

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1979

A Follow-Up Study of Music Educators Prepared at Utah State University Through a Survey of Graduates' Opinions and Professional Responsibilities

Mark Ellis Peterson
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Mark Ellis, "A Follow-Up Study of Music Educators Prepared at Utah State University Through a Survey of Graduates' Opinions and Professional Responsibilities" (1979). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 3418.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/3418>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF MUSIC EDUCATORS PREPARED AT
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY THROUGH A SURVEY OF
GRADUATES' OPINIONS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

by

Mark Ellis Peterson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Secondary Education

with an emphasis in

Music Education

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is due Dr. Ross R. Allen for his support and encouragement throughout the entire program and for his extra efforts in providing frequent contacts despite the long distance. Thanks is expressed to Dr. Terrance Hatch and Dr. Warren Burton for their service on the graduate committee.

Appreciation is extended to the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences for its financial assistance in the computer processing and to Dr. Donald V. Sisson for his aid in processing and analyzing the data.

Special thanks is due my mother, Margaret Peterson and my father, Dr. Ronald S. Peterson for providing the encouragement, the finances, the critical evaluations and the love to see me through this endeavor.

Finally to my children, Jennifer and Melissa and to my wife, Charlene goes my affection and appreciation for their continued support. Without their many sacrifices the opportunity to complete this study would have been lost.

Mark Ellis Peterson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ABSTRACT	v
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
PROCEDURES	10
FINDINGS	14
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28
LITERATURE CITED	32
APPENDICES	34
VITA	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Selected means of the graduate's ratings of the quality of training received	15
2. Selected means of the graduate's ratings of the usefulness of training objectives to current teaching responsibilities	17
3. Results of chi-square tests amongst responses of various subgroups on the quality of training received	18
4. Results of chi-square tests amongst responses of various subgroups on the usefulness of training objectives to current teaching responsibilities	19
5. Chi-square analysis for degree specialty compared with gender of graduates	20
6. Results of chi-square analyses for degree specialty compared with teaching assignments	21
7. Totals from part one of the survey questionnaire	44
8. Totals from part two of the survey questionnaire	45
9-63. Data from part three, items 1-55 of the survey questionnaire	46

ABSTRACT

A Follow-up Study of Music Educators Prepared at
Utah State University through a Survey of Graduates'
Opinions and Professional Responsibilities

by

Mark Ellis Peterson

Utah State University, 1979

Major Professor: Dr. Ross R. Allen
Department: Secondary Education

The purpose of this study was to assess the opinions of Utah State University music graduates regarding (a) the effectiveness of their training at Utah State University and (b) the applicability of the current music and secondary education department objectives to the graduates own teaching situations. An additional objective was to compare teaching assignments of the graduates.

A survey questionnaire was utilized to obtain the data and a return of 85% of the accessible sample was achieved. The sample included all music graduates of Utah State University from 1970-1977.

Based on the graduates responses three recommendations were made: (1) more electives and less requirements should be established in the music education degree program, (2) the course content in music education courses should be centered around the secondary classroom, rather than at the higher education level and (3) students should be encouraged to enroll in the professional education sequence earlier in their program of study.

(79 pages)

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the problem

Numerous studies have been conducted throughout the country to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher education programs in music. Equally as many recommendations have been made based on the results; and although the findings are voluminous, there has been little consensus amongst the research as to the changes music education curricula should take.

For example, Taylor (1970), in his Maryland survey of music teacher opinions regarding professional preparation in music education, reported that the undergraduate courses identified as being least valuable were, for the most part, in professional education.

Taylor concluded:

The amount and kind of requests for certain supplementary instruction reveals a need for either more music related courses in the curriculum, or an extension of the period of study. (Taylor, 1970 p.339)

However, Bell (1976) surveyed the opinions of music graduates from eight colleges and universities in Arkansas and found the following:

There was evidence of need for more training of "teachers" rather than "performers". Many of the respondents felt they were short changed and weak in the area of methods and materials for teaching. (Bell, 1976 p. 1)

The differences illustrated by the two studies cited were typical of research in the area of music teacher education. In an informal symposium of the organization and administration of music

education degree programs, Henke (1966) stated that "it is safe to conclude only that unanimity of opinion does not exist."

The amount of controversy and the differences in the findings indicated that each school of music education should evaluate its own objectives.

Aebischer states:

It is important to know whether the graduates are pleased... as related to their positions and personal fulfillment.
(Aebischer, 1968 p. 3)

No graduate opinion surveys have been conducted in the music department at Utah State University since Wardle (1954). Boyce (1973) evaluated the music education curricula of the four state college-university systems through a survey of the 1969-1971 graduates, however, the following items were not assessed:

(1) differences in opinions between choral, instrumental and string education majors, (2) relationships between teaching responsibilities and academic preparation and (3) graduate opinions regarding the application of professional education and student teaching courses, which made up over one-third of music education requirements.

The problem was, then, the lack of information regarding the opinions of music graduates as to the effectiveness of the existing Utah State University Music and Secondary Education Department competency objectives in meeting the future specialized teaching needs of these graduates.

Statement of purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the opinions of the 1970-1977 music education graduates of Utah State University regarding the teacher training program.

In order to accomplish this purpose, the following objectives were established:

1. To formulate a survey questionnaire that would determine music graduate's opinions regarding (a) the effectiveness of their training at Utah State University and (b) the applicability of the current music and secondary education department competency objectives to the graduates own teaching situations.
2. To determine the common teaching responsibilities of the graduates.
3. To determine the graduate opinions regarding each questionnaire item.
4. To compare the responses of various subgroups; i.e. choral, instrumental and all other music graduates; teaching and nonteaching respondents and the 1970-1973 and 1974-1977 graduates.

In order to meet these objectives the study was designed to answer the following research questions.

1. What are the current teaching responsibilities of Utah State University music graduates?
2. How do the music graduates rate the effectiveness of their training at Utah State University?
3. How do the music graduates rate the applicability of each objective of the current music education teacher training program as it relates to their teaching situations?
4. How do the various subgroup's responses compare with each other on each survey item?

Delimitations

Inasmuch as the study was limited to 1970-1977 graduates, the results only reflect the training program during those years.

In research of this type the results are limited by the percentage of respondents, however, the return of this questionnaire was 85% of the accessible sample and 75% of the total sample.

Definition of terms

Choral music graduates. Those students who emphasized their studies in voice and choral music education. All music graduates have some training in all areas.

Instrumental music graduates. Primarily those students emphasizing band, wind and percussion fields. These music graduates also have limited choral training.

Department competency objectives. The music and secondary education departments have determined specific skills that graduates should obtain while in training. These skills are translated into competency objectives.

Professional education. Courses and objectives discussed under this heading deal specifically with general training for all teachers in the public schools.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the preceding section the problem was presented and some literature cited which provided a rationale and background for this study. Although researchers in the field of music teacher education have used such varied survey techniques as comparing principal's and supervisor's evaluations of the teaching abilities of music graduates from selected universities and assessing the opinions of the music school's faculties regarding program effectiveness; the most frequent form used for evaluation of teacher education programs in music is the graduate opinion survey.

In this section the literature which has considered specifically the results of and the need for graduate opinion research in music education will be reviewed.

Importance of the graduate opinion survey

The need for graduate opinions in evaluating the effectiveness of music teacher programs is emphasized by Borkowski (1967) and Aebischer (1968).

Borkowski (1967) describes the problems associated with the development of music education curriculum when input from those in the public school system is not utilized:

While the selection of courses within the curriculum tend to be standardized due to certification requirements, the content of such courses varies greatly. Although various aspects of teacher education have come under careful consideration, the teacher education curriculum suffers due to a paucity of knowledge among curriculum planners concerning the actual performance of graduates and their education programs.

The rationale for requiring students to complete courses to a Music Education degree seems to be based on assumptions which have not been thoroughly investigated. It is assumed that success in teaching is likely to result from instruction in certain specific courses. These courses are then required for all students working towards a Music Education degree. The selection of courses is not based on reliable evidence as to what is necessary to be a successful music teacher, but is based usually on a general feeling of what the student "ought to have". (Borkowski, 1967, p. 1-2)

Aebischer (1968) further supports the importance of evaluating teacher education programs by assessment of graduate opinions:

Those responsible for the "Selection and Clarification of Objectives", "Selection and Planning of Educational Experiences", and "Organization of Experiences" will need to study responses from School of Music graduates as they continue to develop these other areas.

It is important to know whether the graduates are pleased with certain areas of curriculum and counseling, as related to their positions and personal fulfillment. Because a student receives his training in music and acquires a salaried position, it does not necessarily follow that he has been adequately prepared, nor is it possible to tell how long he will be employed or how competently he will use this training.

There are many variables which influence curriculum and counseling ... but these should not discourage a school from investigating possibilities and instigating the best possible program for its continuity. (Aebischer, 1968, p. 3-4)

Lack of agreement amongst findings

Research cited in this review has met with mixed success and little consistency is found amongst the recommendations for teacher education programs.

The studies to be cited can be classified in two groups. Aebischer (1967), Taylor (1967), Raessler (1967), B. Franklin (1968), Finley (1969), Patterson (1972), Stegall (1975), Childs (1976) and Corbett (1977) surveyed all the music education graduates at selected universities while Brooks (1968), A. Franklin (1968), Lee (1970), Duvall (1970), Leman (1974), Bell (1976) and Choate (1976) assessed responses from

graduates only in the specialized areas of choral and instrumental music.

Aebischer (1967) and Childs (1976) both stated that the training of music teachers at the selected schools was, according to the graduates, adequate and that there was no need for change in the curriculum. On the other hand A. Franklin (1968), Duvall (1970), Choate (1976) and Corbett (1977) surveyed opinions regarding the same question and found that training was said to be inadequate to only moderately effective.

After compiling similarities amongst teacher responsibilities in So. Carolina, A. Franklin (1968) recommended more teaching of both choral and instrumental techniques to all music education majors. In contrast Aebischer (1967), Lee (1970) and Duvall (1970) discovered needs in graduates for more specialized study in the specific areas of emphasis.

In discussing professional education courses B. Franklin (1968), Duvall (1970), Bell (1978) and Corbett (1977) noted that there were requests for more training in measurement and evaluation and general methods for teaching in the public schools. Aebischer (1967) and Lemay (1974), however recommended de-emphasis of nonmusic requirements, specifically those in professional education.

Another suggestion from Raessler (1967) and B. Franklin (1968) was for a change in the format and duration of student teaching. More experiences on all levels and in all areas of music was requested.

Aebischer (1967) and Taylor (1967) mentioned needs for more music related courses and vocational counseling.

In developing a model professional preparation program for prospective music teachers in California, Schafer (1977) emphasized a

need to place students in the public schools earlier, suggesting that they begin intensive contact with secondary students in the freshman year.

Taylor (1967) discussed a need for a longer period of study. Patterson (1972) noted that this was already required in Canada. However, Raessler (1967) mentioned that only two of thirty-nine schools in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland had a five year program and that only one of the three states recommended it.

As cited in the introduction:

It is safe to conclude only that unanimity of opinion does not exist. (Henke, 1966, p. 8)

Need for study at Utah State University

Brooks (1968) describes the need for evaluation of teacher education programs in music in each state and consequently at each institution:

Since each state may have some unparalleled problems in its music education system, it is only through the cooperation of every music education teacher that this variety of problems can be solved. (Brooks, 1968, p. 1)

Few studies have been done evaluating the teacher education programs in music in the state of Utah and specifically at Utah State University.

Wardle (1954), in surveying graduate opinions at Utah State University, noted the importance of continual evaluation:

... it seems only logical that each college should from time to time make an evaluation of its course of study. It should be apparent to educators that within any music course of study there probably exist areas of weakness as well as areas of strength, but agreement as to the areas of weakness and areas of strength may vary widely. An objective study should, to some extent, provide a keener understanding of the relative value of the courses offered. (Wardle, 1954 p. 1)

On that recommendation Boyce (1973) conducted a survey of opinions

of graduates and faculties of the four state college-university systems in Utah. One of the primary recommendations of the study was for an expansion of credit hours, in the major area. This conclusion, however, was reached without assessing the possible difference of opinions amongst choral, instrumental and string education majors. Also, no survey questions discussed the effectiveness of student teaching and professional education courses which made up a large part of the requirements for music education majors.

The above mentioned items, as well as comparisons of the types of responsibilities Utah State University music graduates are asked to assume in the public schools are needed to effectively evaluate the teacher education program in music at Utah State University as it relates to the teaching needs of its graduates.

Summary

In review of literature the importance of continual evaluation of music teacher education programs has been established. The use of graduate opinions to determine program effectiveness has also been shown to be of value. Cited were graduate opinion surveys which have produced a variety of conflicting results demonstrating a need for study of each school of music. Lack of pertinent information regarding the music program at Utah State University indicated a need for current research.

PROCEDURES

Sample

All music majors who graduated from Utah State University during the years of 1970-1977 were selected for the study. The target population was all past, present and future music graduates of the college.

Names of the graduates were taken from the music department alumni file. These names were verified by investigating each student record from the graduation lists of the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences. Eighteen additional names were found and two were deleted. This left a total of 136 music graduates.

All current addresses from the Outlook list in the Utah State University Alumni Office were recorded. This accounted for 86 of the graduates. The remaining fifty addresses were located from the following sources: Utah Music Education Association Directory, personal contacts of the researcher and the permanent records of the graduates located in the office of Admissions and Records at Utah State University.

Addresses for all 136 graduates were located and 120 (88%) of them proved deliverable.

The sample was classified by the demographic data collected through the questionnaire. Subgroups included: choral, instrumental and other specialty graduates; teaching and nonteaching graduates and graduates from different years.

Instrumentation

Data for answering the research questions were collected by means of a questionnaire. Items on the form were divided into four sections.

Part one asked for biographic information and part two surveyed current teaching responsibilities (Appendix A).

Questions in part three were designed to assess the opinions of the graduates in regard to the effectiveness of their training at Utah State University and the applicability of the competency objectives established by the music and secondary education departments to their current teaching assignments. The graduates were asked to rate each item listed on both accounts. (Appendix A)

Items in the third section were compiled by the researcher from the competency objectives listed in the current manual of the Music Department and the course descriptions in the Utah State University general catalog.

After a prototype survey questionnaire was fashioned, faculty members of the Departments of Music and Secondary Education were asked to review the instrument and make comments.

The consensus of the music faculty was that the questions represented their objectives accurately and only a few wordings were changed for clarification.

The Secondary Education faculty as a group recommended the inclusion of several questions regarding human development, classroom management, public school procedures and measurement and evaluation. Seven items were added at the end and a subheading for professional education preceded them. Part four was included for comments.

Several faculty members were approached prior to printing to read through to assure clarity and understanding of the instrument. A computer expert's opinion was also sought so as to assure a programmable questionnaire for later analysis.

The final instrument was printed professionally to reduce its bulkiness and to take advantage of a variety of type styles. The final questionnaire was on one sheet of paper folded to create four pages. (Appendix A)

Research design

The method for the study was a survey. As cited in the review of literature, this format is the most used for describing the status quo. It is also noted that the survey design is one of the most effective for assessing attitudes and opinions.

Collection of data

A cover letter was typed on Secondary Education Department stationery through the use of an IBM Mag-card machine, which enabled the researcher to personalize each of them. (Appendix B) This letter was accompanied by a questionnaire and a stamped return envelope. A twenty-five cent coin was taped to the corner of the questionnaire with a hand written note beneath it inviting the graduate to have a "pop" on the researcher while filling out the form. In the first mailing, April 22, 1978, 120 questionnaires were sent out to the graduates whose addresses had been found. Ten of these were returned undeliverable. Sixty (55%) of the 110 responded to this request.

Three weeks later a hand-written post card was sent to the fifty nonrespondents. (Appendix B) An invitation was made to call the

researcher collect if they needed another form. Four responded to the invitation. Sixteen (32%) answered the correspondence.

On May 20, 1978, a photocopied letter was sent to the remaining thirty-four nonrespondents along with a questionnaire and a stamped return envelope. Eighteen (53%) responded.

The additional sixteen addresses had been obtained by this time and a personalized letter, questionnaire with quarter, and envelope was mailed to these. Six were returned undeliverable and eight (80%) of the remaining ten responded.

During the mailing period sixteen letters were returned undeliverable. The completed questionnaires totaled 102; 85% of the accessible sample, 75% of the total sample.

FINDINGS

In the previous chapter the methods employed to obtain the graduate opinions were presented.

The information gathered through the questionnaire was placed on data sheets which corresponded to the keypunch cards. This process allowed the researcher to make decisions regarding numerical assignment rather than leaving that responsibility to a computer technician. These numbers were then transferred directly to computer cards by a keypunch operator.

Research question I

In order to answer the first research question, "What are the current teaching responsibilities of Utah State University music graduates?", the data in part two of the questionnaire were tabulated by computer.

The graduate's teaching responsibilities varied substantially with junior high chorus, junior high band and high school band being the most frequently named assignments. A complete list of the graduate's teaching responsibilities is presented in tabular form in Appendix C.

Research question II

To answer the second research question, "How do the music graduates rate the effectiveness of their training at Utah State University?", the graduate's ratings from column one of part three of the questionnaire were tabulated by computer. A mean response was computed manually for each survey item. The extreme twenty are listed in Table 1. All the means are presented in Appendix C.

Table 1. Selected means of the graduate's ratings
of the quality of training received.

Training Objectives	Mean
<u>Highest Ten</u>	
Fluency in sight reading, principal instrument	1.60
Methods for private instruction, principal instrument	1.70
Technical facility and repertoire, principal instrument	1.75
Musical interpretation, principal instrument	1.78
Conducting techniques	1.80
Technical facility and repertoire, ensemble performance	1.81
Musical interpretation, ensemble performance	1.83
Instrumental rehearsal techniques	1.86
Rhythm	1.91
Melody	1.91
<u>Lowest Ten</u>	
Synthesizer	4.13
Music theatre production (directing, designing)	3.79
Guitar	3.70
Music theatre performance	3.52
Music therapy practicum	3.47
Church music	3.39
History of jazz and popular music	3.34
Counterpoint	2.88
Organization and administration of public schools	2.85
Curriculum development	2.78
Mean of means = 2.41	
Rating values:	1 = Excellent
	2 = Good
	3 = Fair
	4 = Poor
	5 = No training

Research question III

In order to answer the third research question, "How do the music graduates rate the applicability of each objective of the current music education teacher training program as it relates to their teaching situations?", the graduate's ratings from column two of part three of the questionnaire were tabulated by computer. A mean response was computed manually for each survey item. The extreme twenty-two are listed in Table 2. All the means are presented in Appendix C.

Research question IV

To answer the fourth research question, "How do the various subgroup's responses compare with each other on each survey item?", the following sets of subgroups were established for comparison:

1. 1970-73 graduates versus 1974-77 graduates.
2. Choral emphasis graduates versus instrumental graduates versus all other graduates.
3. Graduates with no teaching experience versus graduates with one or two years experience versus graduates with three or more years experience.
4. Graduates teaching full time versus graduates teaching part time versus all other graduates.

The responses of the subgroups on each item in part three of the questionnaire were tabulated by computer. The mean response of each subgroup on each item was computed manually and is presented in Appendix C.

A chi-square test was computed manually to compare the responses of the subgroups. Listed in Tables 3 and 4 are those tests with a value beyond the .05 level of confidence. The completed chi-square analyses for the items in Tables 3 and 4 can be found in Appendix C.

Table 2. Selected means of the graduate's ratings of the usefulness of training objectives to current teaching responsibilities

Training Objectives	Mean
<u>Highest Ten</u>	
Fluency in sight readings, principal instrument	1.12
Methods for private instruction, principal instrument	1.14
Melody	1.21
Harmony	1.21
Ear training	1.22
Rhythmic reading	1.22
Rhythm	1.23
Fluency in sight reading, keyboard	1.28
Sight singing	1.30
Musical interpretation, principal instrument	1.33
Musical interpretation, ensemble performance	1.33
<u>Lowest Ten</u>	
Synthesizer	3.05
Music therapy practicum	2.65
Music theatre production (directing, designing)	2.49
Music theatre performance	2.39
Church music	2.31
Counterpoint	2.25
Strings	2.15
Guitar	2.12
History of jazz and popular music	2.10
Composition	2.06
Melody writing	2.05
Mean of means - 1.73	
Rating values:	1 = Very useful
	2 = Useful
	3 = Limited usefulness
	4 = Not useful

Table 3. Results of chi-square tests amongst responses of various subgroups on the quality of training received.

Training Objectives	Subgroups and Their Mean Responses			Degrees of Freedom	Chi-square Test Value
	1970-73 graduates	1974-77 graduates			
	Choral graduates	Instrumental graduates	All Other graduates		
Harmony	1.88	2.11		4	10.00*
History of jazz and popular music	3.30	3.06	3.69	8	22.74**
Fluency in sight reading, minor instruments	2.42	1.88	2.25	6	12.80*
Guitar	3.00	4.00	3.84	8	19.93*
Voice	1.52	2.71	2.17	8	38.97**
Woodwind	2.33	1.55	2.04	6	17.90**
Brass	2.54	1.73	2.25	6	19.13**
Strings	3.00	2.06	1.92	8	16.26*
Music theatre production (directing, designing)	3.29	4.13	3.85	8	21.80**
Musical interpretation, principal instrument	3.08	1.47	1.87	6	15.37*
Instrumental rehearsal techniques	2.26	1.49	1.93	8	17.49*
Choral rehearsal techniques	1.59	2.54	2.10	8	24.20**
	Teaching full-time	Teaching part-time	All others		
Fluency in sight reading, keyboard	2.56	1.82	2.58	6	14.10*
Rating values:	1 = Excellent 2 = Good	3 = Fair 4 = Poor	5 = No training		

*Significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Table 4. Results of chi-square tests amongst responses of various subgroups on the usefulness of training objectives to current teaching responsibilities.

Training Objectives	Various subgroups and means			Degrees of Freedom	Chi-square Test Value
	1970-73 graduates	1974-77 graduates			
Music theatre performance	2.63	2.17		3	9.79*
	Choral graduates	Instrumental graduates	All other graduates		
Fluency in sight reading, minor instruments	2.21	1.23	1.63	6	14.91*
Woodwinds	2.45	1.32	2.24	6	25.26**
Brass	2.45	1.32	2.26	6	23.20**
Percussion	2.35	1.36	2.11	6	27.29**
Music theatre performance	1.91	3.00	2.19	6	16.28*
Instrumental rehearsal techniques	2.27	1.08	1.52	6	32.02**
Church music	2.09	2.95	1.85	6	14.51**
	No teaching experience	1-2 years experience	3/more years experience		
Scoring and arranging	2.00	1.56	1.59	6	17.72**
Conducting techniques	2.25	1.24	1.14	6	22.14**
Instrumental rehearsal techniques	2.50	1.33	1.49	6	22.82**
Choral rehearsal techniques	2.42	1.79	1.49	6	12.92*
	Teaching full-time	Teaching part-time	Not teaching		
Fluency in sight reading, minor instruments	1.39	2.28	1.38	6	15.81*
Ability to perform by memory and by "ear", minor instruments	1.70	2.65	1.81	6	14.94*
Percussion	1.57	2.65	1.71	6	13.70*
General music practicum	1.87	2.53	1.78	6	17.26**

Rating values: 1 = Very useful
2 = Useful

3 = Limited usefulness
4 = Not useful

* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

** Significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Responses to parts one and two of the questionnaire from choral, instrumental and other emphases graduates were also compared.

A chi-square test showed a significant difference beyond the .05 level of confidence in the gender of graduates of different speciality emphases. The complete chi-square analysis is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Chi-square analysis for degree speciality compared with gender of graduates

Degree Specialty	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
Choral emphasis	15	16	31
Instrumental emphasis	27	7	34
All others	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>35</u>
Total	59	41	100
Degrees of freedom = 2		Chi-square = 8.87(P<.05)	

Chi-square analyses were computed manually comparing teaching responsibilities of graduates with different degree emphases. Test values significant beyond the .05 level of confidence are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Results of chi-square analyses for degree specialty compared with teaching assignments.

Teaching assignment	Choral emphasis	Instrumental emphasis	All others	Totals	Chi-square test value
Band, grades 7-9	0	11	5	16	12.73**
Band, grades 10-12	0	11	5	16	12.73**
Private wind, grades 7-9	0	10	4	14	11.98**
Private wind, grades 10-12	0	12	2	14	19.85**
String, grades 4-6	1	1	7	9	7.97*
Private string, grades 4-6	0	1	7	8	10.72**
Private string, grades 7-9	0	1	7	8	10.72**
Chorus, community	6	1	2	9	6.05*
Private voice, grades 10-12	5	0	2	7	6.62*
Private voice, community	6	0	1	7	10.75**
Private piano, community	7	0	1	8	13.16**

Degrees of freedom = 2

*Significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Discussion

In the previous section the four research questions were considered as they related to the results of the statistical tests. In this section the findings will be interpreted and implications for the future will be looked at.

Research question I. Responses to part two of the survey questionnaire indicated that the Utah State University Music Graduates are teaching in a great variety of assignments. Teaching responsibilities could be classified in 67 different categories. The most frequently named were junior high chorus, junior high and high school band, junior high general music and private wind for secondary age students. A complete list of assignments and frequency of response is presented in Appendix C. The differences in assignments of choral and instrumental graduates are discussed under the subheading for research question IV.

Research question II. The graduates as a group felt that the quality of their training at Utah State University was fair to good. The mean score was 2.41 (fair = 3, good = 2).

The highest ratings were in the categories dealing with proficiency in training on the principal instrument. Fluency in sight reading, methods for private instruction, technical facility and repertoire, and musical interpretation all received a mean response between good and excellent. The graduates also indicated that their training in technical facility and repertoire and musical interpretation in the area of ensemble performance was good to excellent. A general satisfaction for training in conducting and instrumental rehearsal techniques was also shown.

The quality of training in some of the more specialized areas was rated fair to poor. The items synthesizer, music theatre production, guitar, music theatre performance, music therapy practicum, church music and history of jazz and popular music had a mean response below fair.

A fair to good rating was consistent for all areas in professional education such as: human growth and learning problems, communication skills, measurement and evaluation, curriculum development, procedures of discipline, motivation and classroom management and organization and administration of public schools.

The differences in the responses of the various subgroups are discussed under the subheading of research question IV.

Through the open-ended comment section at the end of the questionnaire the graduates expressed additional concerns. Courses in vocal techniques and choral methods were criticized for not dealing with practical methods for instruction. A typical response was, "More emphasis in techniques, literature and vocal concepts, especially in dealing with beginning students, would have been helpful."

The graduate's comments indicated strong concern for lack of practicality in education and methods courses. Over eleven graduates asked for what was described as a need for "More practical education, rather than philosophy."

Several graduates indicated that the methods in the music courses seemed to be geared to a much higher level than secondary education. Typical of the responses was "In truth, the majority of the management and rehearsal techniques I used were the result of my observations from junior high on--especially my high school experience. Very little of

the education part of my college degree had much effect on my teaching. Let's face it, the real world of teaching is nothing at all like the ivory tower idealized world of the university."

Graduates also requested a change in the program asking for earlier exposure to the public school classroom. Several suggested apprentice programs, supervised teaching for longer periods or a program similar to the elementary education department. One graduate stated that, "If we could get into the foundations of teaching class as sophomores, instead of juniors or seniors we could appreciate the need for our other classes much more and we could glean from them what we truly have to know. It would also allow students a chance to make an earlier decision on whether or not to stay in education."

Research question III. The mean response of the graduates' regarding the utility of all the training objectives listed was 1.73. This indicates that on the average they felt that the items presented were useful to very useful to their current teaching assignments.

As a group the graduates indicated that the items most useful to them in their current teaching responsibilities were in the theory area. A strong desire for training for proficiency on the principal instrument and in ensemble practicum was also expressed.

Fluency in sight reading, methods for private instruction and musical interpretation on the principal instrument all had ratings from useful to very useful. Melody, harmony, ear training, rhythmic reading, rhythm and sight singing were all shown to be useful to very useful as well.

Usefulness was also indicated for training in keyboard sight reading and musical interpretation in ensemble performance.

Although no item was classified as not useful, some of the more specialized areas were reported as having less utility in current responsibilities. These included synthesizer, music therapy practicum, music theatre production, music theatre performance, church music, counterpoint, strings, guitar, history of jazz and popular music, composition and melody writing.

A consistently useful to very useful response was given for items in the professional education area such as: philosophy of education and music education, an understanding of human growth and the learning problems of children, communication skills, measurement and evaluation, curriculum development, procedures of discipline, motivation and classroom management, organization and administration of public schools and student teaching.

The differences in the responses of the various subgroups are discussed under the subheading of research question IV.

Requests for change in course content were discussed in the previous subheading; however, several students made additional suggestions regarding the utility of courses. Some of the students with an emphasis in performance requested that requirements for methods classes be dropped and more classes dealing with pedagogy and analysis be added as electives. Others expressed the desire for a change in the requirements of classes dealing with the minor instruments. Many graduates asked that more classes be made elective, rather than required, giving the student the option of individualizing further his own program.

Research question IV. In the comparison of responses of graduates with choral, instrumental or other emphases, it was discovered that instrumental emphasis graduates were primarily male whereas, other emphases had a more even balance of male and female students. This

fact could explain in part why a higher percentage of instrumentalists are teaching full time.

Teaching responsibilities for choral and instrumental emphasis graduates were extremely different. No choral graduates were teaching band, whereas many instrumental graduates were teaching chorus in the secondary schools. This indicates a need for instrumental emphasis graduates to be trained in secondary choral methods and techniques. Neither choral, nor instrumental emphasis graduates were teaching string.

Comparisons were made of the different subgroup's responses to part three of the survey questionnaire. Part-time teachers expressed a need for better training in keyboard methods for private instruction, while nonteaching graduates indicated a desire for training in church music.

Full-time teachers felt that training in the minor instruments, specifically percussion, and general music practicum was necessary to their current assignments.

Graduates with longer teaching experience expressed a desire for conducting techniques, instrumental and choral rehearsal methods and scoring and arranging.

Instrumental graduates were not satisfied with their training in the history of jazz and popular music, guitar, voice, and music theatre production. They did not, however, express a need for better training in the latter two.

Instrumental graduates were pleased with their training on the principal instrument and in the minor instruments as well as brass and woodwind practica. They also rated the effectiveness of their training

in instrumental rehearsal techniques highly. A desire for all of these classes were also expressed by those graduates.

Choral graduates were not satisfied with their training on the minor instruments and in woodwind and brass practica, however, they indicated that these courses were not useful to their current assignments. Those graduates did express a desire for training in music theatre performance.

Graduate's comments. Of the 102 graduates responding, 58 of them wrote comments in part five of the questionnaire. Typical responses have been quoted in the previous subheadings. Most of the statements centered around three principal ideas: (1) a need for change in the degree requirements, (2) a desire for improvement in the course content of methods and education classes and (3) a request for earlier exposure to the public school classroom.

It should be noted that only 36% of the graduates are currently teaching full time and only 19% are teaching part time. Many commented that they would have changed majors had they been exposed to the public classroom earlier. One graduate stated, "It's too bad that prospective teachers spend four years training for a job, only to find that it's nothing like they're expecting."

Summary

In this chapter the results of the survey questionnaire have been presented in answer to the research questions. Significant statistical tests have been reported in tabular form and interpreted in the discussion section. The comments of graduates were also cited.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In the previous four chapters the purpose of the study and the methods of research were presented. The findings were also reported and discussed.

Statement of the problem. It was shown that a lack of information existed regarding the opinions of music graduates as to the effectiveness of the current Utah State University Music and Secondary Education Department competency objectives in meeting the future specialized teaching needs of those graduates.

Statement of purpose. The purpose of this study was to assess the opinions of the 1970-1977 music education graduates of Utah State University regarding the teacher training program.

Objectives. In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, objectives were established to formulate a survey questionnaire and to collect data regarding graduate's opinions and their teaching responsibilities.

Research questions. The study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the current teaching responsibilities of Utah State University music graduates?
2. How do the music graduates rate the effectiveness of their training at Utah State University?
3. How do the music graduates rate the applicability of each

objective of the current music education teacher training program as it relates to their teaching situations?

4. How do the various subgroup's responses compare with each other on each survey item?

Review of literature. The graduate opinion survey was reported the most frequently used method to evaluate teacher education programs. The results of previous research were cited and the need for a current study at Utah State University was established.

Procedures. All music majors who graduated from Utah State University during the years of 1970-1977 were selected for the study.

Data for answering the research questions were collected by means of a survey questionnaire formulated for the study. The survey items were compiled by the researcher utilizing Utah State University publications and comments from the music and secondary education department faculties.

Questionnaires were mailed to 120 of the 136 Utah State University music graduates of 1970-1977. The completed survey forms totaled 102; 85% of the accessible sample, 75% of the total sample.

Findings. The results of the survey questionnaire were presented and the research questions were answered. Statistical analyses were reported and significant test values were listed in tabular form.

The graduates indicated that they were teaching in a great variety of assignments. Over 67 different categories were listed. The most frequently named were junior high chorus and junior high and high school band.

As a group the graduates felt that the quality of their training was fair to good. The items receiving the highest ratings were in the areas dealing with training on the principal instrument.

The lowest ratings were in the specialized categories, such as synthesizer, music theatre production and performance, guitar, music therapy practicum, and the history of jazz and popular music.

In regard to the utility of the training objectives listed in the questionnaire, the graduates rated them on the average as useful to very useful to their current assignments. The respondents, as a group, expressed a strong desire for training in the areas of theory, principal instrument proficiency and ensemble practicum.

The respondents indicated that their training in the areas of professional education including classroom management and discipline, school administration and organization, human development and measurement and evaluation was generally fair to good. They also indicated that these items were useful to very useful in their current assignments.

In the comparison of the responses of the various subgroups the following significant differences were noted: (1) instrumental emphasis graduates were primarily males, (2) choral graduates were not teaching band, while instrumental graduates were often teaching chorus, (3) part-time teachers expressed a desire for more keyboard training in the areas of music classroom practica.

Comments of the graduates were discussed and the most frequent statements were cited. Typical of the graduates' words were, "We were trained as musicians, often overlooking the fact that we were actually 'music educators'."

Interpretations of the data indicated strong needs and desires in several areas: (1) degree requirements, (2) education course content and (3) exposure to the public school classroom.

Recommendations

Based on the responses of the music graduates, the researcher has made three recommendations.

Degree requirements. More electives and less requirements should be established. A definite distinction should be made between choral and instrumental education course requirements. Students in an instrumental education emphasis should be advised to receive instruction in choral methods, vocal techniques and general music education in addition to their specialty training. Students in the choral emphasis program should also be advised to receive training in general music education, but not necessarily in instrumental methods and performance areas. Music theatre production and performance and church music should be emphasized in the choral education sequence.

Music education course content. Concepts and practica in courses dealing with the methods of instruction in secondary music education should be evaluated and altered to more effectively approach realistic situations encountered in the public school classroom.

Techniques centered around higher education proficiency and college level discipline should not be classified as secondary education methods.

Early exposure to secondary education courses. Education courses, such as Foundation Studies in Teaching (Secondary Education 301) and Music Methods (Choral and Instrumental) should be recommended for the first and second quarters in the sophomore year of study. Students encouraged to wait until the junior year or later to begin their professional education sequence and their exposure to the public schools are beyond the point when they can easily transfer to another field of study as many have done after graduation.

LITERATURE CITED

- Aebischer, Delmer W. 1967. A study of the effectiveness of curriculum and counseling at the University of Oregon School of Music as indicated by a survey of its graduates. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oregon. 120 p.
- Bell, Josephine Crawford. 1976. A study of the bachelor of music education curricula with a major in voice in selected colleges and universities in Arkansas. Ph.D. dissertation, Kansas State University. 156 p.
- Borkowski, Francis Thomas. 1967. The relationship of quality of work in undergraduate music curricula to effectiveness of instrumental music teaching in the public schools. Ph.D. dissertation, West Virginia University.
- Boyce, Howard W. 1973. A graduate-oriented evaluation of the music education curricula of four state college-university systems in Utah. Ed.D. dissertation, Utah State University. 93 p.
- Brooks, Gene Leslie. 1968. An analysis of the vocal music education training program in the state supported four-year colleges of Oklahoma. D. Mus. Ed. dissertation, University of Oklahoma. 144 p.
- Childs, Gordon Bliss. 1976. Innovation and change in curricula for music teachers in the state of Colorado. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Montana. 210 p.
- Choate, James Forrest, Jr. 1976. An analysis of the undergraduate curriculum and the subsequent professional involvement of selected instrumental music education graduates of Louisiana State University. Ed.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College. 326 p.
- Corbett, Donald Lee. 1977. An analysis of the opinions of recent music education graduates from Kansas teacher training institutions regarding the adequacy of their preparation to teach music. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Kansas. 211 p.
- Duvall, Oren Randolph. 1970. The responsibilities and preparation of graduates of Colorado Institutions of Higher Education in their first year of teaching instrumental music in the state. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado. 149 p.
- Finley, John Thornton. 1969. A follow-up study of the elementary and secondary school music teachers prepared at Jacksonville State University from 1956 through 1968 through a survey of graduates' opinions, college grades, employers' evaluation, and pre-college experience. Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers. 173 p.

- Franklin, Alton David. 1968. The relationship between academic preparation and professional responsibilities of instrumental and choral instructors. Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University. 57 p.
- Franklin, Bob Lawrence. 1968. An analysis of the bachelor of music education curriculum with a choral major at Florida State University. Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University. 264 p.
- Henke, Herbert H. Fall, 1969. Report of an informal symposium on the organization and administration of music education degree programs. Journal of Research in Music Education.
- Lee, Ronald Thomas. 1970. A study of teacher training experiences for prospective inner-city instrumental music teachers. Ph.d. dissertation, University of Michigan. 324 p.
- Leman, John William. 1974. A descriptive study of the undergraduate music education program for the preparation of choral directors at five midwestern universities during the 1972-73 school year. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois. 220 p.
- Patterson, Lawrence William Alexander. 1972. Undergraduate programs for music teacher preparation in Canadian Colleges and Universities. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois. 232 p.
- Raessler, Kenneth Ray. 1967. A comparative study of music course requirements and professional laboratory experiences of undergraduate programs in music education in selected colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, Maryland and New Jersey. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University. 446 p.
- Schafer, Carl William. 1977. The development of a model professional preparation program for prospective music teachers in California. Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. 140 p.
- Stegall, Joel Ringgold. 1975. A list of competencies for an undergraduate curriculum in music education. Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina. 179 p.
- Taylor, Corwin H. Winter, 1970. Opinions of music teachers regarding professional preparation in music education. Journal of Research in Music Education.
- Wardle, Alvin. 1954. An evaluation of music education at Utah State Agricultural College. Unpublished MS thesis, Utah State University.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Questionnaire

Questionnaire

Part I

Sex: Male Female .

Age: 21 and under 22-24 25-27 28 and over .

Year graduated from USU: 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 .

Years of training at USU: Less than 4 4 More than 4 .

Years of teaching experience: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 or more .

Degree Specialty: Choral String Instrumental Piano Other(Specify) _____.

Degree held: Bachelor's Master's Doctorate .

Number of graduate credit hours completed: 0-5 6-15 16-35 36 and over .

Current Status (Check only one): Teaching full time Teaching part time Not teaching Continuing studies Other (Specify) _____.

Part II

Check all spaces which describe your current responsibilities.

Assignment	Grade Level					Higher Education
	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Community	
Group piano						
Band						
Chorus						
String						
String & Wind						
General music						
Theory						
Music history						
Private piano						
Private voice						
Private string						
Private wind						
Private percussion						
Music theatre						
Other (Specify)						

Part III

Listed below are the objectives established by the Music and Secondary Education Departments for all students in the music teacher training program.

In Column I please rate the quality of training you received in each area while at Utah State University. Do not rate usefulness, just rate the actual training you received.

In Column II please rate the usefulness of each item as it applies to your current teaching assignment. In other words, what would you recommend in the training area for a prospective teacher who might succeed in your position?

I. Quality of Training Received should be rated as follows: E = Excellent, G = Good, F = Fair, P = Poor.

II. Usefulness to Current Teaching Responsibilities should be rated: VU = Very Useful, U = Useful, LU = Limited Usefulness, NU = Not Useful.

I. Quality of Training Received

II. Usefulness to Current Teaching Responsibilities

Musicianship

E G F P VU U LU NU

Functional knowledge of the language and grammar of music

1. Sight singing
2. Ear training
3. Rhythmic reading
4. Melody writing
5. Harmony writing
6. Keyboard harmony

Ability to hear and grasp the main elements of musical composition.

7. Rhythm
8. Melody
9. Harmony
10. Texture
11. Form

An understanding of the methods by which music is conceived, constructed and scored.

12. Counterpoint
13. Scoring and arranging
14. Composition
15. Form and analysis

Knowledge of the development of the art of music.

16. Music history
17. History of jazz and popular music
18. Master works
19. Exposure to a wide selection of literature

Musical Performance

E G F P VU U LU NU

Fluency in sight reading

20. Principal instrument
21. Minor instruments
22. Keyboard

I. Quality of Training
Received

II. Usefulness to Current
Teaching Responsibilities.

E G F P VU U LU NU

Ability to perform by memory and "by ear."

23. Principal instrument
24. Minor instruments
25. Keyboard

Technical facility and depth of repertoire.

26. Principal instrument
27. Ensemble performance

Technical facility on minor instruments.

28. Guitar
29. Piano
30. Voice
31. Woodwinds
32. Brass
33. Strings
34. Percussion

Technical facility in other areas.

35. Synthesizer
36. Music theatre production
(Directing, designing)
37. Music theatre performance

Thorough understanding of musical interpretations and styles.

38. Principal instrument
39. Ensemble performance

Professional Education

E G F P VU U LU NU

Working knowledge of effective methods, materials and facilities for musical instruction.

40. Private instruction
(Principal instrument)
41. Private instruction
(Minor instruments)
42. Conducting techniques
43. Instrumental rehearsal techniques
44. Choral rehearsal techniques
45. General music practicum
46. Music therapy practicum
47. Church music

Working knowledge of effective methods, materials and facilities for general instruction.

48. Philosophy of education and music education
49. An understanding of human growth and the
learning problems of children
50. Communication skills
51. Measurement and evaluation
52. Curriculum development
53. Procedures of discipline, motivation and
classroom management.
54. Organization and administration
of public schools
55. Student teaching

Part IV

Additional Comments.

Appendix B

Cover Letters

Follow-up Correspondence

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY · LOGAN, UTAH 84322

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS,
AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
UMC 40
(801) 752-4100, EXT. 7793

March 17, 1978

Faculty Member
Address

Dear :

As part of the requirements for the Master's Degree, I am surveying the music graduates of Utah State University (1970-77) to obtain their opinions in regard to the teacher training program in music. In order to gather more accurate and informative data, I would appreciate your comments and suggestions.

I am enclosing a preliminary copy of the survey instrument to be used. You will see that parts three and four of the questionnaire are taken from the USU Music Department Information Manual, 1977-78, and the USU Bulletin, 1976-78. The preliminary survey should reflect the objectives established by the departments, however, you might wish to change items or wording for better understanding and clarity. Please feel free to comment on any aspect of the instrument.

I will be on campus Thursday and Friday, March 23rd and 24th and I will stop by your office to pick up the questionnaire. If you are planning to be out or if my stopping will be inconvenient, please mail the survey to: Mark Peterson, Music Department, UMC 40 Campus.

Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Peterson

Enclosure

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY · LOGAN, UTAH 84322

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF
SECONDARY EDUCATION
UMC 28

April 22, 1978

Graduate Name
Address

Dear ,

You have been selected to participate in a survey being conducted amongst the music graduates of Utah State University. Please help me with your input by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the provided envelope as soon as possible. Your anonymity will be protected.

If you desire to receive the findings of this survey, I'll be happy to furnish them on request. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Peterson
Graduate Student

Enclosures

Text of handwritten postcard letter sent to graduates.

Dear _____ ,

Two weeks ago you should have received a questionnaire. The study needs your input.

If you need another questionnaire, please call me collect at 752-6137.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Peterson

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY · LOGAN, UTAH 84322

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF
SECONDARY EDUCATION
UMC 28

May 20, 1978

Could you please take five minutes right now and fill out the enclosed questionnaire? I must submit the data for analyzation June 1, 1978, and your opinion is needed.

If you haven't five minutes, then please take thirty seconds and fill out parts one and two. An envelope is provided for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Mark E. Peterson
Graduate Student

Enclosures

Appendix C

Tables 7 - 63

Table 7. Totals from part one of the survey questionnaire

Survey Item							
Response Choices							
Totals							
Sex							
Male				Female			
59				49			
Age							
21 and under		22-24		25-27		28 and over	
0		26		33		40	
Year graduated from USU							
1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
8	6	11	19	20	11	10	15
Years of training at USU							
Less than 4			4		More than 4		
32			41		27		
Years of teaching experience							
0	1	2	3	4	5	6 or more	
27	16	16	16	5	6	12	
Degree Specialty							
Choral		String		Instrumental		Piano	Other
31		13		34		5	17
Degree Held							
Bachelor's			Master's			Doctorate	
87			11			2	
Number of graduate credit hours completed							
0-5		6-15		16-35		36 and over	
55		10		12		21	
Current status							
Teaching full time		Teaching part time		Not teaching		Continuing studies	Other
37		19		26		11	6

Table 3. Totals from part two of the survey questionnaire

Teaching Assignment	Level	Total	Teaching Assignment	Level	Total
Group piano:	4-6	1	Private piano:	K-3	6
	Higher education	2		4-6	8
Band:	4-6	10		7-9	7
	7-9	16		10-12	5
	10-12	16		Community	8
	Higher education	1		Higher education	3
Chorus:	K-3	8	Private voice:	K-3	1
	4-6	10		4-6	2
	7-9	17		7-9	4
	10-12	11		10-12	7
	Community	9		Community	7
	Higher education	2		Higher education	5
String:	K-3	3	Private string:	K-3	5
	4-6	9		4-6	8
	7-9	5		7-9	8
	10-12	1		10-12	2
	Community	1		Community	1
String & Wind:	7-9	1	Private wind:	4-6	7
	10-12	1		7-9	14
General Music:	K-3	6		10-12	14
	4-6	9		Higher education	2
	7-9	14	Private percussion:	4-6	2
	10-12	3		7-9	3
	Community	3		10-12	3
	Higher education	1	Music theatre:	4-6	1
Theory:	K-3	3		10-12	5
	4-6	3		Community	3
	7-9	3		Higher education	1
	10-12	4	Private organ:	---	2
	Community	2	Private guitar:	---	7
	Higher Education	1	Other:	---	10
Music history:	10-12	1			
	Community	2			

Table 9. Data from Part III, Item 1 of the questionnaire: Sight singing

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean	
Year graduated												
1970-1973	19	10	10	1	0	1.83	27	6	1	0	1.23	
1974-1977	11	26	14	2	0	2.13	28	11	0	1	1.35	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	8	12	7	1	0	2.03	18	5	0	0	1.22	
Instrumental	11	12	7	2	0	2.00	16	6	1	1	1.46	
Others	11	12	10	0	0	1.97	21	6	0	0	1.22	
Teaching experience												
None	6	10	9	2	0	2.26	8	4	0	0	1.33	
One-two years	9	13	7	0	0	1.93	21	4	1	0	1.23	
Three-more years	15	13	8	1	0	1.86	26	9	0	1	1.33	
Current status												
Teaching full time	13	16	6	0	0	1.80	25	9	0	1	1.34	
Teaching part time	4	7	5	0	0	2.06	13	3	1	0	1.29	
Others	13	13	13	3	0	2.14	17	5	0	0	1.23	
Totals	30	36	24	3	0	2.00	55	17	1	1	1.30	

Table 10. Data from Part III, Item 2 of the questionnaire: Ear training

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean	
Year graduated												
1970-1973	13	15	9	3	0	2.05	27	6	1	0	1.23	
1974-1977	12	21	15	5	0	2.25	32	8	0	0	1.20	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	6	11	8	3	0	2.29	17	6	0	0	1.26	
Instrumental	9	14	7	2	0	2.06	19	4	1	0	1.13	
Others	10	11	9	3	0	2.15	23	4	0	0	1.15	
Teaching experience												
None	4	11	9	3	0	2.41	10	2	0	0	1.17	
One-two years	8	12	7	2	0	2.10	20	5	1	0	1.27	
Three-more years	13	13	8	3	0	2.03	29	7	0	0	1.19	
Current status												
Teaching full time	12	15	5	3	0	1.97	28	7	0	0	1.20	
Teaching part time	4	7	3	2	0	2.18	12	4	1	0	1.35	
Others	9	14	16	3	0	2.30	19	3	0	0	1.14	
Totals	25	36	24	8	0	2.16	59	14	1	0	1.22	

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 11. Data from Part III, Item 3 of the questionnaire: Rhythmic reading

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	11	20	8	1	0	1.97	30	4	0	0	1.12
1974-1977	12	24	15	2	0	2.13	30	9	0	1	1.30
Degree emphasis											
Choral	8	13	7	0	0	1.96	18	5	0	0	1.22
Instrumental	10	14	8	0	0	1.94	20	3	0	1	1.25
Others	5	17	8	3	0	2.27	22	5	0	0	1.19
Teaching experience											
None	5	12	8	2	0	2.26	9	3	0	0	1.25
One-two years	7	15	6	1	0	2.03	22	4	0	0	1.15
Three-more years	11	17	9	0	0	1.95	29	6	0	1	1.25
Current status											
Teaching full time	11	17	6	1	0	1.91	28	6	0	1	1.26
Teaching part time	3	10	3	0	0	2.00	13	4	0	0	1.23
Others	9	17	14	2	0	2.21	19	3	0	0	1.14
Totals	23	44	23	3	0	2.06	60	13	0	1	1.22

Table 12. Data from Part III, Item 4 of the questionnaire: Melody writing

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	4	20	9	6	0	2.43	10	10	11	2	2.15
1974-1977	4	31	16	1	0	2.27	13	17	8	2	1.97
Degree emphasis											
Choral	2	17	6	2	0	2.30	4	11	6	1	2.18
Instrumental	4	14	13	1	0	2.34	9	8	7	0	1.92
Others	2	20	6	4	0	2.37	10	8	6	3	2.07
Teaching experience											
None	3	10	10	3	0	2.50	3	6	1	2	2.17
One-two years	1	18	9	1	0	2.34	11	7	6	2	1.96
Three-more years	4	23	6	3	0	2.22	9	14	12	0	2.09
Current status											
Teaching full time	5	19	9	2	0	2.23	13	11	10	1	1.97
Teaching part time	0	10	5	0	0	2.33	3	8	4	1	2.19
Others	3	22	11	5	0	2.44	7	8	5	2	2.09
Totals	8	51	25	7	0	2.34	23	27	19	4	2.05

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4=Not useful.

Table 13. Data from Part III, Item 5 of the questionnaire: Harmony writing

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	5	20	11	3	0	2.31	11	13	7	2	2.00	
1974-1977	3	33	14	1	0	2.25	17	15	7	0	1.74	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	3	17	5	2	0	2.22	4	13	5	0	2.05	
Instrumental	3	19	9	1	0	2.25	12	6	5	0	1.69	
Others	2	17	11	1	0	2.35	12	9	4	2	1.85	
Teaching experience												
None	2	12	12	0	0	2.38	4	6	1	1	1.92	
One-two years	2	18	7	1	0	2.25	12	7	5	1	1.80	
Three-more years	4	23	6	3	0	2.22	12	15	8	0	1.89	
Current status												
Teaching full time	5	19	9	2	0	2.23	17	10	7	0	1.71	
Teaching part time	0	11	4	0	0	2.27	4	8	4	0	2.00	
Others	3	23	12	2	0	2.33	7	10	3	2	2.00	
Totals	8	53	25	4	0	2.28	28	28	14	2	1.86	

Table 14. Data from Part III, Item 6 of the questionnaire: Keyboard harmony

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	5	14	15	5	0	2.51	13	14	4	2	1.85	
1974-1977	3	17	23	8	0	2.71	17	18	4	0	1.67	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	3	11	10	3	0	2.48	7	13	2	0	1.77	
Instrumental	2	10	14	6	0	2.75	12	7	3	1	1.69	
Others	3	10	14	4	0	2.70	11	12	3	1	1.78	
Teaching experience												
None	1	11	10	4	0	2.65	4	7	1	0	1.75	
One-two years	1	10	13	4	0	2.71	14	7	3	1	1.64	
Three-more years	6	10	15	5	0	2.53	12	18	4	1	1.83	
Current status												
Teaching full time	5	9	13	8	0	2.69	16	13	5	0	1.68	
Teaching part time	0	5	7	3	0	2.87	4	11	1	0	1.31	
Others	3	17	18	2	0	2.47	10	8	2	2	1.82	
Totals	8	31	38	13	0	2.62	30	32	8	2	1.75	

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 15. Data from Part III, Item 7 of the questionnaire: Rhythm

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	18	16	7	0	0	1.73	29	5	0	0	1.15	
1974-1977	12	30	10	2	0	2.04	28	10	1	0	1.31	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	14	10	4	0	0	1.64	17	5	0	0	1.23	
Instrumental	10	19	5	0	0	1.36	22	3	0	0	1.12	
Others	6	17	8	2	0	2.18	18	7	1	0	1.35	
Teaching experience												
None	6	14	7	0	0	2.04	8	3	1	0	1.42	
One-two years	9	16	4	1	0	1.90	22	4	0	0	1.15	
Three-more years	15	16	6	1	0	1.81	27	8	0	0	1.23	
Current status												
Teaching full time	10	19	4	2	0	1.94	27	7	0	0	1.21	
Teaching part time	7	6	4	0	0	1.82	10	6	1	0	1.47	
Others	13	21	9	0	0	1.91	20	2	0	0	1.09	
Totals	30	46	17	2	0	1.91	57	15	1	0	1.23	

Table 16: Data from Part III, Item 8 of the questionnaire: Melody

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	18	15	7	1	0	1.78	30	4	0	0	1.12	
1974-1977	11	33	9	1	0	2.00	29	9	1	0	1.28	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	13	11	3	1	0	1.71	19	3	0	0	1.14	
Instrumental	9	19	6	0	0	1.91	21	4	0	0	1.16	
Others	7	18	7	1	0	2.06	19	6	1	0	1.31	
Teaching experience												
None	7	14	5	1	0	2.00	9	2	1	0	1.33	
One-two years	7	19	3	1	0	1.93	22	4	0	0	1.15	
Three-more years	15	15	8	0	0	1.81	28	7	0	0	1.20	
Current status												
Teaching full time	10	18	6	1	0	1.94	28	6	0	0	1.18	
Teaching part time	5	8	4	0	0	1.94	10	6	1	0	1.47	
Others	14	22	6	1	0	1.86	21	1	0	0	1.05	
Totals	29	48	16	2	0	1.91	59	13	1	0	1.21	

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 17. Data from Part III, Item 9 of the questionnaire: Harmony

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	17	15	6	3	0	1.88*	29	5	0	0	1.15
1974-1977	9	31	13	1	0	2.11	30	8	1	0	1.26
Degree emphasis											
Choral	11	10	4	3	0	1.96	18	4	0	0	1.18
Instrumental	8	19	7	0	0	1.97	21	4	0	0	1.16
Others	7	17	8	1	0	2.09	20	5	1	0	1.27
Teaching experience											
None	6	14	6	1	0	2.07	9	2	1	0	1.33
One-two years	7	17	5	1	0	2.00	22	4	0	0	1.15
Three-more years	13	15	8	2	0	1.97	28	7	0	0	1.20
Current status											
Teaching full time	10	16	8	1	0	2.00	28	6	0	0	1.18
Teaching part time	3	9	4	1	0	2.18	11	5	1	0	1.41
Others	13	21	7	2	0	1.95	26	2	0	0	1.09
Totals	26	46	19	4	0	2.01	59	13	1	0	1.21

*Chi-square = 10.00 (P<.05)

Table 18. Data from Part III, Item 10 of the questionnaire: Texture

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	8	14	11	7	0	2.43	19	8	6	0	1.61
1974-1977	5	21	20	8	0	2.57	16	17	4	1	1.74
Degree emphasis											
Choral	3	11	9	4	0	2.52	6	11	4	0	1.90
Instrumental	5	12	13	4	0	2.47	16	6	2	1	1.52
Others	5	12	9	7	0	2.55	13	8	4	0	1.64
Teaching experience											
None	3	7	9	7	0	2.77	5	2	5	0	2.00
One-two years	4	12	12	2	0	2.40	13	11	0	1	1.56
Three-more years	6	16	10	6	0	2.42	17	12	5	0	1.65
Current status											
Teaching full time	4	17	11	3	0	2.37	20	9	3	0	1.47
Teaching part time	2	4	9	2	0	2.65	4	8	4	1	2.12
Others	7	14	11	10	0	2.57	11	8	3	0	1.54
Totals	13	35	31	15	0	2.51	35	25	10	1	1.68

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 19. Data from Part III, Item 11 of the questionnaire: Form

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	9	13	12	6	0	2.37	21	8	4	0	1.48
1974-1977	6	26	16	6	0	2.41	17	15	5	1	1.74
Degree emphasis											
Choral	4	11	7	5	0	2.48	9	8	4	0	1.76
Instrumental	5	15	11	3	0	2.35	14	7	3	1	1.64
Others	6	13	10	4	0	2.36	15	8	2	0	1.48
Teaching experience											
None	3	10	11	2	0	2.46	7	1	4	0	1.75
One-two years	5	13	8	4	0	2.37	13	10	1	1	1.60
Three-more years	7	16	9	6	0	2.37	18	12	4	0	1.59
Current status											
Teaching full time	5	17	8	5	0	2.37	17	12	3	0	1.56
Teaching part time	3	6	7	1	0	2.35	9	5	2	1	1.71
Others	7	16	13	6	0	2.43	12	6	4	0	1.64
Totals	15	39	28	12	0	2.39	38	23	9	1	1.62

Table 20. Data from Part III, Item 12 of the questionnaire: Counterpoint

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	8	10	8	11	2	2.71	11	9	10	3	2.15
1974-1977	4	11	19	19	0	3.00	6	17	13	3	2.33
Degree emphasis											
Choral	3	9	8	6	0	2.65	4	5	11	1	2.43
Instrumental	6	3	11	14	0	2.97	7	9	5	4	2.24
Others	3	9	8	10	2	2.96	6	12	7	1	2.11
Teaching experience											
None	2	7	6	10	1	3.04	3	3	6	0	2.25
One-two years	2	7	12	8	0	2.90	3	11	8	2	2.37
Three-more years	8	7	9	12	1	2.76	11	12	9	4	2.11
Current status											
Teaching full time	6	5	10	13	0	2.59	9	13	7	3	2.13
Teaching part time	2	5	5	5	0	2.76	3	5	8	2	2.50
Others	4	11	12	12	2	2.93	5	8	8	1	2.23
Totals	12	21	27	30	2	2.88	17	26	23	6	2.25

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 21. Data from Part III, Item 13 of the questionnaire: Scoring and arranging

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	13	19	7	4	0	2.05	17	14	3	0	1.58
1974-1977	10	30	13	1	0	2.09	20	13	6	1	1.70
Degree emphasis											
Choral	8	12	6	3	0	2.14	9	9	4	0	1.77
Instrumental	9	19	6	0	0	1.91	16	7	1	1	1.48
Others	6	18	8	2	0	2.29	12	11	4	0	1.70
Teaching experience											
None	5	19	3	1	0	2.00*	5	2	5	0	2.00
One-two years	9	12	8	1	0	2.03	11	14	0	0	1.56
Three-more years	9	18	9	3	0	2.15	21	11	4	1	1.59
Current status											
Teaching full time	10	13	12	1	0	2.11	18	11	3	1	1.61
Teaching part time	7	9	1	2	0	1.89	8	9	2	0	1.68
Others	6	27	7	2	0	2.12	11	7	4	0	1.68
Totals	23	49	20	5	0	2.07	37	27	9	1	1.65

*Chi-square = 17.72 (P<.05)

Table 22. Data from Part III, Item 14 of the questionnaire: Composition

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	8	9	15	7	0	2.54	10	10	9	2	2.10
1974-1977	6	28	15	3	0	2.29	12	16	7	3	2.03
Degree emphasis											
Choral	4	11	7	4	0	2.42	6	8	6	1	2.09
Instrumental	7	12	11	3	0	2.30	8	6	6	3	2.17
Others	3	14	12	3	0	2.47	8	12	4	1	1.92
Teaching experience											
None	1	14	10	2	0	2.48	3	5	3	1	2.17
One-two years	3	12	9	3	0	2.44	7	7	5	3	2.18
Three-more years	10	11	11	5	0	2.30	12	14	8	1	1.94
Current status											
Teaching full time	8	14	9	3	0	2.21	12	11	5	3	1.97
Teaching part time	2	5	7	2	0	2.56	4	9	2	2	2.12
Others	4	18	14	5	0	2.49	6	6	9	0	2.14
Totals	14	37	30	10	0	2.39	22	26	16	5	2.06

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 23. Data from Part III, Item 15 of the questionnaire: Form and analysis

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	4	15	15	7	0	2.61	11	11	8	2	2.03	
1974-1977	5	23	18	6	0	2.48	11	22	4	1	1.87	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	2	8	13	4	0	2.70	6	10	4	1	2.00	
Instrumental	3	15	11	4	0	2.48	7	12	2	2	1.96	
Others	4	15	9	5	0	2.45	9	11	6	0	1.88	
Teaching experience												
None	2	10	13	2	0	2.56	4	5	3	0	1.92	
One-two years	3	10	9	5	0	2.59	6	11	4	1	2.00	
Three-more years	4	18	11	6	0	2.49	12	17	5	2	1.92	
Current status												
Teaching full time	3	18	10	5	0	2.47	10	16	5	1	1.91	
Teaching part time	2	3	9	2	0	2.69	6	8	2	1	1.88	
Others	4	17	14	6	0	2.54	6	9	5	1	2.05	
Totals	9	38	33	13	0	2.54	22	33	12	3	1.94	

Table 24. Data from Part III, Item 16 of the questionnaire: Music history

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	16	15	10	2	0	1.95	9	16	6	1	1.97	
1974-1977	16	28	7	3	0	1.94	13	18	9	0	1.90	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	9	11	6	2	0	2.03	7	10	4	1	1.95	
Instrumental	10	18	5	2	0	1.97	6	9	9	0	2.13	
Others	13	14	6	1	0	1.85	9	15	2	0	1.73	
Teaching experience												
None	10	14	3	2	0	1.90	4	6	1	1	1.92	
One-two years	11	12	6	0	0	1.83	7	12	6	0	1.96	
Three-more years	11	17	8	3	0	2.08	11	16	8	0	1.91	
Current status												
Teaching full time	11	16	7	2	0	2.00	7	20	5	0	1.94	
Teaching part time	7	6	3	2	0	2.00	8	7	3	0	1.72	
Others	14	21	7	1	0	1.88	7	7	7	1	2.09	
Totals	32	43	17	5	0	1.95	22	34	15	1	1.93	

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 25. Data from Part III, Item 17 of the questionnaire: History of jazz and popular music.

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	2	7	14	14	4	3.27	12	6	10	4	2.19
1974-1977	2	7	14	28	2	3.40	14	12	11	2	2.03
Degree emphasis											
Choral	0	3	13	11	0	3.30	7	8	6	1	2.05
Instrumental	2	8	11	14	0	3.06	13	4	6	1	1.79
Others	2	3	4	17	6	3.69	6	6	9	4	2.44
Teaching experience											
None	1	4	10	11	2	3.32	3	4	3	2	2.33
One-two years	3	3	5	15	1	3.30	8	6	9	1	2.13
Three-more years	0	7	13	16	3	3.38	15	8	9	3	2.00
Current status											
Teaching full time	0	9	11	13	3	3.28	15	8	5	3	1.87
Teaching part time	2	1	5	10	0	3.28	4	6	8	0	2.22
Others	2	4	12	19	3	3.43	7	4	8	3	2.32
Totals	4	14	28	42	6	3.34	26	18	21	6	2.10

Table 26. Data from Part III, Item 18 of the questionnaire: Master works

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	7	20	13	3	0	2.28	14	13	4	1	1.75
1974-1977	7	21	19	6	0	2.45	15	15	10	0	1.87
Degree emphasis											
Choral	2	13	11	2	0	2.46	10	7	4	1	1.82
Instrumental	8	11	12	4	0	2.34	8	8	8	0	2.00
Others	4	17	9	3	0	2.33	11	13	2	0	1.65
Teaching experience											
None	6	10	10	3	0	2.34	6	3	2	1	1.83
One-two years	3	14	9	2	0	2.36	6	12	7	0	2.04
Three-more years	5	17	13	4	0	2.41	17	13	5	0	1.66
Current status											
Teaching full time	5	19	11	1	0	2.22	12	13	7	0	1.84
Teaching part time	2	7	7	2	0	2.50	8	9	1	0	1.61
Others	7	15	14	6	0	2.45	9	6	6	1	1.95
Totals	14	41	32	9	0	2.37	29	28	14	1	1.82

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 27. Data from Part III, Item 19 of the questionnaire: Exposure to a wide selection of music

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	9	16	13	4	0	2.29	19	9	4	0	1.53
1974-1977	9	16	23	5	0	2.45	22	15	3	0	1.53
Degree emphasis											
Choral	5	9	12	2	0	2.39	13	6	3	0	1.55
Instrumental	9	8	14	4	0	2.37	13	8	3	0	1.58
Others	4	15	10	3	0	2.38	15	10	1	0	1.46
Teaching experience											
None	5	12	8	4	0	2.38	6	3	3	0	1.75
One-two years	5	6	15	2	0	2.50	13	11	1	0	1.52
Three-more years	8	14	13	3	0	2.29	22	10	3	0	1.46
Current status											
Teaching full time	9	10	14	2	0	2.26	18	13	1	0	1.47
Teaching part time	2	7	7	2	0	2.50	10	7	1	0	1.50
Others	7	15	15	5	0	2.42	13	4	5	0	1.64
Totals	18	32	36	9	0	2.38	41	24	7	0	1.53

Table 28. Data from Part III, Item 20 of the questionnaire: Fluency in sight reading, principal instrument

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	24	13	4	0	0	1.51	32	3	0	0	1.09
1974-1977	24	26	2	2	0	1.67	33	6	0	0	1.15
Degree emphasis											
Choral	12	13	1	0	0	1.58	21	1	0	0	1.05
Instrumental	22	10	2	1	0	1.49	23	3	0	0	1.11
Others	14	16	3	1	0	1.73	21	5	0	0	1.19
Teaching experience											
None	14	12	2	0	0	1.57	10	2	0	0	1.17
One-two years	14	13	1	1	0	1.62	20	4	0	0	1.17
Three-more years	20	14	3	1	0	1.61	35	3	0	0	1.08
Current status											
Teaching full time	19	15	1	1	0	1.56	32	2	0	0	1.06
Teaching part time	9	8	0	0	0	1.47	14	4	0	0	1.22
Others	20	16	5	1	0	1.69	19	3	0	0	1.14
Totals	48	39	6	2	0	1.60	65	9	0	0	1.12

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 29. Data from Part III, Item 21 of the questionnaire: Fluency in sight reading, minor instrument

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	10	18	7	3	0	2.08	20	7	4	1	1.56
1974-1977	8	24	14	2	0	2.21	22	6	7	2	1.70
Degree emphasis											
Choral	0	15	8	1	0	2.42*	7	3	7	2	2.21**
Instrumental	12	15	6	1	0	1.88	21	4	1	0	1.23
Others	6	12	7	3	0	2.25	14	6	3	1	1.63
Teaching experience											
None	4	12	6	2	0	2.25	4	3	3	1	2.09
One-two years	8	12	6	0	0	1.92	15	4	2	2	1.61
Three-more years	6	18	9	3	0	2.25	23	6	6	0	1.51
Current status											
Teaching full time	9	19	3	1	0	1.87	22	4	3	1	1.39***
Teaching part time	5	6	6	0	0	2.06	6	3	7	2	2.28
Others	4	17	12	4	0	2.43	14	6	1	0	1.38
Totals	18	42	21	5	0	2.15	42	13	11	3	1.64

*Chi-square = 12.80 (P<.05)
 **Chi-square = 14.81 (P<.05)
 ***Chi-square = 15.81 (P<.05)

Table 30. Data from Part III, Item 22 of the questionnaire: Fluency in sight reading, Keyboard

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	10	10	16	3	0	2.31	26	4	4	0	1.35
1974-1977	5	23	16	8	0	2.52	30	8	0	0	1.21
Degree emphasis											
Choral	5	10	9	2	0	2.31	16	6	0	0	1.27
Instrumental	5	11	11	7	0	2.59	21	1	4	0	1.35
Others	5	12	12	2	0	2.35	19	5	0	0	1.21
Teaching experience											
None	4	8	10	4	0	2.54	7	4	0	0	1.36
One-two years	4	13	8	2	0	2.30	22	1	0	0	1.04
Three-more years	7	12	14	5	0	2.47	27	7	4	0	1.39
Current status											
Teaching full time	4	13	11	6	0	2.56*	24	6	3	0	1.36
Teaching part time	7	7	2	1	0	1.82	15	3	0	0	1.17
Others	4	13	19	4	0	2.58	17	3	1	0	1.24
Totals	15	33	32	11	0	2.43	56	12	4	0	1.28

*Chi-square = 14.10 (P<.05)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 31. Data from Part III, Item 23 of the questionnaire: Performance by memory and "by ear", principal instrument

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	14	16	9	2	0	1.97	24	9	2	0	1.37
1974-1977	14	24	12	4	0	2.11	24	13	1	2	1.53
Degree emphasis											
Choral	10	11	4	1	0	1.85	16	6	0	0	1.27
Instrumental	12	12	9	2	0	2.03	17	4	3	2	1.61
Others	6	17	8	3	0	2.23	15	12	0	0	1.44
Teaching experience											
None	12	11	4	1	0	1.79	8	4	0	0	1.33
One-two years	6	11	9	3	0	2.31	14	9	0	2	1.60
Three-more years	10	18	8	2	0	2.05	26	9	3	0	1.39
Current status											
Teaching full time	6	17	9	4	0	2.31	25	7	2	1	1.40
Teaching part time	6	5	5	1	0	2.06	9	8	0	1	1.61
Others	16	18	7	1	0	1.83	14	7	1	0	1.41
Totals	28	40	21	6	0	2.05	48	22	3	2	1.45

Table 32. Data from Part III, Item 24 of the questionnaire: Performance by memory and "by ear", minor instrument

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	5	13	12	6	1	2.59	16	8	7	1	1.78
1974-1977	2	17	19	10	0	2.77	10	15	7	4	2.14
Degree emphasis											
Choral	0	6	11	5	0	2.95	4	5	7	2	2.39
Instrumental	4	11	14	6	0	2.63	13	7	4	2	1.81
Others	3	13	6	5	1	2.57	9	11	5	1	1.83
Teaching experience											
None	2	11	5	4	1	2.61	3	3	3	1	2.20
One-two years	2	10	11	4	0	2.63	7	8	4	4	2.22
Three-more years	3	9	15	8	0	2.80	16	12	7	0	1.74
Current status											
Teaching full time	2	12	11	6	0	2.68	15	11	2	2	1.70*
Teaching part time	2	3	5	6	0	2.94	2	5	7	2	2.65
Others	3	15	15	4	1	2.65	9	7	5	0	1.81
Totals	7	30	31	16	1	2.69	26	23	14	5	1.97

*Chi-square = 14.94 (P<.05)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 33. Data from Part III, Item 25 of the questionnaire: Performance by memory and "by ear", Keyboard

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	7	14	11	7	0	2.46	20	9	5	0	1.56
1974-1977	2	19	20	10	0	2.75	17	16	4	2	1.76
Degree emphasis											
Choral	3	9	9	4	0	2.56	12	7	2	0	1.52
Instrumental	3	11	11	9	0	2.75	14	6	4	2	1.77
Others	3	13	11	4	0	2.52	11	11	3	0	1.68
Teaching experience											
None	2	11	9	3	0	2.52	5	4	1	0	1.60
One-two years	2	9	12	4	0	2.67	12	8	3	1	1.71
Three-more years	5	13	10	10	0	2.67	20	12	5	1	1.66
Current status											
Teaching full time	2	10	11	11	0	2.91	16	11	5	2	1.79
Teaching part time	3	6	5	2	0	2.37	9	6	2	0	1.52
Others	4	17	15	4	0	2.47	12	7	2	0	1.52
Totals	9	33	31	17	0	2.62	37	24	9	2	1.67

Table 34. Data from Part III, Item 26 of the questionnaire: Technical facility and depth of repertoire, principal instrument

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	22	15	5	0	0	1.59	24	8	2	0	1.35
1974-1977	20	22	9	2	0	1.87	22	16	2	0	1.50
Degree emphasis											
Choral	9	14	4	0	0	1.81	13	7	2	0	1.50
Instrumental	20	9	4	1	0	1.59	16	8	1	0	1.40
Others	13	14	6	1	0	1.85	17	9	1	0	1.41
Teaching experience											
None	13	11	5	0	0	1.72	5	6	1	0	1.67
One-two years	9	14	4	1	0	1.89	14	9	2	0	1.52
Three-more years	20	12	5	1	0	1.66	27	9	1	0	1.30
Current status											
Teaching full time	16	14	4	1	0	1.71	22	10	2	0	1.41
Teaching part time	8	5	5	0	0	1.83	12	5	1	0	1.39
Others	18	18	5	1	0	1.74	12	9	1	0	1.50
Totals	42	37	14	2	0	1.75	46	24	4	0	1.43

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4=Not useful.

Table 35. Data from Part III, Item 27 of the questionnaire: Technical facility and the depth of repertoire, ensemble performance

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	24	8	8	1	0	1.66	26	6	2	0	1.29
1974-1977	21	21	8	3	0	1.87	21	16	3	0	1.55
Degree emphasis											
Choral	15	6	5	1	0	1.70	13	7	2	0	1.50
Instrumental	18	8	6	2	0	1.76	17	6	2	0	1.40
Others	12	15	5	1	0	1.85	17	9	1	0	1.41
Teaching experience											
None	13	9	5	1	0	1.51	4	7	1	0	1.75
One-two years	10	13	5	0	0	1.96	16	6	3	0	1.48
Three-more years	22	7	6	3	0	1.74	27	9	1	0	1.30
Current status											
Teaching full time	17	11	4	2	0	1.73	23	11	0	0	1.32
Teaching part time	8	3	6	1	0	2.00	10	6	2	0	1.55
Others	20	15	6	1	0	1.71	14	5	3	0	1.50
Totals	45	29	16	4	0	1.81	47	22	5	0	1.43

Table 36. Data from Part III, Item 28 of the questionnaire: Technical facility on minor instruments, guitar

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	2	1	2	17	7	3.90	10	3	7	4	2.21
1974-1977	2	7	4	18	7	3.55	13	4	6	4	2.04
Degree emphasis											
Choral	3	3	3	7	1	3.00*	6	2	6	0	2.00
Instrumental	1	1	1	22	6	4.00	9	3	4	5	2.23
Others	0	4	2	6	7	3.84	8	2	3	3	2.06
Teaching experience											
None	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	3	1	1	2	2.29
One-two years	1	3	1	12	5	3.91	7	2	4	4	2.29
Three-more years	2	3	2	16	5	3.68	13	4	8	2	1.96
Current status											
Teaching full time	2	2	1	15	5	3.76	13	3	6	3	1.96
Teaching part time	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	2	1	3	5	3.00
Others	2	6	3	15	5	3.48	8	3	4	0	1.73
Totals	4	8	6	35	14	3.70	23	7	13	8	2.12

*Chi-square = 19.93 (P<.05)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 37. Data from Part III, Item 29 of the questionnaire: Technical facility on minor instruments, piano

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	9	16	10	2	0	2.13	21	5	3	1	1.47	
1974-1977	6	18	19	6	0	2.51	24	10	3	1	1.50	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	7	13	5	0	0	1.92	16	3	2	0	1.33	
Instrumental	3	11	15	5	0	2.65	14	5	3	1	1.61	
Others	5	10	9	3	0	2.37	15	7	1	1	1.50	
Teaching experience												
None	2	11	7	3	0	2.48	6	2	1	1	1.70	
One-two years	7	10	8	2	0	2.19	17	5	1	0	1.30	
Three-more years	6	13	14	3	0	2.39	22	8	4	1	1.54	
Current status												
Teaching full time	5	3	10	4	0	2.59	20	8	3	1	1.53	
Teaching part time	4	8	5	0	0	2.06	11	3	2	1	1.59	
Others	6	13	14	4	0	2.43	14	4	1	0	1.31	
Totals	15	34	29	8	0	2.35	45	15	6	2	1.49	

Table 38. Data from Part III, Item 30 of the questionnaire: Technical facility on minor instruments, voice

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	12	13	7	4	0	2.03	19	7	3	2	1.61	
1974-1977	9	17	14	3	1	2.32	19	10	4	1	1.62	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	15	6	1	0	1	1.52*	14	3	2	0	1.37	
Instrumental	2	11	16	5	0	2.71	10	8	4	2	1.92	
Others	4	13	4	2	0	2.17	14	6	1	1	1.50	
Teaching experience												
None	5	8	5	1	1	2.25	5	2	1	1	1.78	
One-two years	5	11	7	3	0	2.31	11	8	2	1	1.68	
Three-more years	11	11	9	3	0	2.12	22	7	4	1	1.53	
Current status												
Teaching full time	6	10	13	2	0	2.35	17	10	3	1	1.61	
Teaching part time	4	7	2	1	0	2.00	6	3	4	2	2.13	
Others	11	13	6	4	1	2.17	15	4	0	0	1.21	
Totals	21	30	21	7	1	2.21	38	17	7	3	1.61	

*Chi-square = 38.97 (P<.01)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 39. Data from Part 31 of the questionnaire: Technical facility on minor instruments, woodwinds

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	15	14	4	6	0	2.03	17	5	6	4	1.91	
1974-1977	13	18	9	1	0	1.85	17	4	9	4	2.00	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	7	7	5	5	0	2.32*	5	3	10	2	2.45**	
Instrumental	20	10	3	1	0	1.56	21	1	2	1	1.32	
Others	6	15	5	1	0	2.04	8	5	3	5	2.24	
Teaching experience												
None	5	9	5	2	0	2.19	4	1	3	1	2.11	
One-two years	14	7	4	2	0	1.78	11	4	4	3	1.95	
Three-more years	14	16	4	3	0	1.89	19	4	8	4	1.91	
Current status												
Teaching full time	19	11	3	0	0	1.51	20	4	4	2	1.60	
Teaching part time	5	5	4	2	0	2.19	5	1	7	4	2.59	
Others	9	16	6	5	0	2.19	15	4	0	0	1.21	
Totals	33	32	13	7	0	1.95	34	9	15	8	1.95	

*Chi-square = 17.40 (P<.01)

**Chi-square = 25.26 (P<.01)

Table 40. Data from Part III, Item 32 of the questionnaire: Technical facility on minor instruments, brass

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	9	17	5	6	0	2.22	17	4	6	4	1.90	
1974-1977	16	15	10	4	0	2.04	17	3	9	4	2.00	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	5	6	8	5	0	2.54*	5	3	10	2	2.45**	
Instrumental	17	12	2	3	0	1.73	21	1	2	1	1.32	
Others	3	14	5	2	0	2.25	8	3	3	5	2.26	
Teaching experience												
None	5	6	7	3	0	2.38	4	1	5	1	2.11	
One-two years	11	7	4	3	0	1.96	11	2	4	3	1.95	
Three-more years	9	19	4	4	0	2.08	19	4	8	4	1.91	
Current status												
Teaching full time	14	14	3	1	0	1.72	20	4	4	2	1.60	
Teaching part time	4	4	5	3	0	2.44	5	1	7	4	2.59	
Others	7	14	7	6	0	2.35	9	2	4	2	1.94	
Totals	25	32	15	10	0	2.12	34	7	15	8	1.95	

*Chi-square = 19.13 (P<.01)

**Chi-square = 23.20 (P<.01)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 41. Data from Part III, Item 33 of the questionnaire: Technical facility on minor instruments, strings

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	11	12	7	6	0	2.22	13	5	9	2	2.00
1974-1977	15	7	14	3	2	2.27	11	7	8	6	2.28
Degree emphasis											
Choral	2	4	6	6	1	3.00*	4	4	9	2	2.47
Instrumental	13	8	11	2	0	2.06	8	4	7	4	2.30
Others	11	7	4	1	1	1.92	12	4	1	2	1.63
Teaching experience											
None	5	3	7	4	1	2.65	2	2	4	1	2.44
One-two years	12	4	3	1	1	1.81	7	5	2	4	2.17
Three-more years	9	12	11	4	0	2.28	15	5	11	3	2.06
Current status											
Teaching full time	15	9	8	0	0	1.78	15	5	5	5	2.00
Teaching part time	2	3	3	3	1	2.83	3	2	6	3	2.64
Others	9	7	10	6	1	2.48	6	5	6	0	2.00
Totals	26	19	21	9	2	2.25	24	12	17	8	2.15

*Chi-square = 16.26 (P<.05)

Table 42. Data from Part III, Item 34 of the questionnaire: Technical facility on minor instruments, percussion

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	10	13	8	7	0	2.31	17	5	7	2	1.81
1974-1977	8	18	14	3	0	2.28	17	4	8	4	1.97
Degree emphasis											
Choral	2	7	7	6	0	2.77	5	4	10	1	2.35*
Instrumental	10	10	11	3	0	2.21	20	1	4	0	1.36
Others	6	14	4	1	0	2.00	9	4	1	5	2.11
Teaching experience											
None	3	7	6	3	0	2.47	3	2	3	1	2.22
One-two years	6	12	4	3	0	2.16	10	4	3	3	1.95
Three-more years	9	12	12	4	0	2.30	21	3	9	2	1.77
Current status											
Teaching full time	11	12	9	1	0	2.00	21	3	4	2	1.57**
Teaching part time	1	7	4	4	0	2.69	3	3	8	3	2.65
Others	6	12	9	5	0	2.41	10	3	3	1	1.71
Totals	18	31	22	10	1	2.30	34	9	15	6	1.89

*Chi-square = 13.70 (P<.05)

**Chi-square = 27.29 (P<.01)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 43. Data from Part III, Item 35 of the questionnaire: Technical facility in other areas, synthesizer.

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	0	0	4	20	10	4.18	4	4	4	17	3.17
1974-1977	2	1	3	25	15	4.09	5	5	10	13	2.94
Degree emphasis											
Choral	1	0	1	11	6	4.11	1	2	4	10	3.35
Instrumental	0	0	2	23	8	4.18	2	4	9	9	3.04
Others	1	1	4	11	11	4.07	6	3	1	11	2.81
Teaching experience											
None	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	1	1	3	3	3.00
One-two years	2	1	3	13	5	3.75	2	4	3	1	3.11
Three-more years	0	0	3	21	10	4.21	6	4	8	17	3.03
Current status											
Teaching full time	1	1	4	17	9	4.00	6	6	7	11	2.77
Teaching part time	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	1	2	2	10	3.40
Others	1	0	2	21	9	4.12	2	1	5	9	3.23
Totals	2	1	7	45	25	4.13	9	9	14	30	3.05

Table 44. Data from Part III, Item 36 of the questionnaire: Technical facilities in other areas, music theatre production.

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	0	5	3	23	6	3.81	7	5	9	10	2.71
1974-1977	3	2	8	23	11	3.79	10	11	6	7	2.29
Degree emphasis											
Choral	3	3	4	12	2	3.29*	7	7	4	2	2.05
Instrumental	0	0	2	24	6	4.12	3	3	7	11	3.08
Others	0	4	5	10	9	3.85	7	6	4	4	2.23
Teaching experience											
None	2	2	1	11	7	3.83	2	0	5	3	2.90
One-two years	1	2	7	12	3	3.56	4	9	1	5	2.37
Three-more years	0	3	3	23	7	3.94	11	7	9	9	2.44
Current status											
Teaching full time	1	2	6	16	7	3.81	11	6	7	6	2.27
Teaching part time	1	0	2	9	5	4.00	3	4	2	7	2.81
Others	1	5	3	21	5	3.69	3	6	6	4	2.58
Totals	3	7	11	46	17	3.79	17	16	15	17	2.49

*Chi-square = 21.80 (P<.01)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4=Not useful.

Table 45. Data from Part III, Item 37 of the questionnaire: Technical facility in other areas, music theatre performance

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean	
Year graduated												
1970-1973	2	4	6	20	6	3.63	9	4	9	10	2.63*	
1974-1977	4	7	11	19	9	3.44	9	16	5	15	2.17	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	4	5	6	11	1	3.00	7	11	3	1	1.91**	
Instrumental	1	2	6	19	5	3.76	3	4	7	10	3.00	
Others	1	4	5	9	9	3.75	8	5	4	4	2.19	
Teaching experience												
None	3	4	5	8	5	3.32	2	2	4	2	2.60	
One-two years	2	2	7	12	3	3.46	5	10	1	4	2.20	
Three-more years	1	5	5	19	7	3.70	11	8	9	9	2.43	
Current status												
Teaching full time	2	4	6	14	7	3.61	10	8	7	6	2.30	
Teaching part time	1	0	5	8	4	3.78	3	6	2	6	2.65	
Others	3	7	6	17	4	3.32	5	6	5	3	2.31	
Totals	6	11	17	39	15	3.52	18	20	14	15	2.39	

*Chi-square = 14.75 (P<.05)

**Chi-square = 16.28 (P<.05)

Table 46. Data from Part III, Item 38 of the questionnaire: Understanding of musical interpretations and styles, principal instrument

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean	
Year graduated												
1970-1973	18	17	4	2	0	1.76	22	8	2	0	1.37	
1974-1977	19	25	5	2	0	1.80	29	8	0	1	1.29	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	8	10	6	2	0	2.08*	13	4	2	1	1.55	
Instrumental	20	13	0	1	0	1.47	19	5	0	0	1.21	
Others	9	19	3	1	0	1.87	19	7	0	0	1.27	
Teaching experience												
None	11	12	4	1	0	1.82	7	4	1	0	1.50	
One-two years	9	15	2	1	0	1.81	16	6	0	1	1.39	
Three-more years	17	15	3	2	0	1.73	28	6	1	0	1.23	
Current status												
Teaching full time	17	13	2	2	0	1.68	28	3	0	1	1.19	
Teaching part time	6	7	5	0	0	1.94	12	6	0	0	1.33	
Others	14	22	2	2	0	1.80	11	7	2	0	1.55	
Totals	37	42	9	4	0	1.78	51	16	2	1	1.33	

*Chi-square = 15.37 (P<.05)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 47. Data from Part III, Item 39 of the questionnaire: Understanding of musical interpretations and styles, ensemble performance

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	19	18	3	2	0	1.71	22	8	2	0	1.37	
1974-1977	18	21	10	2	0	1.92	29	7	2	0	1.29	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	9	12	5	2	0	2.00	11	6	3	0	1.60	
Instrumental	18	10	5	1	0	1.68	20	3	1	0	1.21	
Others	10	17	3	1	0	1.84	20	6	0	0	1.23	
Teaching experience												
None	8	14	4	1	0	1.93	6	4	2	0	1.67	
One-two years	10	14	3	0	0		17	5	1	0	1.30	
Three-more years	19	11	6	3	0	1.82	28	6	1	0	1.23	
Current status												
Teaching full time	15	12	7	1	0	1.83	29	3	0	0	1.09	
Teaching part time	9	5	3	1	0		11	7	0	0	1.39	
Others	13	22	3	2	0	1.85	11	5	4	0	1.65	
Totals	37	39	13	4	0	1.83	51	15	4	0	1.33	

Table 48. Data from Part III, Item 40 of the questionnaire: Effective methods for musical instruction, private instruction (principal instrument)

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	28	8	4	1	0	1.45	28	4	0	0	1.13	
1974-1977	20	20	9	3	0	1.90	33	6	0	0	1.15	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	10	11	4	2	0	1.93	14	6	0	0	1.30	
Instrumental	22	8	3	2	0	1.57	22	3	0	0	1.12	
Others	17	9	6	0	0	1.66	25	1	0	0	1.04	
Teaching experience												
None	13	10	5	0	0	1.71	10	2	0	0	1.17	
One-two years	12	10	5	1	0	1.82	22	2	0	0	1.08	
Three-more years	24	8	3	3	0	1.61	29	6	0	0	1.17	
Current status												
Teaching full time	19	13	2	2	0	1.64	27	6	0	0	1.18	
Teaching part time	8	4	6	0	0	1.89	15	2	0	0	1.11	
Others	22	11	5	2	0	1.67	19	2	0	0	1.09	
Totals	49	28	13	4	0	1.70	61	10	0	0	1.14	

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4=Not useful.

Table 49. Data from Part III, Item 41 of the questionnaire: Effective methods for musical instruction, private instruction (minor instruments)

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	14	12	7	3	2	2.13	18	9	1	2	1.57
1974-1977	12	18	15	1	2	2.23	25	6	3	2	1.50
Degree emphasis											
Choral	5	10	6	2	0	2.22	7	7	2	2	1.94
Instrumental	12	9	9	2	2	2.21	18	6	1	0	1.32
Others	9	11	7	0	2	2.14	18	2	1	2	1.43
Teaching experience											
None	6	9	4	0	3	2.32	7	2	1	0	1.40
One-two years	8	8	11	0	0	2.11	18	2	1	2	1.43
Three-more years	12	13	7	4	1	2.16	18	11	2	2	1.54
Current status											
Teaching full time	14	12	5	2	1	1.94	21	7	1	1	1.40
Teaching part time	4	5	8	0	0	2.23	8	4	1	3	1.93
Others	8	13	9	2	3	2.40	14	4	2	0	1.40
Totals	26	30	22	4	4	2.19	43	15	4	4	1.53

Table 50. Data from Part III, Item 42 of the questionnaire: Conducting techniques

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	22	14	5	1	0	1.64	28	4	1	1	1.26
1974-1977	19	22	9	3	0	1.92	29	5	3	2	1.43
Degree emphasis											
Choral	14	8	4	1	0	1.70	17	2	2	1	1.41
Instrumental	16	12	4	3	0	1.83	22	2	0	0	1.08
Others	11	16	6	0	0	1.85	18	5	2	2	1.55
Teaching experience											
None	10	12	3	3	0	1.96	5	2	2	3	2.25*
One-two years	12	13	4	0	0	1.72	20	4	1	0	1.24
Three-more years	19	11	7	1	0	1.74	32	3	1	0	1.14
Current status											
Teaching full time	18	11	6	1	0	1.72	31	1	1	0	1.09
Teaching part time	6	9	3	0	0	1.83	9	5	3	1	1.78
Others	17	16	5	3	0	1.85	17	3	0	2	1.41
Totals	41	36	14	4	0	1.80	57	9	4	3	1.36

*Chi-square = 22.14 (P<.01)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 51. Data from Part III, Item 43 of the questionnaire: Instrumental rehearsal techniques

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	19	11	7	3	0	1.85	22	5	4	1	1.50
1974-1977	22	18	12	0	1	1.87	23	7	7	2	1.69
Degree emphasis											
Choral	7	9	8	3	0	2.26*	5	7	9	1	2.27**
Instrumental	21	11	3	0	0	1.49	23	0	1	0	1.08
Others	13	9	8	0	1	1.93	17	5	1	2	1.52
Teaching experience											
None	8	10	8	1	1	2.18	4	1	4	3	2.50***
One-two years	17	6	5	0	0	1.57	17	6	1	0	1.33
Three-more years	16	13	6	2	0	1.84	24	5	6	0	1.49
Current status											
Teaching full time	17	13	4	1	0	1.69	26	2	4	0	1.31
Teaching part time	10	1	6	1	1	2.05	7	7	4	1	1.95
Others	14	15	9	1	0	1.92	12	3	3	2	1.75
Totals	41	29	19	3	1	1.86	45	12	11	3	1.61

*Chi-square = 17.48 (P<.05)
**Chi-square = 32.02 (P<.01)
***Chi-square = 22.82 (P<.01)

Table 52. Data from Part III, Item 44 of the questionnaire: Choral rehearsal techniques

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment				
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	17	15	10	0	0	1.83	23	3	4	3	1.61
1974-1977	15	14	15	7	1	2.33	22	4	7	5	1.87
Degree emphasis											
Choral	17	7	5	0	0	1.59*	18	1	4	0	1.39
Instrumental	7	8	14	6	0	2.54	14	2	3	4	1.87
Others	8	14	6	1	1	2.10	13	4	4	4	1.96
Teaching experience											
None	6	11	6	3	1	2.33	5	0	4	3	2.42**
One-two years	9	11	5	3	0	2.07	13	5	4	2	1.79
Three-more years	17	7	14	1	0	1.97	27	2	3	3	1.49
Current status											
Teaching full time	14	6	13	2	0	2.09	22	2	5	2	1.58
Teaching part time	4	8	4	2	1	2.37	8	2	5	4	2.26
Others	14	15	8	3	0	2.00	15	3	1	2	1.52
Totals	32	29	25	7	1	2.11	45	7	11	8	1.75

*Chi-square = 24.20 (P<.01)
**Chi-square = 12.95 (P<.05)

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 53. Data from Part III, Item 45 of the questionnaire: General music practicum

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	5	15	11	5	0	2.44	14	8	4	3	1.86	
1974-1977	4	16	15	10	5	2.92	13	11	6	6	2.14	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	2	10	10	3	1	2.65	7	7	6	1	2.05	
Instrumental	3	10	12	6	3	2.82	8	7	3	4	2.14	
Others	4	11	4	6	2	2.67	12	5	1	4	1.86	
Teaching experience												
None	1	10	7	4	4	3.00	3	1	5	2	2.55	
One-two years	4	8	8	5	0	2.56	9	7	1	3	1.90	
Three-more years	4	13	11	6	1	2.63	15	11	4	4	1.91	
Current status												
Teaching full time	6	10	9	7	1	2.61	14	10	2	4	1.87*	
Teaching part time	1	5	5	4	2	3.06	3	7	2	5	2.53	
Others	2	16	12	4	2	2.67	10	2	6	0	1.78	
Totals	9	31	26	15	5	2.72	27	19	10	9	2.01	

*Chi-square = 17.26 (P: .01)

Table 54. Data from Part III, Item 46 of the questionnaire: Music therapy practicum

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	3	9	7	13	2	3.06	7	7	4	10	2.61	
1974-1977	2	4	7	22	11	3.78	6	8	8	10	2.69	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	0	3	9	12	2	3.50	3	7	6	5	2.62	
Instrumental	1	4	2	19	4	3.70	3	3	5	9	3.00	
Others	4	6	3	4	7	4.17	7	5	1	6	2.31	
Teaching experience												
None	0	3	6	11	4	3.67	3	1	2	5	2.82	
One-two years	3	4	3	10	5	3.40	3	4	4	7	2.94	
Three-more years	2	6	5	14	4	3.39	7	10	6	8	2.48	
Current status												
Teaching full time	4	3	4	15	4	3.40	5	7	7	3	2.67	
Teaching part time	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	3	3	3	6	2.80	
Others	0	9	7	14	4	3.38	5	5	2	6	2.50	
Totals	5	13	14	35	13	3.47	13	15	12	20	2.65	

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 55. Data from Part III, Item 47 of the questionnaire: Church music.

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	3	8	11	10	3	3.06	11	9	3	7	2.20	
1974-1977	3	2	12	20	9	3.65	9	9	9	7	2.41	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	2	4	11	8	2	3.15	7	8	5	2	2.09*	
Instrumental	0	4	6	18	3	3.65	3	4	6	9	2.95	
Others	4	2	6	4	7	3.35	10	6	1	3	1.85	
Teaching experience												
None	1	2	6	8	6	3.69	3	5	1	2	2.18	
One-two years	3	3	8	7	4	3.24	6	4	6	4	2.40	
Three-more years	2	5	9	15	2	3.30	11	9	5	8	2.30	
Current status												
Teaching full time	3	6	9	11	3	3.16	8	7	8	6	2.41	
Teaching part time	1	0	5	7	3	3.69	5	6	0	6	2.41	
Others	2	4	9	12	6	3.48	7	5	4	2	2.05	
Totals	6	10	23	30	12	3.39	20	18	12	14	2.31	

*Chi-square = 14.51 (P<.05)

Table 56. Data from Part III, Item 48 of the questionnaire: Philosophy of education and music education

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	9	19	10	2	1	2.19	16	13	2	3	1.76	
1974-1977	12	21	13	1	2	2.18	13	19	2	2	1.81	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	6	14	7	1	0	2.11	8	10	2	2	1.91	
Instrumental	12	14	7	1	0	1.91	13	12	0	1	1.58	
Others	3	12	9	1	3	2.61	8	10	2	2	1.91	
Teaching experience												
None	6	12	7	0	1	2.15	3	5	2	2	2.25	
One-two years	7	12	8	0	0	2.04	10	13	0	0	1.57	
Three-more years	8	16	8	3	2	2.32	16	15	2	3	1.77	
Current status												
Teaching full time	8	16	5	2	2	2.21	14	14	1	1	1.64	
Teaching part time	5	4	7	1	1	2.39	7	8	0	3	1.94	
Others	8	20	11	0	0	2.08	8	9	3	1	1.86	
Totals	21	40	23	3	3	2.19	29	32	4	5	1.79	

Column one values: 1= Excellent, 2=Good, 3= Fair, 4=Poor, 5= No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 57. Data from Part III, Item 49 of the questionnaire: An understanding of growth and learning problems of children

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	5	16	15	4	1	2.51	19	11	4	0	1.56
1974-1977	4	19	20	5	2	2.64	22	11	3	1	1.54
Degree emphasis											
Choral	2	8	15	3	0	2.68	9	9	4	0	1.77
Instrumental	5	13	14	2	0	2.38	19	7	0	0	1.27
Others	2	14	6	4	3	2.72	13	6	3	1	1.65
Teaching experience											
None	2	13	8	2	1	2.50	6	1	4	1	2.00
One-two years	2	10	12	3	0	2.59	16	7	0	0	1.30
Three-more years	5	12	15	4	2	2.63	19	14	3	0	1.55
Current status											
Teaching full time	6	13	10	2	2	2.42	18	12	1	0	1.45
Teaching part time	0	6	9	3	1	2.95	9	6	3	1	1.79
Others	3	16	16	4	0	2.54	14	4	3	0	1.48
Totals	9	35	35	9	3	2.58	41	22	7	1	1.55

Table 58. Data from Part III, Item 50 of the questionnaire: Communication skills

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	4	16	17	3	1	2.54	22	10	2	0	1.41
1974-1977	4	22	18	4	2	2.56	21	12	1	2	1.55
Degree emphasis											
Choral	2	11	12	3	0	2.57	11	8	2	0	1.57
Instrumental	4	13	14	3	0	2.47	17	8	0	1	1.42
Others	2	14	9	1	3	2.62	15	6	1	1	1.48
Teaching experience											
None	2	13	9	1	1	2.46	6	3	2	1	1.83
One-two years	3	11	11	2	0	2.44	15	6	0	1	1.41
Three-more years	3	14	15	4	2	2.68	22	13	1	0	1.42
Current status											
Teaching full time	3	17	10	2	2	2.50	18	13	1	0	1.47
Teaching part time	2	4	10	2	1	2.79	10	6	0	2	1.67
Others	3	17	15	3	0	2.47	15	3	2	0	1.35
Totals	8	38	35	7	3	2.55	43	22	3	2	1.49

Column one values: 1= Excellent, 2=Good, 3= Fair, 4=Poor, 5= No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 59. Data from Part III, Item 51 of the questionnaire: Measurement and Evaluation

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	3	17	15	5	1	2.61	18	9	6	0	1.64
1974-1977	4	19	19	7	2	2.69	15	16	4	2	1.81
Degree emphasis											
Choral	2	7	14	6	0	2.83	7	11	3	0	1.81
Instrumental	2	14	15	3	0	2.56	14	9	2	1	1.62
Others	3	15	5	3	3	2.59	12	5	5	1	1.78
Teaching experience											
None	3	11	9	1	1	2.44	3	3	4	1	2.27
One-two years	2	10	10	6	0	2.71	11	9	2	1	1.69
Three-more years	2	15	15	5	2	2.74	19	13	4	0	1.58
Current status											
Teaching full time	2	17	11	3	2	2.60	17	12	3	0	1.56
Teaching part time	1	5	6	6	1	3.05	5	8	3	2	2.11
Others	4	14	17	3	0	2.50	11	5	4	0	1.65
Totals	7	36	34	12	3	2.65	33	25	10	2	1.73

Table 60. Data from Part III, Item 52 of the questionnaire: Curriculum development

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean
Year graduated											
1970-1973	4	14	13	9	1	2.73	19	8	4	1	1.59
1974-1977	4	15	20	10	2	2.82	18	14	3	3	1.76
Degree emphasis											
Choral	1	8	12	8	0	2.93	8	10	4	0	1.82
Instrumental	5	11	12	6	0	2.56	15	7	2	2	1.65
Others	2	10	9	5	3	2.90	14	5	1	2	1.59
Teaching experience											
None	3	7	13	2	1	2.65	3	2	4	2	2.45
One-two years	1	10	9	7	0	2.81	11	9	1	2	1.74
Three-more years	4	12	11	10	2	2.79	23	11	2	0	1.42
Current status											
Teaching full time	4	14	9	6	2	2.66	23	8	1	0	1.31
Teaching part time	0	4	7	7	1	3.26	5	9	1	4	2.21
Others	4	11	17	6	0	2.66	9	5	5	0	1.79
Totals	8	29	33	19	3	2.78	37	22	7	4	1.69

Column one values: 1= Excellent, 2=Good, 3= Fair, 4=Poor, 5= No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 61. Data from Part III, Item 53 of the questionnaire: Procedures of discipline, motivation and classroom management

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean	
Year graduated												
1970-1973	3	15	12	10	1	2.78	19	11	3	0	1.51	
1974-1977	13	17	15	4	2	2.31	29	5	2	1	1.32	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	4	8	11	5	0	2.61	13	7	2	0	1.50	
Instrumental	9	11	10	4	0	2.26	20	4	2	0	1.31	
Others	3	13	6	5	3	2.73	15	5	1	1	1.45	
Teaching experience												
None	6	10	5	4	1	2.38	6	2	2	1	1.81	
One-two years	7	10	8	3	0	2.25	18	5	1	0	1.29	
Three-more years	3	12	14	7	2	2.81	24	9	2	0	1.37	
Current status												
Teaching full time	6	12	11	3	2	2.50	24	7	1	0	1.28	
Teaching part time	5	3	7	3	1	2.58	8	6	3	1	1.83	
Others	5	17	9	8	0	2.51	16	3	1	0	1.25	
Totals	16	32	27	14	3	2.52	48	16	5	1	1.41	

Table 62. Data from Part III, Item 54 of the questionnaire: Organization and administration of public schools

Subgroups	Quality of training received						Usefulness to assignment					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	1	2	3	4	Mean	
Year graduated												
1970-1973	3	13	11	13	1	2.90	12	10	8	3	2.06	
1974-1977	7	14	14	14	2	2.80	15	12	8	3	1.97	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	2	4	10	12	0	3.14	5	7	9	1	2.27	
Instrumental	5	12	10	7	0	2.56	14	7	3	2	1.73	
Others	3	11	5	8	3	2.90	8	8	4	3	2.09	
Teaching experience												
None	4	7	8	6	1	2.73	3	1	5	2	2.73	
One-two years	3	10	7	8	0	2.71	9	9	4	2	1.96	
Three-more years	3	10	10	13	2	3.03	15	12	7	2	1.89	
Current status												
Teaching full time	2	15	6	9	2	2.82	15	14	2	1	1.66	
Teaching part time	4	2	5	7	1	2.95	5	5	4	5	2.47	
Others	4	10	14	11	0	2.82	7	3	10	0	2.15	
Totals	10	27	25	27	3	2.85	27	22	16	6	2.01	

Column one values: 1= Excellent, 2=Good, 3= Fair, 4=Poor, 5= No training.

Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4= Not useful.

Table 63. Data from Part III, Item 55 of the questionnaire: Student teaching

Subgroups	Quality of training received					Mean	Usefulness to assignment					Mean
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4		
Year graduated												
1970-1973	3	18	7	6	1	2.35	20	10	3	1	2.56	
1974-1977	11	25	6	6	3	2.31	23	11	2	1	1.49	
Degree emphasis												
Choral	4	15	5	4	0	2.32	10	9	2	1	1.73	
Instrumental	11	13	6	3	1	2.12	18	7	1	0	1.35	
Others	4	15	2	5	3	2.59	15	5	2	1	1.52	
Teaching experience												
None	5	10	7	1	2	2.40	7	3	0	1	1.55	
One-two years	6	14	1	7	0	2.32	13	8	2	0	1.52	
Three-more years	8	19	5	4	2	2.29	23	10	3	1	1.51	
Current status												
Teaching full time	9	19	0	4	2	2.14	22	9	2	0	1.39	
Teaching part time	2	10	3	3	1	2.53	8	6	2	2	1.89	
Others	8	14	10	5	1	2.39	13	6	1	0	1.40	
Totals	19	43	13	12	4	2.33	43	21	5	2	1.52	

Column one values: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=poor, 5=No training.
 Column two values: 1=Very useful, 2=Useful, 3=Limited usefulness, 4=Not useful.

VITA

Mark Ellis Peterson

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: A Follow-up Study of Music Graduates Prepared at Utah State University through a Survey of Graduate's Opinions and Professional Responsibilities

Major Field: Secondary Education with an emphasis in Music Education

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Ogden, Utah, April 6, 1951, son of Ronald S. and Margaret Ellis Peterson; married Charlene Pound November 16, 1973; two children- Jennifer and Melissa.

Education: Attended elementary school in Logan, Utah; graduated from Logan High School in 1969; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Utah State University, with a major in music education and a minor in Spanish, in 1975; did graduate work at Northern Arizona University and Brigham Young University, 1975-1976; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree in Secondary Education in 1979.

Professional Experience: President, Utah State University student chapter of MENC from 1973-1975; music teacher in North Summit County School District, 1975-1976; music teacher at Union High School and surrounding elementary schools, Roosevelt, Utah, 1976-1979; instructor for Utah State University Extension in Roosevelt, Utah, 1978-1979; coordinating director, Roosevelt Community Fine Arts Council, Roosevelt, Utah, 1977-1979.