject and Grade level. Each subject strand has the same number of specific expectations for each Grade level: dance has 9, drama has 9, music has 10, and visual art has 10. Most of these expectations are specific to a ‘knowledge element (i.e., in music: tempo, dynamics; in drama, character or story, etc.) and some of the expectations capture more abstract elements of knowing and learning about and through the arts, (eg. “identify the elements of dance used in their own and others’ dance pieces and explain how they help communicate a message”, Ontario, 2009, p. 110) but it is the front matter of the document that most clearly describes these less tangible learning expectations.

Overall, the arts curriculum document clearly describes many specific expectations, gives examples for teachers of ways to facilitate understanding of these elements (i.e., the teacher prompts), and describes some of the many benefits of engaging in these activities. It is a complex document, and one that requires some knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject in order to effectively interpolate discrete learning expectations into engaging classroom experiences.

The implementation and dissemination of this policy document seems to have been well executed, with in-person presentations at all boards, interactive internet presentations with key authors, and funding allotted for policy dissemination (Phillips, 2012). There are no data available
about how teachers are implementing the policy, how well they feel they are meeting the expectations, or what their difficulties are with the process.
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The rationale for this research is based on the importance of the inclusion of the performing arts in the elementary curriculum, and the educational value gained through their effective instruction. In chapter one, I briefly reviewed some of the intrinsic and extrinsic benefits of engaging in these activities. This chapter describes in more detail some of the evidence supporting these claims. It should be noted that even in the quasi-experimental studies explored below, many of the conclusions are supported by primarily correlational and not causal evidence. It is difficult to prove causation in educational research. The studies presented below (particularly in the music section) are a cross-section of the available research in this area. While these studies do correlate factors related to performance arts education with other variables, they do not prove a causal linkage between these variable. For clarity, the three subject strands are explored separately.

While most of the research questions guiding this study are straightforward, question number two requires additional explanation of the concepts presented for exploration. The question “Does previous training and experience in the performing arts influence teachers’ comfort and perceived ability to teach the performing arts curriculum” investigates comfort and perceived ability. Comfort is a feeling which teachers may experience and may be self-assessed on a continuum or spectrum. Perceived ability is somewhat more complex, as it contains elements of perceptions of effectiveness, which is very close to self-efficacy. Conceptually linked to this area is preparedness, a concept that affects comfort and of self-efficacy: if a teacher feels prepared to teach something, they will feel more comfortable teaching it, and if a teacher feels prepared to teach something, they will feel more self-efficacious. All of these concepts are discussed in this section.
Music

Engaging in regular music practice has been linked to significant social, cognitive, and emotional benefits through a variety of experimental studies and analyses of existing data (Bidelman, Hutka & Moreno; Hetland, 2000; Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010; Miksza, 2010; Reynolds, 1995; Ruismäki & Tereska, 2006; Schellenberg, 2004, 2011). Reynolds (1995) performed a meta-analysis of literature surrounding general and musical self-concept, and she concluded that although it is “firmly established in the educational community” (The Relationship Between General Self-Concept section, para. 1) that music improves general self-concept, this belief in a positive relationship between the arts and general self-concept continues to proliferate “in spite of the lack of empirical data to support such beliefs” (Implications of the Existing Research section, para. 4). She also found that music education in the elementary grades is critical to the development of musical self-concept, illustrating the importance of an early start in music practice to feelings of ability to engage in musical activities later in life. Other researchers report that music training has been shown to positively affect self-concept in musical enjoyment and ability in adulthood (Ruismäki & Tereska, 2006), and that listening to music and participating in music sub-cultures has been shown to positively affect motivation and be a “rejuvenating mechanism” for self-concept (Berry, 1990).

In pursuit of patterns of improved performance, Miksza (2010) analyzed data from the American Education Longitudinal Study of 2002. Through multilevel model analyses of sample (N = 12,160), Miksza presented evidence that students who participated in high school music ensembles were significantly more likely to (a) “have higher standardized math achievement scores,” (b) be “more concerned about community ethics” (i.e., helping others, working to correct social inequalities), and (c) be “more committed to school” (i.e., fewer absences and skipped classes) than students who did not participate in these programs (p. 7).
Kraus and Chandrasekaran (2010) reviewed literature and studies to assess the effect of music training on auditory skills. They found evidence in the extant literature showing that music training has beneficial effects on auditory skills that are not exclusively related to music, by affecting brain plasticity to develop enhancement of salient auditory signals, and improving ability to extract statistical regularities, sound objects and relevant information from soundscapes. They also argue that engaging in the performing arts may benefit academic achievement by improving listening ability and learning skills. They attempted to address the criticism of this evidence being correlational, by including longitudinal studies and rigorous quasi-experimental studies in their analysis.

Music training has been shown to have a significant benefit to spatial-temporal reasoning (Rauscher & Hinton, 2011), which they define as “the ability to visualize spatial patterns and transform them mentally over time in the absence of a physical model” (p. 2). This finding was first reported by Rauscher, Shaw and Ky’s (1993) article explaining the effect of music listening activities on spatial task performance. The finding was described as the “Mozart Effect” by the media, and the modest claims made in the original article were quickly overshadowed by hype and a rush on mozrt CDs. While Rauscher wrote many articles after that 1993 article explaining that the effect of music listening on spatial-temporal reasoning was short-term and limited in scope, other researchers have conducted research which support this claim.

Hetland (2000) performed a meta-analysis of music intervention studies, and found overall a moderate effect ($r = .37$) of “enhanced spatial-temporal performance for preschool and elementary-aged students”, generalizable to other similar-aged students in “active music programs, with or without keyboard instruments, taught in groups or individual lessons. The effect cannot be explained away by a Hawthorne effect, nonequivalence of experimental groups, experimenter bias, or study quality. It is a solid finding” (p. 220). Several other benefits were found to music-specific
skills which were considered also to be beneficial to extramusical outcomes, including temporal succession, transformation, and abstraction (Serafine as referenced by Hetland (2000, p. 181).

Music and language processing has also been explored in depth, and new discoveries are made frequently due to the new technologies available to researchers (Patel, 2008). It has recently been discovered that music and language processing happen in the same part of the brain, (Bidelman, Hutka & Moreno, 2013), supporting the hypothesis of Hauser, Chomsky and Fitch (2002).

Schellenberg (2004) performed a study that showed increased performance on an IQ test by students who participated in keyboard and Kodaly programs, which was “generalized across IQ subtests, index scores, and a standardized measure of academic achievement” (p. 511).

Schellenberg (2011) and Hetland (2000) independently offer their evidence of transferrable benefits of music practice with a caveat that these benefits must not be seen as a replacement for instruction in other discrete subject areas. Rauscher and Hinton (2011) caution that while music practice has positive cognitive implications, and evidence of transferrable benefits shows a potentially important educational intervention worthy of further study … music instruction has the added advantage of teaching students music—certainly a primary goal in and of itself. In fact, an emphasis on extramusical values may be detrimental to the progress of music education. As long as we attempt to justify the arts by reference to nonaesthetic values, we diminish their enduring personal value to the individual. (p. 225)

Advanced training in other areas must be continued, and while music may have transferrable benefits to other subject areas and life skills, the arts must be valued as subjects with intrinsic benefit.

De Vries (2006) described his experience of his music practice enhancing his ability to reflect on his teaching practice, which helped him to improve his instruction. One day after a frustrating class, he went to the practice room to play piano, to think about what had gone wrong with his class. His description of his reflection process captures the way that music and reflective thought can
occur iteratively and simultaneously, one helping the other. Working his way through problems intellectually while improvising a musical composition helped him to do both at the same time:

A final B flat7 chord played, a final C chord played and slowly resolved to an F chord. The end. Improvisation complete. And with it came revelation: I knew what I had to do … I had made a real breakthrough, I’d found resolution—both in my piano improvisation and in where I would go with my teaching. The musical feature of harmonic resolution … has frequently elicited in me a response of completion, often a feeling of breakthrough. Was it mere coincidence that with this musical breakthrough I also achieved a breakthrough of sorts in my teaching reflection? (De Vries, 2006, p. 247)

De Vries’ (2006) article sparked a reflection on my own experience as a musician. I have played music for years, and often a harmonic resolution is accompanied by an internal feeling of unity commensurate with the outside representation of musical harmonic unity. The use of music for relaxation or for thoughtful consideration of complex ideas is common. Persson (2001) contends that musicians perform music with a primarily hedonic motivation, which is “a means to generate positive emotional experiences mostly for one’s own satisfaction” (as cited by Woody & MacPherson, 2010, p. 403). Some musicians and teachers might simply call this ‘enjoyment,’ which is a benefit in and of itself.

Drama

Engaging in the dramatic arts have been shown to improve a wide variety of skills, including leadership, literacy, metacognitive, and social skills (Andersen, 2002, 2004). A 2004 study which immersed one class of students (N was not reported) in improvised roles within an inquiry-based dramatic ‘imagined context’ for science learning showed improved performance on all assessment tasks (including quality of writing and accuracy of science diagrams) over a control group of students who participated in the tasks through an inquiry-only structure (Warner & Andersen, 2004).
Schellenberg (2004) performed an intervention study where participant students \((N = 132)\) were randomly assigned to participate in music keyboard lessons, music voice lessons, drama lessons or no lessons. Participants were recruited through a newspaper advertisement, and the six-year old participants engaged in music or drama lessons weekly for a period of one year. Although the drama group was created in this study as a control group for the study focused on the effect of music interventions, Schellenberg found that participating in a drama intervention exhibited significant and “substantial pre- to post-test improvements in adaptive social behaviour” (p. 511).

A four-year study in England examined the impact of the National Theatre’s Transformation drama project on multiple pre- and post-test outcome measures (Fleming, Merrell & Tymms, 2004). The intervention consisted of regular workshops and performances, and participant students’ scores \((n = 58)\) on a nationally-distributed standardized test were compared against non-participant scores from the national database and against scores from two monitored control groups \((n = 50)\). Pre- and post-test measures showed a significant improvement in self-concept \((r = .62, p < .01)\) and mathematics ability \((r = .08, p < .01)\) after a drama intervention (Fleming, Merrell and Tymms, 2004). Although this study contained a small number of participants \((N = 108)\) and teacher effects cannot be ruled out, the inclusion of two intervention and two control groups make a strong case for the validity of the results. All of these results show that engaging in dramatic activities can enhance meaning-making in students, and help to create feelings of community and interconnectedness (Cornett & Smithrim, 2001) and other improvements to social behaviour.

Social behaviour improvements were also found in Joronen, Konu, Rankin, & Åstedt-Kurki’s 2012 study in Finland. Finnish primary students \((N = 190, \text{Grades 4-5}, \text{mean age 10.4 years})\) were recruited from two primary schools and some participated in drama interventions consisting of classroom drama sessions, follow-up activities at home, and three evening meetings of parents. Students participating in the high-intensity intervention classes showed a significant \((p < .05)\)
decrease in bullying victimization incidents (Joronen et al, 2012). Meta-analyses of other studies confirm this finding.

Podlozny (2000) describes the results of 200 experimental studies over 35 years, and four meta-analyses. She describes six experimental studies analysed by Kardash and Wright between 1970 and 1983 which showed strong effects ($r = .32$) of drama interventions on cognitive outcomes, including reading, oral and written communication, person-perception, and drama skills (p. 240). Her meta-analyses show a significant ($p < .05$) relationship between drama interventions and improved oral story understanding/recall ($r = .27$), written story understanding ($r = .47$), reading achievement ($r = .19$), reading readiness ($r = .24$), oral language development ($r = .15$), and writing achievement ($r = .29$). The strongest effect size was found for written story understanding (Podlozny, 2000).

Dance

Dance training has been shown to improve critical thinking and analytical reasoning, among many other skills (Hanna, 2008). Gault (2005) explained benefits of combining his music instruction with movement and kinaesthetic approaches to improving comprehension through multimodal and embodied engagement. Multimodal approaches to musical understanding and kinaesthetic awareness have been around for many years in the Dalcroze (1915, 1930) and Kodaly (1952, 1967, 1969, 1974) methods, and Gault describes the importance of their application in the classroom. Green (2002) describes the ways in which dance practice enhances somatic knowledge, which she defines by reference to the use of that term by Hanna (1998) as a “field of study that generally views the body from a first-person perception … an embodied process of internal awareness and communication … [focused] on an inner experiential body” (Green, 2002, p. 114). Green argues through a review of research and self-reflexive observations that the intrinsic values of dance training by describing the importance of exploring their range of movements, improving kinetic awareness of the body and
bodily processes such as breathing, and addressing the body as a source of somatic knowledge and a “tool for expressive movement and art-making” (p. 118) through the “complex psychophysical process” of dance learning (p. 117). These observations support empirical findings on the benefits to improved social competence and somatic knowledge.

Lobo and Winsler (2006) conducted an eight-week instructional program in creative dance/movement to assess the effects of this intervention on social competence of low-income American preschool children (N = 40) enrolled in the Head Start program. The assessment of students was conducted by parents and teachers through completion of the Social Competence Behavior Evaluation: Preschool Edition (LaFreniere & Dumas, 1995 as cited in Lobo & Winsler, 2006), who were blind to whether the students were enrolled in the intervention or control group. Researchers found significant improvements in social competence and significant reductions in behaviour problems for students in the intervention group.

Hanna (2008) describes the unique position of dance education as facilitating the language and knowledge of and through the body, and dance as a way of knowing that fosters creative problem solving and the acquisition of “nondance knowledge” (p. 491). She describes how the educational philosophy and research of John Dewey and Elliott Eisner create a solid theoretical foundation for the importance of dance education for fostering knowledge and understanding through doing (Dewey, 1934) and how concept formation is triggered by sensory interactions among varied sensory modalities (Eisner, 2002). Dance, as Hanna explains through a description of relevant theoretical and empirical research, is “a powerful multisensory language, a means of thinking, doing, and experiencing [which] has been demonstrated to be an engaging cognitive way of solving problems as it communicates emotions and ideas and declarative and procedural knowledge” (2008, p. 501).
The benefits of dance instruction affect many other areas. Quiroga Murcia, Kreutz, Clift, & Bongard (2010) report many benefits of dancing for therapeutic treatment of many neurological and mental afflictions, and physical ailments such as fibromyalgia and cardiac insufficiency. They also report many other benefits to participants, including: reduced anxiety, improved mood and other emotional benefits, increased self-esteem, improved social relations, and improvements to physical well-being, including: flexibility, strength, balance, coordination, and speed (Quiroga Murcia et al., 2010).

Some teachers are integrating dance into their instruction of other subjects. For example, Zimmerman (2002) describes her experience of integrating dance into her English literature classroom at the University of Virginia, where students were asked to explore and experience poetry and literary meter through dance. She describes the success with which the students danced a poem as a culminating activity:

Its whirling dactyls, … made dancing an easy choice, but when they danced to it and inhabited its meter, the students perceived the poem's complexity. They observed enjambment, with dactyls carrying over from one line to the next, and they noticed extra syllables that complicated the meter. They handled these and the accompanying caesuras with a pause and curtsy: acting out the irregularities led to a keen awareness of the poem's rhythm and its effects. (Zimmerman, 2002, p. 412)

Zimmerman calls the pedagogical choice of using dance to teach literature as an experiment, and she judged it to be a very successful one, evidenced by the number of students who wrote about meter and the experience of dancing poetry, their appreciation of the complexity and emotional resonance of the poetry, and their high scores on the section of the exam related to meter and scansion.
As shown in the preceding section, there is enormous value to the individual of participation in the performing arts, both in terms of aesthetic and personal development and in the transferrable social, cognitive and physical benefits realized through regular engagement in these artistic activities.

**Empirical Studies on Performing Arts Instruction**

This study builds on previous research, including the work of Beatty (2001), Hennessy, Rolfe and Chedzoy (2001), Morin (1984), Oreck (2001), Russell-Bowie (2009a), Shand (1982), and Shand and Bartel (1993) regarding music and arts education practices in elementary classrooms. In addition to gathering descriptive data, this study examines teachers’ perceptions of their teaching practice at the theoretical intersection of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), teacher self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), preparedness (Al-Bataineh, 2009; Housego, 1992; Hudson & Hudson, 2007), and comfort (Brophy, 1959; O’Connor Clarke et al., 1988) as informed by the empirical research described below.

Beatty (2001) conducted survey research using an instrument of his own design by mailing an invitation to participate in his research to all elementary and secondary principals in Ontario, to gather data from music teachers about the state of their music program. This survey was designed to gather data related to: (a) music teacher training, (b) music program descriptive data, (c) capability in using the provincial curricula, (d) availability of resources and support for music programs, (e) funding, and (f) awareness of advocacy groups in music education. The data gathered from 283 Elementary teachers who responded to the survey was primarily descriptive, and only descriptive and frequency data were reported. Relevant findings include a perception that while 85% of respondents reported feeling “comfortable” with the curriculum, “many commented that the generalist classroom teacher is struggling with this implementation … ‘The level of personal musicianship required to implement the curriculum effectively (and further, to evaluate it properly) is beyond the reasonable scope of the average teacher’s experience’ ” (elementary teacher as quoted
by Beatty, 2001, p.5). Participants identified many challenges, including (a) the inadequacy of funds in their program (60%), (b) their perception that music education was not important to their school board (50%), (c) inadequacy of music equipment and resources (64.3%), and (d) inadequacy of music facilities and resources (53.3%). On a positive note, 83.8% reported that their principal was supportive of their music program. An enthusiastic principal commented that “‘I love music! I am dismayed with the number of teachers who do not teach music in their regular classroom because they do not feel [sic] comfortable’” (principal as quoted by Beatty, 2001, p.6). While Beatty did not conduct analyses by training level, he did find that music instruction was conducted in 18.8% of schools by people who were not certified teachers.

Oreck (2000) created a survey to examine “attitudes of teachers and to discover the primary motivations and concerns of teachers related to arts use in teaching” (p. 3). The resulting Teaching With the Arts Survey (Oreck, 2000) was revised after review by content experts and pilot tested with teachers. In a 2004 study, Oreck uses the survey to examine what attitudes related to arts use in teaching can be identified, and examines the extent to which variance in teachers’ self-reported frequency of use in their teaching can be explained by demographic characteristics, attendance in arts-based professional development, personal experiences in the arts, and measures of their attitudes in the arts (Oreck, 2004). It also examined teachers’ perceptions of the primary “issues related to the use of the arts” (Oreck, 2001, p. 58). This study was distributed to K-12 teachers in schools with an existing relationship with arts-in-education service providers (eg., ArtsConnection, Lincoln Center Institute), so that access to arts professional development could be asserted. 423 teachers responded to the survey, and a factor analysis revealed four components from the 23 attitude items which were described as (a) importance of the arts, (b) self (efficacy and image), (c) Support, and (d) constraints. A multiple regression analysis revealed that self-efficacy/image and constrains made the greatest contributions to variance in arts use in teaching, while “neither prior
formal arts instruction nor current artistic practice outside of school were significant predictors” in this area (Oreck, 2004, p. 61).

However, in qualitative responses teachers most often reported that their lack of confidence was explained by their lack of specific training and prior experience. Teachers who used the arts most frequently were motivated most often by their belief in (a) multiple intelligences theory (Gardner, 1983 as cited in Oreck, 2004), aesthetic education (Schubart, 1996 as cited in Oreck, 2004) and a “philosophy of teaching the whole child” (Oreck, 2004, p. 63). The most frequently cited hindrances to arts instruction, gathered through open-ended questions, were the desire for more training in teaching the arts, and pressure to teach the mandated curriculum.

Oreck’s (2004) study provided a great deal of guidance in the design of the current study, influencing the tone and type of questions in the survey. Its previous use and validation was an appealing reason to use it in the context of the current study. However, the survey as written was not an appropriate instrument for use in the context of the current study.

Other studies have examined factors that influence teachers’ confidence to teach the arts, including Hennessy, Rolfe and Chedzoy’s 2001 study of preservice teachers in England. A sample of 12 primary division student teachers were interviewed six times over three years, and the resulting data were analysed using a recursive comparative analysis. The authors investigated many concepts relating to confidence, following other research including Green et al. (1998 as cited in Hennessy, Rolfe & Chedzoy, 2001) which found that confidence was significant to student teachers’ perceptions of their professional development. Hennessy, Rolfe and Chedzoy found that the instructional elements (i.e., instructional techniques and ideas) that they used most often and considered themselves most confident with using were defined by (a) elements experienced by participants as learners (i.e., in university courses), (b) elements which allowed for adaptation to the student teachers’ skill level, (c) elements with a “clear organizational framework,” and (d) elements
that were reflective of the student teachers’ interests (Hennessy, Rolfe & Chedzoy, 2001, p. 68). The authors also found that prior experience and beliefs did not appear to be very important in influencing non-arts trained teacher candidates’ confidence to teach the arts. Confidence is a feeling or sense that people have about their teaching ability, and is closely related to self-efficacy (Russell-Bowie, 2012).

Previous measures of teacher efficacy were considered as a basis for the design of the survey for this study, but they proved inappropriate in the current context and the research questions. A validity and reliability-tested measure by Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) called the “Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale” was considered for this study, but was rejected because it did not address the research questions or consider self-efficacy in a performing arts context.

Garvis and Pendergast (2011) adapted the Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy survey for an arts context, and conducted a study of 21 early childhood teachers in Queensland Australia to investigate their self-efficacy beliefs and perceptions of their competence in the arts, science and math. The convenience sample yielded a return rate of 27%, and they found that content knowledge was an important source of self-efficacy. Sample items included “How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in the arts?” and “How well can you implement alternative arts strategies in your classroom?” The researchers asked teachers to rate their content knowledge in the arts, science and math, concluding that content knowledge for the arts were consistently lower than for science and math, and that content knowledge is an important source of teacher self-efficacy. They also asked about time of “arts exposure per week,” finding that “a large proportion of children in early childhood classrooms had no exposure to dance (95%), drama (90%) and media (85%)” (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011). This survey instrument was considered inappropriate for the current study because it did not effectively address the research questions, but the items and findings in this study informed the creation of the SAS.
While literature showing pedagogical differences according to confidence or comfort is scarce, Garvis and Pendergast (2011) review literature showing that teachers lacking subject-specific knowledge “tended to avoid teaching topics they did not know well” (p. 6) and that teachers with low self-efficacy in a teaching area used low levels of pedagogical variety and deemphasized those subject areas. Russell-Bowie (2012) reported that the Australian Senate Inquiry into Arts Education (1995) referenced a similar finding, that “generalist primary classroom teachers, because of their own poor arts experience at school and inadequate teachers training lack confidence to teach the arts [and] as a result… there is a strong impulse to marginalize the arts in their teaching” (as quoted by Russell-Bowie, 2012, p. 60).

Russell-Bowie’s (2012) study of 138 preservice primary teachers consisted of delivery of an survey designed for this study, the “Creative Arts” survey, which was completed by teacher candidates before and after a six-week class in creative arts teaching. This study was designed to investigate primary teachers’ confidence and competence in arts education, and reported that only 21% of teacher candidates “felt confident” in music instruction, 25% felt confident in dance instruction and 26% in drama instruction (Russell-Bowie, 2012). Sampled teacher candidates generally reported low background and confidence in the arts, which aligns with results from previous studies (Ballantyne, 2006; Duck, 1990; Meiners, Schiller & Orchard, 2004).

This creative arts class focused on each of the four arts strands for one week each (i.e., dance, drama, music, visual art) and then engaged students in instruction related to consolidation and arts integration. The instruction was designed based on theories of authentic learning environments as described by Herrington, Oliver and Reeves (2003, as cited in Russell-Bowie 2012). Authentic learning experiences in this context should among other qualities (a) have “real-world significance,” (b) be “ill-defined,” requiring students to define the tasks required to complete the activity, (c) be “complex tasks” investigated over a sustained period, (d) provide opportunities to collaborate and
reflect, (e) be “integrated and applied across subject areas and lead beyond domain-specific outcomes” (Russell-Bowie, 2012, p. 62). Teacher candidates reported that they had developed confidence over the course of the semester, and confidence was reported as the most frequently reported self-assessed indicator of learning (i.e., their increased feelings of confidence were reported as the way that they would know they achieved their learning goals). The second most frequently reported item was “the ability to implement knowledge and skills [and] successful and effective performance in the classroom” (Russell-Bowie, 2012, p. 66).

Upitis (2005) also discusses the importance of “authentic” experiences in the performing arts in a study of artists and artist-teachers in national Canadian and American professional development programs in arts education. This study investigated the processes associated with teaching and learning, how the mandated curricula affected their work, and the participants’ own art-making practices. Data collection occurred through focus groups (one session each in year 1, 2 and 4), surveys ($N = 90$), and individual interviews ($n = 4$) over a period of four years. Analyses showed that while many teaching artists learned to appreciate “the patience and organizational skills of elementary school teachers” a “sizeable portion” of artists felt that “their work as artists was not valued by teachers” or that their work was “so distorted by the educational system that they were no longer producing art but rather creating lessons with the art as a “motivational gimmick” to engage children” (Upitis, 2005, p. 5). This motivates questions about the value of various types of instructional integration, about the perceived value of art as intrinsic or as subservient to a more ‘important’ discipline, and the limitations of timetabling and curriculum.

One teaching artist expressed their frustration with teachers’ constant focus on curricular expectations saying “We’re too worried about the curricular links … isn’t instilling a passion for something in a child as important as … math concepts?” (Upitis, 2005, p. 6). Participants reported other obstacles to effective instruction including limitations imposed by lack of appropriate physical
space; indeed, when asked to describe their vision of their “dream school” or “dream partnership,”
all participants mentioned improved physical space before they mentioned other elements such as
teachers or curricular changes. Upitis describes implications of the research as providing empirical
support for recommendations for improved arts professional development proposed by Fullan
(1982), who states that professional development work with teachers should include (a) theory, (b)
demonstration, (c) practice, and (d) feedback, and that “several sessional are important, with
appropriate intervals between follow-up sessions” (as cited in Upitis, 2005, p. 8). She also describes
that while “authentic learning” experiences can lead to “meaningful and long-lasting learning,” these
practices are hindered by the “present political and social realities of schools” (Upitis, 2005, p.8).

Tanriseven (2013) designed a 44-item survey called the “Sense of Efficacy Scale Relating to
Use of Drama in Education,” which was validated through expert review and pilot testing with 353
primary teacher candidates in Mersin, Turkey. This survey was distributed to 52 teacher candidates
for pre-and post-testing in a quasi-experimental study examining the effect of reflective practices and
additional professional development on general efficacy. The control group participated in regular
drama instruction class activities, including lesson planning and basic stages of drama. The
experimental group participated in the same activities but participated also in additional activities,
where they assessed and evaluated their teaching and their students’ learning within a peer-sharing
reflective context. T-tests were used to describe the differences between and within groups. Results
show that engaging in reflection upon and evaluation of their teaching and their students’ learning
within the context of peer-sharing can have a significant effect on a teachers’ sense of general
efficacy, and the implementation and evaluation of dramatic activities. The survey instrument was
not appropriate for application in the context of the current study.

Confidence and efficacy were also explored in the context of elementary music education in
England by Hallam et al. (2009), who undertook research with 341 participant teacher candidates
from four post-secondary institutions to ascertain their levels of confidence in teaching using a survey-research method. Three levels of previous experience were defined, based on participant responses to a question regarding the number of instruments they play. Of the teachers surveyed, 56% reported not playing any instrument, 17% reported playing one instrument, and 27% reported playing two or more instruments. Multi-instrumentalists rated their confidence in teaching music significantly higher than those who played only one instrument, and teachers who played one instrument rated their confidence in teaching music significantly higher than those who did not play any instruments. Perceptions of effectiveness were also statistically different between training groups, and positively correlated with previous experience. Participants suggested their desire for more specific training including (a) lesson ideas (32%), (b) implementation of ideas (10%), (c) more activities (20%), (d) singing training (19%), and (e) teaching music reading and theory (14%).

As described above, previous research in performing arts teaching and professional development reveal significant benefits to professional development in the performing arts for teachers, and benefits to students of effective performing arts instruction. Additionally, some research shows benefits to previous experience while other research shows that interest in the subject has a similar effect. Challenges to effective performing arts instruction include (a) impediments imposed by curricular expectations or timetabling, (b) lack of appropriate space, (c) insufficient access to appropriate professional development and arts resources, and (d) low sense of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence in teaching the performing arts.

**Theoretical Framework**

The purpose of my study is to investigate the state of performing arts education in Ontario elementary schools, and to explore how teacher training and personal experiences might affect teachers’ perceptions of their abilities to teach these subjects. Teachers’ experiences of their enacted curriculum and the factors influencing their instruction (i.e., training and experiences which lead
them to feel comfortable or effective at teaching the performing arts) are central to this study.
Following previous research (Russell-Bowie, 2009a; Oreck, 2004), I draw on theories connecting
teacher training and experience with effectiveness, and the processes by which perceptions of
effectiveness can be achieved. Theories of self-efficacy, preparedness, and comfort framed the
creation of the survey instrument and my interpretation of results.

The concepts that are most relevant to the research questions are: self-efficacy, which is
related to a teacher’s perceptions of effectiveness; and comfort, which is related to a teacher’s
confidence in a subject area and their perceptions of their preparedness to teach that subject.

In this study I examine the effects of training and experience of the performing arts and
teachers’ perceptions of their abilities and comfort in teaching these subjects, but the underlying
reasons which may make a teacher want to engage in these activities and how teachers may be
helped to overcome reluctance to include more performing arts activities in their classrooms cannot
be effectively captured through this instrument and is beyond the scope of this study. Upitis,
Smithrim and Soren (1999) gathered data over a two-year longitudinal study of teachers and artist-
educators, and found that substantial change is difficult to achieve, even over a long period of
intensive professional development. They present a matrix for analyzing teacher transformation in
the arts, and found that engagement in the higher-order levels of transformation requires a mindset
of openness and risk-taking and extension, an “artistic” process. The authors reported that more
successful participants exhibited resilience and engagement with the activities, and that they tended
to continue with activities that they “liked” (p. 31). The first level of their matrix for transformation requires (a) “a feeling of community,” (b) “taking personal risks,” (c) “creation of public artifacts,”
and (d) “connections with prior experiences” (p. 28). The importance of connection with prior
experience was key in their findings, as teachers tended to continue to do what they were doing, and
prioritize the art forms that they were already practicing. In this way, prior experiences are an
indicator of predisposition to artistic activities and pedagogy, and influence a teacher’s perceptions of their preparedness, self-efficacy, and comfort.

The theoretical framework of this study draws on all of these concepts. Some of the relevant literature relating to these concepts is explored below, to triangulate a theoretical position intersecting preparedness, self-efficacy, confidence and comfort where the locus of the perception of ability is located.

Self-efficacy was first described by Bandura (1977) to describe the concept of a person’s belief in their ability to successfully complete a particular task. This concept contains elements of “locus of control” theory (Rotter, 1966), which focuses on perceptions of possibility to change a particular outcome, and puts the focus on a person’s belief in their individual abilities to complete a task successfully. The concept has changed and adapted to many areas since that time, including the specific application as “teacher efficacy” in education.

The concept of teacher efficacy as defined by Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, Hoy (1998) is important to this study. They define teacher efficacy as, “a teacher’s belief in her or his capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context” (p. 233).

A person’s perceptions of their ability to complete a task successfully is a strong predictor of their actual ability to do so (Sherer & Maddux, 1982). In the current study, the idea of self-efficacy is not directly addressed. Rather, it is addressed through asking teachers about their perceptions of their comfort in teaching these subjects, and their perceptions of the success of their instruction according to their adherence to the curricular expectations. The question “to what extent does your Performing Arts instruction cover the Ministry expectations as outlined in the Ontario curriculum document?” asks participants to describe the degree to which they perceive they are successful at
accomplishing a task, which approaches self-efficacy while encompassing elements of effectiveness and preparedness.

Preparedness is not quite as clearly defined in the literature. Some researchers have used it as a proxy measure for self-efficacy (Housego, 1992), or as a self-assessment of teaching competence (Housego, 1990) which is a similar concept. Some define perceived preparedness simply as “a feeling of being prepared” (Giallo & Little, 2004, p. 24). In 1999 the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics described preparedness as their “indicator of the month” and described preparedness as “the extent to which preservice and on-the-job learning prepare [teachers] to meet the new demands” and “how well prepared [teachers] felt to perform various activities in the classroom” (U.S. Department of Education, 1999, p. 2000-003). Housego (1992) describes preparedness in an education context as a “feeling” in relation to self-efficacy: “self-efficacy … seems to imply a degree of preparedness by virtue of training, experience, or talent” (p. 50). In the rest of her study preparedness is presented as related to self-efficacy, where she developed the “Student Teachers’ Feelings of Preparedness to Teach” (PREP) Scale, capturing preparedness through direct questions such as “I feel prepared to …” with answers scored on a 7-point semantic differential scale anchored with “very poorly prepared” at one end and “almost completely prepared” at the other end (Housego, 1992, pp. 53-54). In this way it is the study participants’ definition of preparedness which is captured.

Schyns (2004) defines preparedness in the context of occupational change as “the wish to take over a task with higher task demands … than those that existed in the previous task,” which implies a condition of readiness or competence with the existing task (p. 250). This is relevant to this study because when teachers are asked to teach a subject for which they are not qualified, they are being asked in effect to change positions and conduct a task for which they have not had sufficient training. Schyns defines preparedness further as consisting of qualifications gained prior to the
change of task, in the midst of the process of task change, and after the changes have been introduced. In a teaching context this addresses the prior training or experience of the teacher and the in-service training and supports available to the teacher, as making up their perception of preparedness. In Schyns’ model, leadership and self-efficacy are determinants for preparedness for occupational change and adaptation to new demands. Therefore, a person’s perception of their self-efficacy influences their preparedness to take on additional responsibilities. It is but one element leading to a perception of preparedness (Schyns, 2004).

Hudson and Hudson (2007) describe their measurement of teachers’ perceptions of their abilities to complete a teaching task effectively (i.e., likert-scale survey items including “I believe that I am able to discuss artworks and their properties” and “I believe that I am able to demonstrate various visual effects”) as an indication of perceptions of their preparedness (p. 18). Brannon and Fiene (2013) use preparedness in a similar way. They do not directly address the concept, rather they use it as a way to describe the degree to which they assess the congruence of their participants’ training and experience with successful task completion.

Despite the different uses of the term preparedness in the literature, it is most commonly captured through direct measurement of participants’ feelings or perceptions of their own abilities and preparedness (e.g., “I feel prepared to…”), or participants’ perceptions of others’ preparedness (e.g., “preservice teachers engage in an appropriate amount of observation time to prepare them for their instructional experience”), which in effect relies on the participants’ perception of the meaning of the term “prepared” or “preparedness” (Al-Bataineh, 2009; Crosswell & Beutel, 2012; Housego, 1992).

Preparedness therefore lies somewhere between a feeling of preparedness and a perception of ability (which is closer to self-efficacy), while including an element of preparation. For the purposes of this study, preparedness will be defined using the aforementioned definition of teacher
efficacy as a basis for adding this additional dimension: A teacher’s belief that they have the appropriate training, resources, and personal experience to organize and execute the courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular area.

For this study, in addition to capturing information about the preparation and training of teachers and their perceptions of their abilities to effectively complete these teaching tasks, the concept of “comfort” captures an aspect of calm and confidence which can only be attained through adequate preparation and feelings of efficacy.

Teachers who feel prepared to teach a subject will rate their confidence level higher due to their perceptions of being prepared to do so. Comfort and confidence are often used interchangeably in the research literature. For example, Oreck (2004) reported survey results as that “teachers seem more comfortable with the visual, as opposed to the performing, arts” although comfort was not a survey item and not examined in the theoretical framework. Confidence was measured in the attitude items, but comfort was not. This conflation reflects the widespread confusion around this term while asserting its connection with confidence.

Confidence as conceptualized by Holroyd and Harlen (1996) is “a feeling of self-assurance, a feeling that some tasks can probably be completed with the knowledge and skills one possesses and without having to call on others for rescue” (p. 326, as cited in Hennessy, Rolfe and Chedzoy, 2001, p. 57). Due to the similarity of this concept with self-efficacy, it was decided that it may be more useful to use comfort as the most relevant measure of the desired construct.

In the present study, participants are asked to rate their perception of their comfort directly, without proxy measures or complex inter-item factors. Barry (1996) describes the results of her study assessing teacher candidates’ comfort teaching in multicultural situations, and does not address a meaning of comfort in her literature review or theoretical framework. Rather it is presented alone as a conceptual item in her instrument, for the participant to self-define and score themselves on a
likert scale. O’Connor-Clarke et al. (1988) developed a 28-item instrument to measure comfort in clinical teaching settings that included three factors: authority, sensitivity, and capability. They quote Brophy’s finding that “congruence in the intrapersonal relationship between the self-concept and the ideal self is one of the most fundamental conditions for both general happiness and satisfaction in specific life areas” (1959, p. 300, as cited in O’Connor-Clarke et al., 1988, p. 1083) which they assessed to be a key definition of comfort. In these studies, as in the current study, since comfort is self-assessed, it is the participants’ view of the meaning of this term that is most important, which will be captured in part by the item “How comfortable are you at teaching the performing arts?”

The concepts discussed above can be applied to investigation of teacher classroom practice and attitudes, and inform the research design and data analyses in the current study to gain a perspective on a theoretical site at the intersection of self-efficacy, preparedness, confidence, and comfort.
CHAPTER 4: METHOD

A primarily quantitative, survey-based design was used to respond to the research questions. There are limited data and few studies approaching these questions in a broad manner, as they are quite difficult to quantify. This study builds on previous studies, including the work of Beatty (2001), Morin (1984), Oreck (2001), Shand (1982), and Shand and Bartel (1993) regarding music and arts education practices in elementary classrooms.

It was my aim in this study to establish broad baseline data on all aspects of performing arts instruction in Ontario schools, including infrastructure, teachers, written policy and ad hoc solutions ‘on the ground’; a survey instrument was designed specifically for this study. This study had two phases: (a) survey instrument design and development, and; (b) provincial administration of survey.

Phase 1: Survey Instrument Design and Development

The research instrument developed for this study, entitled the “State of the Arts Survey” (SAS), is a comprehensive survey designed to gather broad data on (a) teachers’ attitudes towards teaching the performing arts, (b) instructional practices in the performing arts, and (c) teachers’ training and experience in the performing arts. Descriptions of school structures, administrative support, and pedagogical data were also captured with this survey in order to clarify other potential effect factors and provide additional context. The survey was developed over a period of 10 months, from January to October 2013. This developmental period involved two stages: (a) initial survey design, and (b) expert review and practitioner consultation.

Stage 1: Initial survey design. The initial survey design stage included a review of the relevant literature and extant instruments measuring similar concepts, which influenced question stems and scales (see Chapter 3). Existing measures of self-efficacy (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001; Sherer & Maddux, 1982; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001) and arts education
programming and instruction (Beatty, 2001; Morin, 1984; Oreck, 2001) were further considered, but these did not adequately fit this context or address the research questions. The survey was designed to gather data surrounding the demographic and training characteristics of the teachers, the structural and infrastructural constraints and opportunities within schools, teachers’ descriptions of their pedagogy and implementation, and teachers’ perceptions of their comfort and effectiveness in teaching the performing arts. The survey was designed to also give teachers an opportunity to reflect on their training and pedagogy and the connection between them, and offer them a chance to comment on the challenges they face in these areas.

The survey was designed and administered using an online electronic survey platform, “FluidSurveys”, licensed and approved for use by Queen’s University researchers. A mix of dichotomous, open, and visual-analogue items were created over a period of four months before the “beta” version of the survey was distributed for feedback. This initial survey consisted of six demographic questions, five training questions, nine instructional/pedagogical questions, six questions regarding extracurricular activities visitors and field trips, one question regarding resources, five arts-integration questions, and three questions about suggested improvements to professional development and instructional support for teachers.

During this initial design stage, two focus groups helped to guide the design of the survey. The survey was first presented to the Arts Committee of the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario (ETFO), whose members offered suggestions and voiced concerns. This perspective was valuable not only for the expertise of the ETFO arts committee members, but it helped to clarify aspects of the survey which could be perceived by some teachers as problematic or offensive. Primary concerns raised in this focus group were about clarity of terms (i.e., making sure that language was plain enough so that non-specialists could understand them and not “feel bad about themselves and their abilities”) and to ensure that survey items were not evaluative in nature. There
was concern that asking an ETFO member to reveal any deficiencies in the performance of another ETFO member was inherently problematic for teachers. This feedback led to changes in wording and removal of some questions, although some evaluative components were retained to address the research questions.

The second focus group occurred during a first year Master’s of Education class on educational research methods. Fifteen students gave verbal feedback and asked questions about items as we worked through the preliminary instrument as a group, helping to clarify terms and identify layout and scale issues, and to test usability and coherence in the interface and question design. Some changes were made to items at this stage, including wording changes and the addition of more qualitative response options.

Survey questions were primarily quantitative, designed to gather a large range of data that could be analyzed to respond to the research questions. Qualitative items were collected for secondary analysis. Most qualitative items asked participants to provide further details on their scaled item responses (e.g., “if other, please explain”, or, “if you wish to comment further on the questions on this page, please do so below”). This opportunity for open-ended responses allowed participants to respond more fully about their experience and to give feedback on the survey design, and offered potential for gathering answers outside of the given choices.

**Stage 2: Expert review.** After the initial design of the survey was complete, an expert review panel was convened to aid in refining survey items. The purpose of this panel was to specifically examine the content of survey items and ensure that items aligned with the intended research questions. Data obtained from the expert review provided content validity information (Berk, 1990; Cantrill, Sibbald, & Buetow, 1998) to ensure that the survey provided valuable information on teachers' training, attitudes, and praxis.
In July and August 2013, experts in the areas of (a) arts education research, (b) arts teaching, and (c) survey design reviewed drafts of the survey and made suggestions for improvements. Experts were selected based on the following criteria: expertise in arts education; expertise in survey design and analysis; expertise in survey research in arts education; expertise in quantitative data analysis; expertise in teacher training, and; expertise in program evaluation. Additionally, 10 practicing Ontario elementary teachers were consulted during this development stage to ensure clarity and understanding of the items from a sample of the target population.

The expert panelists and the 10 teachers were all asked to complete the survey, and describe their reactions to the questions. They were also asked to comment on the nature of the questions, the layout of the survey, and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the instrument. They had an opportunity to respond to the survey online, and respond with written comments via email. All feedback was considered and guided revisions to the instrument. Revisions were made based on their comments, primarily related to wording, question format, and scales.

The resulting survey consists of 46 questions: Ten demographic questions, five training/experience questions, three questions regarding teacher efficacy, eleven pedagogical/structural questions, seven questions regarding extracurricular arts opportunities, two questions about resources, four questions about arts integration, and four questions about suggestions for improving performing arts education in Ontario.

In total, 324 separate variables were collected (21 qualitative items and 303 quantitative items) in six categories: (a) demographic (58 variables: 51 quantitative, 7 qualitative); (b) training/experience (70 variables: 67 quantitative, 3 qualitative); (c) perceptions of teacher efficacy (10 variables, all quantitative); (d) pedagogical/structural (134 variables: 126 quantitative, 8 qualitative), (e) arts integration pedagogical/structural (36 variables, all quantitative), and (f) improvements/reflection (16 variables: 13 quantitative and 3 qualitative).
Phase 2: Provincial Administration of Survey Participants and Recruitment

The population relevant to this study was public elementary school teachers in Ontario, all of whom were members of the Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario (ETFO). ETFO lists on their website a membership of 76,000 teachers. The primary target population consisted of generalist teachers, but data from specialist and highly-trained teachers were also collected, offering opportunities for comparisons between groups. No population demographic data regarding the gender, age, Full-Time Equivalency (FTE), training, certification, or job classification/title are available for this population, so sample characteristics will not be able to be evaluated for representativeness.

Participants were recruited via numerous methods. First, formal requests for ethical approval and board co-operation were submitted to 21 school boards. Ethical approval was sought from the two largest boards in the province (Ottawa and Toronto) and from 19 additional randomly selected school boards. Two of the school boards responded positively, two boards asked for amendments to be made to the instrument or the process, 10 responded negatively, and 7 did not respond to the request for ethical approval. Some replies cited reasons for the rejection of the request to conduct research. The most cited reason was that the survey asked teachers to be evaluative of colleagues or themselves; the second most-cited reason was that board policy forbids remuneration; the third most-cited reason was concern for the teachers’ time, the fourth most-cited reason was that the research board felt that the instrument didn't adequately address the research questions. In all, three school boards participated in recruitment for this study on condition that they not be identified, none representing a large urban centre.

Participants were then recruited through “Facebook,” through posts to teacher resource-sharing groups of a link to the study and an explanatory note and video. Six teacher resource-sharing groups were targeted for this recruitment, with a total membership of approximately 24,000 teachers.
Participants were also recruited via personal networks, using a stock email script (See Appendix 2). Professional groups, including CODE (Council of Ontario Drama and Dance Educators), OMEA (Ontario Music Educators Association), CNAL (Canadian Network for Arts and Learning), and People for Education were also contacted about distributing the survey link to their membership. It is unknown how many people actually received the invitation to participate in this study, so a response rate cannot be calculated.

Of the 214 participants who began completing the survey online, 46 of them stopped completing the survey before the dependent variable data were collected. Additionally, 6 participants who teach only secondary grades were eliminated. Of the 161 remaining participants, 23 participants indicated that they taught at private ($n = 5$), or Catholic ($n = 16$) school boards, and these participants were eliminated from all analyses. Participants who indicated other school board ($n = 2$), were also separated from the rest of the sample and not included in analyses of the public elementary schools. Two participants were removed because they indicated that they were “retired” and a “consultant”.

The final sample consisted of 138 elementary educators teaching in non-Catholic publicly funded schools in Ontario. All participants ($N = 138$) navigated first to a letter of information describing the study design and their participation, and indicated their active and informed consent to participate.

Remuneration was offered to participants in the form of an opportunity to enter a draw to win one of ten (10) Starbucks Coffee gift cards and one (1) Canadian Tire gift card, awarded by random selection. In order to enter the draw while preserving participant anonymity, a link to a separate survey for entering contact information was provided at the end of the main survey. Seventy-nine participants asked to be considered in the raffle, and 62 of these participants chose to give their contact information for follow-up interviews and future research.
Data Collection

The survey was administered electronically to all participants via “Fluidsurveys,” an online survey platform licensed for use by Queen’s University. Participation was entirely anonymous, and no identifying data (i.e., IP address, location, email address) were collected. Anonymity was assured because participants were asked to provide sensitive information and potentially controversial opinions about their professional abilities and practice, and evaluative comments about their peers, their local supervisors, and their employers. The online survey was opened for data collection on March 17, 2014 and closed on August 1, 2014.

Data Analyses

A number of analyses were conducted to respond to the identified research questions. Demographic characteristics of teachers were identified and analyzed through descriptive statistics. Demographic data included descriptions of teacher training, qualifications and experience (i.e., age, gender, full-time equivalency [FTE], Grade level/subjects taught), teacher training and previous experience in the performing arts, teacher qualification (specialist/non-specialist), and school context (i.e., community size, student access to extracurricular arts activities, space and infrastructure for performing arts activities, teacher access to performing arts mentors or resources). Participants also answered questions about their perception of their challenges in teaching these subjects, and were offered an opportunity to describe ways that they think it could be better.

Aside from describing the conditions surrounding teachers’ experiences of performing arts instruction in Ontario, three additional questions were posed to find out if teachers feel comfortable and qualified to teach the Arts, and examine how their training and comfort may impact their perceived ability to meet the requirements of the mandated curriculum: (a) do teachers’ level of training and experience impact class time teaching the Performing Arts, (b) do teachers’ level of training and experience impact their feelings of comfort in teaching the performing arts, and (c) do
teachers’ level of training and experience impact their perception of the degree to which they adhere to the expectations of the curriculum document. The dependent variables used to answer these questions are defined by individual survey items. The minutes variables were an open response question, “For your students, how many minutes per week are dedicated to subject-specific instruction in: (music, drama, dance).” The comfort variables were “How comfortable are you with teaching the Performing Arts? (music, drama, dance),” with the responses collected using a 7-point semantic differential scale, anchored with not comfortable at one end and very comfortable on the other. The expectations variables were measured on a forced-choice interval scale, with options of Less than 20%, 20%-40%, 40%-60%, 60%-80%, and more than 80% in response to the question, “To what extent does your Performing Arts instruction cover the Ministry expectations as outlined in the Ontario curriculum document?”

Grouping variables based on training and experience were created to form independent variables for ANOVAs. Using participants’ responses to the three questions regarding training and experience, they were grouped into low, medium, and high training groups for each of these variables for music, drama, and dance (see Chapter 5 for more detailed description of these grouping variables). These training and experience variables became the primary independent grouping variables for the study. These variables were analyzed against the following dependent variables: (a) teachers’ perceptions of their comfort teaching these subjects, (b) teachers’ perceptions of their adherence to the Ministry of Education curricular expectations for the performing arts, (c) weekly class time dedicated to the Arts in minutes; (d) pedagogical approaches used by teachers to teach the performing arts, and (e) extracurricular activities available to students.

Relationships between these responses were described using ANOVA and bivariate (Pearson r) correlations. All results were considered to be significant at the p < .05 level.
Bonferroni and Scheffe post hoc tests were used for ANOVAs. In addition, in some cases non-parametric tests (e.g. Spearman rank correlations, Welch F-tests) were used in cases where violations of normality were considered to warrant these analyses. In certain cases, correlations and non-parametric tests were also conducted where appropriate, as described below.

Qualitative responses were analyzed using an inductive coding protocol to illuminate common responses and themes (Patton, 2002), and are reported with the quantitative results to provide a more complete description of the situation, and a more detailed depiction of teachers’ lived experiences.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

The results presented below address the first research question by describing the conditions surrounding performing arts instruction in Ontario public elementary schools, including the infrastructure and pedagogy used to facilitate these experiences, through descriptive analyses of survey responses and other analyses. The other three research questions, which ask about the relationship between teachers’ training and experience in the performing arts to their perceptions of their effectiveness, comfort, and quantity of instruction, are addressed through participants’ quantitative and qualitative responses.

In this chapter, descriptive statistics are reported first to give an overall picture of the conditions surrounding classroom instruction in the performing arts in Ontario schools. Then, training and experience factors are used to define groups within the sample, and ANOVAs and t-tests are used to describe the differences between groups on the following dependent measures: (a) perceived comfort (the comfort variables, in response to the question “How comfortable are you with teaching the Performing arts?”); (b) perceived effectiveness (the expectations variables, in response to the question “To what extent does your performing arts instruction cover the Ministry expectations as outlined in the Ontario curriculum document?”); and (c) instructional minutes per week (the minutes variables, in response to the question “For your students, how many minutes per week are dedicated to subject-specific instruction in: [music, drama, dance]).

Demographic Information on Participants

Of the 138 valid respondents, 92 participants indicated that they taught Primary Grades (i.e., Grades K-3), 87 indicated that they taught Junior Grades (i.e., Grades 4, 5, and 6), and 47 indicated that they taught Intermediate Grades (i.e., Grades 7 and 8). The grouping of these participants by division was complicated by the fact that many teachers taught in more than one division.

Participants were initially further subdivided into those who taught in only one or in multiple
divisions: 43 participants taught only Primary Grades, 25 participants taught only Junior Grades, and 8 participants taught only Intermediate Grades, while 23 participants taught Primary and Junior Grades, 13 participants taught Junior and Intermediate Grades, and 26 participants taught in all three divisions (Table 1). These divisions were considered to be unwieldy and confusing, so Chi-square analyses were conducted to demonstrate the validity of simplifying the grouping into three groups: (a) Primary \( n = 92 \), (b) Junior \( n = 87 \), and (c) Intermediate \( n = 47 \). Participants who taught in all three divisions were considered separately for each divisional analyses, (i.e., those who indicated teaching in the Primary, Junior, and Intermediate divisions were considered to be a part of all three groups).

In order to demonstrate the statistical similarities of these simplified groupings, Chi-square tests were performed to compare the responses of Junior and Junior/Intermediate respondents on teachers’ years of experience expressed by Full Time Equivalency (FTE) \( \chi^2 (4, n = 38) = 2.90, p = .574 \), and the comfort-music variables \( \chi^2 (6, n = 22) = 8.33, p = .215 \), which showed no significant differences between the groups. These two groups were different in size for the comfort-music variable (Junior \( n = 17 \), Junior/Intermediate \( n = 4 \)), which was another factor motivating the decision to group those participants into three instead of seven divisional groups.

Additional Chi-square tests were performed on the Primary and Primary/Junior respondents, which verified the association between these participants on the FTE \( \chi^2 (6, n = 66) = 5.70, p = .457 \), and the comfort-music variable \( \chi^2 (6, n = 50) = 5.44, p = .488 \). This provided further statistical justification that the groups could be analyzed separately to describe the overall educational experiences of students in each Grade division. An independent samples t-test was also performed to test the differences between the Primary only \( n = 40 \) and Primary-Junior \( n = 10 \) participants for the comfort-music, comfort-drama, and comfort-dance variables, and the results showed no significant difference between the groups on any of the measures \( t(49) = 1.11, p \)
\[ t = .272; \text{comfort-drama: } t(49) = .99, \; p = .324, \text{comfort-dance: } t(49) = 1.03, \; p = .306. \]

Therefore, the groupings for division were retained as Primary Grades, Junior Grades, and Intermediate Grades, with some crossover in participants between categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary only</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior only</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate only</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Junior</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/Intermediate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Intermediate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Junior/Intermediate</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural community (less than 2,000 people)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>town (2,000 - 30,000 people)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small city (30,000 - 90,000 people)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium city (90,000 - 200,000 people)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large city (more than 200,000 people)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you currently teach?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years of experience.** Participants’ years of experience ranged from 0 to 34 years of FTE \( n = 130 \), with a mean value of 10.99 years \( M = 10.99, SD = 8.69 \). Half the participants had less than 10 years of full-time teaching experience. Demographic characteristics for the population (ETFO research department, private telephone conversation, August 2014), were used to determine the
representativeness of the sample in this regard. Data were first combined into year categories to match the binned reporting style of the population data obtained from ETFO (i.e., 0-4 years, 5-10 years, etc.); a weighted cases approach was then used to conduct a Chi-square test of association on the sample data against the population data. Results of the Chi-square analysis show a rejection of the null hypothesis of association between the distribution of years of experience scores in the sample and population statistics, $\chi^2 (6, n = 130) = 69.734, p < .01$, which demonstrates that this sample is not representative of the general population’s years of teaching experience distribution. This significant difference between the sample characteristics and the population characteristics should be considered when reading the results, as the sample for this study generally has a lower mean years of experience than the population at large and is not representative of the population in that regard.

**Gender.** The gender breakdown of the group was 120 female, 17 male, and 1 unidentified individual. A Chi-square analysis of these data was conducted to compare the sample characteristics against the population values of 81% female and 19% male (ETFO, private telephone conversation, August 2014), $\chi^2(1, n = 129) = 3.64, p = .056$. These results show that the distribution of sample scores are not significantly different from those of the population, and while it should be noted that the sample contains proportionally more female participants than the population, the sample is statistically similar to the population in that regard.

**Geographic representation.** Participants identified their school board by name, which allowed coding by geographic region and type of school. A map showing the participants’ geographic location (Appendix 3), was created using the postal code of their school board and mapped using an online mapping platform. Overall, the sample from this study represents teachers from every geographic region of Ontario, although it is likely to not be proportionally representative in this regard. Since none of the official education bodies (the Ontario Ministry of Education, the
Ontario College of Teachers, or the Elementary Teachers Federation of Ontario) keep public records of the geographic distribution of teachers, it is impossible to determine the degree to which the sample is not proportionally representative.

The distribution of the respondents according to their reporting of the population density of the community in which their school is located (Table 1) was 12% rural community (less than 2,000 people), 18% town (2,000 - 30,000 people), 10% small city (30,000 - 90,000 people), 29% medium city (90,000 - 200,000 people), and 29% large city (more than 200,000 people).

**Language of instruction.** Participants were asked to describe the primary language of instruction in their school (Table 1). Teachers indicated English (n = 115), French (n = 10), English and French (n = 12) or other (n = 1). No population data are available to compare these data for representativeness, and these data were not used as grouping or comparison variables for any analysis.

**Training during initial teacher education program.** Participants were asked if they wished that there had been more opportunities to learn about the performing arts during their initial teacher education program. To address concerns that this question might be construed as leading, a neutral option was offered in addition to a yes or no option. Of the 128 participants who answered the music question, 55% said that they wished for more opportunities to learn music, and 7% answered no.

For drama (n = 127), 70% said that they wished for more opportunities during their initial teacher education program, and 6% answered no. For dance, (n = 124), 70% said that they wished there had been more opportunities to learn about dance during their initial teacher education program, and 6% answered no. It is clear from these results that more than 50% of teachers wish that they had had more opportunities to learn about the performing arts during their initial teacher education programs.
Teaching specialization. Some participants indicated that they were a music teacher \(n = 34\), visual art teacher \(n = 13\), dance teacher \(n = 13\), drama teacher \(n = 18\), physical education teacher \(n = 14\) or teacher-librarian \(n = 3\). These responses do not align with participant responses around training as subject specialists as assessed later in the survey, so it is assumed that for some participants these responses do not indicate a position of employment as a subject specialist in these areas, but instead represent special aspects of their responsibilities as a generalist teacher with designated performing arts teaching responsibilities. The difference in response illuminates issues with the internal validity of this item, and it was disregarded in analyses due to the various potential interpretations of the item stem. The term “designated arts teacher” is used to denote a teacher who has designated teaching responsibilities in the subject area but does not have official specialist certification.

Teaching specialization for the purposes of analysis was therefore assessed using participants’ responses to survey items about their formal training in the art form and training in the teaching of the art form. For this study teachers with a high degree of training in an art form were considered to be specialists in the area, which included participants with a bachelor’s degree (or higher) in the subject area, three “Additional Qualification” courses (AQ’s) in the subject area, or substantial relevant other experience (i.e., Grade 8 piano or above, over ten years of formal training in the subject area). From this analysis, participants were identified as music specialists \(n = 39\), drama specialists \(n = 1\), dance specialists \(n = 3\), music/dance specialists \(n = 4\), and drama/dance specialists \(n = 1\). The remaining 90 teachers were considered to be generalist teachers. The 5 participants who qualified as specialists in more than one subject area were considered separately in the different subject-specific analyses.
Some teachers of the arts are employed as specialty teachers and were hired specifically for this purpose while having no formal training in the art form. This phenomenon was only illuminated by the qualitative responses:

I am not a specialist but I can read music and play some band instruments, sing, and WANTED to do it, so I got the job. My contract is for Music and French - not exactly an easy contract to fill so my principal was happy enough that I had some music background. To be clear, I have not taken a single music education course and do not know what I am doing :) But I am figuring it out and I love it. (music/french teacher)

Some teachers without official training or specialty in the subject report working as a performing arts teacher because of their interest as a teacher already employed in the school in another capacity: “A designated music teacher delivers the music program and covers dance during part of her time with my classroom students. This is not a specialist teacher” (generalist teacher).

While many participants described their success as non-trained arts teachers, some specialist teachers dismiss the abilities of those without formal training:

Ensuring [that] a music specialist is teaching music is key to making sure that all students have high-quality music education. Too often, the music teachers in our board are teachers who have had some musical experience (such as playing trombone in Grade 8) who are willing to teach music. (specialist teacher)

Other teachers lament the lack of consistency of qualifications of the itinerant arts teachers in their board:

Itinerant arts teachers in our school board do not need to have any arts training or education in order to get the job. So it's a bit 'hit and miss.' We've had outstanding IA teachers and mediocre ones. So perhaps demanding more qualifications would help but them the board would probably have a hard time filling the positions. (generalist teacher)
There were mixed opinions about the “natural” ability to teach the arts versus how much those skills could be learned, but most agreed that some professional development was important: “The teacher in my school who covers the K-2 classes for music is not a specialist, and does not seek out any PD. It should be a requirement of the position that a teacher at least get their AQs within a reasonable space of time” (specialist teacher). This discussion about the benefits of having a specialist teacher has been going on for years, and the data illuminate its continued prevalence in schools. Data from this study did not provide any new answers in this regard, as the dependent measures described a teacher’s perception of their practice and abilities, and was not a criterion-based measure.

**Training in the Performing Arts.** Participants were asked to describe their training and experience in each of the three performing arts (music, drama, and dance) in three main categories: (a) formal training in the art form, (b) formal training in instruction of the art form, and (c) experiences outside school settings in the art form. Table 2 describes the final twelve (12) grouping variables for training and experience. Details of the grouping process and final groups are described separately below, separated by type of training/experience and subject (i.e., formal training in the performing arts [music, drama, dance], formal training in performing arts education [music, drama, dance], experiences outside school settings in the performing arts [music, drama, dance], and overall training and experience in the performing arts [music, drama, dance]).

For music, 45% of generalist teachers ($n = 86$) say that their students are taught by a subject specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in the subject. For drama, 5.8% of teachers say that their students are taught by a subject specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in the subject. For dance, 4.6% of teachers say that their students are taught by a subject specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in the subject.

Considering that there are many ways in which someone may gather the skills to effectively teach the performing arts in our schools, data were gathered to describe training in three categories:
(a) formal training in the art form, (b) formal training in instruction of the art form, and (c) experiences in the art form outside school settings. They are analyzed separately in an attempt to gather broad data surrounding the factors influencing a teacher’s performing arts instruction.

Table 2
Participant Grouping Variables and Sample for Training Characteristics (N = 138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Training Level</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Training in the Performing Arts</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>no training</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some training</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>highly trained</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>no training</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some training</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>no training</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some training</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Training in Performing Arts</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>no training</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>some training</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>no training</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some training</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>no training</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some training</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Experience in the Performing Arts</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>no experience</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lessons as a child only</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adult experiences</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>highly experienced</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>no experience</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some experience</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>no experience</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lessons as a child only</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adult experiences</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formal training in the performing arts—music.** Participants were asked about their formal training in music. Four groups were created based on their responses: no training—music, some training—music, medium degree of training—music, and highly trained—music. Participants who answered parts of this question or later questions in the survey, and who did not indicate any training in response to this item, were considered to be in the no training—music group. Participants indicating 1–3
college/university courses and some equivalent other experience were considered to be in the some training-music group. Participants indicating Royal Conservatory Grades 2−7, 4−6 college/university courses, college diploma, or equivalent other experience were put into the medium degree of training-music group. Participants indicating Royal Conservatory Grade 8 or higher, bachelor’s degree, or master’s degree were considered to have a high degree of training in music. For example, a participant who did not indicate any experience but ticked other and described their additional experience as very involved in drum corps from age 7 to age 32 was considered to be in the medium training-music group because of the length of their significant experience in a musical training environment. A participant who described their other training as self-taught musician was placed in the no training-music group because their training was not formal. This participant’s experience was considered in the experiences outside school settings question and grouped accordingly.

In the analyses, the medium training-music group (n = 10) was combined with the some training-music group (n = 10) to ensure similar-size groupings for analyses. Therefore, the final groupings were no training-music (n = 77), some training-music (n = 19), and highly trained-music (n = 42). In total, 56% of participants reported having no training in music, and 30% of respondents were highly trained.

**Formal training in the performing arts—drama.** Participants were asked to describe their formal training in drama. Initially, the intent was to group them into three groups: no training-drama, some training-drama, and highly trained-drama. The no training-drama group were gathered from missing responses, the some training-drama group would be defined by an indication of 1–3 university courses or similar other training, and the highly trained-drama group would consist of participants who indicated any of: (a) professional theatre program, (b) 4–6 university courses, (c) college diploma, (d) bachelor’s degree, (e) master’s degree, (f) PhD, or (g) other similar experience. However, very few participants had any experience in drama, so these groupings yielded very small some training (n = 8) and highly trained (n =
9) groups. The two trained groups were combined and the final groupings for the new formal training-drama variable were: (a) no training-drama \((n = 121)\), and (b) some training-drama \((n = 17)\). In total, 88% of teachers reported having no training in drama, and 7% of teachers are highly trained in drama.

**Formal training in the performing arts—dance.** Participants were asked to describe their formal training in dance. Response options for this variable were (a) professional dance program, (b) 1–3 college/university courses, (c) 4–6 college/university courses, (d) college diploma, (e) bachelor’s degree, (f) master’s degree, (g) PhD, and (h) other. As with the drama training variable, the intended groupings of low, medium and high training groups were ineffective due to low response rates from any teachers with training in this area. Two groups were therefore defined in a new dichotomous variable: (i) no training-dance \((n = 129)\), and (ii) some training-dance \((n = 9)\). Within the some training-dance group, 7 participants were considered to be highly trained in dance, and the remainder indicated only 1–3 university courses or similar other experience. In total, 93% of participant teachers reported having no training in dance, and 5% of participant teachers reported being highly trained.

**Formal training in performing arts instruction—music.** Participants were asked to describe their level of training in music education. The response options were: (a) AQ level 1, (b) AQ level 2, (c) specialist (3 AQs), (d) bachelor’s degree in performing arts education, (e) master’s degree in performing arts education, (f) PhD, and (g) other. The intended grouping for this variable was three groups: (a) no training-music instruction \((n = 102)\), (b) some training-music instruction \((n = 13)\), and (c) highly trained-music instruction \((n = 23)\). The some training-music instruction group had indicated completion of AQ level 1, AQ level 2, or similar other experience, and the highly trained-music instruction group indicated training at any of the other higher levels or similar other experience. To increase the power of the analyses, the some training-music instruction and highly trained-music instruction groups were combined to make a new some training-music instruction group \((n = 36)\) for statistical analysis purposes. In total, 74% of teachers
reported having no training in music instruction, and 17% of teachers reported being highly trained in music instruction.

**Formal training in performing arts education—drama.** Participants were asked to describe their level of training in dance instruction. The response options were: (a) AQ level 1, (b) AQ level 2, (c) specialist (3 AQs), (d) bachelor’s degree in performing arts education, (e) master’s degree in performing arts education, (f) PhD, and (g) other. Again, the a priori groupings were discarded due to a low response from teachers with any training in drama. Two groups were defined for a new dichotomous grouping variable: (a) no training-drama instruction (n = 125), and (b) some training-drama instruction (n = 13). Within the some training-drama instruction group, 4 participants are considered highly trained according to the procedure outlined in the previous section “Formal training in performing arts instruction—music.” In total, 91% of participant teachers were considered to have no training in drama instruction, and 3% of teachers were considered to have a high degree of training in drama instruction.

**Formal training in performing arts education—dance.** Participants were asked to describe their level of training in dance instruction. The response options were: (a) AQ level 1, (b) AQ level 2, (c) specialist (i.e., 3 AQs), (d) bachelor’s degree in performing arts education, (e) master’s degree in performing arts education, (f) PhD, and (g) other. Due to low response rate from teachers with any training in dance, the a priori groupings were disregarded and participants were grouped into either the no training-dance instruction (n = 134) and some training-dance instruction groups (n = 4). The low number of teachers with any training in dance education limits the power of any comparative analysis on this variable. In total, 91% of participant teachers were considered to have no training in dance instruction, and 3% of teachers reported having a high degree of training in dance instruction.

**Experiences outside school settings—music.** Participants were asked to describe their experience of the performing arts outside of formal training. Participants were offered the following
choices to describe their experiences in all performing arts areas: (a) took lessons as a child, (b) took
lessons as an adult, (c) community arts organization participant (community theatre, choir, etc.), (d) professional
experience, and (e) other. A new grouping variable was created to divide participants into four groups:
(a) no experience-outside experience music ($n = 42$), (b) lessons as a child only-outside experience music ($n = 25$),
(c) adult experiences-outside experience music ($n = 43$), and (d) highly experienced-outside experience music ($n = 28$). The adult experience-outside experience music group consists of participants who responded to one or
two of the variables in addition to took lessons as a child, not including the professional experience variable.
The highly experienced-outside experience music group answered yes to more than four of the variables,
including professional experience and/or substantial other experience. In total, 30% of participant teachers
were considered to have no experience in music, 18% reported having only lessons as a child, while
20% of teachers reported having substantial experience in music outside school settings.

**Experiences outside school settings—drama.** Participants were asked to describe their
experiences in drama outside of formal and school settings, and they reported a variety of
experiences. Some other answers included “university program that specialized in the integration of
drama,” “participation in choirs and community theatre for years,” “professional actor”, and “PD
workshops.” All of these experiences were counted as informal drama experiences, and they were
placed in the some experience-outside experience drama group. Due to the low number of respondents with
lessons as a child only ($n = 6$) and the low number of respondents with a highly experienced-outside experience
drama ($n = 5$) these groups were combined into the some experience-outside experience drama group. The
final groupings for this new dichotomous variable outside experiences in drama were: (a) no experience-
outside experience drama ($n = 91$) and (b) some experience-outside experience drama ($n = 47$). In total, 66% of
participant teachers were considered to have no experience in drama outside school settings, and 4%
of teachers were considered to have a high degree of experience in drama outside school settings.
Experiences outside school settings—dance. For the grouping variable dance experiences outside school settings, participants were initially divided into four groups: no experiences-outside experience dance \((n = 93)\), lessons as a child only-outside experience dance \((n = 21)\), lessons as a child and other adult experiences-outside experience dance \((n = 22)\), and highly experienced-outside experience dance \((n = 2)\). Due to the small number of participants in the highly experienced-outside experience dance group, these participants were combined with the lessons as a child-outside experience dance and other adult experiences-outside experience dance group to form the new group adult experiences-outside experience dance \((n = 24)\). The final groupings for this new variable were: (a) no experiences-outside experience dance \((n = 93)\), (b) lessons as a child only-outside experience dance \((n = 21)\), and (c) adult experiences-outside experience dance \((n = 24)\). In total, 67% of participant teachers were considered to have no experiences in dance outside school settings, and 17% of teachers were considered to have a high degree of experience in dance outside school settings.

Overall training in the performing arts. A combined grouping variable was created for additional exploratory analyses (Table 3). Each of the three questions regarding formal training, formal training in the art form, and outside experience in the art form were used as independent variables for most of the analyses in this study. It became clear through the analysis process that it would be useful to have another combined variable to describe participants’ experiences in some way that combined all three areas of training and experience. Based on grouping scores for each subject variable I established an overall score for participants related to participants’ proficiency, training, and enthusiasm in a particular subject area.

These three subject-specific variables were created by summing the grouping score for each of the three training/experience variables. For music, the no formal training participants received a score of 1, the some formal training participants received a score of 2, and the highly formally trained participants received a score of 4. The no training in the art form participants received a score of 1,
the *some training in education of the art form* participants received a score of 2, and the *highly trained in education of the art form* participants received a score of 3. For experiences outside school settings, the *no outside experience group* received a score of 1, the *some outside experience* participants received a 2, and the *highly experienced* participants received a 3. In this way, a rough score was achieved for each participant ranging from 3 to 11 for music, 3 to 8 for drama, and 3 to 7 for dance. Additional groups were created from these scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable for Overall Training/Experience</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Training Level</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Variable for Overall Training/Experience</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>no overall experience</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some overall experience</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high overall experience</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dram a</td>
<td>no overall experience</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some overall experience</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high overall experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>no overall experience</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some overall experience</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high overall experience</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For music, three groups were created: (a) *no overall experience-music* (*n* = 40), (b) *some overall experience-music* (*n* = 37), and (c) *high overall experience-music* (*n* = 48). Thirteen (13) participants received a score of 6, and were excluded from these analyses to achieve a separation between the *some overall experience-music* group and the *high overall experience-music* group (Table 3). In total, 29% of participants had no experience or training in music of any kind, while 35% of participants were considered to have a high degree of experience and training in music.
The final groupings in the drama category were *no overall experience-drama* \( (n = 85) \), *some overall experience-drama* \( (n = 37) \), *high overall experience-drama* \( (n = 16) \). Overall, 62% of participants had no experiences in drama, 27% had some experience and only 12% of participants were considered to have a high degree of overall experience and training in drama.

The final groupings in the dance category were *no overall experience-dance* \( (n = 90) \), *some overall experience-dance* \( (n = 21) \), *high overall experience-dance* \( (n = 27) \). The majority of participants in this study \( (65\%) \) showed no experience and training in drama, with only 20% reporting a high level of training and outside experiences in drama.

**Instructional Context**

Participants identified the instruction context (i.e., location) in which their students experienced the performing arts education (Table 4). Participants described the space where they engage in performing arts activities from nine choices: (a) dedicated space, (b) shared/multi-purpose room, (c) gymnasium, (d) stage/auditorium, (e) library, (f) their regular classroom, (g) outdoors, (h) other, or (i) don’t know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Music a</th>
<th>Drama b</th>
<th>Dance c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated space</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared/ multi-purpose room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage/Auditorium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our regular classroom</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a n = 100, ^b n = 98, ^c n = 97 \)
For music \((n = 100)\), 47% of respondents said that their students used a *dedicated space* for music instruction, while 49% said that students experienced music instruction in their *regular classroom*. For drama \((n = 98)\), only 14% of respondents had access to a *dedicated space* (8%) or *stage/auditorium* (6%) for their drama instruction, while 84% of respondents said that they used their *regular classroom* and 9% used the *gymnasium*. For dance \((n = 97)\), only 9% had access to a *dedicated space* (7%) or a *stage/auditorium* (3%) for their dance instruction, while 49% of teachers said that their students experience dance instruction in their regular classroom, and 39% use the gymnasium.

**Performing Arts Teachers**

Teachers were asked, “Who teaches the performing arts to your students?” (Table 5). Of the generalist teachers \((n = 86)\) who answered this question, 45% said that their students receive music instruction from a music specialist. 26% of these teachers reported that their students were taught by themselves (a non-specialist), or by a non-specialist colleague (24%). For drama, 64% of participant generalist teachers taught their own drama class, 26% sent their students to a non-specialist colleague, and 6% said that their students were taught by a drama specialist. For dance, 48% of participant generalist teachers reported teaching dance to their own class, 37% sent their students to a non-specialist colleague, and 5% said that their students were taught by a subject specialist.

Teachers were asked to further describe this phenomena of teaching other teachers’ students (Table 6). For music, 62% of participant music specialists taught music to one or more other classes, while 8% of generalist teachers taught music to one or more other classes. For drama, 32% of participant music specialists taught drama to one or more other classes, and 12% of generalist teachers taught drama to one or more other classes. Due to the small number of drama specialists \((n = 2)\) these results are not reported. For dance, 25% of participant music specialists taught dance to one or more other classes, and 12% of generalist teachers taught dance to one or more other classes. Due to the small number of dance specialists \((n = 3)\) these results are not reported.
Table 5
Responses to Survey Question: Who Teaches the Performing Arts Strands to Your Students?
Expressed As Percentage Of Item Response Stratified By Subject Specialty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Respondent Teacher n</th>
<th>A colleague (non-subject specialist)</th>
<th>A colleague (subject specialist)</th>
<th>A visiting subject specialist</th>
<th>No One</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalists</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Specialists</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Specialists</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Drama</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalists</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Specialists</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Dance</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalists</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Specialists</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When analyzed by the overall experience variables (i.e., overall experience in music, drama, or dance), the data show some interesting characteristics (Table 7). Participants who scored themselves highly in music experience were more than 10 times more likely than participants with no overall experience in music to teach multiple other teachers’ music classes: 55% of teachers with high overall music experience scores taught multiple other classes in music, compared with 5% of those teachers with no musical experience. For drama, participants who received a high overall experience score were almost three times more likely to be teaching drama to another teacher’s students (31%)
than teachers with no experience in drama (12%). For dance, teachers who received a high overall score were almost twice as likely to be teaching other teacher’s dance classes (28%) than teachers with a low overall score (16%).

Table 6
Responses To Survey Question, "Do You Teach These Subjects To Other Teachers' Students?"
Stratified By Subject Specialty (Expressed As Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Yes, one other class</th>
<th>Yes, multiple other classes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Generalists</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Specialists</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Generalists</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Specialists</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Generalists</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Specialists</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama and Dance Specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some more highly trained teachers reported that their superior knowledge of the subject makes them better teachers of the subject, and that the lesser-trained teachers do a less effective job of instruction in these areas. A recurring theme among both specialist and generalist teachers participants was that “having a natural enthusiasm and passion for the arts is important to help inspire and teach children” (generalist teacher).
Table 7
Participant Instructional Duties, Stratified by Rough “Overall Experience” Score
(Expressed as Percentage of Grouping Variable Participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants, by experience grouping</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th></th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaches</td>
<td>Teaches</td>
<td>Teaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>own students</td>
<td>one other class</td>
<td>multiple other classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample response</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No overall experience</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some overall experience</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High overall experience</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No overall experience</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some overall experience</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High overall experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No overall experience</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some overall experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High overall experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Pedagogy

Participants were asked to describe many different aspects of how frequently their students experienced different types of instruction for each of the three performing arts subjects. Responses were gathered separately for instrumental and non-instrumental music, but these responses were combined in the analyses under the heading of “music.” Participants were asked to describe the frequency of these activities according to the following scale: 1 = never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = monthly, 4 = weekly.

The survey included branching coding to skip the pedagogy questions if a teacher did not teach that subject to their students. However, there was a coding issue that allowed teachers who did not teach these subjects to their students to answer questions surrounding the nature of the activities in which their students participated. While not ideal, this question does capture data about teachers’ perceptions of the activities their students are experiencing, which comes mostly from the perspective of teachers teaching the subject. Whether the additional participants were commenting on their own integrated instruction or their perceptions of their colleagues’ instruction is not clear. Both numbers are clearly reported below.

For music, 62 teachers reported that their students experience non-instrumental music activities, and only 50 teachers indicated that they teach this subject to their students. These participants responded to the question “How often do your students participate in the following activities during regular school hours?” (i.e., non-instrumental music, instrumental music, drama, and dance; see Appendix 3 for the full list of activities, described in Tables 8, 9, and 10).

In response to the question regarding non-instrumental music activities, 56 of the 62 respondents said that they performed at least some of the non-instrumental activities weekly. A new variable was added to reflect the summed score of each activity, which was used to rank the pedagogical techniques in subject categories (i.e., music, drama, dance). The three highest scoring
items were: (a) listening to music, (b) body percussion (clapping, snapping, patching, etc), and (c) vocal music. The three lowest scoring items were: (a) composition, (b) invented/graphic notation, and (c) improvisation. These rankings are almost identical to a ranking of items based on the number of instances they were rated weekly or monthly.

For the sub-question regarding instrumental music activities, 62 teachers responded that they engage in some of these activities with their students (Primary, \( n = 44 \); Junior, \( n = 41 \); Intermediate, \( n = 25 \)). Thirty-six (36) of the 62 respondents performed at least some of these instrumental activities weekly. A new variable was added to reflect the summed score of each activity, which was used to rank the pedagogical techniques in terms of overall frequency. The three highest scoring items were: (a) playing a rhythmic instrument while seated, (b) playing a rhythmic instrument (rhythm sticks, band drum, bells, shakers, etc.) while walking/moving, and (c) recorder. The three lowest scoring items were: (a) ukulele/guitar, (b) other stringed instruments, and (c) band instruments. This shows that percussion, vocal music and recorder are the most frequently used elements in elementary school music classes, while stringed and band instruments were the least used elements.

For the sub-question regarding drama instruction, 80 teachers indicated that their students experience these activities (Primary, \( n = 51 \); Junior, \( n = 52 \); Intermediate, \( n = 24 \)), while only 74 participants responded that they teach this subject to their own students. Of the 80 respondents, 24 performed at least some of these dramatic activities weekly. A new variable was added to reflect the summed score of each activity, which was used to rank the pedagogical techniques in terms of overall frequency. The three highest scoring items were: (a) movement improvisation, (b) movement improvisation including props, and (c) reading/performing scripts. The three lowest scoring items were: (a) adapting movies for performance, (b) writing/performance tasks based on film/tv characters, and (c) using masks (pre-made). This shows that teachers are doing quite a lot of ‘improv’ and not as much writing or adaptation of stories from mainstream culture.
For the sub-question regarding dance activities, 66 teachers indicated that their students engage in dance activities (Primary, \( n = 45 \); Junior, \( n = 47 \); Intermediate, \( n = 20 \)), while only 56 teachers responded that they teach this subject to their own students. Of the 66 respondents, 31 performed at least some of these dance and movement activities at least weekly. A new variable was added to reflect the summed score of each activity, which was used to rank the pedagogical techniques in terms of overall frequency. The three highest scoring items were: (a) movement exercises, (b) movement improvisations, and (c) using contemporary music (i.e., that the students bring from popular culture).

The three lowest scoring items were: (a) integrating singing, i.e., for musical theatre, (b) using orchestral music, classical and modern composers for orchestra, and (c) pre-defined choreography. This shows that movement ‘improv’ is the most frequently used exercise in dance instruction, while integrating music performance, orchestral music, and prescribed choreography were the least used techniques.

Additional analyses were conducted to analyze activities by division. (Primary Grades, \( n = 44 \); Junior Grades, \( n = 41 \); Intermediate Grades, \( n = 25 \)). For these analyses, group sample size was calculated by counting the number of participants who answered any of the subject-specific pedagogical questions; participants who did not answer any questions for that subject were not counted. Missing values were not counted from participants who did not indicate any pedagogical techniques for that subject area, but missing values were counted as never for participants who answered one or more of the pedagogical questions for each subject area. This decision was based on the assumption that if a participant indicated a positive frequency for one or more of the variables in a particular pedagogical sub-question, it could be safely assumed that their non-response on other items in the same question was a negative response. Generally in this study, non-responses have been disregarded and treated as missing values, except where otherwise indicated.

For dance instruction in the Primary Grades panel (\( n = 37 \)), the highest scoring items were (a) movement exercises, (b) movement improvisation, and (c) using contemporary music (i.e., that the students bring
from popular culture). The lowest scoring items (not including other) were (a) integrating singing (i.e., for musical theatre), (b) collaborative choreography, and (c) using orchestral music, classical and modern composers for orchestra. For the Junior Grades panel (n = 47), the highest scoring items were (a) movement exercises, (b) movement improvisation, and (c) using contemporary music (i.e., that the students bring from popular culture). The lowest scoring items (not including other) were (a) integrating singing, i.e., for musical theatre, (b) using orchestral music, classical and modern composers for orchestra, and (c) pre-defined choreography. For the Intermediate Grades panel (n = 20), the highest scoring items were (a) movement exercises, (b) using contemporary music (i.e., that the students bring from popular culture), and; (c) movement improvisation. The lowest scoring items (not including other) were (a) integrating singing, ie. for musical theatre, (b) pre-defined choreography, and; (c) collaborative choreography.

For drama instruction in the Primary Grades panel (n = 44), the highest scoring items were (a) movement improvisation, (b) movement/mixed improvisation to music, and; (c) movement improvisation including props. The lowest scoring items (not including other) were (a) integrating singing, i.e., for musical theatre, (b) collaborative choreography, and (c) using orchestral music, classical and modern composers for orchestra. For the Junior Grades panel (n = 51), the highest scoring items were (a) movement improvisation, (b) group writing/performance tasks, and (c) dialogue/mixed improvisation. The lowest scoring items (not including other) were (a) using masks (pre-made), (b) writing/performance tasks based on film/television characters, and (c) adapting movies for performance. For the Intermediate Grades panel (n = 23), the highest scoring items were (a) movement improvisation, (b) movement improvisation including props, and (c) group writing/performance tasks. The lowest scoring items (not including other) were (a) making and using masks, (b) using masks (pre-made), and (c) adapting movies for performance.

For music in the Primary Grades panel (n = 40), the highest scoring items were (a) body percussion, (b) listening to music, and (c) movement to music. The lowest scoring items (not including other) were (a) other stringed instruments, (b) ukulele/guitar, and (c) band instruments. For the Junior Grades panel
(n = 43), the highest scoring items were (a) *listening to music*, (b) *body percussion*, and; (c) *vocal music*. The lowest scoring items (not including *other*) were (a) *other stringed instruments*, (b) *ukulele/guitar*, and (c) *band instruments*. For the Intermediate Grades panel (n = 26), the highest scoring items were (a) *listening to music*, (b) *body percussion*, and (c) *movement to music*. The lowest scoring items (not including *other*) were (a) *ukulele/guitar*, (b) *other stringed instruments*, and (c) *instrumental music improvisation*. It is important to note that there are differences in the implementation and practice of the same pedagogical techniques between divisions and grade levels, as one participant who teaches in the Primary, Junior and Intermediate panels noted: “Everybody does movement every week but it looks different for primary and intermediate students!” (specialist teacher).

Music activities that require specialized equipment (i.e., band instruments, stringed instruments) are among the lowest-ranked frequency of use. While improvisation is the highest ranked activity in drama and dance, it is one of the lowest ranked activities in music.

**Instructional Time**

Participants reported a wide range of responses for number of minutes of instruction per week (see Table 11). Outliers were identified by running stem and leaf distribution plots in SPSS. Osborne (2002) and others (including Lee, 2008) have described the benefits of outlier transformation, especially when there are strong group differences, to reduction in Type I error rates in t-statistic and correlation analyses (Lee, 2008, p. 211). Accordingly, a transformation was applied to these values based on Cots et al.’s (2003) trimming procedures. This study compared various strategies to deal with outliers, and found that the trimming procedure which yielded results closest to actual observed values was to replace these values with a value equal to the geometric mean plus two standard deviations. For drama, two cases were changed from 120 minutes to 86 minutes, and for dance, one case was changed from 120 minutes to 78 minutes. All teachers were offered the
opportunity to respond to this question, regardless of whether they taught their students the subject or whether it was taught by a different instructor.

Table 11
Weekly Instructional Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>65.54</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36.02</td>
<td>22.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33.28</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average amount of weekly music instruction reported was 65 minutes \((n = 93, M = 65.54, SD = 26.22)\), the median value and the mode values were 60 minutes. The minimum value was 5 minutes and the maximum value was 180 minutes. For drama, the average amount of weekly instruction reported was 36 minutes \((n = 59, M = 35.54, SD = 21.32)\), the median and the mode values were both 30 minutes. The minimum value was 0 minutes and the maximum value was 100 minutes. For dance, the average amount of weekly instruction reported was 33 minutes \((n = 61, M = 33.08, SD = 19.65)\), the median and the mode values were both 30 minutes. The minimum value was 0 minutes and the maximum value was 90 minutes. In order to remain conservative, missing values for all analyses were considered as missing values, not as a zero response. However, the large discrepancy in response rate between music, drama and dance variables should be noted, as 50% more participants responded to the music question than they did the drama or dance questions. The average number of minutes per week for the performing arts was found to be: (a) music, 65 minutes \((SD = 26.22)\); (b) drama, 36 minutes \((SD = 21.32)\), and (c) dance, 33 minutes \((SD = 19.65)\).

There is a possibility that missing values for these questions were an indication that students receive little or no weekly instruction in these subjects. If the data are recalculated using this assumption, the average times are much lower: music, 44.17 minutes \((SD = 37.58)\); drama, 15.20
minutes ($SD = 22.45$); dance, 14.62 minutes ($SD = 21.00$). It is unclear whether teachers considered that by leaving the question blank their students would be considered to not be receiving any weekly instruction in the performing arts. However, the data for minutes has been analysed to express the average number of minutes of weekly instruction for students who receive instruction, and does not include those who do not receive instruction.

### Instructional Time and Integration

Arts integration for the purposes of this study is defined as using the arts in the assessment or instruction of other subjects. Teachers were asked, “Do you use the arts in the instruction or assessment of other subjects, at least once per year?” If teachers indicated a positive response to this question, they were also asked to answer a number of sub-questions organized by art form (i.e., music, drama, dance) to describe the frequency with which they integrate these arts with other core subjects. Overall, 33% of participant teachers integrate music in their instruction in some way, 41% integrate drama in their instruction in some way, and 75% integrate dance into their instruction in some way (Table 12). Responses were also analyzed by the *overall experience* variable to show differences between training groups on the integration measure. While no significant differences were found for any of the different overall training groups, a much higher percentage of people with dance training (60%) are likely to integrate drama in their instruction or assessment of other subjects than those with no experience (34%).

Teachers report combining or integrating the instruction of performing arts subjects with other subjects in their qualitative responses: “Drama is part of language. Dance is part of gym. Both are taught in one term only in a unit” (generalist teacher). Another participant indicated that integration was a common occurrence in their classroom: “When using an inquiry approach to learning these three areas can pop up at any given time” (generalist teacher). Teachers indicated that integration happened more often in primary, especially when they had some training in the art form:
Table 12
Response to Survey Question, “Do you use the Performing Arts in the Instruction Or Assessment Of Other Subjects, At Least Once Per Year?” (Expressed as Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Grouping Variable</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Dance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No overall experience</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some overall experience</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High overall experience</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No overall experience</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some overall experience</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High overall experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No overall experience</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some overall experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High overall experience</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Some of the K-4 lessons are Dalcroze based, so there is a dance and movement/eurythmics component” (specialist teacher).

In response to questions about instructional time and integration, teachers reported: (a) that drama and dance may be covered during a “short-block” period (i.e., during a single week or month during the year and not touched during the other seven months); and (b) that drama and dance expectations may be covered during other class time, and often do not have their own discrete class period. For this sample, 46% of respondents reported that dance expectations happen during a short-block period once a year, and 25% report the same for drama expectations; only 6% report the same phenomenon happening for their music instruction (Table 13). The qualitative data show similar themes: “dance is taken care of in physical education by another teacher. Some music is done in gym too” (generalist teacher).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Dance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum is covered during a short-block intensive program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts curriculum expectations are covered during another subject’s class time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a n = 130, ^b n = 128, ^c n = 127\)

The question addressing expectations covered during other subjects’ time was written based on anecdotal observations that dance expectations seemed to often happen during Health and Physical Education class time. The results for dance support this observation, showing that 58% of teachers reported teaching dance during another subjects’ class time, compared with 47% for drama and 15% for music.
This is different than arts integration. Using drama as a vehicle to address literacy and drama expectations simultaneously, for example, is different than having a ‘dance station’ during physical education class time, where neither the dance nor physical education expectations are being effectively addressed.

**Extracurricular Activities**

Teachers were asked to describe their students’ participation in extracurricular activities, for each of music, drama, and dance. Of the 113 participants who answered this question, 42% say that their students have no access to extracurricular vocal music programs, 60% say that their students have no access to extracurricular instrumental music programs, 70% say that their students have no access to extracurricular drama or dance programs (Table 14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>One option</th>
<th>Multiple options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal ensemble</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental ensemble</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama club/group</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance club/group</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers who did not answer this question (n = 25) were counted as missing values and not considered as a negative response, so as to be conservative. Of the remaining 113 participants who answered this question, 30% answered no to all four questions regarding extracurricular activities. This means that 30% of elementary teachers sampled say that their students have no access to extracurricular performing arts opportunities of any kind.

**Visitors**

Teachers (n = 116) described their students’ experiences of artistic visitors, using a frequency scale of (a) never, (b) once per year, (c) twice per year, (d) 3-7 times per year, (e) monthly. For the visiting musician variable, 25.0% of teachers reported that they never had a music-based visitor, 43.1%
reported having a music-based visitor once a year, 24.1% reported having a music-based visitor twice per year, and 7.8% reported having a music-based visitor three or more times per year. For the visiting actor/writer/director/theatre company variable, 35.3% of teachers reported that they never had a drama-based visitor, 42.2% reported having a drama-based visitor once a year, 19.0% reported having a drama-based visitor twice per year, and 3.4% reported having a drama-based visitor three or more times per year. For the visiting dancer(s) variable, 53.6% of teachers reported that they never had a dance-based visitor, 37.5% reported having a dance-based visitor once a year, 6.3% reported having a dance-based visitor twice per year, and 2.7% reported having a dance-based visitor three or more times per year.

Integration

Of the teachers who responded to the question about music integration (n = 64), 32.8% reported that they integrated music into their instruction or assessment of other subjects at least once per year. Of the teachers who responded to the question about drama integration (n = 65), 40.0% reported that they integrated drama into their instruction or assessment of other subjects at least once per year. Of the teachers who responded to the question about dance integration (n = 66), 72.7% reported that they integrated dance into their instruction or assessment of other subjects at least once per year.

Performance Opportunities

Teachers were asked about the opportunities students have to showcase their learning of the performing arts to their parents and peers (Table 15). Of the 112 teachers who responded to this question, they report that their students perform at: (a) school assemblies (62%); (b) special school functions (i.e., parents’ night, talent show, 75%); (c) at special evening concerts (i.e., band/choir night, seasonal concerts, 69%); (d) music festivals (i.e., Kiwanis, 37%); (e) the community (i.e., Library, Mall, 19%); and (f) conferences (i.e., OMEA, CODE, 3%). Responses to this question indicate that the students of 86% of the
elementary teachers in this study participate in some sort of performing art performance at least once per year at a school assembly.

Table 15
Responses to Survey Questions "How Often Do Your Students Perform..." (Expressed as Percentage, n = 112)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once per year</th>
<th>Twice per year</th>
<th>3-7 times per year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at school assemblies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at special school functions (ie. parent's night, talent show)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at special evening concerts (ie. band/choir night, seasonal concerts)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at music festivals (ie. Kiwanis)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the community (ie. Library, Mall)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at conferences (ie. OMEA, CODE)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comfort in Performing Arts Instruction**

Participants who indicated that they taught the performing arts to their students or to other teachers’ students were asked to rate their comfort in teaching each of the performing arts subjects. A seven point semantic differential scale was used, anchored at both ends with *not comfortable at all* and *very comfortable*, with a value of 4 indicating a neutral choice. Teachers who rated their comfort level in teaching these subjects 1 or 2 were considered to be *very uncomfortable* at teaching the subject, and teachers who rated their comfort level at 6 or 7 were considered to be *very comfortable* at teaching the subject.

Of the participant teachers who answered this question and who taught music to their own students (n = 84), 18.1% rated themselves as *very comfortable* at teaching music, and 23.9% rated themselves *very uncomfortable* teaching music (M = 3.77, SD = 2.21). Of the generalist teachers who taught music to their own students (n = 67), 17.9% rated themselves as *very comfortable* at teaching music, and 46.2% rated themselves *very uncomfortable* teaching music (M = 3.27, SD = 2.01).

Of the participant teachers who answered this question and who taught drama to their own students (n = 83), 17.4% rated themselves as *very comfortable* at teaching drama, and 12.3% rated
themselves very uncomfortable teaching drama ($M = 4.02, SD = 1.80$). Of the generalist teachers who taught drama to their own students ($n = 67$), 29.9% rated themselves as very comfortable at teaching drama, and 20.8% rated themselves very uncomfortable teaching drama ($M = 4.19, SD = 1.79$).

Of the participant teachers who answered this question and who taught dance to their own students ($n = 83$), 6.5% ranked themselves as very comfortable at teaching dance, and 24.6% ranked themselves very uncomfortable teaching dance ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.69$). Of the generalist teachers who taught dance to their own students ($n = 67$), 10.4% rated themselves as very comfortable at teaching dance, and 43.3% rated themselves very uncomfortable teaching dance ($M = 2.99, SD = 1.68$).

**Adherence to Curricular Expectations**

Teachers who indicated that they taught a specific art form (i.e., music, drama, or dance) were offered the opportunity to comment on their instruction, and identify their perceptions of their adherence to the specific curricular expectations in their instruction. The question stem was, “To what extent does your performing arts instruction cover the Ministry expectations as outlined in the Ontario curriculum document?” This item is the expectations variable, one of the main dependent variables for ANOVA as described above.

Participants were given 5 choices: (a) Less than 20%, (b) 20% - 40%, (c) 40% - 60%, (d) 60% - 80%, and (e) more than 80%, which places the responses on a continuous scale from 1 to 5. For the 52 participants who answered this question, the highest overall mean response was for the music expectations ($M = 4.10, SD = 1.38$), followed by drama ($M = 3.30, SD = 1.31$), and dance ($M = 3.15, SD = 1.33$). Additional analyses are shown below organized by independent grouping variables.

**Overall Experience Variable**

For an exploratory analysis, the same 3 dependent variables were analyzed using an ANOVA by the groups defined by the rough overall experience grouping variable. These groups were: group 1, no overall experience ($n = 40$); group 2, some experience ($n = 37$); and group 3, highly experienced ($n = 48$).
This analysis showed a significant difference only for the overall experience-music independent variable on the expectations-music dependent variable, \( F(3, 51) = 3.572, p < .05 \) \((M_1 = 3.33, SD_1 = 1.51; M_2 = 3.20, SD_2 = 1.75; M_3 = 4.53, SD_3 = .95)\). Post-hoc tests conducted using the Bonferroni method indicated a significant difference between the some overall experience-music \((M_2 = 3.20, SD_2 = 1.75)\) and the high overall experience-music \((M_3 = 4.53, SD_3 = .95)\) groups, but because these tests did not reveal any significant difference between the no overall experience-music group and the high overall experience-music group, these results were deemed to be inconclusive and the utility of the variable is questioned.

**Comfort, Experience, and Instructional Time Analyses**

The dependent variables for ANOVA and t-test analyses were based on participant responses to the questions: “How comfortable are you with teaching the performing arts?” (comfort), “To what extent does your performing arts instruction cover the Ministry expectations as outlined in the Ontario curriculum document?” (expectations), and “For your students, how many minutes per week are dedicated to subject-specific instruction in: [music, drama, dance]?” (minutes). Data were collected for each of these questions in each of the three subject areas, creating nine main dependent variables (i.e., comfort-music, experience-music, minutes-music, comfort-drama, experience-drama, minutes-drama, comfort-dance, experience-dance, minutes-dance) for analysis.

These dependent variables were analyzed according to twelve independent grouping variables: (a) formal training in music, (b) formal training in music education, (c) experiences outside school settings in music, (d) formal training in drama, (e) formal training in drama education, (f) experiences outside school settings in drama, (g) formal training in dance, (h) formal training in dance education, (i) experiences outside school settings in dance, as described below.

**Formal training in music.** An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed on the formal training in music variable, between the no training-music, some training-music and highly trained-music groups on the dependent variables of comfort-music, expectations-music, and minutes-music (Table 16).
Table 16
Means, Standard Deviations, and One-way Analysis of Variance for the Effects of Formal Music Training on Three Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No formal music training</th>
<th>Some formal music training</th>
<th>High degree of music training</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort a</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations b</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week c</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>59.64</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>68.79</td>
<td>22.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a df = 2, 83. b df = 2, 51. c df = 2, 92.
Significant differences were found between training groups for the comfort-music variable, \( F(2,83) = 18.40, p = .000 \), and for the expectations-music variable, \( F(2,51) = 4.54, p = .016 \). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni method revealed significant differences on the comfort-music variable between the no training-music (\( M = 2.91, SD = 1.86 \)) and some training-music (\( M = 4.47, SD = 2.07 \)) groups, and on the expectations-music variable between the no training-music (\( M = 2.91, SD = 1.86 \)) and highly trained-music (\( M = 6.00, SD = 1.59 \)) groups. No significant differences were found between the some training-music and highly trained-music groups.

Teachers reporting high levels of training in music (\( M = 67.58, SD = 22.76 \)) reported a higher average minutes of instruction per week than teachers reporting no training in music \( M = 63.84, SD = 28.28 \), but the differences between these groups was not significant. Some teachers indicated that their instruction was integrative of other arts, which made it hard to define a quantity for average weekly instructional time:

> We have a specialist teacher who covers dance and music in primary, and a music teacher in intermediate, and they share music instruction in junior. We are lucky to still have an instrumental music program. There are 90-120 minutes a week dedicated to EITHER music or dance -- the teacher alternates her focus. (generalist teacher)

These analyses indicate that even a small amount of training in music has a significant effect on a teacher’s comfort teaching these subjects and their perceptions of their effectiveness in meeting the curricular expectations. Training in music does not have a significant effect on the number of minutes of weekly instruction in a subject.

**Formal training in music instruction.** To examine the effect of formal training in the art form, participants’ responses were grouped according to no training-music instruction (\( n = 102 \)), some training-music instruction (\( n = 13 \)), and highly trained-music instruction (\( n = 23 \)). The some training-music instruction group was combined with the highly trained-music instruction group for this analysis,
and renamed some training-music instruction. An ANOVA was performed to see if there were significant differences between the training groups for the dependent variables comfort-music, expectations-music, and minutes-music (Table 17). For the expectations variable, there was a significant difference between the no training-music instruction group \( (n = 27) \) and the some training-music instruction group \( (n = 25) \), \( F(1, 51) = 6.01, p < .05 \).

For the comfort-music variable, there was a significant difference between the no training-music instruction group \( (n = 75, M = 3.47, SD = 2.07) \) and the some training-music instruction group \( (n = 9, M = 6.33, SD = 1.66) \), \( F(1, 83) = 15.99, p < .001 \). There was no significant difference between the groups for the minutes-music variable, \( F(1,92) = .005, p = .945 \). A Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance was performed which found significant differences in the equality of variance in the groups. A subsequent non-parametric Brown-Forsythe test was performed on the data. These tests showed significant differences between the means of the two variables of comfort-music, \( F(1, 83) = 22.66, p < .001 \), and expectations-music, \( F(1, 51) = 6.23, p < .05 \). A non-parametric Mann-Whitney test was performed on the groups for these variables. This test showed significant differences between the training groups for comfort-music \( (p < .001) \) and expectations-music \( (p < .05) \). It can be said with a significant degree of confidence that there is a difference between the two groups (i.e., no training-music instruction, some training-music instruction) on the mean scores of the dependent variables (i.e., comfort-music, expectations-music). Hence, these analyses indicate that participant comfort and adherence to curricular expectations were significantly different based on their level of training in music instruction.

A subsequent Welch test for equality of means (Two-sample unpooled t-test for unequal variances) was performed, which also showed a significant difference between these groups, \( t(1,14.77) = 11.57, p < .01 \). Accordingly, these analyses reveal that teachers with any amount of adult experiences in music outside school settings rate their comfort and their perceptions of their
Table 17
Means, Standard Deviations, and One-way Analysis of Variance for the Effects of Formal Training in Music Instruction on Three Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No formal training</th>
<th>Some formal training</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort a</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>15.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations b</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week c</td>
<td>65.40</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a df = 1, 83. b df = 1, 51. c df = 1, 92.*
effectiveness at meeting the curricular expectations significantly higher than teachers with no adult experiences in music outside school settings.

**Experiences outside school settings in music.** In order to explore the effect of experience in music outside of formal training, participants were grouped into three groups: *no experience-outside experiences music* (*n* = 42), *lessons as a child only-outside experiences music* (*n* = 25), *other experience-outside experiences music* (*n* = 43), and *highly experienced-outside experiences music* (*n* = 28). An ANOVA was performed on the dependent variables *comfort-music* (*n* = 84), *minutes-music* (*n* = 93), and *expectations-music* (*n* = 52) based on these four training groups (Table 18). The results show a significant difference between groups for *comfort-music*, *F*(3, 83) = 12.16, *p* < .001, and *experience-music*, *F*(3, 51) = 7.18, *p* < .001. Post hoc tests were performed using the Scheffe method, which revealed a significant difference between the *no experience-outside experiences music* (*comfort-music*: *M* = 2.55, *SD* = 1.85; *expectations-music*: *M* = 3.33, *SD* = 1.51), *other experience* (*comfort-music*: *M* = 4.93, *SD* = 1.81; *expectations-music*: *M* = 4.59, *SD* = .87), and *highly experienced-outside experiences music* groups (*comfort-music*: *M* = 6.00, *SD* = 1.53; *expectations-music*: *M* = 4.45, *SD* = 1.06). Although significant differences were found between the groups for the *expectations-music* variable, Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance revealed a significant difference in homogeneity of variance between these groups. A subsequent Welch test for equality of means (Two-sample unpooled t-test for unequal variances) was performed, which also showed a significant difference between these groups, *t*(1,14.77) = 11.57, *p* < .01. Accordingly, these analyses reveal that teachers with any amount of adult experiences in music outside school settings rate their comfort and their perceptions of their effectiveness at meeting the curricular expectations significantly higher than teachers with no adult experiences in music outside school settings.

**Formal training in drama.** In drama, far fewer participants had training in the art form (Table 19). They were grouped into three groups: *no experience-drama* (*n* = 121), and *some training-drama*
Table 18
Means, Standard Deviations, and One-way Analysis of Variance for the Effects of Experiences Outside School Settings In Music On Three Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No experiences</th>
<th>Lessons as a child</th>
<th>Other Experiences</th>
<th>Highly Experienced</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comfort a</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations b</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week c</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>66.58</td>
<td>62.69</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* df = 3, 83. b df = 3, 51. c df = 3, 92.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No formal training</th>
<th>Some formal training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort a</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations b</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week c</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>22.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a df = 1, 82. b df = 1, 72. c df = 1, 58.*
As in previous analyses, formal drama training (1-3 university courses or similar training, n = 8), and high training-drama (n = 9), and then re-grouped (so that the groups would be larger for analyses) into two groups: no experience-drama (n = 121): comfort-drama: M = 4.04, SD = 1.78; expectations-drama: M = 3.15, SD = 1.28), and some experience-drama (n = 17): comfort-drama, M = 5.56, SD = 1.42; expectations-drama, M = 4.71, SD = 0.49. An ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the difference between the groups, which showed a significant difference between groups for comfort-drama, F(1, 82) = 6.04, p < .05, and expectations-drama, F(1, 72) = 10.17, p < .01. The expectations-drama variable did not pass Levene’s test for equality of variance, so the more robust Welch F test was also performed. A significant difference between the groups was found by this test on the expectations-drama variable, F(1, 17.11) = 41.51, p < .001. These results show a difference in perceived instructional performance of people who have training in drama to those who do not.

**Formal training in drama instruction.** To determine whether there is a difference in comfort or perceived performance by teachers who have had formal training in drama instruction versus those who do not have formal training in drama instruction, participants were divided into two groups based on their response to the question “Do you have any formal training/certification in teaching the performing arts? (i.e., music education, drama education, dance education)” in the drama category. A very small proportion (9%) of respondents had any training in the art form at all, and of those an even smaller proportion (3%) were deemed to have substantial training in drama. The two final training groups, no training-drama instruction (n = 125) and some training-drama instruction (n = 13) were compared using an ANOVA (Table 20). On both the comfort-drama and the expectations-drama measures, the Levene’s test for equality of variance was violated slightly, and other indicators of normality were also violated. Welch’s robust test for equality of means were employed in this circumstance, and the results showed significant differences on the comfort-drama measure, F(1, 6) = 25.01, p = .002, between the no training-drama instruction (M = 4.08, SD = 1.77) and some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No formal training</th>
<th>Some formal training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort a</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations b</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week c</td>
<td>34.17</td>
<td>21.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a df = 1, 82.  b df = 1, 72.  c df = 1, 58.*
training-drama instruction \((M = 6.20, SD = 0.83)\) variables. Significant differences were also found between the no training-drama instruction \((M = 3.21, SD = 1.32)\) and some training-drama instruction \((M = 4.33, SD = 0.51)\) variables on the expectations-drama measure. These results show that there is a significant difference in the responses of people with training in drama education regarding their comfort in teaching drama and their perceptions of their effectiveness in covering the expectations in the drama curriculum document. There was no difference found between groups on the minutes-drama variable, indicating that training in drama instruction does not have an effect on instructional time.

**Experiences outside school settings in drama.** Participants were asked to describe their experiences in drama outside of formal settings and outside of school, and reported a variety of experiences. Due to the low number of respondents with lessons as a child only \((n = 6)\) and the low number of respondents in the highly experienced-outside experiences drama group \((n = 5)\) these groups were combined to become the some experience-outside experiences drama group. Some other answers included “university program that specialized in the integration of drama”, “participation in choirs and community theatre for years,” “professional actor,” and “PD workshops.” All of these experiences were counted as informal drama experiences, and they were placed in the some experience-outside experiences drama group.

The responses of the final groups no experience-outside experiences drama \((n = 91)\) and some experience-outside experiences drama \((n = 47)\) were compared using an ANOVA on the comfort-drama, minutes-drama, and expectations-drama variables (Table 21) This analysis shows a significant difference, \(F(1, 82) = 14.94, p < .001\), between teachers who have had informal or extracurricular experiences in drama on the comfort-drama variable \((M = 5.28, SD = 1.43)\) versus those who did not have outside experiences \((M = 3.74, SD = 1.75)\). No significant differences were found between the experience groups on the expectations-drama or minutes-drama measures.
### Table 21
Means, Standard Deviations, and One-way Analysis of Variance for the Effects of Experiences Outside School Settings in Drama on Three Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No experiences</th>
<th>Some experiences</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort a</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>14.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations b</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week c</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>2.981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a df = 1, 82.  b df = 1, 72.  c df = 1, 58.*
**Formal training in dance.** For dance, similar procedures were applied. Participants were grouped into formal training groups, and due to the low number of participants with training only two groups were identified, no training-dance \( (n = 129) \) and some training-dance \( (n = 9) \). An ANOVA was performed on these variables to compare the differences between the groups, and significant differences were found on the comfort-dance variable, \( F(1,82) = 4.70, p < .05 \), between the no training-dance \( (M = 2.95, SD = 1.64) \) and the some training-dance \( (M = 4.60, SD = 1.36) \) groups (Table 22). Therefore, training in dance is shown to have a significant effect on teachers’ perceptions of their comfort teaching dance, but not on their perceptions of their ability to cover the curricular expectations or on the number of weekly minutes of dance instruction that their students receive.

**Formal training in dance instruction.** For training in dance education, participants were grouped into no training-dance instruction \( (n = 134) \) and some training-dance instruction groups \( (n = 4) \). The low number of teachers with any training in dance education should be noted and the low power of these results considered when assessing the value of this ANOVA (Table 23), however the results are worth noting for future study on this variable. On the comfort-dance variable, the no training-dance instruction group \( (M = 2.96, SD = 1.62) \) was significantly different from the some training-dance instruction group \( (M = 6.50, SD = 0.71) \). Since only 2 participants from the some training-dance instruction group answered this question the results are not considered to be reliable by the researcher, however they do provide justification for further study into the effect of this training in future research. No significant differences were found between the groups for any other dependent measures.

**Experiences outside school settings in dance.** For the independent variable outside experiences in dance (Table 24), participants were initially divided into four groups: no experience-outside experiences dance \( (n = 93) \), lessons as a child only-outside experiences dance \( (n = 21) \), lessons as a child and other adult experience-outside experiences dance \( (n = 22) \), and highly experienced-outside experiences dance \( (n = 2) \).
Table 22
Means, Standard Deviations, and One-way Analysis of Variance for the Effects of Formal Dance Training on Three Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No formal dance training</th>
<th>Some formal dance training</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort a</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations b</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week c</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a df = 1, 82. b df = 1, 54. c df = 1, 60.
Table 23: Means, Standard Deviations, and One-way Analysis of Variance for the Effects of Formal Training in Dance Instruction on Three Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No formal training</th>
<th>Some formal training</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort a</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations b</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week c</td>
<td>31.89</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a df = 1, 82. b df = 1, 54. c df = 1, 60.
Table 24
Means, Standard Deviations, and One-way Analysis of Variance for the Effects of Experiences Outside School Settings in Dance on Three Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No experiences</th>
<th>Lessons as a child only</th>
<th>Adult experiences</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Expectations</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes per week</td>
<td>33.11</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>37.73</td>
<td>21.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a df = 1, 82. b df = 1, 54. c df = 1, 60.
Due to the small number of participants in the *highly experienced-outside experiences dance* group, these participants were combined with the *lessons as a child-outside experiences dance* and *other adult experience-outside experiences dance* group to form the new group *some experience-outside experiences dance* ($n = 24$). An ANOVA was conducted to see if there were any significant differences between the groups’ mean responses on the dependent variables *comfort-dance*, *expectations-dance*, and *minutes-dance* (Table 26). Significant differences were found between the groups for *comfort-dance*, $F(1,82) = 10.94, p < .001$, and *expectations-dance* variables, $F(1,82) = 3.71, p < .05$.

Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni method revealed that there were significant differences on the *comfort-dance* variable ($p < .001$) between the *no experiences* group ($M = 2.65, SD = 1.40$) and the *some experiences-outside experiences dance* group ($M = 4.91, SD = 1.92$), and on the *expectations-dance* variable ($p < .05$) between the *no experience-outside experiences dance* group ($M = 2.80, SD = 1.30$) and the *some experience-outside experiences dance* group ($M = 3.85, SD = 1.21$). These analyses indicate that participants with adult experiences in dance outside school settings respond significantly differently than participants without adult experience in dance, to questions about their comfort and their perceptions of their effectiveness in covering the curricular expectations in dance. No significant differences were found between experience groups on the number of minutes of instruction their students receive.

**Correlation Between Comfort and Expectations**

Since the largest difference between groups was shown on the comfort variable, a correlation analysis was conducted between the continuous *comfort*, *expectations*, and *minutes* variables, using all participants’ data ($N = 138$). The results of this analysis (Table 25) showed a strong and significant correlation between *comfort-music* and *expectations-music* ($r = .85, p < .01$), drama ($r = .67, p < .01$), and dance ($r = .63, p < .01$). This shows that teachers who rate themselves as being more comfortable in teaching the subject also rate themselves more highly in being able to fully implement the curriculum.
expectations into their instruction. Interestingly, cross-subject correlations were found for a number of variables. Significant correlations were also found between comfort-dance and expectations-drama ($r = .41, p < .01$). Comfort-drama was significantly correlated with expectations-dance ($r = .85, p < .01$), and with expectations-music ($r = .48, p < .01$). Comfort-music was significantly correlated with expectations-dance ($r = .48, p < .01$), and expectations-drama ($r = .68, p < .01$). These analyses show that participant teachers’ perceptions of their comfort in teaching any of the performing arts (i.e., music, drama, dance) is significantly correlated with their perceptions of their effectiveness at teaching all of the performing arts.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. comfort with teaching dance</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. meeting dance curriculum expectations</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. comfort with teaching drama</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. meeting drama curriculum expectations</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. comfort with teaching music</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. meeting music curriculum expectations</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01

Since training and experience have been shown to have a significant effect on comfort, it can be concluded that training and experience in any of the performing arts can have an effect on teachers’ perceptions of their ability to effectively cover the curricular expectations of all performing arts. This justifies the importance of further research in this area, to determine the elements of training or experience that may be most useful and broadly applicable to performing arts instruction generally.

Perceived Obstacles to Effective Instruction of the Performing Arts

Participants described a number of difficulties that they have experienced with performing arts instruction, including integrating the arts into their instruction, issues of training and certification portability, the lack of professional development, and the need for specialist support of generalist practitioners.
Too many curricular expectations. A frequently reported theme was teachers’ frustrations with the current curriculum documents: “drama is often integrated with other subjects. However, what is assessed and evaluated is taught directly. The problem is that the drama curriculum is massive. Though it uses the same lens that the visual arts and language curriculum use, the processes are complicated and involved” (generalist teacher).

The reality for many teachers is that the arts curriculum is crowded with expectations that are quite abstract to anyone other than a specialist in the area. The amount of time needed to teach the other core subjects well (language, math, science, social studies, etc.) leaves very little time to address the demands of the arts curriculum. In short, we are allocated too little time to teach a vast number of abstract expectations that most teachers know little about.

(generalist teacher)

Instructional time and instructional space. When asked what would help teachers to do more performing arts activities in their classrooms, time was a major factor: “more time! There's just too much to cover in ‘core’ subjects!” (generalist teacher) Another generalist teacher describes their situation in more detail:

The day is so crowded already with an emphasis on Math and Language in our school board, it is difficult to find time for the arts. We are fortunate to have a music specialist on staff but the teaching of music and dance by her is mainly to provide planning time for classroom teachers. It's not really looked upon as an essential curriculum area.” (generalist teacher)

“It's all about timetabling and ensuring we teach all that we need to teach. Our plate is full, to overflowing!!” (generalist teacher). “More time! I only see the kids for 40 minutes a week while the expectation is that I am teaching them to play band instruments” (music specialist).

The need for more and better quality space was also indicated as a major issue for a number of participants:
It would be nice to have a drama room, a visual arts room and a music room. That way the ‘stuff’ isn't jammed into existing places. Currently at my school, music classes happen on the stage in the gym. During gym, we have to be extra careful not to hit any balls onto the stage to avoid knocking over equipment. Also, music can only happen when gym is not happening or when the gym is not being used for presentations etc. (music specialist)

A performing arts specialist with access to a dedicated space described some of the instructional challenges they face due to inappropriate space: “I teach in a portable, which makes it awkward to teach drama and dance, and also awkward to transition between music in different divisions (chairs, no chairs, etc)” (arts specialist).

Time and space were mentioned together as combined issues, especially related to music instruction: “More class time in larger chunks of time - thirty minutes to reorganize a classroom, tune everybody, have a lesson and put everything back is not enough time” (music specialist).

**Standardized testing.** Some referenced the issues surrounding standardized testing as a major impediment to improving their instruction in these areas:

We are living in a time when provincial test scores are the biggest focus of all schools and school boards. This is the actual problem. I have been teaching Grade 3 for several years, and to be honest, the pressure that these kids go through to write this test at such a young age … utterly shapes the curriculum delivery. (generalist teacher with arts experience)

The complaint about standardized testing was common across training and experience groupings, as even teachers with arts integration skills and experience in the arts seemed unable to integrate the arts as fully as they would if standardized testing were not an issue, due to their perceptions of the pressure on them and their students to perform well on the tests: “As soon as EQAO goes, we can teach the whole student!” (generalist teacher).
Perceived Opportunities for Improvement

Teachers described a number of things that they thought would help them in their practice, and to improve their ability to facilitate quality performing arts experiences for their students. These include suggestions in the areas of mentorship and additional involvement by the Ministry of Education to facilitate mentorship and training opportunities for teachers in both performing arts specific and arts integration practices.

Mentorship and professional development. Mentorship and access to experienced teachers was an important factor for people: “Having PD whereby specialists come to the school and walk through sample units and provide instructional strategies would be helpful. Being able to observe qualified teachers in action would be great” (generalist teacher). The performing arts was recognized as an area in which observation of a specialist was perceived to be of great value: “I need someone who has experience and can demonstrate what to do. I’d like to see them model lessons in my classroom, and help me to plan” (generalist teacher).

Other participants described the importance of mentorship and professional development being initiated at the board and ministry levels: “From my own studies about improving arts, and specifically Music Education, I know that the first thing that needs to improve is the funding and support of the arts by the Ontario Ministry of Education. At the board level, there needs to be an active and pro-active arts consultant” (specialist teacher). Another participant was more succinct: “The thing that would make the biggest difference is at the MINISTRY level” (generalist teacher). Another participant connected the importance of subject-specific knowledge to being able to comprehend the expectations thoroughly enough to effectively teach them, or to integrate this with their instruction of other subjects.

The curriculum being “crowded with expectations” was mentioned many times, and the need for mentorship or exemplars in integrated arts practices was a common theme. A generalist
teacher was clear with what would help them most: “more flexibility with timetabling and practical examples of how to implement the curriculum” (generalist teacher).

Expanding community-based artist-in-the-schools programs. Some teachers described the value of community-based artists-in-the-schools programs (i.e., Learning Through The Arts, ArtSmarts), to their instruction: “We have an Arts in Action Program at our school. Me being the classroom teacher, I cover a good portion of the arts curriculum on a weekly basis, but we also have the opportunity to work with artists in our community through intensive arts workshops a few time throughout the school year. This year my class had a breakdancing and drumming workshop” (generalist teacher). The mentorship provided by these types of opportunities was considered by teachers to be helpful to their practice, which suggests a benefit to future research in this area.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

In this thesis, I aimed to investigate the state of performing arts education in Ontario elementary schools, and to gather data which might assist in creating effective policy. To this end, I endeavoured to examine the curriculum as written and as enacted in the classroom, by analyzing the curriculum document and by asking teachers to describe their experience of teaching and their observations of their students’ experiences of performing arts instruction. This research responds to the pressing need for baseline data describing performing arts education in Ontario classrooms, and the training and experience of teachers teaching these subjects. This chapter will first discuss the research questions. The first question, “What are the conditions surrounding performing arts education in Ontario public schools” consists of three subdivisions: (a) curriculum, (b) teacher experience and qualifications, and (c) structural considerations (i.e., instructional space, timetabling, support and resources). The other three research questions are next addressed: (a) “Does previous training and experience in the performing arts influence teachers’ comfort and perceived ability to teach the performing arts curriculum?”, (b) “Does previous training and experience in the performing arts impact the frequency or duration of teachers’ performing arts instruction in elementary schools?”, and (c) “To what extent do elementary teachers perceive that they are teaching the expectations of the Ontario performing arts curriculum?” After the primary research questions are addressed, I will then discuss the limitations of this study and opportunities for future research.

The ‘Conditions’

Based on data collected in this study, the ‘conditions’ surrounding performing arts education are comprised of three main components: (a) curriculum, (b) teacher experience and qualifications, and (c) structural considerations. As the results in the previous sections show, these conditions for performing arts instruction in Ontario public elementary schools are challenging. Teachers report
that the school day is not long enough to teach everything that needs teaching, and there are not enough support staff to help students with special needs. The qualitative data show that some teachers perceive that there is not enough appropriate space for students to engage with these subjects, and they don’t have access to the appropriate equipment and resources.

Many generalist teachers who teach the performing arts to their students \((n = 67)\) report that they feel very uncomfortable teaching the performing arts (music, 46.2%; drama, 20.8%; dance, 43.2%), and many report that they are teaching less than 60% of the performing arts expectations as defined in the curriculum document (music \([n = 22]\), 36.3%; drama \([n = 54]\), 57.4%; dance \([n = 39]\), 56.4%). Based on the responses of teachers we know that a large proportion of their students do not have access to instrumental music, specialist teachers, or extracurricular activities in the arts. Teachers of all training levels perceive other impediments to effective instruction in the performing arts including lack of time, the pressures of preparing for standardized testing, and insufficient expertise and support.

**Curriculum.** The curriculum document “The Arts, Grades 1-8, 2009” is complex yet well organized. It clearly describes many benefits of performing arts practice, elements of practice in each performing arts area, how the creative process is a part of and enhanced by participation in these activities, guidelines for assessment of and through the arts, and tips for teachers on how to implement instruction of these subjects, in addition to the many specific expectations for each subject and Grade level.

The current curriculum documents were created within a particular political context, and the framework and content still bear the mark of the ideologies of the political situation of 1995-2001. The main issues described by teachers related to the curriculum were in the implementation of this curriculum by teachers in the classroom. Policy implementation is one of the most challenging parts of the policy cycle (Delaney, 2002), and in arts education the implementation by the classroom
teacher is especially complex due to the specialized knowledge and processes involved and the kinaesthetic nature of the knowledge (Russell-Bowie, 2009a). Results from this research reveal characteristics of curriculum-related conditions, including that generalist teachers find the curriculum complex and difficult to implement given the combined challenges of (a) the number of expectations; (b) the specialized content, process and pedagogical knowledge required; and (c) the timetabling pressures from other subjects.

Teachers’ responses suggested ways in which the curriculum might be improved to benefit teachers and students. Frequently observed criticisms from teachers were “too many expectations” (generalist teachers) and “too little time” (generalist and specialist teachers). The ‘teacher prompts’ sections, which are intended to give examples, can often be limiting or even contradictory to the broader educational goals. Many teachers voiced their concern about the complexity and quantity of the specific expectations, and their frequent feelings of being overwhelmed by the amount they are required to teach in the allotted instructional time. Combining subject areas and integrating the arts with other subjects can help to ameliorate these issues, and learning through the arts in an integrated manner can show measurable benefits (Gullatt, 2008).

Combined with their criticism of the document for having too many expectations, many teachers asked for help to integrate instruction in different subjects. The results for integration show that 72.7% of teachers integrate dance into their instruction or assessment of other subjects, 40.0% integrate drama, and 32.8% integrate music. However, this finding might indicate a need for additional investigation of the interpretation of the term “integration.” Lenoir, Larose, and Geoffroy (2000) report that there is a great deal of confusion around the meaning of integration to Quebec teachers, according to data gathered over a 10-year period. If that finding can be generalized to Ontario teachers, it is possible that some teachers may be doing what some researchers call “service connections,” where the “outcomes of one subject are promoted at the expense of the second
subject” (Russell-Bowie, 2009b, p. 5). The many subject-specific expectations are mandated for instruction and assessment, so engaging students in authentic activities following emergent curriculum and inquiry models require a great deal of work from the teacher to fit ‘round’ learning ‘pegs’ into ‘square’ evaluation ‘holes.’ It is a complex task to map specific expectations from the curriculum onto engaging cross-curricular lessons. Teachers report that they need help with the task of curricular integration, through access to additional resources, access to mentors and arts specialists, and professional development in the art form and in the effective integration of instruction.

**Teacher experience and qualifications.** Respondents reported having a broad range of experience in the arts: in combined training profiles, 28.2% of respondents were highly qualified in music ($n = 39$), 0.7% were highly qualified in drama ($n = 1$), 2.2% were highly qualified in dance ($n = 3$), 2.9% were highly qualified in both music and dance ($n = 4$), and 0.7% were highly qualified in both drama and dance ($n = 1$).

For music, 56% of participants reported having no training in music, and 30% of respondents were highly trained; 74% of participants reported having no training in music instruction, and 17% of participants reported being highly trained in music instruction; 30% of participant teachers were considered to have no experience in music, 18% reported having only lessons as a child, while 20% of teachers reported having substantial experience in music outside school settings.

For drama, 88% of participant teachers reported having no training in drama, and 7% of participant teachers reported being highly trained in drama; 91% of participant teachers were considered to have no training in drama instruction, and 3% of participant teachers were considered to have a high degree of training in drama instruction; 66% of participant teachers were considered
to have no experience in drama outside school settings, and 4% of participant teachers were considered to have a high degree of experience in drama outside school settings.

For dance, 93% of participant teachers reported having no training in dance, and 5% of participant teachers reported being highly trained in dance; 91% of participant teachers were considered to have no training in dance instruction, and 3% of teachers reported having a high degree of training in dance instruction; 67% of participant teachers were considered to have no experiences in dance outside school settings, and 17% of teachers were considered to have a high degree of experience in dance outside school settings.

In contrast to the teachers who have some experience in the performing arts, 26.1% of participant teachers have absolutely zero experience (i.e. they have no formal or informal training or experiences in any of music, drama, and dance) with any of the performing arts ($n = 36$). Data show that a minority of generalist teachers’ students are taught by subject specialists: for music, 45% of generalist teachers ($n = 86$) report that their students are taught music by a subject specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in music; 5.8% of generalist teachers report that their students are taught drama by a subject specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in drama; and 4.6% of generalist teachers report that their students are taught dance by a subject specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in dance.

Researchers have shown that training in the performing arts can improve teacher self-efficacy (Russell-Bowie, 2009a, 2012; Tanrîseven, 2013; Upitis, 2005) and that teachers with low levels of experience feel less confident and less effective in their instruction (Russell-Bowie 2009a; Hallam et al., 2009). The high percentages of teachers without any training in the performing arts is concerning, especially considering that (a) generalist teachers are teaching the performing arts in a majority of Ontario classrooms, and (b) analyses indicate that teachers without any training report
significantly lower perceptions of comfort and effectiveness in teaching the expectations of the performing arts curriculum document.

Data show that teachers are working to find solutions to these issues. Teachers who have experience are more likely to teach other peoples’ classes than those who do not have any experience, showing that teachers cooperate and work together as a team to “trade” subjects with colleagues who do have expertise or interest in those areas. Generalist teachers report that a non-subject specialist colleague teaches drama to their students in 26% of cases, and in 37% of cases in dance. Hopefully, these teachers may have some training in the arts, or just an interest in the arts, that drives them to teach these subjects, but it is possible that they have been asked to take on these responsibilities for other reasons. Future research should consider why generalist teachers without specialty training are teaching other teachers’ classes. Collaboration between teachers of the arts and regular classroom teachers can be beneficial to both parties (Davis, 1999).

A high percentage of teachers reported wishing that there had been more opportunities to learn about the performing arts during their initial teacher education program: 55% desired more music training, 70% desired more drama training, and 70% desired more dance training. Teachers at all levels of training and experience generally reported their perceived need for more professional development, resources, and training opportunities. More research in this area is recommended to find out what PD interventions may be most useful for teachers, and how teacher education programs could better prepare candidates to teach the arts.

**Structural considerations.** Teachers reported perceived obstacles from some of the structural elements, including lack of appropriate space, lack of time, and lack of support and resources.

**Lack of appropriate space.** For music 47% of respondents reported that their students used a dedicated space such as a music room for music instruction. For drama 23% of teachers
reported that their students experience drama on a stage, auditorium, or gymnasium; for dance, 19% of teachers reported access to a dedicated space, while 39% experience dance in the gymnasium. In this non-forced choice question, 49% of teachers said that their students experience dance instruction in their regular classroom, and 84% of respondents report that they used their regular classroom for drama activities. Access to specialized space is important for effective instruction, partly because of the noise produced by enthusiastic engagement with music (Beaty, 2001). Upitis (2005) describes the specialized requirements of drama and dance instruction, and artist-teachers’ perceptions of not being “given priority” in booking gymnasium or multipurpose space over other activities. Effective engagement with the performing arts requires appropriate space, where teachers and students can spread out, relax and create (Upitis, 2005). Not having a dedicated space was reported by participants to be obstructive to effective instruction of the performing arts due to lack of space and time spent getting the classroom ready for these activities.

**Lack of time.** Lack of time due to timetabling and other pressures were reported as a major concern. Standardized testing was also considered to be an issue for teachers trying to create balanced experiences in the performing arts for their students, and the pressures of taking time specifically to prepare for these tests was reported as an impediment. Researchers have argued for many years that standardized testing has adverse effects on teaching and learning and is of limited value (Bhattacharyya, Junot, & Clark, 2013; Hilliard, 2000; Kohn, 2000; McNeil, 2000; Neill, 1989; Ravitch, 2011). However, due to the political context within which the current curricular documents were created, and the current climate of accountability as discussed in Chapter 1, the current problem for arts advocates is finding ways to justify the inclusion of the arts over other activities which lead to improved test scores. If arts integrated instruction or arts activities can improve standardized test scores, that may provide justification to teachers, principals, and school boards for the prioritization of the arts in timetabling.
More research is needed in this area. Until the curriculum changes or the arts are more formally prioritized, a way to include more of the arts in the school day is for teachers to increase their cross-curricular and integrative instruction through the arts. As mentioned above, teachers need to be supported in their efforts to learn about the arts and arts integration strategies, which can be realized by engaging teachers in meaningful artistic activities with mentor artist-teachers (Upitis, 2005) and by providing more resources for teachers as evidenced in the current data.

Lack of support and resources. In qualitative responses, many teachers reported feeling unsupported by their school board, principal or colleagues, and desired additional resources to help them in their performing arts instruction. The Ministry of Education has exemplar documents available for the arts, and ETFO has recently released a support document “Revised ETFO Arts” (ETFO, 2014) which provides many detailed examples of effective performing arts instruction for all teachers. The Ontario Music Educators Association (OMEA) and the Council of Ontario Drama and Dance Educators (CODE) also provide teacher- and researcher-created lesson plans and tips for practicing teachers. However, many teachers indicated that they didn’t know about these organizations and would be very happy to receive information that would help them in their instruction.

Teacher Training—Comfort

The second research question guiding this study was, “Does previous training and experience in the performing arts influence teachers’ comfort and perceived ability to teach the performing arts curriculum?” In addition to all of the above-mentioned challenges, many teachers feel underprepared to teach the arts. Of teachers who answered this question and who are responsible for teaching music to their students, only 18.1% rated themselves as very comfortable at teaching music, while 23.9% rated themselves very uncomfortable teaching music ($M = 3.77, SD = 2.21$). Of the respondents who answered this question and who taught drama to their own students ($n =$
17.4% rated themselves as very comfortable at teaching drama, and 12.3% rated themselves very uncomfortable teaching drama ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 1.80$). Of the respondents who answered this question and who taught dance to their own students ($n = 83$), 6.5% ranked themselves as very comfortable at teaching dance, and 24.6% ranked themselves very uncomfortable teaching dance ($M = 3.05$, $SD = 1.69$).

Some teachers feel that they could teach these subjects better if they had more training, but others feel that no amount of training could make up for their lack of ‘natural’ talent. Some say that the arts can be taught, and some say that people with a ‘natural’ affinity with it will always perform better. As a participant noted,

> It would be good to have more opportunities to learn about the Performing Arts in Teacher Education programs, but I think I'd still feel uncomfortable teaching it. I think these subjects need to be taught by people who are naturally talented in these areas. Their personal experiences and connections to the arts allow for a better understanding of these subjects. (generalist teacher)

This raises a question for future research to endeavour to answer how much knowledge or natural talent teachers need to teach the arts effectively? More specialized training is required as the level of difficulty of the material increases, but there are no clear benchmarks at any level for training and experience. Future research should evaluate not only the amount of training but what types of training provide an adequate amount of expertise and self-efficacy to meet various performance standards.

Some teachers with limited training and experience who report high levels of comfort in their performing arts instruction described the value of their informal learning experiences in the performing arts, while other more highly trained teachers stressed the importance of their formal training to their feelings of comfort and effectiveness. These comfortable teachers have a
background or interest in the performing arts which help them to feel comfortable in teaching them, and even small amounts of this experience has an effect.

The data gathered in this study show that teachers with more training and experience in the performing arts feel more comfortable teaching these subjects, and that they feel more confident in their abilities as teachers. People with formal training ranked themselves generally higher on comfort scales than people without formal training, and people with experiences in the performing arts outside school settings ranked themselves higher than people who did not have any experience, but it is difficult to compare the relative effectiveness of either teacher. However, there is evidence that non-specialist teachers of the arts are teaching these subjects, and according to their perceptions of their performance, many of them are doing a good job. These teachers have had experiences that led to an increased perception of preparedness and self-efficacy to teach these subjects.

The data show that teachers who are highly trained in the performing arts see themselves as more comfortable and more efficacious than teachers with little training and experience. However, the data also suggest that teachers without formal training can feel comfortable, effective, and passionate about the arts if they have engaged in these arts in any way, either through formal training or outside of formal avenues. Some participants described the passion that these teachers without formal training bring to their teaching. Other participants shared their perception of the success with which their colleagues without formal training taught the performing arts, and additional research is needed to investigate factors that may predict teacher success other than training and experience. It may be because the teacher is focused on engaging the students and facilitating a love of the performing arts, and sharing their passion for these arts, instead of focusing on technique or content knowledge.

Many experts in this area agree with the goal, especially in the Primary division, for encouraging a love and passion for the subject over rote learning of content, and suggest that a
focus on content knowledge could even be detrimental to a child’s future engagement with the subject. Jorgensen (2008) describes the special place that this plays in music education:

It is impossible to fake enthusiasm for any length of time. Students eventually know when a teacher’s heart is not in teaching them or the subject matter under study. For this reason, it is essential that teachers love music and want to teach it, and love students and enjoy working with them. This love of the subject and students somehow created the energy and will to teach them… such is the importance of this energy, liveliness, zest, and passion in motivating teacher and student alike and the impossibility of pretending enthusiasm over the long term that, insofar as it is possible, we need to teach those things that we truly love to teach. (Jorgensen, 2008, p. 51)

More research in this area is necessary to investigate the connection of passion for a subject to learning outcomes.

Teachers with high degree of training and experience reported significantly higher levels of comfort than teachers with low levels of training and experience, which aligns with findings in the research literature (Garvis & Pendergast, 2011; Hallam et al., 2009; Russell-Bowie, 2009a). Since comfort is significantly correlated with adherence with the curricular expectations, further research is warranted to investigate the factors underlying these phenomena.

**Teacher Training—Instructional Duration and Frequency**

My third research question was “Does previous training and experience in the performing arts impact the frequency or duration of teachers’ performing arts instruction in elementary schools?” Previous training and experience was not a factor in the frequency or duration of performing arts instruction, in any of the three subject areas. This finding indicates that other factors dictate the frequency and duration of instruction. Some qualitative evidence indicated that timetabling is a major issue for teachers, and that their day is too full with other subject curricula to fit in more time
for the arts in their schedules. Mandatory minimums for instruction in Literacy and Numeracy impact the amount of time remaining for the arts, and teachers report that preparation for standardized testing further limits opportunities for artistic exploration. Integrating the arts into other subjects was indicated as a way that some teachers are finding a way around these other pressures. Additional training in integration of the performing arts is recommended, so that teachers can start doing more arts activities with their students containing a combination of arts, literacy-, numeracy-focused outcomes.

Teachers need to have some examples of how to integrate, and some resources on how to integrate. Given the constraints of timetabling, one way to get more arts in the classroom is if teachers use the arts as vehicles for learning and understanding, facilitating educational experiences that leverage multiple ways of knowing and cross over subject divisions. The lack of flexibility in timetabling core subjects including literacy and math, and the many benefits to integrated learning of engagement and assessment through the arts support this solution (Brewer, 2002). This could be aided in the short term by having a professional development focus on integration (Russell-Bowie, 2009b) and improved instruction for teachers in meeting multiple curricular expectations simultaneously, as requested by teachers participating in the current study.

Adherence to Curricular Expectations

My final research question was “To what extent do general elementary teachers perceive that they are teaching the expectations of the Ontario performing arts curriculum?” The data show that generally, teachers are not meeting the expectations of the performing arts curricula. Teachers reported many reasons for this, and holding them fully personally accountable for this discrepancy misses a number of important considerations. It is difficult to teach these subjects, especially if one has not had any training or experience in these areas (Russell-Bowie, 2009a). Analyses of the data reveal a strong and significant correlation between comfort and perceived effectiveness at teaching
the performing arts, and there is a strong and significant difference in perceived performance from people who have some training and experience in the performing arts versus those who have no or little training and experience in these areas. Future research should examine more closely which aspects of training and experience facilitate which aspects of comfort, and how this translates to effectiveness.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations to this study. First, it would have been ideal to have more participants, and since participants were recruited through multiple avenues an analysis of response rate was not possible. School boards were approached with a request to email the link to the teachers in their board, which would have made it easier to gauge response rate. As it was, the very few boards that agreed to participate either made the information available on the homepage of a web portal/intranet system, or sent it out as part of a newsletter. There are 24,000 teachers in the Facebook teacher resource-sharing groups, but it is unknown how many teachers actually saw and read the recruitment post in the groups or on the Board website. The convenience/snowball sample provided by my personal network of 14 teacher friends/coworkers recruited an unknown number of participants, and is not a random sampling method. However, in combination with the random Facebook and School Board procedures, it is likely that some randomness was achieved. As shown by the Chi-square tests, this sample is representative of the population in many respects. Many teachers responded to these recruitment strategies, but it is not possible to define response rate, name a singular recruitment strategy used, or to claim true random sampling.

It would be beneficial to add some additional qualitative evidence of teachers’ experience of enactment of the curriculum in the classroom. The primarily quantitative methodology used in this study could be best supported with additional interviews and classroom observations.
qualitative responses to the survey data were helpful in describing phenomena that were not captured in the quantitative items, and additional data around these phenomena would be useful.

Additional analyses including regression analyses could be useful to describing patterns in the data collected and show the effect of training on different elements of instruction, including pedagogical techniques used by teachers with different training. Additional participants would allow for more complex analyses, including exploratory factor analyses. When used in combination with regression analyses these may capture effects and describe effect sizes in a more elegant way, giving additional insight into the observed phenomena.

Another possible limitation is that the respondents may be answering the survey because they care about the arts. The response bias presented by this theory is problematic, partly for the question on instructional time: data collected may be more reflective of teachers who already attempt to prioritize the arts in their timetabling and therefore may be higher than the population amounts. In this scenario, the perspective of teachers who care about the arts may be being captured more than the perspective of those practicing teachers who do not care about the arts, and the study may be less representative of the general population than may be indicated by the analyses of homogeneity employed to demonstrate representativeness. To combat this issue in future research, the survey may be adjusted by adding a question to gauge a participants’ engagement with or interest in the arts, to be used as a control measure.

Similarly, it is possible that different teachers may assign different numerical values to their comfort and other perceptual items. For example, a teacher who rates their comfort as a “5” may actually be more comfortable than a teacher who rates themselves a “4,” and that it would be best to compare their comfort level by holding a focus group or pursuing other qualitative means to differentiate their actual comparative comfort. There are many personal differences in perception of comfort and the rating of that comfort on a scale. While it is expected that some of this will be
remedied due through random selection, the small sample size increases the possibility that these types of error are systematic and pervasive.

Some other subject areas may benefit from specialist teachers in the elementary Grades. Research has shown that “out-of-field” teachers teaching in many disciplines may not be teaching as effectively as their subject-trained colleagues (Ingersoll, 1999), and further research exploring these phenomena in the Ontario context is recommended. While subject specialists may be more effective in teaching many subjects, not just the arts, the focus of this particular study is solely on the performing arts. The limitations created by the lack of comparative measures to other subject areas are noted, and future research should consider how subject specialists in other subject areas may be of benefit to students.

Future Research

This study provides a baseline for future research in performing arts instruction. At present, this study presented the views of 138 teachers throughout Ontario. Based on these views, additional research questions are raised on the situation surrounding performing arts instruction in Ontario elementary schools. Issues of professional development, community artists in the schools, specialists vs. non-specialists, performance vs. process, advocacy, passion/interest/motivation, mentorship, integration and resource development are discussed below, and opportunities for future research and follow-up are identified.

The data show a clear connection between training and experience in the performing arts with feelings of comfort which lead to teachers’ perceptions of effective instruction. How can confidence and comfort in teaching the performing arts be acquired? Is it possible for inservice teachers who have very little performing arts experience to gain skills and ability to effectively teach these subjects? Further research in this area is required. Some studies have shown some positive effect of professional development in the performing arts (Oreck, 2004), but there is need for an
experimental intervention in this area in the present Ontario context. The qualitative responses to the survey indicated that more mentorship and professional development is needed, but what types of professional development would be most useful for the largest number of teachers?

If it is not possible, or possible in very few cases to achieve significant improvements in personal teaching efficacy of the performing arts through professional development or other training interventions, what are the other alternatives for making effective educational experiences in these areas available to Ontario students? Research surrounding the extension of community-based artist-in-the-schools initiatives, like Learning Through The Arts, is also recommended.

Some specialists were dismissive of the abilities of those who have no formal training in the art form. While data do show that teachers with specialist qualifications in the arts are more comfortable in teaching the performing arts and report high accord with the ministry expectations, some non-specialist and non-formally trained teachers report covering the expectations quite well. Further research is needed to further illuminate the differences in instruction between highly trained and informally trained teachers of the performing arts.

Future research should evaluate opportunities for increasing knowledge of performing arts practices within the population of inservice teachers. This research should investigate not only the amount of training and what types of training provide an adequate amount of expertise and self-efficacy to meet minimum performance standards.

Additional research investigating the ‘conditions’ surrounding performing arts education, arts education policies, and teacher training practices in other provinces could help all provinces to make policy improvements to the state of performing arts education across Canada. There are little data indicating the extent to which the issues illuminated through this study are also issues in other provinces, and gathering these type of baseline data on a national level is recommended.
Summary

The students described by teachers in this study as receiving instruction in the performing arts receive an average of 65 minutes of instruction in music weekly, and 45% of respondent generalist teachers ($n = 86$) say that their students are taught by a music specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in music. Music is not integrated in any way into other subjects by 67.2% of respondent generalist teachers, and 46.2% of respondent generalist teachers who teach music to their students feel very uncomfortable at teaching music.

The students described by teachers in this study as receiving instruction in the performing arts receive an average of 36 minutes of instruction in drama weekly, and 5.8% of respondent generalist teachers say that their students are taught drama by a drama specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in drama. Drama is not integrated in any way into other subjects by 60% of respondent generalist teachers, and 20.8% of respondent generalist teachers who teach drama to their students feel very uncomfortable at teaching drama.

The students described by teachers in this study as receiving instruction in the performing arts receive an average of 33 minutes of instruction in dance weekly, and 4.6% of respondent generalist teachers say that their students are taught dance by a dance specialist or someone with substantial training or experience in the subject. Dance is not integrated in any way into other subjects by 27.3% of respondent generalist teachers, and 43.4% of respondent generalist teachers who teach dance to their students feel very uncomfortable at teaching dance.

The results show that there is a strong correlation between teachers’ perceptions of their comfort in teaching the performing arts with their perceptions of their effectiveness at teaching these subjects. Analyses indicate that teachers with even a small amount of training or experience in the performing arts have a significantly higher perception of their comfort in teaching the performing arts than teachers who have no training or experience in these areas, and that these
teachers also have significantly higher perceptions of their effectiveness in meeting the curricular expectations for each subject strand. Further, teachers with a high degree of training rate their both their comfort and effectiveness in meeting the curricular expectations for each subject strand significantly higher than those with only limited experience.

A number of avenues for improvement of the state of performing arts education in Ontario schools have been identified, including improvements to initial teacher education and professional development opportunities, more involvement of community artists-in-the-schools, and mobilization of strategies for integrated curriculum delivery. Teachers must be involved in the process of developing professional development opportunities for teachers, and encouraged to seek out opportunities to engage in authentic music, drama, and dance activities (Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Upitis, Smithrim & Soren, 1999).

Analyses indicate that Ontario teachers desire more training and experiences in the performing arts, and that having more performing arts training and experiences can help to improve teachers’ perceptions of their comfort and effectiveness at teaching the performing arts. The number of students taught these subjects by teachers with specialized training in the arts is very low, and the responses of teachers with low training and experience indicate that many are not teaching these subjects effectively. This in turn indicates that many Ontario students are not receiving the amount or nature of instruction mandated by the Ministry of Education.

Training and professional development in the performing arts can improve teacher efficacy, and some teachers without formal training perceive themselves to be comfortable and effective at teaching these subjects. Additional instruction in the performing arts in initial teacher education programs is recommended, and facilitating engaging experiences for teachers is an effective way to improve the situation for Ontario students. Data clearly show that even though the benefits of this instruction are described in the literature and comprehensive instruction in the performing arts is
mandated by the provincial curricula, many Ontario students do not have sufficient access to meaningful artistic mentorship, resources, or experiences. These findings justify future research in this area, further examining the factors influencing Ontario elementary teachers’ performing arts instruction.

It is my hope that these data will be received by teachers, administrators, policymakers and politicians as a contribution to the discussion about how the state of performing arts education in Ontario schools may be improved to benefit all Ontario students.
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APPENDIX 1: STATE OF THE ARTS SURVEY

The State of the Arts Survey

The Performing Arts in Ontario Public Schools

Welcome to our survey! Please read the following, and click below to signal your consent to participate in this study:

Letter of Information and Consenting

Procedures

Project Title: State of the Arts: Factors Influencing Elementary Teachers’ Performing Arts Instruction

Researchers: Paul Vernon, OCT, MEd candidate, Faculty of Education, Queen’s University Dr. Christopher DeLuca, Faculty Supervisor, Faculty of Education, Queen’s University

Ethical Clearance: This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines and Queen’s University policies.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to explore factors influencing elementary teachers’ instruction of the performing arts curricula in Ontario schools.

Participation: Participation in this study is completely voluntary and confidential, and all data will be anonymous. If you choose to click on the link embedded within the emailed invitation, you will be taken to a secure online survey. This survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Survey questions ask you about your experiences and training related to teaching the performing arts. The final page of the survey asks you for contact information to be entered into a draw to win a prize and for potential follow-up, including sharing of results. Collection of contact information in this stage of the survey is entirely optional and your contact details will not be linked to your survey responses in any way.

Risks and Withdrawal Procedures: There are no known risks associated with your participation in this study. You are not obliged to answer any questions you find objectionable or uncomfortable. You are free to withdraw at any time without consequence by simply exiting the survey before the end of the survey and closing the survey window. After your responses are entered into the fields and the “save and continue” button is pressed, those responses have been anonymously captured. Since there is no way for the study administrators to connect your identity to any particular responses, data can not be deleted after it is submitted.
Privacy and Confidentiality: Your confidentiality will be maintained to the extent possible. Any information which may identify participants will be kept confidential, and stored separately from survey data. Results from this study will be published and presented; however, your name or any other identifying information will never be published or presented. All data will be encrypted using secure sockets layer (SSL) encoding, and stored on servers located in Canada. These data will be accessible only to the researchers involved with this study, and all data will be stored on a password-protected computer in accordance with faculty of education policy and retained indefinitely. If data are used for secondary analysis, they will contain no identifying information. While survey data will never be correlated with any participant contact information, participants will be invited to provide their contact information for three purposes: (a) remuneration in the form of entry into a draw to win a prize, (b) a summary of research results; (c) potential follow-up. Separate consent will be sought for each of these purposes. Contact information will be collected on a separate electronic form, disconnected from your survey responses. This protocol is in place to maintain and safeguard your confidentiality.

Compensation: If you wish, you will be offered an opportunity to enter a draw to win a number of prizes. Ten (10) “Starbucks Coffee” gift cards and one (1) “Canadian Tire” gift card will be awarded by random selection. In order to enter the draw while preserving participant anonymity, a link to a separate survey for entering your contact information will be provided at the end of the survey. Your chances of winning will depend on the number of participants who select this option.

Consenting Procedures: In order to indicate your consent to participate in the study, please click on the survey link and begin the survey. Your submitted survey responses will signify your consent to participate.

Questions: Any questions about study participation may be directed to principal investigator Paul Vernon by email at arts.ed@queensu.ca or supervisor Christopher DeLuca at cdeluca@queensu.ca or 613-533-6000 x 77675. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at 613-533-6081 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca. Thank you for considering to participate in this research.

Sincerely,
Paul Vernon, OCT
MEd Candidate
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario

Please click here to indicate your informed consent:

☐ I have read the letter of information and I agree to participate in this study

Thank you for participating in our research!
Your participation will provide valuable information for researchers and teachers about the ways in which the Performing Arts are being taught in Ontario schools. You will be asked questions about your training and experience in the Performing Arts, your training and experience in teaching the Performing Arts, and the nature of your students' Performing Arts experiences. The survey will also allow you to share with us your successes and challenges in delivering effective Performing Arts experiences to your students. This survey should take approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete. If you are unsure about a question please feel free to leave it blank and move on to the next question. Let's get started!

**What grade levels do you teach?**

- [ ] Primary
- [ ] Junior
- [ ] Intermediate
- [ ] Secondary

**First, please tell us a little about yourself:**

**What Grade do you currently teach?**

(check all that apply - if you teach a combined Grade class please also check that option)

- [ ] I teach a combined Grade class
- [ ] Occasional Teacher
- [ ] Music Teacher
- [ ] Visual Art Teacher
- [ ] Drama Teacher
- [ ] Dance Teacher
- [ ] Physical Education Teacher
- [ ] Teacher-Librarian
- [ ] Junior Kindergarten
- [ ] Senior Kindergarten
- [ ] Grade 1
- [ ] Grade 2
What Grade do you currently teach?
(check all that apply)

☐ Grade 3

☐ Grade 4

☐ Grade 5

☐ Grade 6

☐ Grade 7

☐ Grade 8

☐ other, please specify: ______________________

Where is your school located?

☐ rural community (less than 2,000 people)

☐ town (2,000 - 30,000 people)

☐ small city (30,000 - 90,000 people)
medium city (90,000 - 200,000 people)
large city (more than 200,000 people)
Select your school board from the following drop-down menu (optional):

- Algoma District School Board
- Avon Maitland District School Board
- Bluewater District School Board
- Conseil des écoles publiques de l'Est de l'Ontario
- Conseil scolaire Viamonde
- Conseil scolaire de district du Grand Nord de l'Ontario
- Conseil scolaire public du Nord-Est de l'Ontario
- District School Board of Niagara
- District School Board Ontario North East
- Durham District School Board
  ... 21 additional choices hidden ...
- Toronto District School Board
- Trillium Lakelands District School Board
- Upper Canada District School Board
- Upper Grand District School Board
- Waterloo Region District School Board
- York Region District School Board
- Other - private school
- Other - Catholic school
- Other - On-reserve school
- Other - Other school
What is the primary language of instruction in your classroom?

- English
- French
- Both English and French
- Other, please specify... ______________________

What are the Grade levels in your school?

- Grades K-3
- Grades K-4
- Grades K-6
- Grades K-8
- Grades K-12
- Grades 4-6
- Grades 4-8
- Grades 9-12
- Other, please specify... ______________________

Does your school have an overall special focus in subjects or approach?

- No
- Arts-focused school
- Outdoor/experiential focused school
- Science and technology focused school
- Language or culturally focused school
- Social justice focused school
- Other, please specify... ______________________

Do you identify as:

- Male
Female

Unspecified

How many years of Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) teaching experience do you have?

Training and experience in the Performing Arts and Performing Arts instruction

Training and experience is divided into three separate questions, below: (a) formal training/certification in the Performing Arts, (b) formal training in teaching the Performing Arts, and; (c) experience in Performing Arts practice.

Do you have formal training/certification in the Performing Arts?

(check all that apply)

Music:

Royal Conservatory
(completed between Grades 2-7)

Royal Conservatory
(completed Grade 8 or above)

1 - 3 College/University courses

4 - 6 College/University courses

College diploma

Bachelor's degree (ie. B.Mus.)

Master's degree

PhD

other

Drama:

Professional Theatre Program (ie. National Theatre School)

1 - 3 College/University courses

4 - 6 College/University courses

College Diploma

Bachelor's degree (ie. BFA)

Master's degree

PhD

other

Dance:

Professional Dance Program (ie. National Ballet School)

1 - 3 College/University courses

4 - 6 College/University courses

College diploma

Bachelor's degree (ie. BFA)

Master's degree

PhD

other
If you answered "other" to the previous questions, please describe:

Do you have any formal training/certification in teaching the Performing Arts? (ie. Music education, Drama education, Dance education)

(check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQ Level</th>
<th>AQ Level</th>
<th>Specialist (3 AQs)</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree in Performing Arts Education</th>
<th>Master's degree in Performing Arts Education</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Music

Drama

Dance

If you answered "other" to the previous question, please describe:

Do you have experience in any of the Performing Arts outside of school?

(check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Took lessons as a child</th>
<th>Took lessons as an adult</th>
<th>Hobby</th>
<th>Community Arts organization participant (community theatre, choir, etc.)</th>
<th>Professional experience</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Music

Drama

Dance

If you answered "other" to the previous question, please describe:

Do you wish there had been more opportunities to learn about the Performing Arts during your Initial Teacher Education program (B.Ed)?
Music
Drama
Dance

Integrating the Performing Arts into instruction of other subjects

How comfortable are you with teaching the Performing Arts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not comfortable at all</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you wish to comment further on the questions on this page, please do so below:

Performing Arts Curriculum Instruction

The following questions will help us to understand the amount and nature of the Performing Arts instruction that your students experience.

Who teaches the Performing Arts strands to your students?

I do a colleague (non-subject specialist) a colleague (subject specialist) a visiting subject specialist no one not sure other

Music
Drama
Dance

Do you teach these subjects to other teachers' students?

Yes, one other class Yes, multiple other classes No

Music
Drama
To what extent does your Performing Arts instruction cover the Ministry expectations as outlined in the Ontario curriculum document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 20%</th>
<th>20% - 40%</th>
<th>40% - 60%</th>
<th>60% - 80%</th>
<th>over 80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For your students, how many minutes per week are dedicated to subject-specific instruction in:

(if not sure, please leave blank)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the curriculum covered during a short-block intensive program? (i.e., all expectations are covered in a single week or month during the year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are arts curriculum expectations covered during another subjects' class time? (i.e., dance expectations are covered during phys-ed class time, music expectations covered during french class time, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If "yes", please tell us which other class time is used to deliver arts curriculum:

[ ]

If you wish to comment further on the questions on this page, please do so below:

[ ]

Performing Arts Pedagogy and Physical Infrastructure

Where do your students participate in Performing Arts curriculum programming?

(check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dedicated space</th>
<th>Shared/multi-purpose room</th>
<th>Gymnasium</th>
<th>Stage/Auditorium</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Our regular classroom</th>
<th>Outdoors</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "other", please describe:

[ ]

How often do your students participate in the following activities during regular school hours?

Music, non-instrumental:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal music</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing games</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement to music (listening and moving)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to music</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative response to music listening activities (ie.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
writing, talking, drawing)

Body percussion (clapping, snapping, patching, etc) 

Invented/graphic notation 

Interactive technology/media 

Composition 

Improvisation 

Other 

If you answered "other", please describe:

Music, instrumental:

Playing a rhythmic instrument (rhythm sticks, hand drum, bells, shakers, etc.) while walking/moving 

Playing a rhythmic instrument while seated 

Recorder 

Ukulele/Guitar 

Other stringed instruments 

Band instruments 

Composition 

Improvisation 

Other 

If you answered "other", please describe:
### Drama:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement improvisation</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement improvisation including props</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue/mixed improvisation</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/mixed improvisation to music</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/mixed improvisation to video/visual cues</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/performing scripts</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group writing/performance tasks</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual writing/performance tasks</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting books for performance</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting movies for performance</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/performance tasks based on film/tv characters</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and using masks</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using masks (pre-made)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If you answered "other", please describe:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement improvisation</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement exercises</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative choreography</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-defined choreography</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using &quot;contemporary&quot; music (ie. that the students bring)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from popular culture)

Using orchestral music, classical and modern composers for orchestra

Integrating singing, ie. for musical theatre

Other

If you answered "other", please describe:


If you wish to comment further on the questions on this page, please do so below:


Performing Arts Experiences and Resources

This section will allow you to tell us where you get your ideas for lessons in the Performing Arts, and how often your students have access to special arts-focussed programming.

How often do your students experience the following visitors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Type</th>
<th>Never per year</th>
<th>Once per year</th>
<th>Twice per year</th>
<th>3 - 7 times per year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting musician</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting actor/writer/director/theatre company</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting dancer(s)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting teaching artist (ie. Learning Through The Arts, ArtSmarts)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe your students' experience of these visitors:

(Please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Type</th>
<th>Large group presentation (80+ students)</th>
<th>Medium group presentation (40-80 students)</th>
<th>Group presentation/workshop (25-40 students)</th>
<th>Small group presentation/workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

156
To what extent did these visitors change or influence your teaching of the Performing Arts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>___</th>
<th>___</th>
<th>___</th>
<th>___</th>
<th>___</th>
<th>Drastically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor/Writer/Director/Theatre company</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancer(s)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting teaching artist (ie. Learning Through The Arts, ArtSmarts)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are the following arts resources near your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 10km away</th>
<th>Less than 100km away</th>
<th>Greater than 100km away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art gallery</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre company</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra/Symphony</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance company</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera company</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often do your students go on field trips to the following sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once per year</th>
<th>Twice per year</th>
<th>3 - 7 times per year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play/dramatic performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical theatre/Opera performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do your students have regular access to the following extracurricular programming?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>One option</th>
<th>Multiple options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal ensemble</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental ensemble</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama club/group</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance club/group</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How often do your students perform:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Never per year</th>
<th>Once per year</th>
<th>Twice per year</th>
<th>3 - 7 times per year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at school assemblies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at special school functions (ie. parent's night, talent show)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at special evening concerts (ie. band/choir night, seasonal concerts)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at music festivals (ie. Kiwanis)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the community (ie. Library, Mall)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at conferences (ie. OMEA, CODE)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In your teaching of the Performing Arts, how often do you use the following resources?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry support documents (ie. exemplars)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETFO publications/resources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMEA/CMEA (Ontario/Canadian Music Educators)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Association) website

CODE (Council of Ontario Drama and Dance Educators) website

LTTA (Learning Through The Arts) website

Textbook/publisher resources

Material/equipment supplier resources

School Board resource centre/website

Other resources

If you answered "other" above, please specify the source of your resources:

If you wish to comment further on the questions on this page, please do so below:

Cross-curricular integration of the Performing Arts

Do you use the Performing Arts in the instruction or assessment of other subjects, at least once per year?

Yes  No

Music  o  o

Dance  o  o

Drama  o  o

Cross-curricular Integration of the Performing Arts

This section will help us to understand the extent to which you use the Performing Arts in your instruction of other subjects.

How often do you integrate Music with:

Never  Occasionally  Monthly  Weekly

Visual Art  o  o  o  o

Drama  o  o  o  o
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies (includes History and Geography)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Technology</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How often do you integrate Drama with:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies (includes History and Geography)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Technology</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How often do you integrate Dance with:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visual Art  o  o  o  o  o  
Drama  o  o  o  o  o  
Physical Education  o  o  o  o  o  
Math  o  o  o  o  o  
Science  o  o  o  o  o  
Language  o  o  o  o  o  
Social Studies (includes History and Geography)  o  o  o  o  o  
Media Technology  o  o  o  o  o  
French  o  o  o  o  o  
Other  o  o  o  o  o  

What would help you to integrate the Performing Arts more than you do?

(drag the number on the left to rank ONLY those choices that you think would help to improve your instruction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>More specialized resources (ie. books, videos, etc)</th>
<th>More specialized equipment (ie. instruments, lighting)</th>
<th>More materials (ie. costumes, props, music, supplies)</th>
<th>Improved access to specialists or consultants</th>
<th>Different classroom space</th>
<th>More prep time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered "other" please specify:

[Blank]

If you wish to comment further on the questions on this page, please do so below:
It's almost over!
(phew!)

How do we make it better?

This section allows you to tell us about things that could help you to include more and better Performing Arts programming in your classroom.

What would most help to improve the quality of Performing Arts education for your students?

(drag the number on the left to rank the options that would be most helpful)

1. more specialist (or additional specialist)
2. more money for materials and equipment
3. more professional development
4. improved physical space
5. more flexible scheduling
6. more easy access to Performing Arts lead teacher
7. more access to specialist/consultant
8. if my school board were more supportive of the Arts
9. if my administration were more supportive of the Arts
10. other

If you answered "other", please specify:

If you would like to elaborate on the previous question, use this space to tell us more about what would help to improve the quality of Performing Arts education for your students:

Are you doing something spectacular that we should know about? How do you improve your students' Performing Arts experiences that others could try?
This is the last page of the survey!

We would like to offer you the opportunity to participate in future research, to be sent additional teaching resources for the Performing Arts and a summary of results of this study, and give you a chance to win an exciting prize!

However, we also want to safeguard your anonymity. If you check "Yes" below, you will be redirected to a four-question survey where you may input your email address and opt-in for each of these specific purposes.

May we redirect you to the four-item contact survey?

- Yes
- No
APPENDIX 2: RECRUITMENT AND ETHICS

Recruitment Script – Teacher Email

Dear Ontario Teacher,

I am a graduate student at the Faculty of Education at Queen’s University, and I am doing a study on performing arts education for my master’s thesis. I am hoping that you will participate in this important study.

Over the past 20 years, elementary teachers have been increasingly asked to assume responsibility for teaching specialty subjects like music, dance, and drama. The performing arts are important for emotional, social, character, cognitive and physical development, and regular practice of these arts leads to measurable improvements in other subject areas. However, very little information is known about how prepared teachers feel to teach these subjects. Your help is needed to increase our understanding of this complex issue.

Several questions underpin this issue: Who is teaching the performing arts? What methods and resources do teachers use in teaching the arts? How comfortable are teachers at teaching these subjects? What supports would be useful to teachers in teaching the performing arts? The person who can best help us to find answers to these questions are teachers in the classroom.

Below you will find a link to a secure online survey, which will take approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete. Your participation is confidential, and your responses will be anonymous. You will not be contacted for follow-up data collection unless you specifically consent to such additional participation. The attached letter of information further details the purpose and procedures for this research.

By clicking on the link below, you consent to participate in this research as outlined in the attached Letter of Information.

[link to survey]
Many thanks,

Paul Vernon

Recruitment Script – School Boards

Dear [School Board],

I am a graduate student at Queen’s University, and I am conducting research on performing arts education in Ontario schools. I am hoping that you will help me to gather data from your elementary teachers about their performing arts instruction.

Primarily, this study will assess teacher preparedness to teach the performing arts. Many classroom “generalist” teachers are instructing students in music, drama, and dance, and very little is known about their preparedness to do so. The performing arts are important for emotional, social, character, cognitive and physical development, and regular practice of these arts leads to measurable improvements in other subject areas. Illuminating factors that contribute to teachers’ confidence in teaching these subjects will help Ontario school boards build capacity for teaching and learning across districts and subject areas, improve student learning and achievement, and help to create healthy, accepting, and safe schools.

To facilitate this important research, I would like to send a hyperlink to elementary teachers in your board, which will guide them to an online survey. After teachers navigate to this survey, they will be given an opportunity to describe their experiences in performing arts training and instruction.

Participation in this research is completely voluntary and anonymous, and data collected will be confidential. Although the survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete if all questions are answered, “branching” will reduce that time significantly for many participants. This study has been granted ethical clearance by the research ethics board at Queen’s University. This study poses no known risks to participants.
This research will be valuable in maximizing professional development opportunities to improve instruction in the performing arts, which may benefit other subject areas including literacy and math. It is my hope and expectation that teachers will appreciate the opportunity to voice their opinions about this matter, and that the results of this study will illuminate valuable ways to improve the efficiency and efficacy of arts education in Ontario.

Please join with other Ontario school boards, and make sure your teachers’ voices are heard in this important study. I look forward to hearing from you so that we may start learning together.

Sincerely,

Paul Vernon, OCT
MEd Candidate, Curriculum Studies
Queen’s University

Recruitment Script – Facebook Admin

Dear administrator, Ontario teachers - resource and idea sharing facebook group,

Hello __________,

I am a graduate student in education, I'm hoping to distribute a link to my survey on performing arts education to members of your resource-sharing group. I can do this via email or a post on your group's page. Is this something that you would be able to support?

Please find below the long-winded (and ethics committee approved) wording of this request :) thanks! paul

---

I am a graduate student at the Faculty of Education at Queen’s University, and I am doing a study on performing arts education for my master’s thesis. It is difficult to recruit teacher participants except through their school boards, which makes it difficult for teachers to provide
honest information. Your group represents an opportunity for teachers to participate in educational research without requiring the consent of individual school boards. As such, I would like to distribute a link to an online survey through your Facebook group for teachers.

Over the past 20 years, elementary teachers have been increasingly asked to assume responsibility for teaching specialty subjects like music, dance, and drama. The performing arts are important for emotional, social, character, cognitive and physical development, and regular practice of these arts leads to measurable improvements in other subject areas. However, very little information is known about how prepared teachers feel to teach these subjects. Your help is needed to increase our understanding of this complex issue.

Several questions underpin this issue: Who is teaching the performing arts? What methods and resources do teachers use in teaching the arts? How comfortable are teachers at teaching these subjects? What supports would be useful to teachers in teaching the performing arts? The person who can best help us to find answers to these questions are teachers in the classroom.

I would like to send a message to all members of your group, with a short email introducing the study and a link to my online survey. It is estimated that this survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Please find attached the letter of information for the study, and a link to a test version of the survey. Responses in this version will not be counted, it is for evaluation purposes only. If you support me in contacting teachers in your group, I will send the real link to an identical survey.

https://queensu.fluidsurveys.com/surveys/vernon/sas-final-test-data/

Many thanks,

Paul Vernon, OCT

Recruitment Script – Facebook Post

Elementary Teachers! Please participate in this important survey!
While research shows the performing arts to be important for emotional, social, character, cognitive and physical development, little is known about teachers’ preparedness to teach these subjects, or how they are teaching them.

The “State of the Arts Survey” was designed by Queen’s University researchers to gather data about teachers’ training and preparedness in performing arts instruction, in addition to other valuable data about the performing arts in Ontario schools. The survey asks teachers to describe their training and experience in this area, in order to highlight factors leading to teacher efficacy.

If you are a practicing teacher, PLEASE take a few minutes to complete this important survey. You could win a prize! And you will help to improve our understanding of how to better support teachers in providing excellent performing arts experiences for their students.

Follow the link below to participate:

[link to survey]

Many thanks!
Ethics Approvals

September 04, 2013

Mr. Paul Vernon
Master’s Student
Faculty of Education
Duncan McArthur Hall
Queen’s University
511 Union Street
KINGSTON, ON K7M 3R7

GRBB Ref #: GEDUC 694 13; Romeo #: 6010732
Title: “GEDUC 694 13 State of the Arts: Factors Influencing Elementary Teachers’ Performing Arts Instruction”

Dear Mr. Vernon:

The General Research Ethics Board (GRBB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled “GEDUC 694 13 State of the Arts: Factors Influencing Elementary Teachers’ Performing Arts Instruction” for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCPS) and Queen’s ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (article D 1.6) and Senate Terms of Reference (article G), your project has been cleared for one year. At the end of each year, the GRBB will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GRBB, with a copy to your unit REB, of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period (access this form at https://services.queens.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GRBB Adverse Event Report). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GRBB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GRBB. For example you must report changes to the level of risk, participant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To make an amendment, access the application at https://services.queens.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GRBB Amendment to Approved Study Form. These changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services or davemay@queens.ca for further review and clearance by the GRBB or GRBB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

John Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair, General Research Ethics Board

c: Dr. Chris Deluca, Faculty Supervisor
    Dr. Don Klinger, Chair, Unit REB
    Erin Wickham, UNO Graduate Studies and Bureau of Research
January 27, 2014

Mr. Paul Vernon
Master's Student
Faculty of Education
Queen's University
Duncan McArthur Hall
511 Union Street West
Kingston, ON, K7M 5R7

Dear Mr. Vernon:

RF: Amendment for your study entitled: GEOH/C 694.13 State of the Arts: Factors Influencing Elementary Teachers' Performing Arts Instruction; ROMEO# 6049732

Thank you for submitting your amendment requesting the following changes:

1) To recruit participants through school boards;
2) Letter of Information (revised January 26, 2014);

By this letter you have ethics clearance for these changes.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair
General Research Ethics Board

c.: Dr. Chris DeLuca, Faculty Supervisor
March 10, 2014

Mr. Paul Vernon
Master’s Student
Faculty of Education
Queen’s University
Duncan McArthur Hall
511 Union Street West
Kingston, ON, M7M 5R7

Dear Mr. Vernon:

RE: Amendment for your study entitled: GEDUC 606-13 State of the Arts: Factors Influencing Elementary Teachers’ Performing Arts Instruction; ROMEO# 6019732

Thank you for submitting your amendment requesting the following changes:

1) To recruit participants through: (1) teacher Facebook groups; (2) teacher continuing education bodies, including Queen’s University Faculty of Education Continuing Education, and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education; (3) full and part-time graduate students at all faculties of education in Ontario,

2) To change the remuneration from “The Source” gift card to “Canadian Tire” gift card;

3) To change the survey instrument as follows: (1) to add a question about school focus/specialty, (2) to change scale from 5-point frequency to 4-point frequency in a few questions, (3) to put the Letter of Information on the front page; (4) to add branching logic to decrease survey length for some participants;

4) Revised documents: (1) recruitment script teacher continuing education Mar 7; (2) recruitment script graduate students Mar 7; (3) recruitment script grad office Mar 7; (4) recruitment script Facebook teacher e-mail Mar 7; (5) recruitment script Facebook post Mar 7; (6) recruitment script Facebook admin Mar 7

By this letter you have ethics clearance for these changes.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jean Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair
General Research Ethics Board

c.: Dr. Chris De Luca
APPENDIX 3: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES AND FIGURES

Map of Ontario Showing Geographic Distribution Of Sample
Table 8
Pedagogical Practices in Music in
Order of Frequency
(Rank Order by Summed Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Listening to music</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Body percussion</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Vocal music</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Movement to music</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Singing games</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Creative response</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ie. writing, talking, drawing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Playing a rhythmic</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument while seated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Playing a rhythmic</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument (rhythm sticks, hand drum, bells,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shakers, etc.) while walking/moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Interactive technology/media</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Recorder</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Improvisation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Invented graphic</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Composition</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Improvisation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Composition</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Band instruments</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Other stringed</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Ukulele/Guitar</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instrumental music: Other</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Music: Other</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>Weekly (n)</td>
<td>Weekly (%)</td>
<td>Monthly (n)</td>
<td>Monthly (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drama</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement improvisation</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13 16</td>
<td>20 25</td>
<td>38 48</td>
<td>9 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement improvisation including props</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>19 24</td>
<td>38 48</td>
<td>17 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/mixed improvisation to music</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>18 23</td>
<td>37 46</td>
<td>19 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/performing scripts</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>20 25</td>
<td>43 54</td>
<td>15 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue/mixed improvisation</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7 9</td>
<td>17 21</td>
<td>35 44</td>
<td>21 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group writing/performance tasks</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>16 20</td>
<td>37 46</td>
<td>22 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting books for performance</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>12 15</td>
<td>42 53</td>
<td>25 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual writing/performance tasks</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>14 18</td>
<td>25 31</td>
<td>38 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/mixed improvisation to video/visual cues</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>8 10</td>
<td>34 43</td>
<td>35 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and using masks</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>41 51</td>
<td>38 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using masks (pre-made)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>31 39</td>
<td>49 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/performance tasks based on film/tv characters</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>20 25</td>
<td>57 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting movies for performance</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>18 23</td>
<td>58 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>72 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10  
*Pedagogical Practices in Dance in Order of Frequency*  
*(Rank Order by Summed Score)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Weekly n</th>
<th>Weekly %</th>
<th>Monthly n</th>
<th>Monthly %</th>
<th>Occasionally n</th>
<th>Occasionally %</th>
<th>Never n</th>
<th>Never %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement exercises</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement improvisation</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using 'contemporary' music (ie. that the students bring from popular culture)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative choreography</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-defined choreography</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using orchestral music, classical and modern composers for orchestra</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating singing, ie. for musical theatre</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>