5-1973

A Graduate-Oriented Evaluation of the Music Education Curricula of Four State College-University Systems in Utah

Harold W. Boyce
Utah State University

Recommended Citation

Utah State University
MERRILL-CAZIER LIBRARY

A GRADUATE-ORIENTED EVALUATION OF THE

MUSIC EDUCATION CURRICULA

OF FOUR STATE COLLEGE-UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS IN UTAH

by

Harold W. Boyce

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

of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Curriculum Development and Supervision

Approved:

_____   _____
Major Professor   Committee Member

_____   _____
Committee Member   Committee Member

_____   _____
Committee Member   Dean of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah
1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Max F. Dalby for his encouragement, advice, and friendship. I would also like to express my gratitude to the other members of my committee: Dr. Alvin Wardle, Dr. Keith Checketts, Dr. David Stone, and Dr. Malcom Allred. I would be remiss if I did not specifically acknowledge Dr. Wardle for special help in completing this study.

A special thanks to my wife, Catherine, for her encouragement, understanding, and sacrifice.

Last, but certainly not least, I must express appreciation to the Utah State University Music Department secretaries, Georgia Rudolph and Linda Lee, not only for their secretarial skills, but also for their competency in deciphering my manuscript.

Harold W. Boyce

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

ABSTRACT

A Graduate-Oriented Evaluation of the

Music Education Curricula

of Four State College-University Systems in Utah

by

Harold W. Boyce, Doctor of Education

Utah State University, 1973

Major Professor: Dr. Max F. Dalby
Department: Music

The purpose of the study was to make an evaluation of curricula-
training effectiveness, applicability, and need for additional training
within four of the state-supported college-universities of Utah. The
schools researched were Utah State University, the University of Utah,
Weber State College, and Southern Utah State College.

The descriptive research techniques of a closed-form questionnaire
were utilized to obtain informational data for the years 1969-1971
from graduates, faculties, and selected graduates concerning common
and traditional curricular areas of (a) music theory, (b) scoring
and arranging, (c) music history, (d) conducting and rehearsal tech-
niques, (e) vocal methods and materials, (f) instrumental methods and
materials, (g) group instruction, (h) private instruction on the major
instrument, (i) performance, and (j) minor instrument repair.

The data revealed that there was no significant difference in the
responses to the questionnaire across graduates, across faculties,
across institutions, or across graduates and faculty from the same

institution. The conclusions from the study indicated: present training effectiveness is generally excellent in all areas of the music education curricula in all four schools; training is highly applicable; although the training is excellent and applicable, there remains the strong desire by both graduates and faculty for additional training in all areas of curricula with the exception of traditional music history.

(93 pages)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of
existing music education curricula of four state college-university
systems in Utah. The primary emphasis was on evaluation of the curri-
cula by the graduates and the staff with a comparative analysis of the
four programs across institutions.

Although constant evaluation is usually pursued through adminis-
trative and faculty observation, there seems to exist additional and
reinforcing information obtainable from the graduates of these programs.
This information would support existing evaluation devices and results.

The evaluative process suggested by this study is often considered
but seldom becomes an actuality because of two serious limitational
factors: (1) the shortage of time of the members of the administration
and faculty, and (2) the lack of serviceable evaluation instruments.
These factors signify the need for additional research which may act
as an extension of plans to broaden the resources of effective and
reliable evaluation devices.

This study will be a graduate-oriented evaluation with objective
interpretations of the results coupled with a philosophical review of
the programs that are evaluated.

Need for Research

The need for this research is couched in the responsibility of
the institutions of higher education to be cognizant of the success or
failure of their curricula in preparing students to become competent
music educators. Even though there always exists an apparent effort
on the part of music departments in colleges and universities to fulfill
this responsibility, formal evaluation is often relegated to a lower
priority in the hierarchy of "things to do." If there were more
expeditious devices for curriculum evaluation, it is likely that music
department faculties, through the use of these devices, would be more
aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their curricula.

A graduate-oriented evaluation instrument which is applicable to
the uniqueness of a particular music education program would enhance
the validity of other information pertaining to curriculum modification.
This instrument would eliminate many of the reasons for not meeting the
need of curricular evaluation because it would be limited to: (1) only
those problems of teacher education that are unique to a particular
program; and (2) a more narrow scope of disparity in the philosophical
determination of what is essential in the preparation of teachers at
a given college or university. Because of these limiting factors it
would obviously be easier to revise and update the instrument for use
more frequently.

This need for updating was indicated by the review of pertinent
literature. For example, no evaluation of this kind in music education
was in evidence in Utah since 1954. At that time a study by Wardle was

concerned with an evaluation of the music education programs at Utah

State University through a survey of its graduates. This, in and of

itself, points up the need for research of a more current nature,

because since 1954 there have not only been changes at Utah State

University but at all other institutions of higher education in Utah.

Some of these changes are: the establishment of the State Board of

Higher Education; the establishment of two more four-year colleges;

the increase in enrollment at all of the institutions of higher

education; and the establishment of a quota for each institution which

controls the number of certified teachers that may be graduated.

Procedure

The procedure for obtaining the necessary information included

the utilization of: (1) a listing of the music education graduates

along with their last-known address which was obtained from the music

department head or chairman of each of the colleges and universities

involved (1969 through 1971); (2) a closed-form questionnaire with a

cover letter of explanation which was mailed to each of the graduates

and the music department staff members of each institution asking them

to respond to the questionnaire as it was applicable to them; (3) the

information gathered was then further supplemented by observation and

interviews of selected graduates from each institution.

The basic assumptions were that: (1) there would be no significant

difference between responses to questionnaire items across institutions;

and (2) there would be no significant difference between the responses

of the graduates and the responses of their respective music faculties.

Statement of Objectives

The questionnaire was devised to elicit information which pertains
to the following: the graduate's present position, teaching assignments
and duties; the school from which he received his degree(s); the amount
of training in his professional field received from his degree-granting
institution; the music classes that he is required to teach; the use
made of the training received; the effectiveness of this training and
whether or not he should have received additional or less training
within the areas of sight-reading, ear-training, harmony, methods,
performance, and conducting in a realistic rehearsal and/or performance
situation (Wardle, 1954).

Delimitations

This research was limited to the responses to a questionnaire
and/or personal interview and observation of the music education gradu-
ates with both bachelor's and master's degrees from Utah State University,
the University of Utah, Weber State College, and Southern Utah State
College for the years 1969 through 1971. The personal interview and
observation technique was limited to four outstanding graduates from
each school for the above-mentioned two-year period. The selection of
the outstanding graduates was done by each music department head or
chairman. This research was concerned only with the training that the
graduate completed at his graduating institution.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature pertaining to curriculum evaluation and research is becoming more and more voluminous. There is, however, a sameness in the information presented which implies a general agreement that a college-university graduate-oriented evaluation is useful and necessary. The practice of actual implementation of evaluation tends to be infrequent. Investigation of the literature revealed many recommendations for continual evaluation of curriculum by graduates in various academic disciplines.

The need for graduate-oriented evaluation of music education curricula was supported by Eurich, Pace, and Ziegfield (1942), The American Educational Research Association (1949), Wardle (1954), and Dvorak (1955). More recent studies by Darnell (1963), Aebischer (1968), Poolos (1968), Carrubba (1968), Colwell (1970), Sorkowski (1970), and Glenn, McBride and Wilson (1970), not only support varied forms of evaluation, but also give justification for the need.

In the interest of clarity, the literature related to this study was categorized as follows: (1) the need for evaluation as it is related to the problems concerning the processes of teacher education and the disparity of agreement on the curricular essentials of this education; (2) the weaknesses of evaluation procedures; and (3) the need for updating evaluation. The Need for Evaluation as it is Related to the Problems Concerning the Processes of Teacher Education and the Disparity

of Agreement on the Curricular Essentials of this Education, Colwell

(1970) presented a definition which forms a logical basis for a

discussion of the need for evaluation:

> A broad definition of educational evaluation is (1) the
> systematic process of collecting information, (2) the en-
> lightened interpretation of the information, and (3) the
> dissemination of the results back into the teaching-learning
> situation. Each step of this process must be related to
> the specific problem for which evaluation is sought, the
> problem usually being stated in terms of behavioral ob-
> jectives in order to provide an intelligent, responsible
> judgment about a process, an act, or an idea (p. 4).

A further discussion by Colwell was that if teachers realized

that the entire purpose of evaluation is to aid the learning process,

not to find fault, they would not hesitate to welcome outside evaluation

In discussing some of the needs and values of evaluation, Troyer

and Pace (1944) stated:

> One very clear reason is in order to judge the effectiveness
> of an education program. We undertake to evaluate the
> program because we hope thereby to improve it. By knowing
> its strengths and weaknesses we are enabled to plan more
> intelligently for its improvements (p. 2)

Carrubba (1968), in an evaluation of the undergraduate preparation

of music teachers in the colleges and universities of Mississippi,

stated in a summary of his review of related literature:

> Thus it is seen that music teachers have suggested needs
> for improvements in virtually every phase of teacher
> training in music education. Most frequently mentioned
> was the need for more training in instruments other then
> the applied major or applied minor (p. 30).

In his conclusions, Carrubba also makes three observations per-

taining to curriculum disparagement:

> (1) Although the colleges and universities were ostensibly
> complying with the recommendations of the recognized national
> associations, the opinions of the teachers indicated a lack
> of depth in their preparation.

(2) The divergence of opinions between the departmental heads
of the colleges and universities of the state and the members
of the national advisory boards of the Music Educators National
Conference and the National Association of Schools of Music
bore witness to the fact that there were many and varied
frames of reference.

(3) The divergence of opinions between the administrators
and the teachers in the field was indicative of the fact that
unless administrators remain in close contact with those
actually teaching, their perspective of the needs of teachers
will have been lessened (p. 307).

In a more general manner, Carrubba is supported by Hoffer (1964)

as he states:

Schools and states vary in what they feel a school music
teacher should study in college. Some stress the musical
aspect of training, others the professional courses in
education, and still others a general liberal arts training
(p. 54).

It is not surprising that there is so much disparity of agreement

on what should or should not be included in teacher-education curricula

when some of the influences that affect these curricula are realized.

Poolos (1968), who conducted a survey of influences that affect the

music curricula of state-supported universities, states in his

analysis of data:

The analysis of data indicated ten local items that strongly
influenced music curriculum decisions. Of these ten, the
strongest five influences discussed at length were: (1) the
faculty of the music department, (2) students' needs and
demands, (3) chairman of the department, (4) teaching
specialties of the faculty, and (5) the university general
education requirements (p. 20).

The analysis of data indicated five national influences
that strongly affected music curriculum decisions. They were
(1) other colleges', universities', and/or conservatories'
catalogs, (2) curriculum stidies, (3) correspondence with
other colleges, etc., (4) music studies, and (5) NCATE (National
Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) (p. 54).

Although the above-mentioned influences are seemingly important,
the influence of the graduates of a particular curriculum would be
of a more practical nature, and easier to obtain.

Aebischer (1968), in a survey of the University of Oregon School
of Music graduates, supported this position:

> 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 (pp. 3-4).

In discussing these types of evaluations which are made through
the use of empirical data, Aebischer declares that:

> Recognizing that curriculum reconstruction based entirely
> on empirical investigation would be less than adequate, it is
> equally foolish to advocate evaluation totally devoid of
> empirical data. Information from many sources is essential to
> comprehensive evaluation.
>
> The careful researcher makes every effort to foresee
> probable sources of bias and sampling error. With proper
> techniques in preparation, seeking complete returns, and
> statistical analysis, the opinion survey must be regarded
> as a valuable tool in evaluation (pp. 12-13).

Most of the results of a graduate-oriented evaluation of curricula
would probably not surprise anyone. For example, Aebischer found
through the results of his survey a recurring criticism charging that
courses such as theory, history, and literature do not have enough

practical application to public school teaching.

     Authorities agree that certain core information needs to
be taught in these subjects and application to practical
situations made as possible. Difficulty arises, however, when one
attempts evaluation of this area, since many music professors
have never taught public school music, and most students have
not yet been exposed to the problems for which they want
solutions (p. 71).

In a statement of his findings, Aebischer indicates some requests

and suggestions by the graduates that are not unique, but are indicative

of the many diverse opinions as to what should be taught:

     Graduates offered many suggestions for improvements in
curriculum and counseling, but were generally well satisfied
with the education they received. The most frequent request
was for more vocational counseling, more instruction in
instrumental and vocal methods, or fewer education courses (p. 7).

The need for evaluation as it is related to teacher education and

the differences of opinion as to what essentials should constitute

this education is magnified by Dvorak (1955) in <u>Music Education Source</u>

<u>Book Number Two</u>, "Music in American Education." He reported that

music education curricula should be subjected to constant reappraisal

and evaluation to insure growth. The basis of his contention was that

teacher education is a complex educational problem.

     The problem of teacher education in music obviously is con-
cerned with just how the course offerings may be geared to
attain desirable ends. Within the limitations of the under-
graduate degree, the problem becomes complex. ... pre-college
training is not adequate for continuation at the college level.

     The program of musical training at the college level may
be generally described as follows:

     (1) Development of basic technical skills giving oppor-
tunities for personalized expression in music in gaining
experiences for teaching.

     (2) Development of understandings, uses, and ability to
respond to visual, auditory, and aesthetic considerations in
music.

(3) Experiences to develop understandings and the
abilities to use techniques of the classroom in the
teaching of music (pp. 134-135).

Borkowski (1967) gives further insight into the problems of
teacher education as he relates certification requirements to
curriculum evaluation and course content:

While the selection of courses within the curriculum tend
to be standardized due to certification requirements, the con-
tent 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
leading 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 toward a Music Education
degree. The selection of courses is not based, however, 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" (pp. 1-2).

Corey (1958) supports Borkowski's contentions as he gives this
warning:

Making a sharp separation between teaching theory and
teaching practice is an artificial compartmentalization of
training experience that reduces the liklihood of transfer
(p. 433).

Cunningham (1948) emphasizes the importance of relating the
theory and practice of education:

It is recognized that teacher education is inadequate
where its theoretical insights fail to illuminate is practical
procedures. Teacher education institutions, therefore, have a
central responsibility, shared through the profession, for so
improving instruction that the prospective teacher may enter
a profession which he knows is consistent in purpose and
practice (p. 69).

Cunningham also indicates that teaching must be judged by the
basic standard of student needs and that a change will be realized

in student behavior as the program of improvement in teaching becomes more effective.

The idea of obtaining data from graduates in an effort to improve teacher education is not new. For example, Wolfe (1937) suggests:

> One other type of information is essential if the program of curriculum improvement is to be most effective, namely that which evaluates the preparation in terms of its adequacy for meeting the needs of actual music teaching in the public schools. Obviously, a program of teacher education which fails to check its results against its purposes is in danger of becoming theoretical and impractical (p. 10).

A statement by Wardle (1954) provides a good summation of this section:

> ... 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 (p. 1).

Weaknesses of Evaluation Procedures

Most of the weaknesses of evaluation procedures are couched in the poor use of evaluation tools and the data they produce. According to Colwell:

> The use made of evaluation depends upon one's opinion as to what evaluation is and what its purposes are, one's expectations as to what it can do, and knowledge of the ways it can be effective in improving teaching and learning. It is often pointed out that evaluation can be a menace when it is used ignorantly or for the wrong purposes. However, in such cases the fault lies not with evaluation itself but with inept handling of evaluative tools. Understanding the whys and wherefores of evaluation is necessary for successful teaching. Those who, through ignorance or because of a bad experience with evaluation, refuse to make use of it in their teaching are robbing themselves of a useful, even vital, tool (p. 203).

Inaccuracies of evaluation in graduate-oriented studies are often caused by the subjectiveness of human opinion. Darnall (1963) has this explanation:

> The accuracy of measurement with factual data is not expected when dealing with human opinion. However, human opinion will usually determine to what extent scientific, accurate and factual data will be used and the influence it will wield. Opinion is particularly important in the field of education because content and methods employed in schools are largely determined by human judgment (p. 6).

Another weakness in evaluation procedures in music education is caused by a lack of understanding of these procedures. Glenn, McBride, and Wilson (1970) state some of the reasons for this:

> First, subject matter is elusive and difficult to define. Because teachers disagree as to the nature of music, the objectives and purposes of music education are seldom agreed upon unanimously by any sizable group of teachers. Evaluation can take place only after the objectives and purposes of a music program have been established. Second, there is little agreement as to the nature of music talent or ability; thus, researchers have difficulty in educating groups for purposes of designing reliable research studies in music education. Third, there has been a tendency to evaluate music in terms of the material possessions of a music program rather than on the basis of the learnings of students.
>
> Any satisfactory measuring (evaluative) instrument in music must have three qualities: validity, reliability, and usability (pp. 254-255).

Mono-dimensional investigation as a basis for developing a curriculum is also a weakness according to Jones (1958). He believes that there should be a philosophical check on the results achieved through empirical methods. In support of this statement he says:

> Music teachers are inclined to evaluate in terms of practical experience in a specific job. One may say, "Harmony courses are of no great value. I find that I do not need harmonic technique in my position." This may be literally true, but the teacher of music in elementary grades needs a knowledge of harmony in order to thoroughly understand the material. Teachers of music in the public schools usually praise the so-called "practical courses" in conducting and methodology, relegating the basic

disciplines and background courses to a subordinate position.
If a student finds keyboard harmony difficult he may question
its value, or if music history is less exciting than playing
in the college orchestra he may dismiss it as relatively un-
important. It is evident that we can scarcely afford to accept
all replies at face value and base curriculum reconstruction
on the result of an empirical investigation. Such results must
be subjected to a philosophical x-ray in order to locate
hidden weaknesses (pp. 168-169).

Another problem suggested by Mr. Jone's statement is realized when

one considers the possibility of disparity between existing philosophies.

Need for Updating Evaluation

It is logical that for any kind of evaluation to be effective

it must be continual, systematic endeavor. Carrubba contends:

Rapid technological advances of the twentieth century have
had substantial influence on many facets of society and have
in turn brought greater urgency for curricular re-examination.
With society in flux, a music educator cannot rely upon
hallowed tradition as his sole reason for being. He must
designate a rationale for his curriculum oriented to the past,
but which is designed to meet the needs of the present and to
prepare for the future (p. 1).

According to the American Educational Research Association (1949)

graduate-oriented evaluation is comparable to classroom testing

procedure:

The educational product can be evaluated by taking
inventory of his behavior at various stages--at the end of a
course, at the time of graduation, and at the adult level
of participation in society (p. 285).

Aebischer supported this by indicating that follow-up programs

are an important part of the overall evaluation process. He also main-

tains that literature fails to supply consistent follow-up programs,

especially in music. He says, "The available college studies usually

cover total school programs or involve a very narrow segment of one

department" (p. 29).

The idea of a continual evaluation of curricula with the help of responses elicited from graduates is not a new one. Eurich, Pace, and Ziegfeld (1942) give this supportive statement:

> Although the effectiveness of a program can be measured in part by immediate results, the fact that much education is designed for future use indicates the need for an evaluation of student development over a longer period of time. After leaving schools, students are subject to many situations. Their abilities to make the necessary adaptations in after school life and to achieve in relation to their capacities constitute acid tests for an educational program. Consequently, there is a need for follow-up studies ... (p. 523).

The literature reviewed supported the writer's contention for: (1) a need for evaluation of the music education programs in the state-supported colleges and universities of Utah; (2) a careful review of the problems concerning the processes of music teacher education; (3) a review of the curricular essentials of music teacher education; and (4) the need for updating the music education curricula in Utah.

The present study attempts to satisfy these needs with an emphasis upon careful evaluation procedures encompassing the problems inherent in previous studies.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The design of this study required that responses be elicited from the music education faculties and the 1969, 1970, and 1971 music education graduates of Utah State University, the University of Utah, Weber State College, and Southern Utah State College. This was accomplished by using a closed-form questionnaire in addition to one open-ended question for comments. The questionnaire was completed by faculty members and graduates. In addition, four selected graduates from each institution were interviewed in order to give the study another dimension. These selected graduates were chosen by the department head or chairman of each college or university.

Thus, the multidimensional design resulting from this procedure provided evaluative information pertaining to each of the four music departments from three sources: (1) the faculty; (2) the graduates; (3) the selected graduates. Not only was there an opportunity to observe and compare the data from these three samples within each institution, but it was possible to make comparisons across institutions and across samples.

The selection of the questionnaire items was based on the existing similarities across the curricula of the four institutions. This necessitated the assumption that the catalogue of each school represented its music education philosophy and intended emphasis. This assumption provided for the selection of thirty-six items which represented the

areas of music history and literature, music theory, instrumental and vocal methods, conducting and rehearsal techniques, major and minor instrument instruction, performance, scoring and arranging, and instrument repair. These areas of training closely parallel the recommendations set forth by the Music Educators National Conference in their Music Education Source Book, Number Two, "Music in American Education" (1955).

The questionnaire answer sheet was designed so that it could be processed by an optical-scan mechanism which automatically punched the computer cards. This facilitated the tabulation of the data in a most expeditious manner.

The open-ended question was an optional item designed to elicit any additional information which the respondent felt to be pertinent.

The interview was structured as an extension of the "selected" graduates' responses to ten selected questionnaire items (see Appendix) in an attempt to attain further insight into the reasons for his evaluation. In most cases it revealed a tempering effect upon their responses which reflected criticism and/or personal biases pertaining to certain areas of their training. Although it magnified the graduates' thoughts and suggestions for further improvement within these areas, they indicated that there were definite strengths and weaknesses in all of the areas. However, the problems implicit in each graduate's training were amplified by these interviews.

Sampling Procedure

The study was dependent upon the sampling percentage (graduates and faculty). It was necessary to write follow-up letters and send

additional questionnaire materials to those who failed to respond to
the initial request.

The final graduate sample was one hundred and six: forty from
Utah State University, forty-three from the University of Utah,
seventeen from Weber State College, and six from Southern Utah State
College.

The total selected graduate sample was sixteen -- four from each
institution. The percentage of this sample that responded to the
interview was 56.3, reflected by three respondents from Utah State
University and two from each of the other institutions.

Sample Table 1 illustrates total population samples, respondents,
and percentages for all schools across all samples, i.e. graduates,
faculty, and selected graduates.

Sample Table 1.

Institution	Graduates			Faculty			Sel. Graduates		
	Sample	Respondents	Percent	Sample	Respondents	Percent	Sample	Respondents	Percent
USU	40	31	77.5	11	7	63.6	4	3	75.0
U of U	43	22	51.2	6	4	66.6	4	2	50.0
WSC	17	10	58.8	10	6	60.0	4	2	50.0
SUSC	6	4	66.6	4	2	50.0	4	2	50.0
Totals	106	67	63.2	31	19	61.3	16	9	56.3

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The data was processed through the Utah State University Computer
Center using the StatPac-Chi Square Two Way Analysis of Independence.
This provided a comparison of each questionnaire item across institutions
and across graduates and their respective faculties within the following
categories: Effectiveness of Training, Application of Training, and
Need for Additional Training.

By using a significance level of .05, having a critical value of
21.03, it was found that there was general agreement in the ten broad
areas of responses across institutions, and across graduates and their
respective faculties.

Of the two hundred and sixteen chi squares that were calculated,
there were only nineteen that indicated a significant difference at the
.05 level; eight in the category of Effectiveness of Training, seven
in the category of Application of Training, and four in the category of
Need for Additional Training. The following tables and discussion
illustrate these significant differences giving the category, question-
naire item and sample source. The numbers in each cell of the tables
represent raw data.

Table I-1 illustrates that there was a significant difference
between USU and the U of U because there are ten responses representing
USU in the Very Significant cell and nine responses representing the
U of U in the Not Significant cell. The wide variation of responses

within each institution also contributes to the significant

difference.

Table I-1. Category: Effectiveness of Training
           Item: Instrumental Scoring and Arranging
           Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

| | Significance at .05 Level | | | | |
Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	10	6	8	5	1
U of U	3	1	4	5	9
WSC	2	3	2	3	0
SUSC	2	1	1	0	0

Chi Square Value = 22.9

The significant differences illustrated in Table I-2 are that USU

has twelve responses in the Very Significant cell while the U of U and

WSC have a combination of ten responses in the Not Significant cell.

There is also a wide distribution of responses within each institution,

especially in USU.

Table I-2. Category: Effectiveness of Training
            Item: Instrumental Methods and Materials -
                       Literature Selection
            Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	12	4	6	5	4
U of U	0	2	2	10	8
WSC	1	0	2	5	2
SUSC	2	0	2	0	0

Chi Square Value = 76.4

Table I-3 illustrates a difference in the patterns of responses
between USU and the U of U, and that all institutions also have a
significant distribution.

Table I-3. Category: Effectiveness of Training
            Item: Instrumental Methods and Materials - Application
                       of the Principles of Effective Learning
            Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	10	8	6	4	3
U of U	1	3	7	3	8
WSC	1	2	3	4	0
SUSC	1	2	1	0	0

Chi Square Value = 21.7

Table I-4 shows a significant difference between USU, the U of U, and WSC, as compared to SUSC.

Table I-4. Category: Effectiveness of Training
　　　　　　　　Item: Minor Repairs of Woodwind Instruments
　　　　　　　Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	1	1	2	12	14
U of U	0	0	2	5	15
WSC	1	1	1	1	6
SUSC	2	0	0	2	0

Chi Square Value = 24.1

Table I-5 illustrates significant difference by variation in responses from SUSC, whereas the responses from the other institutions are predominantly grouped in the Slightly Significant and Not Significant cells.

Table I-5. Category: Effectiveness of Training
            Item: Minor Repairs of Brass Instruments
            Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	1	0	5	11	4
U of U	0	0	1	3	18
WSC	1	1	1	0	7
SUSC	1	1	1	1	0

Chi Square Value = 28.3

As in Table I-5, Table I-6 illustrates a significant difference because of the variation in responses from SUSC and the responses from the other institutions predominantly grouped in the Slightly Significant and Not Significant cells.

Table I-6. Category: Efectiveness of Training
            Item: Minor Repair of Percussion Instruments
            Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	2	0	1	11	17
U of U	0	0	1	3	18
WSC	1	0	2	1	6
SUSC	1	0	2	1	0

Chi Square Value = 22.2

The significant difference illustrated by Table II-1 is caused
by all of the responses from USU and SUSC being in the Very Significant
cells, and all of the responses from the U of U being in the Moderately
Significant cell. The responses from WSC are evenly distributed with
the exception of the Significant cell.

Table II-1. Category: Effectiveness of Training
             Item: Group Instruction - Brass
             Source: Faculties

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	5	2	0	0	0
U of U	0	0	4	0	0
WSC	1	2	1	1	1
SUSC	1	1	0	0	0

Chi Square Value = 21.3

In Table II-2, the cause of significant difference is illustrated
by a wide discrepancy in the responses from all four institutions.
With the exception of institution A, all of the responses are evenly
distributed.

Table II-2. Category: Effectiveness of Training
            Item: Group Instruction - Percussion
            Source: Faculties

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	3	4	0	0	0
U of U	0	0	2	0	2
WSC	1	1	2	2	0
SUSC	0	1	0	1	0

Chi Square Value = 22.0

The significant difference illustrated by Table III-1 is caused by a wide distribution of responses from the U of U and WSC, while most of the responses from USU and SUSC are in the Very Significant and Significant cells.

Table III-1. Category: Application of Training
             Item: Instrumental Scoring and Arranging
             Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	15	7	2	6	1
U of U	3	4	5	4	6
WSC	2	3	3	2	0
SUSC	3	1	0	0	0

Chi Square Value = 21.8

Table III-2 shows the responses from all institutions to be in
general agreement with the exception of the U of U.

Table III-2. Category: Application of Training
              Item: Instrumental Methods and Materials -
                         Literature Selection
              Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	13	8	7	1	2
U of U	2	4	4	3	9
WSC	6	1	1	2	0
SUSC	1	2	1	0	0

Chi Square Value = 25.6

The significant difference illustrated in Table III-3 was caused
by a general disagreement in the responses from the U of U and those
responses from the other three schools.

Table III-3. Category: Application of Training
              Item: Instrumental Methods and Materials - Organi-
                     zation and Administration of the Instrumental
                     Program
              Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	10	10	7	1	3
U of U	2	7	2	3	8
WSC	6	1	2	1	0
SUSC	1	1	2	0	0

Chi Square Value = 22.0

The significant difference illustrated by Table III-4 is indicated by the generally wide variation of responses within each institution.

Table III-4. Category: Application of Training
              Item: Group Instruction - Strings
              Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	7	3	7	4	10
U of U	1	4	3	3	11
WSC	1	0	6	1	2
SUSC	0	0	1	3	0

Chi Square Value = 25.1

Table III-5 illustrates a significant difference because of a wide variation of responses within the U of U while almost all of the responses from USU, WSC, and SUSC are in the Very Significant and Significant cells.

Table III-5. Category: Application of Training
             Item: Private Instruction-Literature Selection
             Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	14	10	6	1	0
U of U	8	6	0	2	6
WSC	7	2	0	0	1
SUSC	2	2	0	0	0

Chi Square Value = 21.1

The significant difference illustrated by Table III-6 was caused by a variation of responses within all institutions and a marked overall difference between USU and the U of U.

Table III-6. Category: Application of Training
             Item: Minor Instrument Repair - Percussion
             Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	11	3	4	8	5
U of U	2	1	5	3	11
WSC	2	3	0	2	3
SUSC	2	0	2	0	0

Chi Square Value = 23.1

Table IV-1 indicates a significant difference of the responses

within all institutions with the exception of SUSC.

Table IV-1. Category: Application of Training
             Item: Music History - Pre-Classical
             Source: Faculties

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	0	4	2	1	0
U of U	0	1	0	3	0
WSC	0	1	3	2	0
SUSC	2	0	0	0	0

Chi Square Value = 26.1

The significant difference shown in Table V-1 is caused,

generally, by a wide distribution of responses within each institution.

Table V-1. Category: Need for Additional Training
            Item: Vocal Scoring and Arranging
            Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution

Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	11	4	8	4	4
U of U	5	11	1	3	2
WSC	3	4	0	2	1
SUSC	0	1	0	2	1

Chi Square Value = 21.8

As with Table V-1, the significant difference illustrated in Table

V-2 is created by the wide distribution of responses within each

institution.

Table V-2. Category: Need for Additional Training
            Item: Group Instruction - Woodwinds
            Source: Graduates

Number of Responses to each Item within
each Cell for each Institution
Significance at .05 Level

Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	14	10	3	2	2
U of U	4	6	7	2	3
WSC	6	1	2	1	0
SUSC	1	0	0	3	0

Chi Square Value = 27.6

Table V-3 illustrates significant differences because of the even distribution within the U of U, WSC, and SUSC, and the predominance of responses within USU in the Very Significant and Significant cells.

Table V-3. Category: Need for Additional Training
            Item: Solo Performance
            Source: Graduates

| | Number of Responses to each Item within each Cell for each Institution | | | | |
| | Significance at .05 Level | | | | |
Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	11	13	5	0	1
U of U	6	2	7	4	3
WSC	5	0	2	2	1
SUSC	1	1	0	1	1

Chi Square Value = 21.2

The significant difference illustrated in Table VI-1 was caused by the responses within USU and WSC being predominantly in the Very Significant and Significant cells, the responses within the U of U being evenly distributed, and all of the responses within SUSC being in the Slightly Significant cell.

Table VI-1.   Category: Need for Additional Training
              Item: Music History - Modern
              Source: Faculties

| | Number of Responses to each Item within each Cell for each Institution | | | | |
| | Significance at .05 Level | | | | |
Institution	Very Sig.	Sig.	Moderately Sig.	Slightly Sig.	Not Sig.
USU	2	4	0	0	1
U of U	1	1	1	0	1
WSC	3	1	0	0	2
SUSC	0	0	0	2	0

Chi Square Value = 25.7

Critical Responses by Percentages

Assuming that the responses which indicated Slightly Significant and Not Significant were negative, they were combined for each item within each category to reflect a total percentage. In addition to this, the Very Significant and Significant responses for each item within the category of Need for Additional Training were combined to reflect a total positive percentage. This was done separately for both the graduate sample and the faculty sample using the combined responses of all four institutions. Tables VII-1 to VII-10 refer to percentages of all thirty-six items and the major areas with emphasis upon critical items.

Within the area of music theory, 61.2 percent of the graduates indicated that their training in counterpoint was ineffective; however this was tempered by 64.2 percent of them indicating that counterpoint was not applicable to their teaching. The faculty members concurred in this, albeit to a lesser degree. Although only 31.3 percent of the graduates indicated that their training was ineffective in Composition, 51 percent indicated a need for additional training. Only

19.4 percent of the graduates indicated that their training in

keyboard harmony was not applicable to teaching, while 41.8 percent

indicated that their training was ineffective, and 58.2 percent

indicated a need for additional training. The faculty percentages on

this item were in opposite proportion to the graduate percentages.

Only 11.9 percent of the graduates indicated that their training

was ineffective in Four-Part Writing; 20.9 percent indicated that

Four-Part Writing was not applicable to their teaching; 43.2 percent

indicated a need for additional training in this area. The faculty

members were in general agreement with the graduates.

Table VII-1. Percentage of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

	Graduates				Faculty			
	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Music Theory								
Sight Singing	32.8	19.4	46.3	31.3	21.0	10.5	63.1	21.0
Dictation	40.3	40.3	43.2	31.3	10.5	21.0	53.0	26.3
4-pt. Writing	11.9	20.9	43.2	32.8	0	15.8	31.5	26.3
Keyb. Harmony	41.8	19.4	58.2	19.4	21.0	26.3	36.8	63.1
Counterpoint	61.2	64.2	40.3	43.2	31.5	36.8	31.5	47.4
Composition	31.3	31.3	51.0	16.1	5.3	10.5	47.4	21.0

In Scoring and Arranging, 56.4 percent of the graduates indicated

that they needed additional training in the vocal area, and 59.8

percent indicated that they needed additional training in the instrumental

area. The percentages of the faculty members for the same areas were

58 and 53 respectively.

Table VII-2. Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

	Graduates				Faculty			
	Effect.	Applic.	Addit. for	Need	Effect.	Applic.	for Addit.	Need
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Scoring & Arranging								
Vocal	38.8	25.4	56.4	26.9	26.3	5.3	58.0	26.3
Instrumental	34.3	28.2	59.8	23.9	26.0	10.5	53.0	31.6

There were 55.2 percent of the graduates and 63.1 percent of the faculty that indicated a need for additional training in modern music history. There was also a considerable percentage of each sample which indicated a need for additional training in classical and romantic music history. In the pre-classical area of music history, 37.3 percent of the graduates and 31.5 percent of the faculty indicated that this was not applicable to the graduate's teaching skills.

Table VII-3. Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

	Graduates				Faculty			
	Effect.	Applic.	Addit. for	Need	Effect.	Applic.	for Addit.	Need
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Music History								
Pre-Classical	26.9	37.3	28.9	43.2	15.7	31.5	31.5	47.4
Classical	16.1	26.9	35.8	32.8	5.3	0	47.4	36.8
Romantic	16.1	20.9	37.3	31.3	0	5.3	42.1	42.1
Modern	34.3	25.4	55.2	26.9	15.7	10.5	63.1	31.6

There was a major indication by both faculty and graduates that the training in Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques was generally effective with the exception of laboratory conducting and rehearsal experience -- 41.8 percent of the graduates and 36.8 percent of the faculty indicated that the training in this area was ineffective; 71.6 percent of the graduates, in addition to 79 percent of the faculty, indicated a need for additional training. There was also an obvious concern for a need for additional training in the use of the baton and left hand, and in rehearsal techniques, as was shown by 46.3 percent of the graduates and 68.4 percent in both instances for the faculty.

Table VII-4. Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

	Graduates				Faculty			
	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Cond. & Reh. Tech.								
Use of Baton and Left Hand	5.9	4.5	46.3	28.2	10.5	0	68.4	5.3
Reh. Problems and Procedures	23.9	11.9	62.7	13.4	21.0	5.3	68.4	10.5
Lab Conducting & Reh. Exper.	41.8	14.9	71.6	14.9	36.8	0	79.0	10.5

A high percentage of the graduates (44.8) indicated that their training in the organization and administration of the vocal program was ineffective, and 47.8 percent of the graduates and 42.1 percent of the faculty indicated a need for additional training in this area. In vocal literature selection and the application of principles of effective learning to vocal music, there was an emphatic indication of need

for additional training -- 50.7 and 56.7 percent respectively for

the graduates; 68.4 and 53 percent respectively for the faculty.

Table VII-5. Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

	Graduates				Faculty			
	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Vocal Meth. & Mat.								
Lit. Selection	32.8	26.9	50.7	31.3	15.7	10.5	68.4	15.7
Org. & Admin. of Vocal Prog.	44.8	37.3	47.8	35.8	21.0	10.5	42.1	31.5
App. of Prin. of Eff. Learn.	32.8	29.8	56.7	28.2	15.7	10.5	53.0	15.7

In Instrumental Methods and Materials, 50.7 percent of the gradu-

ates indicated that their training in the selection of literature was

ineffective and 64.1 percent of them indicated a need for additional

training. In this category of need for additional training, 62.7 per-

cent of the graduates and 53 percent of the faculty gave positive

responses in the area of organization and administration of the

instrumental program.

Table VII-6.   Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

	Graduates				Faculty			
	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Inst. Meth. & Mat.								
Lit. Selection	50.7	25.4	64.1	20.9	5.3	5.3	53.0	42.1
Org. & Admin. of								
Inst. Prog.	35.8	23.9	62.7	19.4	5.3	5.3	53.0	47.4
App. of Prin. of								
Eff. Learn.	32.8	23.9	58.2	19.4	5.3	5.3	53.0	42.1

The percentages indicating ineffective training on the various minor instruments were generally low with the exception of percussion. Again, the percentage of responses by graduates and faculty indicating need for additional training were generally high for all group instruction areas.

Table VII-7.   Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

	Graduates				Faculty			
	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Group Instruction								
Piano	35.8	14.9	59.6	17.9	15.7	10.5	42.1	31.5
Vocal	28.2	14.9	58.2	23.9	26.3	26.3	53.0	21.0
Woodwind	26.9	17.9	62.7	19.4	10.5	10.5	36.8	21.0
Brass	22.4	20.7	59.6	20.7	10.5	15.7	31.5	31.5
Percussion	40.3	22.4	62.7	17.4	26.3	21.0	58.0	21.0
Strings	37.3	50.7	46.3	38.8	21.0	21.0	42.1	31.5

There were no critically high percentages of negative responses concerning private instruction; however, a considerable percentage of the graduates and faculty indicated a need for additional training; 58.2 and 47.4 percent respective in methodology; 71.6 and 47.4 percent respectively in literature selection.

Table VII-8. Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

| | Graduates | | | | Faculty | | | |
| | Effect. | Applic. | Addit. | for Need | Effect. | Applic. | Addit. | for Need |
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Private Instruction- Major Instrument								
Methodology	11.9	5.9	58.2	16.1	5.3	5.3	47.4	31.5
Lit. Selection	25.4	14.9	71.6	16.1	5.3	5.3	47.4	15.7

The percentage of negative responses indicated that some of the most effective training was in the area of performance. Only 4.5 percent of the graduates indicated that their training in large group performance was ineffective.

Table VII-9. Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

| | Graduates | | | | Faculty | | | |
| | Effect. | Applic. | Addit. | for Need | Effect. | Applic. | Addit. | for Need |
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Performance								
Solo	17.9	16.1	58.2	19.4	0	0	47.4	31.5
Ensemble	22.4	16.1	61.2	16.1	10.5	0	47.4	31.5
Large Group	4.5	10.4	56.7	25.4	0	0	31.5	47.4

Minor Instrument Repair training showed the highest percentage of ineffectiveness of any category; 82.1 for woodwinds, 80.6 for brass, and 85.1 for both strings and percussion were the responses of the graduates. The response percentages for the faculty were 42.1 for woodwinds, and 53 for brass, strings, and percussion.

Table VII-10. Percentages of Critical Responses-Combined Institutions

	Graduates				Faculty			
	Effect.	Applic.	Addit.	Need for	Effect.	Applic.	Addit. for	Need
	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.
Inst. Repair (Minor)								
Woodwinds	82.1	44.8	59.6	26.9	42.1	36.8	26.3	53.0
Brass	80.6	44.8	56.7	29.9	53.0	42.1	26.3	63.1
Strings	85.1	58.2	46.3	41.8	53.0	36.5	31.5	42.1
Percussion	85.1	47.8	53.7	29.9	53.0	36.8	36.8	47.4

Of the thirty-six items on the questionnaire, there were only three, pre-classical, classical, and romantic music history, that less than 40 percent of the graduates responded to as needing additional training. There were only eleven items that did not need additional training according to over 40 percent of the faculty.

The selected graduates interviewed supported the data resulting from the questionnaire. In some instances, however, they did qualify their responses to the interview with such remarks as; "Perhaps my training would have been better if I had applied myself more." "I am not sure how effective my training was because I have never had to use it." "One cannot possible receive enough training in some areas

in four years." These remarks and many others were indicative of the
selected graduates' concern for the music education curricula in the
colleges and universities.

It is assumed that critical areas illustrated by the combined
institutions were a reflection of critical areas in individual insti-
tutions. For the percentages of responses that reflected these critical
areas for individual institutions, see Appendix, pp. 66-81.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATIONS

The study was an evaluation of the music education curricula of
the four-year state-supported colleges and universities in Utah. It
was based on data obtained through the responses to a closed-form
questionnaire by the 1969, 1970, and 1971 music education graduates
of these institutions. Additional data was gathered by eliciting re-
sponses to the same questionnaire from the music education faculties.
Additional information pertaining to the evaluation was acquired
through interviews of selected graduates from each institution who
were chosen by their respective department head or chairman.

The results of the study revealed a common concern for the
adequacy of music education curricula. This conclusion was based on
the reflected opinions of the responses of the graduates and faculties.
Responses (raw data) were computer-processed using a chi-square two-way
analysis of independence which indicated no significant difference at
the .05 level across or within institutions in the total study.

Combined-Response percentages showed an exceptionally string
need for additional training in almost every area of the music education
curricula. Inferences can be drawn from this evidence that curricula
needs to be modified in terms of providing for additional training
through the improvement of basic requirements or expansion of the
present curricula.

Careful study of the percentages which reflect the non-applica-
*
bility of various facets represented within the curricula point to

conclusions that some areas should receive less emphasis while others

should be more strongly emphasized. Such revisions might establish

improved balance within the curricula for more adequate teacher

preparation.

The percentages of negative responses pertaining to effective

training support conclusions that there are weaknesses in methodology

and content.

Interpretation Summary

In music theory 64.2 percent of the graduates indicated that

training in counterpoint was not applicable to teaching while 58.2

percent indicated a need for additional training in keyboard harmony.

This indicates that there should be less emphasis on counterpoint and

more emphasis on keyboard harmony. The faculty percentage on each of

these items was 36.8 which neither concurred nor refuted the position

of the graduates.

There should be additional training in vocal and instrumental

scoring and arranging. This interpretation is indicated in that 56.4

percent of the graduates indicated a need for additional training in

the vocal area and 59.8 percent in instrumental. In support of this

were 58 and 53 percent of the faculty.

Only one segment of music history was responded to as not receiving

enough emphasis -- 55.2 percent of the graduates and 63.1 percent of

*
The percentages represent only those responses which indicated that
the training was not applicable to teaching specialties.

the faculty indicated that there was a need for additional training
in modern (contemporary) music history. Over 43 percent of the graduates
and faculty indicated that there was a need for less training in
pre-classical music history.

An extremely high percentage of graduates and faculty (71.6
percent and 79 percent) indicated a need for additional training in
the area of conducting and rehearsal techniques. This was in labora-
tory conducting and rehearsal experience. Also, there were 62.7
percent of the graduates and 68.4 percent of the faculty who indicated
a need for expanded training in rehearsal problems and procedures.
Since 46.3 percent of the graduates and 68.4 percent of the faculty
indicated a need for additional training in the use of the baton
and the left hand, it would not be beneficial to sacrifice any
training in this portion of conducting to accomodate additional training
in other portions.

In vocal methods and materials, 50.7 percent of the graduates and
68.4 percent of the faculty indicated that there was need for additional
training in literature selection while 56.7 percent and 53 percent
respectively expressed a need for additional training in applying the
principles of effective learning. Perhaps more training could be
given in these areas by allocating less training to organization and
administration because only 47.8 percent of the graduates and 42.1
percent of the faculty expressed a need for additional training in this
area.

In instrumental methods and materials 50.7 percent of the graduates
expressed that their training was ineffective in selection of literature
whereas only 5.3 percent of the faculty gave this indication. However,

53 percent of the faculty, in addition to 64.1 percent of the graduates proclaimed a need for additional training in this area. The need for additional training in organizing and administering the instrumental program and in applying the principles of effective learning was expressed by 53 percent of the faculty on both items in addition to 62.7 percent and 58.2 percent of the graduates. This indicates that all facets of instructional methods and materials need more attention.

The need for additional training in minor instrument instruction is reflected by the following graduate percentages: piano, 59.6; vocal 58.2; woodwind, 62.7; brass, 59.6; percussion, 62.7; strings, 46.3. There were only two items (vocal and percussion) in which over 50 percent of the faculty felt there was a need for additional training.

In private instruction, 58.2 percent of the graduates and 47.4 percent of the faculty asserted a need for additional training in methodology. This need was also reflected for literature selection by 71.6 percent of the graduates and 47.4 percent of the faculty.

In performance, 61.2 percent of the graduates and 47.4 percent of the faculty indicated that there was a need for additional training in the ensemble area. Solo performance was regarded by 58.2 percent of the graduates and 47.4 percent of the faculty as needing additional training.

In large group performance, 56.7 percent of the graduates and 31.5 percent of the faculty indicated a need for additional training. The effectiveness of training in large group performance was considered ineffective by only 4.5 percent of the graduates and 0 percent of the faculty which was the lowest percentage of combined responses to any single item.

The highest percentages which reflected ineffective training were those in the area of minor instrument repair. The graduate percentages for each item were: woodwinds, 82.1; brass, 80.6; strings, 85.1; and percussion, 85.1. For the faculty the percentages for these same items were: woodwind, 42.1; brass, 53; strings, 53; and percussion, 53. This would not appear to be critical since on each item over 44 percent of the faculty indicated that this training was not applicable to teaching, except that over 46 percent of the graduates indicated a need for additional training in this area.

The interviews with the selected graduates elicited information which supported these interpretations.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the study was to make an evaluation of curricula-training effectiveness, applicability, and need for additional training within four of the state-supported college-universities in Utah. The schools researched were Utah State University, the University of Utah, Weber State College, and Southern Utah State College.

The descriptive research techniques of a closed-form questionnaire were utilized to obtain informational data for the years 1969-1971 from graduates, faculties, and selected graduates concerning common and traditional curricular areas of (a) music theory, (b) scoring and arranging, (c) music history, (d) conducting and rehearsal techniques, (e) vocal methods and materials, (f) instrumental methods and materials, (g) group instruction, (h) private instruction on the major instrument, (i) performance, and (j) minor instrument repair.

The data revealed that there was no significant difference in the responses to the questionnaire across graduates, across faculties, across institutions, or across graduates and faculty from the same institution. The conclusions from the study indicated: present training effectiveness is generally excellent in all areas of the music education curricula in all four schools; training is highly applicable; although the training is excellent and applicable, there remains the strong desire by both graduates and faculty for additional training in all areas of curricula with the exception of traditional music history.

Recommendations

Because of the desired need for additional training, the curriculum
should be studied in terms of possible modification to accomodate
these needs. The recommendations which follow are considerations to
give directions for revision based on the evaluative process of this
and other studies. (1) There should be continued evaluation and
strengthening of the curriculum according to the needs reflected by the
students, faculties, and institutions; (2) There should be emphasis on
flexibility of the curriculum to fit the individual in his area of
emphasis; (3) Continuous effort should be made to obtain the highest
quality staff available; (4) Teaching methods and materials should be
constantly evaluated internally and externally, and revisions made in
an effort to increase learning efficiency; (5) Consideration should be
given to suggested improvements of professional educators such as (a)
implementation of summer programs, (b) expansion of credit hours in
the major area, and (c) extension of the music major to a five-year
program.

LITERATURE CITED

Aebischer, Delmer W. 1968 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. Ph.D. dissertation,
    Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. 3-71.

Baird, Forrest J. 1955. A follow-up inquiry of secondary school music
    teachers prepared at San Jose State College. Ph.D. dissertation,
    Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Borkowski, Francis Thomas. L967. 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, Morgantown, West Virginia. 1-2.

Carrubba, Rosario M. 1968. An evaluation of the undergraduate prepara-
    tion of music teachers as represented by the four-year colleges and
    universities of Mississippi. Ph.D. dissertation, University of
    Mississippi, University, Mississippi. 1, 30, 307.

Colwell, Richard. 1970. The evaluation of music teaching and learning.
    Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 2-4.

Corey, Stephen M. 1958. Controversy in teacher education: the central
    issue. Teachers College Record 8: 433. May.

Cunningham, M.C. 1948. Improvement of Instructions in college preparing
    teachers. The Education of Teachers as viewed by the Professions.
    National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards,
    National Education Association, Washington, D.C. 69 p.

Darnall, Josiah. 1963. The Bachelor of Music Education curriculum at
    Murray State College through an analysis of the opinions of its
    teaching graduates. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University,
    Bloomington, Indiana. 6 p.

Eurich, A.C., C. Robert Pace, and Edwin Ziegfeld. 1942. Evaluative
    Studies. Review of Educational Research 12: 523. December.

Glenn, McBride, Wilson. 1970. Secondary School Music. Prentice-Hall,
    Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 254-255.

Growing points in Educational Research. 1949. Official report American
    Educational Research Association, National Education Association,
    Washington, D.C. 285 p.

Hoffer, Charles R. 1964. Teaching music in the secondary school. Wadsworth, Belmont, California. 54 p.

Jones, Vincent. 1958. Music education in the college. Highland Music Company, Hollywood, California. 168-169.

Lyle, Mary S. 1957. Graduates reflect on their education. Journal of Home Economics 49:9. January.

Morgan, Hazel N. Editor. 1955. Music in American education. Music Education Source Book Number Two, Music Educators National Conference, Washington, D.C. 134 p.

Poolos, James G. 1968. A survey of the influences that affect the music curriculum of state-supported universities. Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida. 20-54.

Taylor, Guy G. 1954. An evaluation and recommended development of the music education program at Capital University. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Troyer, Maurice E. and Robert C. Pace. 1944. Evaluation in teacher education. American Council of Education, Washington, D.C. 2.

Wardle, Alvin. 1954. An evaluation of music education at Utah State Agricultural College. Master's thesis, Utah State University, Logan,Utah. 1.

Wolfe, Irving M. 1937. An analysis of the teachers college education of teachers and supervisors of music. Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. 10.

APPENDICES

September 12, 1972

Dr. Herbert Cecil
Head, Music Department
Weber State College
Ogden, Utah 84403

Dear Dr. Cecil:

I am presently writing my doctoral dissertation and I need information and help concerning your graduates and curriculum.

The study is entitled <u>A Graduate-Oriented Evaluation of the Music Education Curricula of Four State College-University Systems in Utah</u>. Therefore, I need a listing of your music education graduates along with their last-known address for the years 1969 through 1971. These graduates will be asked to respond to a questionnaire. I would also like to have your music department staff respond to this same questionnaire. To further supplement the information gathered by the questionnaire, I need to observe and interview four of your graduates who you feel are the most outstanding for these same years (1969 through 1971).

I know how extremely busy you are but I feel that this is a project which will provide all of us with some vital information. I will see that you receive a copy of the findings.

Enclosed you will find a form that you may use to supply the above-mentioned information.

Best wishes for a successful year, and thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Boyce
Graduate Assistant

I. The number of copies of the questionnaire that you will need for your staff. _____

II. Weber State College Music Education Graduates, 1969 through 1971.

Name   Address

III. Of these, which four are the most outstanding?

Dear Colleague:

To satisfy one of the requirements for the Educational Doctorate Degree in Curriculum Development and Supervision, I am writing a dissertation entitled "A Graduate-Oriented Evaluation of the Music Education Curricula of Four State College-University Systems in Utah." In order to complete this study it is necessary that I impose upon your good nature and cooperative spirit in obtaining your reactions to the training that you received in the music education program from your graduating institution. Please indicate your reactions by filling out the answer sheet which accompanies the enclosed questionnaire. All information will be kept confidential.

Should you wish a complimentary copy of the findings of the study, I shall be happy to send you one.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Boyce
Graduate Assistant

November 9, 1972

Dr. Herbert Cecil, Head
Department of Music
Weber State College
Ogden, Utah 84403

Dear Dr. Cecil:

Please find enclosed a copy of my questionnaire, an answer
sheet, a cover letter, and a return envelope for each of your
music education faculty members. The response of you and your
faculty members will be extremely helpful in completing my study.

Thank you for all of the help you have been.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Boyce
Graduate Assistant

November 10, 1972

Dear Colleague:

To satisfy one of the requirements for the Educational Doctorate
Degree in Curriculum Development and Supervision, I am writing
a dissertation entitled "A Graduate-Oriented Evaluation of the Music
Education Curricula of Four State College-University Systems in Utah."
In order to complete this study it is necessary that I impose upon
your good nature and cooperative spirit in obtaining your reactions
to the training that is being provided in the music education
program of your institution.

Since this questionnaire was designed primarily for your graduates,
it is not necessary for you to respond to any of the items concerning
general information except five, six, and eight. Your responses on
all other items should reflect how effective and how applicable YOU
feel the training is that is being provided for your institution's
music education graduates. I would also like to have you indicate
how you feel regarding the need for additional training in the
various areas. Please indicate your reactions by filling out the
answer sheet which accompanies the enclosed questionnaire. All
information will be kept confidential.

Should you wish a complimentary copy of the findings of the
study, I shall be happy to send you one.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Boyce
Graduate Assistant

P.S. Please return only the answer sheet and page 4 if you have
additional comments.

December 4, 1972

Dear Colleague:

You should have received a questionnaire approximately three
weeks ago pertaining to an evaluation study of the music education
curricula of four state college-university systems in Utah. Your
responses to the questionnaire are extremely important in facili-
tation the completion of this study. I would sincerely appreciate
having your responses by December 15, 1972.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Boyce
Graduate Assistant

January 5, 1973

Mr. William D. Bertolio
165 North 4th East
Providence, Utah

Dear Bill:

This is just a short note to make one final appeal for you to
return the questionnaire concerning the graduate-oriented evaluation
study that I am working on.

I realize how busy you must be, but your response to this
questionnaire is of vital importance, not only to my study, but
to each music education department in our state-supported four-
year institutions.

Again, thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Boyce
Graduate Assistant

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please mark answers to first 8 sections in the section marked general information.

1. Degree

    0. Bachelor's
    1. Master's
    2. Doctor's

2. College or University from which you graduated

    0. Utah State University
    1. University of Utah
    2. Weber State College
    3. Southern Utah State College

3. Years of training in that institution

    0. Less than one year
    1. 1 year
    2. 2 years
    3. 3 years
    4. 4 years
    5. 5 years
    6. 6 years
    7. 7 years
    8. over 7 years

4. Year graduated

    0. 1969
    1. 1970
    2. 1971

5. and 6. Major Instrument

  5-0. Voice
    1. Violin
    2. Viola
    3. Cello
    4. String Bass
    5. Piano
    6. Organ
    7. Flute
    8. Clarinet
    9. Saxophone

6-0. Oboe
   1. Bassoon
   2. Cornet-Trumpet
   3. Horn
   4. Trombone-Baritone
   5. Tuba
   6. Percussion

7. Teaching Level

   0. Elementary
   1. Junior High
   2. High School
   3. College
   4. District Supervisor
   5. Combination of the Above
   6. Not teaching

8. Subject Area

   0. Vocal
   1. Piano
   2. Strings
   3. Strings with winds, brass, and percussion
   4. Winds and/or brass and/or percussion
   5. General Music
   6. Theory
   7. Music History
   8. Combination of the above

Please read the following instructions carefully. You will notice that there are three categories pertaining to each item. These are: (1) The effectiveness of the training that you received from your graduating institution; (2) The application of this training to your work; (3) The need for additional training. You should respond to each of these categories by blackening the appropriate box on the answer sheet to indicate significance. For example, item I-1 is sight singing. If you consider the effectiveness of your training in this area to be of a moderate nature, you would blacken box C under effectiveness of training. If you consider that your training is only slightly applicable to your work, you would blacken box D under application of training. If you consider the need for additional training to be extreme, you would blacken box A under need for additional training.

I. MUSIC THEORY

1. Sight Singing

Effectiveness of Training Received

- A Very Significant
- B Significant
- C Moderately Significant ■
- D Slightly Significant
- E Not Significant

Application of Training Received

- A Very Significant
- B Significant
- C Moderately Significant
- D Slightly Significant ■
- E Not Significant

Need for Additional Training

- A Very Significant ■
- B Significant
- C Moderately Significant
- D Slightly Significant
- E Not Significant

I. MUSIC THEORY

    1. Sight singing
    2. Dictation
    3. Four-part writing
    4. Keyboard harmony
    5. Counterpoint
    6. Composition

II. SCORING AND ARRANGING

    7. Vocal
    8. Instrumental

III. MUSIC HISTORY

    9. Pre-Classical
   10. Classical
   11. Romantic
   12. Modern

IV. CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES

   13. Use of Baton and Left Hand
   14. Rehearsal Problems and Procedures
   15. Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience

V. VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS

   16. Literature Selection
   17. Organization and Administration of Vocal Program
   18. Application of Principles of Effective Learning to Vocal
       Music Instruction

VI. INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS

   19. Literature Selection
   20. Organization and Administration of Instrumental Program
   21. Application of Principles of Effective Learning to
       Instrumental Music Instruction

VII. GROUP INSTRUCTION (Workshops in Minor Instruments)

   22. Piano
   23. Vocal
   24. Woodwind
   25. Brass
   26. Percussion
   27. Strings

VIII. PRIVATE INSTRUCTION - MAJOR INSTRUMENT

    28. Methodology
    29. Literature Selection

IX. PERFORMANCE

    30. Solo
    31. Ensemble
    32. Large Group

X. INSTRUMENT REPAIR (minor)

    33. Woodwinds
    34. Brass
    35. Strings
    36. Percussion

Comments pertaining to your training _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do you feel that your training in composition was effective?
   Is it applicable to your teaching? Do you feel that there is
   a need for additional training in this area?

This same question was asked pertaining to the following items:

    Counterpoint
    Vocal Methods and Materials
    Instrumental Methods - Literature Selection
    Instrument Repair
    Dictation - Melodic and Harmonic
    Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience
    Private Instruction Methodology
    Group Strings
    Music History

CHI-SQUARE VALUE TABLE
12 df ∝ .05   21.03 critical value

Effectiveness of Training

	Graduates	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	10.6	8.4
Dictation	7.7	12.6
Four-part Writing	8.5	3.2
Keyboard Harmony	13.1	16.0
Counterpoint	14.2	13.8
Composition	15.4	11.0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	14.0	11.5
Instrumental	22.9	11.4
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	17.9	8.9
Classical	18.1	3.4
Romantic	19.9	5.9
Modern	17.6	11.5
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	10.6	10.9
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	11.4	5.9
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	9.4	8.6
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	15.3	17.7
Organization & Administration of Program	19.7	10.2
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	9.2	11.1
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	26.4	8.2
Organization & Administration of Program	17.8	8.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	21.7	5.7
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	21.0	12.9
Vocal	16.2	15.4
Woodwind	16.2	15.6
Brass	11.0	21.3
Percussion	18.6	22.0
Strings	31.5	18.2
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	11.8	5.7
Literature Selection	16.9	11.7
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	8.6	5.3
Ensemble	3.8	2.7
Large Group	18.6	13.7
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	24.1	12.6
Brass	28.3	19.4
Strings	11.9	17.3
Percussion	22.2	10.0

APPENDIX C

CHI-SQUARE VALUE TABLES
12 df α .05 21.03 critical value

Application of Training

	Graduates	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	13.1	7.5
Dictation	8.4	12.3
Four-part Writing	15.5	19.1
Keyboard Harmony	10.5	5.5
Counterpoint	13.0	5.7
Composition	13.5	13.4
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	9.8	7.5
Instrumental	21.8	11.2
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	9.7	26.1
Classical	8.5	9.7
Romantic	8.3	10.5
Modern	15.3	13.9
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	10.2	9.4
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	14.9	7.3
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	9.4	9.2
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	11.1	14.8
Organization & Administration of Program	12.2	10.9
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	9.6	7.0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	25.6	11.5
Organization & Administration of Program	22.0	11.4
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	12.6	8.0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	5.7	13.1
Vocal	14.7	11.0
Woodwind	13.2	4.9
Brass	19.5	14.5
Percussion	20.9	15.1
Strings	25.1	10.9
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	11.7	9.4
Literature Selection	21.1	9.8
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	9.9	4.0
Ensemble	10.5	7.5
Large Group	11.6	9.4
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	14.8	16.4
Brass	13.7	14.8
Strings	8.6	16.7
Percussion	23.1	13.8

CHI-SQUARE VALUE TABLE
12 df $\propto$ .05   21.03 critical value

Need for Additional Training

	Graduates	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	10.5	8.7
Dictation	10.5	11.4
Four-part Writing	9.2	8.7
Keyboard Harmony	14.9	11.3
Counterpoint	10.4	12.4
Composition	10.3	19.0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	21.8	8.9
Instrumental	15.0	16.2
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	12.6	11.0
Classical	14.8	17.2
Romantic	15.4	9.8
Modern	13.9	25.7
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	10.8	11.3
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	18.1	19.4
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	18.4	14.9
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	2.9	8.2
Organization & Administration of Program	6.6	9.7
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	8.6	8.2
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	12.6	6.1
Organization & Administration of Program	8.9	3.9
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	6.4	6.1
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	8.6	5.1
Vocal	17.5	11.6
Woodwind	27.6	16.7
Brass	11.5	16.3
Percussion	16.4	8.5
Strings	10.5	10.5
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	19.9	11.2
Literature Selection	16.4	9.8
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	21.2	16.3
Ensemble	14.2	15.1
Large Group	12.4	11.1
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	17.6	13.4
Brass	14.4	10.1
Strings	10.0	12.3
Percussion	9.4	12.7

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Effectiveness of Training
USU

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	32.2	28.5
Dictation	32.2	28.5
Four-part Writing	12.9	0
Keyboard Harmony	38.7	28.5
Counterpoint	61.3	42.9
Composition	32.2	0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	38.7	28.5
Instrumental	19.3	0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	16.1	14.3
Classical	12.9	14.3
Romantic	12.9	0
Modern	32.2	28.5
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	9.7	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	12.9	0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	45.2	42.9
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	29.0	14.3
Organization & Administration of Program	45.2	28.5
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	35.5	14.3
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	29.0	0
Organization & Administration of Program	22.6	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	22.6	0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	29.0	0
Vocal	22.6	0
Woodwind	22.6	0
Brass	12.9	0
Percussion	25.8	0
Strings	19.3	0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	3.2	0
Literature Selection	16.1	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	12.9	0
Ensemble	19.4	0
Large Group	3.2	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	83.5	42.8
Brass	80.6	71.7
Strings	80.6	57.1
Percussion	90.3	71.7

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Application of Training
USU

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	25.8	14.3
Dictation	38.7	14.3
Four-part Writing	29.0	14.3
Keyboard Harmony	25.8	14.3
Counterpoint	61.3	28.5
Composition	35.5	0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	32.2	14.3
Instrumental	22.6	0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	35.5	14.3
Classical	29.0	0
Romantic	16.1	0
Modern	19.3	0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	3.2	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	9.7	0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	12.9	0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	25.8	0
Organization & Administration of Program	45.2	14.3
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	29.0	14.3
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	9.7	0
Organization & Administration of Program	12.9	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	16.1	0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	12.9	0
Vocal	9.7	0
Woodwind	9.7	0
Brass	12.9	0
Percussion	16.1	0
Strings	45.2	0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	3.2	0
Literature Selection	3.2	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	9.7	0
Ensemble	9.7	0
Large Group	3.2	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	42.0	14.3
Brass	38.7	28.5
Strings	52.0	14.3
Percussion	42.0	14.3

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Need for Additional Training
USU

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	32.2	42.9
Dictation	29.0	42.9
Four-part Writing	32.2	42.9
Keyboard Harmony	22.6	42.9
Counterpoint	41.9	57.1
Composition	16.1	14.3
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	25.8	28.5
Instrumental	12.9	57.1
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	45.2	28.5
Classical	32.2	14.3
Romantic	29.0	14.3
Modern	19.3	14.3
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	19.3	14.3
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	0	14.3
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	3.2	14.3
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	35.5	14.3
Organization & Administration of Program	35.5	14.3
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	22.6	14.3
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	16.1	42.9
Organization & Administration of Program	12.9	42.9
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	19.3	28.5
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	22.6	42.9
Vocal	16.1	28.5
Woodwind	12.9	42.9
Brass	12.9	42.9
Percussion	9.7	42.9
Strings	35.5	42.9
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	12.9	42.9
Literature Selection	9.7	28.5
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	3.2	42.9
Ensemble	6.5	42.9
Large Group	19.3	71.7
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	19.3	28.5
Brass	19.3	57.1
Strings	32.2	28.5
Percussion	22.6	42.9

PERCENTAGES OF POSITIVE RESPONSES
(Significant to Very Significant)

Need for Additional Training
USU

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	45.2	42.9
Dictation	35.5	57.1
Four-part Writing	32.2	14.3
Keyboard Harmony	48.3	14.3
Counterpoint	41.9	28.5
Composition	52.0	42.9
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	48.3	57.1
Instrumental	70.9	28.5
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	19.3	28.5
Classical	29.0	42.9
Romantic	32.2	57.1
Modern	64.0	85.0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	54.8	71.7
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	77.4	71.7
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	90.3	85.0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	51.6	57.1
Organization & Administration of Program	45.2	42.9
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	54.8	57.1
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	67.7	57.1
Organization & Administration of Program	67.7	57.1
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	58.0	57.1
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	54.8	28.5
Vocal	67.7	71.7
Woodwind	77.4	42.9
Brass	74.2	42.9
Percussion	74.2	42.9
Strings	48.3	28.5
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	61.3	42.9
Literature Selection	77.4	42.9
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	77.4	42.9
Ensemble	74.2	57.1
Large Group	61.2	28.5
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	70.9	28.5
Brass	70.9	28.5
Strings	48.3	28.5
Percussion	64.0	28.5

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Application of Training
U of U

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	13.6	25.0
Dictation	50.0	50.0
Four-part Writing	13.6	50.0
Keyboard Harmony	18.1	50.0
Counterpoint	77.2	50.0
Composition	36.4	25.0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	21.0	0
Instrumental	45.9	50.0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	50.0	25.0
Classical	27.3	0
Romantic	27.3	0
Modern	36.4	0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	9.1	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	18.1	0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	18.1	0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	36.4	0
Organization & Administration of Program	36.4	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	40.9	0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	54.5	0
Organization & Administration of Program	50.0	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	40.9	0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	18.1	25.0
Vocal	27.3	25.0
Woodwind	40.9	25.0
Brass	45.9	25.0
Percussion	45.9	50.0
Strings	63.6	50.0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	9.1	0
Literature Selection	36.4	25.0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	31.8	0
Ensemble	27.3	0
Large Group	18.1	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	59.1	75.0
Brass	59.1	75.0
Strings	68.2	50.0
Percussion	63.6	75.0

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Effectiveness of Training
U of U

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	27.3	25.0
Dictation	50.0	0
Four-part Writing	13.6	0
Keyboard Harmony	40.9	0
Counterpoint	72.7	25.0
Composition	45.9	25.0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	40.9	25.0
Instrumental	63.6	50.0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	36.4	50.0
Classical	13.6	0
Romantic	13.6	0
Modern	31.8	0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	0	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	36.4	25.0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	36.4	25.0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	40.9	0
Organization & Administration of Program	45.9	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	36.4	0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	81.8	0
Organization & Administration of Program	59.1	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	50.0	0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	36.4	25.0
Vocal	31.8	25.0
Woodwind	40.9	0
Brass	40.9	0
Percussion	54.5	50.0
Strings	63.6	50.0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	18.2	25.0
Literature Selection	36.4	25.0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	27.3	0
Ensemble	31.8	0
Large Group	0	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	90.9	75.0
Brass	95.4	75.0
Strings	95.4	75.0
Percussion	95.4	75.0

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Need for Additional Training
U of U

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	27.3	25.0
Dictation	40.9	75.0
Four-part Writing	45.9	75.0
Keyboard Harmony	31.8	75.0
Counterpoint	59.1	50.0
Composition	22.9	25.0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	22.9	50.0
Instrumental	27.3	25.0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	36.4	75.0
Classical	27.3	50.0
Romantic	27.3	50.0
Modern	27.3	25.0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	31.8	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	27.3	25.0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	31.8	0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	27.3	25.0
Organization & Administration of Program	31.8	50.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	36.4	0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	27.3	50.0
Organization & Administration of Program	27.3	75.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	18.2	50.0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	9.1	25.0
Vocal	22.9	25.0
Woodwind	22.9	25.0
Brass	31.8	50.0
Percussion	27.3	25.0
Strings	45.9	50.0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	9.1	25.0
Literature Selection	13.6	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	31.8	25.0
Ensemble	27.3	25.0
Large Group	31.8	50.0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	40.9	50.0
Brass	40.9	50.0
Strings	45.9	25.0
Percussion	40.9	50.0

PERCENTAGES OF POSITIVE RESPONSES
(Significant to Very Significant)

Need for Additional Training

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	45.9	75.0
Dictation	45.9	25.0
Four-part Writing	54.5	25.0
Keyboard Harmony	72.7	50.0
Counterpoint	36.4	0
Composition	54.5	0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	72.7	25.0
Instrumental	50.0	25.0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	40.9	25.0
Classical	40.9	50.0
Romantic	36.4	25.0
Modern	40.9	50.0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	40.9	50.0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	54.5	50.0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	40.9	50.0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	50.0	50.0
Organization & Administration of Program	54.5	25.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	54.5	50.0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	54.5	25.0
Organization & Administration of Program	59.1	25.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	54.5	50.0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	63.6	50.0
Vocal	45.4	25.0
Woodwind	45.9	0
Brass	40.9	0
Percussion	40.9	50.0
Strings	45.9	50.0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	63.6	50.0
Literature Selection	72.7	50.0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	36.4	75.0
Ensemble	40.9	50.0
Large Group	40.9	25.0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	45.9	25.0
Brass	40.9	25.0
Strings	45.9	50.0
Percussion	36.4	25.0

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Effectiveness of Training
WSC

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	50.0	16.6
Dictation	50.0	0
Four-part Writing	10.0	0
Keyboard Harmony	60.0	16.6
Counterpoint	60.0	33.2
Composition	10.0	0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	50.0	16.6
Instrumental	30.0	16.6
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	50.0	16.6
Classical	40.0	0
Romantic	40.0	0
Modern	60.0	16.6
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	10.0	33.2
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	40.0	33.2
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	60.0	33.2
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	50.0	16.6
Organization & Administration of Program	50.0	16.6
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	30.0	16.6
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	70.0	16.6
Organization & Administration of Program	40.0	16.6
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	40.0	16.6
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	60.0	33.2
Vocal	50.0	33.2
Woodwind	20.0	33.2
Brass	10.0	33.2
Percussion	50.0	33.2
Strings	50.0	33.2
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	30.0	0
Literature Selection	40.0	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	20.0	0
Ensemble	20.0	16.6
Large Group	20.0	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	70.0	33.2
Brass	70.0	33.2
Strings	90.0	50.0
Percussion	70.0	33.2

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Application of Training
WSC

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	20.0	0
Dictation	40.0	16.6
Four-part Writing	20.0	0
Keyboard Harmony	10.0	33.2
Counterpoint	40.0	33.2
Composition	20.0	16.6
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	20.0	0
Instrumental	20.0	0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	30.0	33.2
Classical	30.0	0
Romantic	30.0	16.6
Modern	30.0	33.2
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	0	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	10.0	16.6
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	20.0	0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	20.0	16.6
Organization & Administration of Program	30.0	16.6
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	20.0	16.6
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	20.0	16.6
Organization & Administration of Program	10.0	16.6
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	20.0	16.6
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	20.0	16.6
Vocal	10.0	50.0
Woodwind	0	16.6
Brass	0	33.2
Percussion	0	33.2
Strings	30.0	33.2
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	10.0	16.6
Literature Selection	10.0	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	10.0	0
Ensemble	20.0	0
Large Group	20.0	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	40.0	50.0
Brass	50.0	50.0
Strings	50.0	50.0
Percussion	50.0	50.0

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Need for Additional Training
WSC

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	30.0	0
Dictation	30.0	0
Four-part Writing	30.0	0
Keyboard Harmony	20.0	16.6
Counterpoint	10.0	16.6
Composition	20.0	16.6
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	30.0	16.6
Instrumental	30.0	16.6
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	30.0	33.2
Classical	30.0	33.2
Romantic	30.0	50.0
Modern	20.0	33.2
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	30.0	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	10.0	0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	10.0	0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	30.0	16.6
Organization & Administration of Program	40.0	50.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	30.0	33.2
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	20.0	33.2
Organization & Administration of Program	20.0	33.2
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	10.0	50.0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	10.0	16.6
Vocal	30.0	16.6
Woodwind	10.0	0
Brass	10.0	0
Percussion	10.0	0
Strings	30.0	0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	20.0	33.2
Literature Selection	30.0	16.6
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	30.0	33.2
Ensemble	20.0	16.6
Large Group	20.0	16.6
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	20.0	66.6
Brass	30.0	66.6
Strings	60.0	50.0
Percussion	30.0	33.2

PERCENTAGES OF POSITIVE RESPONSES
(Significant to Very Significant)

Need for Additional Training
WSC

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	60.0	83.3
Dictation	60.0	83.3
Four-part Writing	60.0	50.0
Keyboard Harmony	60.0	50.0
Counterpoint	50.0	66.6
Composition	50.0	83.3
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	70.0	66.6
Instrumental	60.0	83.3
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	50.0	50.0
Classical	60.0	66.6
Romantic	60.0	50.0
Modern	70.0	66.6
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	40.0	100.0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	60.0	100.0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	70.0	100.0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	50.0	83.3
Organization & Administration of Program	50.0	50.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	70.0	50.0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	70.0	66.6
Organization & Administration of Program	60.0	66.6
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	80.0	50.0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	70.0	50.0
Vocal	70.0	33.2
Woodwind	70.0	66.6
Brass	70.0	50.0
Percussion	90.0	83.3
Strings	40.0	66.6
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	50.0	66.6
Literature Selection	70.0	66.6
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	50.0	50.0
Ensemble	80.0	50.0
Large Group	80.0	50.0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	70.0	33.2
Brass	50.0	33.2
Strings	40.0	33.2
Percussion	60.0	66.6

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Effectiveness of Training
SUSC

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	25.0	0
Dictation	25.0	0
Four-part Writing	0	0
Keyboard Harmony	0	0
Counterpoint	0	0
Composition	0	0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	0	50.0
Instrumental	0	50.0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	0	0
Classical	0	0
Romantic	0	0
Modern	0	0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	0	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	0	50.0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	0	50.0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	0	50.0
Organization & Administration of Program	25,0	50.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	50.0	50.0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	0	0
Organization & Administration of Program	0	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	0	0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	0	0
Vocal	0	100.0
Woodwind	0	0
Brass	25.0	0
Percussion	50.0	50.0
Strings	0	0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	0	0
Literature Selection	0	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	0	0
Ensemble	0	0
Large Group	0	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	50.0	0
Brass	25.0	0
Strings	50.0	0
Percussion	25.0	0

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Application of Training
SUSC

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	0	0
Dictation	0	0
Four-part Writing	0	0
Keyboard Harmony	0	0
Counterpoint	50.0	50.0
Composition	0	0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	0	0
Instrumental	0	0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	0	0
Classical	0	0
Romantic	0	0
Modern	0	0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	0	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	0	0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	0	0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	0	50.0
Organization & Administration of Program	0	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	0	0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	0	0
Organization & Administration of Program	0	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	0	0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	0	0
Vocal	0	50.0
Woodwind	0	0
Brass	0	0
Percussion	0	0
Strings	75.0	0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	0	0
Literature Selection	0	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	0	0
Ensemble	0	0
Large Group	0	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	0	0
Brass	0	0
Strings	25.0	0
Percussion	0	0

PERCENTAGES OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES
(Slightly Significant to Not Significant)

Need for Additional Training
SUSC

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	50.0	0
Dictation	50.0	50.0
Four-part Writing	50.0	50.0
Keyboard Harmony	25.0	50.0
Counterpoint	50.0	100.0
Composition	50.0	50.0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	100.0	0
Instrumental	75.0	0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	100.0	100.0
Classical	75.0	100.0
Romantic	75.0	100.0
Modern	75.0	100.0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	75.0	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	50.0	0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	25.0	50.0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	25.0	0
Organization & Administration of Program	50.0	0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	25.0	0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	25.0	50.0
Organization & Administration of Program	25.0	50.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	50.0	50.0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	50.0	50.0
Vocal	75.0	0
Woodwind	75.0	0
Brass	50.0	50.0
Percussion	50.0	0
Strings	50.0	50.0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	75.0	0
Literature Selection	50.0	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	50.0	0
Ensemble	25.0	50.0
Large Group	50.0	50.0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	25.0	100.0
Brass	50.0	100.0
Strings	50.0	100.0
Percussion	25.0	100.0

PERCENTAGES OF POSITIVE RESPONSES
(Significant to Very Significant)

Need for Additional Training
SUSC

	Students	Faculty
MUSIC THEORY		
Sight Singing	25.0	50.0
Dictation	50.0	0
Four-part Writing	25.0	50.0
Keyboard Harmony	50.0	50.0
Counterpoint	25.0	0
Composition	25.0	50.0
SCORING AND ARRANGING		
Vocal	0	100.0
Instrumental	25.0	100.0
MUSIC HISTORY		
Pre-Classical	0	0
Classical	0	0
Romantic	25.0	0
Modern	25.0	0
CONDUCTING AND REHEARSAL TECHNIQUES		
Use of Baton and Left Hand	25.0	0
Rehearsal Problems and Procedures	0	0
Lab Conducting and Rehearsal Experience	50.0	50.0
VOCAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	50.0	100.0
Organization & Administration of Program	25.0	50.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	50.0	50.0
INSTRUMENTAL METHODS AND MATERIALS		
Literature Selection	75.0	50.0
Organization & Administration of Program	25.0	50.0
App. of Prin. of Effective Learning	25.0	50.0
GROUP INSTRUCTION		
Piano	50.0	50.0
Vocal	25.0	100.0
Woodwind	25.0	0
Brass	25.0	0
Percussion	25.0	50.0
Strings	50.0	0
PRIVATE INSTRUCTION		
Methodology	25.0	0
Literature Selection	25.0	0
PERFORMANCE		
Solo	50.0	0
Ensemble	25.0	0
Large Group	50.0	0
INSTRUMENT REPAIR (MINOR)		
Woodwinds	25.0	0
Brass	50.0	0
Strings	50.0	0
Percussion	50.0	0

Combined Responses for each Item within each Category
Students and Faculty

Question		Effectiveness of Training					Application of Training					Need for Additional Training				
		VS	S	MS	SS	NS	VS	S	MS	SS	NS	VS	S	MS	SS	NS
THEORY																
Sight Singing	St	4	17	24	14	8	18	22	14	5	8	16	15	15	10	11
	F	4	6	5	4	0	7	7	3	2	0	6	6	3	1	3
Dictation	St	6	13	21	19	8	5	16	19	16	11	12	17	17	10	11
	F	4	6	7	2	0	5	7	3	4	0	5	5	4	1	4
4-Pt. Writing	St	16	23	20	4	4	8	29	16	6	8	12	17	16	15	7
	F	8	6	5	0	0	7	2	7	3	0	3	3	8	0	5
Keybd.Harmony	St	6	16	17	17	11	14	22	18	4	9	27	12	15	9	4
	F	3	9	3	3	1	8	2	4	5	0	3	4	5	4	3
Counterpoint	St	4	8	13	19	22	3	11	9	17	25	14	13	9	14	15
	F	2	4	6	5	1	2	3	6	7	0	3	3	5	4	
Composition	St	12	12	19	9	12	10	20	12	10	11	18	16	18	6	5
	F	5	6	7	0	1	5	6	6	1	1	5	4	6	1	3
SCORING AND ARRANGING																
Vocal	St	14	8	18	11	15	17	20	12	4	13	19	19	9	11	7
	F	1	5	8	3	2	4	7	7	1	0	6	5	3	4	1
Instrumental	St	17	11	15	13	10	23	15	10	12	7	21	19	10	9	7
	F	3	8	4	3	1	6	6	5	1	1	5	5	3	5	1
MUSIC HISTORY																
Pre-Classical	St	13	18	18	11	7	6	6	28	16	9	10	10	17	18	11
	F	2	9	5	3	0	2	6	5	6	0	0	6	4	2	7
Classical	St	14	18	22	10	1	8	10	30	14	4	12	12	21	15	7
	F	4	9	5	1	0	4	8	7	0	0	2	7	3	1	6
Romantic	St	15	22	18	10	1	8	13	31	10	4	12	13	21	14	7
	F	6	8	5	0	0	5	9	4	1	0	2	6	3	2	6

VS - Very Significant   SS - Slightly Significant   St - Students
S - Significant   NS - Not Significant   F - Faculty
MS - Moderately Significant

Question		Effectiveness of Training					Application of Training					Need for Additional Training				
		VS	S	MS	SS	NS	VS	S	MS	SS	NS	VS	S	MS	SS	NS
Modern	St	12	20	11	14	9	15	15	20	12	5	17	20	12	11	7
	F	4	6	3	3	0	5	8	4	2	0	6	6	1	2	4
COND. & REH. TECH.																
Use of Baton	St	25	25	13	3	1	48	8	8	1	2	15	14	17	15	4
& Left Hand	F	1	10	6	2	0	7	9	3	0	0	5	8	5	0	1
Reh. Prob.	St	18	21	12	10	6	46	8	5	4	4	23	19	16	5	4
& Procedures	F	3	7	5	4	0	9	6	3	1	0	8	5	4	1	1
Lab Cond. &	St	15	8	16	19	9	41	10	6	7	3	28	20	9	5	5
Reh. Exper.	F	2	3	7	5	2	6	8	5	0	0	10	5	2	2	0
VOCAL METH & MAT.																
Lit. Select.	St.	7	12	25	11	12	23	12	14	5	13	21	13	12	8	13
	F	4	5	7	1	2	6	9	2	1	1	5	8	3	2	1
Org. & Admin.	St.	4	13	20	18	12	19	16	7	10	15	18	14	11	12	12
of Vocal Prog.	F	3	8	4	3	1	5	9	3	1	1	4	4	5	5	1
App. of Prin.	St	8	18	17	13	11	21	17	9	9	11	19	19	10	10	9
of Eff. Learn.	F	3	5	8	2	1	6	5	6	1	1	6	4	6	2	1
INST. METH. & MAT.																
Lit. Select.	St.	15	6	12	20	14	22	15	13	6	11	26	17	10	8	6
	F	5	7	6	0	1	8	6	4	1	0	4	6	1	8	0
Org. & Admin.	St	10	14	19	10	14	19	19	14	5	11	25	17	12	7	6
of Inst.Prog.	F	9	5	4	0	1	8	8	2	1	0	3	7	0	6	3
App. of Prin.	St.	13	15	17	11	11	21	18	12	7	9	22	17	15	7	6
of Eff. Learn.	F	6	7	5	0	1	7	6	4	0	1	3	7	1	6	2
GROUP INSTRUCTION																
Piano	St	14	11	17	12	12	23	16	17	5	5	23	17	14	6	6
	F	5	6	5	1	2	6	5	6	1	1	4	4	5	5	1
Vocal	St	19	17	10	12	7	35	13	9	4	6	20	19	10	8	8
	F	3	6	5	3	2	5	4	5	5	0	4	6	5	2	2

VS - Very Significant   SS - Slightly Significant   St - Students
 S - Significant   NS - Not Significant   F - Faculty
MS - Moderately Significant

Question		Effectiveness of Training					Application of Training					Need for Additional Training				
		VS	S	MS	SS	NS	VS	S	MS	SS	NS	VS	S	MS	SS	NS
Woodwind	St	18	19	12	10	8	29	13	13	4	8	25	17	12	8	5
	F	6	5	6	2	0	9	5	3	2	0	2	5	8	1	3
Brass	St	22	15	15	8	7	27	16	10	6	8	22	18	13	7	7
	F	7	5	5	1	1	9	4	3	3	0	3	3	6	3	3
Percussion	St	14	14	11	15	12	23	16	11	6	9	22	20	12	6	6
	F	4	6	4	3	2	7	5	4	3	3	6	5	4	2	2
Strings	St	17	13	12	13	12	9	7	17	11	23	12	19	10	10	16
	F	7	5	3	3	1	7	5	3	4	0	3	5	5	3	3
PRIVATE INSTRUC.																
Methodology	St	35	16	7	0	8	36	18	8	1	3	24	15	16	6	5
	F	7	11	0	1	0	11	6	1	1	0	5	4	4	6	0
Lit. Select.	St	24	9	17	10	7	31	20	6	3	7	30	18	8	5	6
	F	7	7	4	1	0	8	6	4	1	0	6	3	7	2	1
PERFORMANCE																
Solo	St	24	16	14	6	6	24	15	16	5	6	23	16	14	7	6
	F	5	9	5	0	0	11	6	2	0	0	5	4	4	5	1
Ensemble	St	25	9	16	7	8	30	21	4	5	6	29	12	13	6	5
	F	8	4	5	2	0	14	4	1	0	0	4	5	4	5	1
Large Group	St	31	23	10	2	1	39	16	5	3	4	25	13	12	6	11
	F	11	7	1	0	0	14	4	1	0	0	3	3	4	5	4
INSTRUMENT REPAIR																
Woodwinds	St	4	2	5	20	35	20	6	10	8	22	29	11	9	7	11
	F	2	2	7	4	4	1	5	6	4	3	2	3	4	6	4
Brass	St	3	2	8	15	39	18	5	13	9	21	24	14	9	10	10
	F	1	2	6	5	5	1	5	5	4	4	3	2	2	9	3
Strings	St	5	3	2	12	45	14	4	8	8	31	22	9	8	12	16
	F	1	2	6	5	5	1	5	7	4	2	2	4	5	5	3
Percussion	St	4	0	6	16	41	16	7	11	13	19	24	12	11	10	10
	F	2	1	6	4	6	2	4	6	3	4	4	2	3	7	2

VS - Very Significant   SS - Slightly Significant   St - Students

S - Significant   NS - Not Significant   F - Faculty

MS - Moderately Significant

VITA

Harold W. Boyce

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Dissertation Report: A Graduate-Oriented Evaluation of the Music
        Education Curricula of Four State College-University
        Systems in Utah

Major Field: Music

Biographical Information:

    Personal Data: Born at Silverton, Texas, June 4, 1936, son of
        George H. and Dorothy S. Boyce; married Catherine Stephens
        June 5, 1968; two children -- Aaron and Cameron.

    Education: Graduated from Center High School, Center, Colorado
        in 1954; Bachelor of Arts degree from Western State College,
        Gunnison, Colorado, 1958; Master of Science degree from
        Utah State University, 1961; completed requirements for
        Doctor of Education degree in Curriculum Development and
        Supervision in Music at Utah State University, 1973.

    Professional Experience: Graduate Assistant at Utah State
        University, 1958-59; Music Teacher at Lewiston Junior High
        School, Lewiston, Utah, 1960-61; Director of Bands, Cedar
        City, Utah Public Schools, 1961-66; Director of Bands,
        Southern Utah State College, 1966 to present.