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The purpose of this study was to investigate college applied music instruction practices, evaluation agencies' criteria, and relationships between the instruction and the criteria. The study ascertained the nature and extent of existing applied music practices required of music education majors in those North Carolina colleges and universities which (a) offer the baccalaureate degree in music education and (b) have a music unit (department or school of music) independent from a general fine arts or humanities department.

The three evaluation agencies used in the study were the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction (SDPI), and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Consideration of applied music practices was expanded into the following areas of investigation:

1. Selection of valid criteria for evaluating applied music practices.
2. Identification of admission, retention, and exit practices in applied music.
3. Inspection of written regulations which are directly or indirectly controlled by the music unit administrators and which a. establish standards and describe expected competencies for music performance or
b. describe procedures used for evaluating music performance.

4. Determination of the extent to which applied music practices conform to the evaluation criteria established by accrediting agencies.

The data were collected from published general catalogues and from personal interviews with administrative heads of the music units of the 28 colleges and universities in the study population (SP). Inspection of catalogues provided descriptive identification of (a) the SP, (b) requirements of applied music instruction, (c) designs for numbering and identifying specific levels of applied music study, and (d) published admission, retention, and exit procedures. Information obtained from the personal interviews was recorded on a questionnaire which provided descriptive identification of music units and their applied music study practices related to (as corroboration and extensions of, or in addition to) catalogue description. All data were collected from 100% of the SP.

Compilation of data was by frequency counts and percentage of compliance to a synthesis of agencies' criteria. The specific design of frequency tables emerged from the character of the information as it related to five divisional representations of the anonymously-treated SP: (a) the total SP, (b) the public (state-supported) institutions SP, (c) the private institutions SP, (d) the NASM-affiliated SP, and (e) the non-NASM-affiliated SP.
The criteria used for evaluating compliance were synthesized from the NASM and North Carolina SDPI standards and guidelines as supported by the SACS. Compliance percentages were ranked in levels of high, medium, low, and unacceptable. The ranked averages were used as supportive evidence for qualitative conclusions and recommendations.

The investigation revealed that the applied music practices of the SP complied with the criteria to either a high or moderate degree in the areas of (a) amount and frequency of performance evaluations, (b) type and historical scope of performed literature, (c) recital participation requirements, (d) recital attendance expectations, (e) requirement of solo and large ensemble participation, and (f) secondary instrumental study proficiency requirements. Low to unacceptable degrees of compliance were found in the areas of (a) small ensemble participation requirements, (b) sight reading as a structured part of applied music performance, (c) systems of applied music instructional designs. The study revealed an institutional need for improvement in structured (a) admissions policies, (b) audition evaluations, (c) applied music teaching objectives of observable and measurable design, (d) institutional directives and guidelines, (e) minimum performance exit levels, and (f) performance evaluation independent of semester time durations.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement and Scope of the Problem

The investigation undertaken in this study was directed toward applied music instruction practices, evaluation agencies' criteria, and the relationships between the instruction and the criteria. The three agencies from which criteria were obtained were the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction (SDPI), and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

The study was designed to ascertain the nature and extent of existing applied music practices required of students who have declared music education to be their major study area. Included are the practices followed by those four-year colleges and universities in the state of North Carolina which (a) offer the baccalaureate degree in music education and (b) have a music unit (a department or school of music) independent from a general fine arts or humanities department.

Consideration of applied music practices led to the following areas of investigation:

1. Selection of valid criteria for evaluating applied music practices.
2. Identification of admission, retention, and exit practices in applied music.

3. Inspection of printed regulations which are directly or indirectly controlled by the music unit administrator and which
   a. establish standards and describe expected competencies for music performance or
   b. describe procedures used for evaluating music performance.

4. Determination of the extent to which applied music practices relate or conform to the evaluation criteria established by accrediting agencies.

Significance of the Study

Need for Investigation

The premise for this study is that preparation for musical performance can be supported by a taxonomy of related progressive tasks which are evaluated by observation and measurement. This support is a justification for referring to applied music as a major comprehensive culmination of the curriculum in music instruction. The specific purpose of this study, which is to ascertain the nature and extent of existing applied music requirements for music education students, embodies the concept of applied music comprehensiveness; as such, it is worthy of research.

The evaluation of applied music practices is based upon the possible relationship between applied music requirements in a given institution and the requirements described in the criteria of accrediting agencies. Investigation of these
criteria is regarded as important by this investigator because consistent guidelines are needed for the inclusion of musical performance in the academic preparation of future music teachers; it is helpful for a music unit administrator to know (a) how well these individuals are expected to be able to perform, (b) by what means the achievement of competence is to be planned, and (c) how it is to be recognized when completed.

Selection of the accrediting agencies to be used in this study was made as a result of personal observations by this investigator. The following requirements and possibilities influenced the choice of agencies:

1. If the graduates of an institution are to receive certification for teaching in public schools of the State of North Carolina the education programs of the college or university must be approved by the SDPI.

2. If degrees that are granted by an institution in North Carolina are to be respected by the national academic community the institution as a whole must be approved by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Such approval is voluntarily sought.

3. If the music degrees granted by an institution are to be respected by the national academic community of musicians it is desirable for the music unit to be a member of an association of schools of music. NASM is such an organization, and membership is granted only to those institutions which voluntarily meet the association membership requirements and request membership.

There is a need for research into the degree of accountability for the outcome of applied music instruction which is accepted by administrators of music units. Since
the individual product of a curriculum in music education is a music teacher whose skills may have significant usefulness to many students over a long period of time, it is desirable to discover the exact ways in which those skills are being achieved. The realization of these facts is the basis for inclusion in this study of only those colleges and universities which have music units independent of arts or humanities divisions. It was believed that unit administrators would be in a position to exercise ultimate control over statements of objectives and methods of rating outcomes of instruction. The unit head holds ultimate responsibility for success of the unit, and in order to be knowingly responsible for unit performance he should be aware of structural success. Unless objectives and standards are written and structured, the actual power of responsibility lies with someone else, and the music administrator may be held responsible for results which are achieved with little causal input from him.

Complying with accrediting agencies' standards implies institutional conformity to standardization. A certain amount of conformity seems necessary to assure basic undergraduate preparation leading to fitness-for-job preparation or for graduate-studies preparation. For students transferring from one institution to another, some standardization will facilitate the process. This study may be used as a basis for comparison and standardization of policies, as set forth by the accrediting agencies, and practices, as seen in the institutions employed in the study.
At least two previous investigators have made statements concerning the need for research that are relevant to the present study. Kuersteiner (1946) pointed out that the amount of time spent by all concerned on instruction, practice, group rehearsal, and performance was influential in determining that a study of this type was needed. He reported an estimation that over half the instructional time of institutions had been scheduled to the applied music aspect of the curriculum.

Carrico (1955) stated:

First, in the light of its importance to the growth and development of both music education majors and applied majors, applied music occupies a prominent place in the music curriculum. In addition, in view of the fact that the applied music phase of music instruction in college music is generally agreed to contribute to a sizeable proportion of the problem related to administrative, instruction, and budgetary aspects, it is felt that this area is in need of investigation (pp. 15, 16).

Objectives Used in Achievement of Study Purpose

1. Determination of the status of applied music instruction for music education majors in the four year colleges of North Carolina.

2. Description of practices in the administration of music units as related to applied music for music education majors.

3. Recommendation of areas toward which applied music policy changes could be directed.

Conceptual Setting of the Study

Standards and Guidelines Used

The basis for relating actual collegiate practice
with nonvariable recommendations was drawn from publications of the following agencies:


Rationale for Emphasis on Competency-Based Instruction

In the recommendations of the three accrediting agencies used in this study standards are set forth in terms of competencies to be achieved and those competencies are described as taxonomies of related expectations. This use of the term competency has a different meaning from an earlier use of the words competency and competence.

In the NASM Handbook 1972 the term competence is used to describe an unspecified standard of performance ability. The handbook section which deals with Bachelor of Music Education Degree guidelines under the heading of Musical Performance contains the statement, "The prospective music teacher must be a thoroughly competent performer . . . . Such competence is essential for artistic music teaching" (pp. 36, 37).

The above use of competence connotes levels from adequate to thorough accomplishment. It is made clear in the Handbook that competence means a degree of skill accomplishment and not the skill itself as part of a taxonomy of skills.
The same organization, in its Handbook 1974, used the term *competence* in an entirely different context; the implied meaning is that of a taxonomy of study areas which suggest systems of tasks or observable behaviors. The organization proposed that performance skills required of prospective music teachers should be added to those basic competencies outlined for all musicians. The performance skills required of all musicians were stated as:

III. COMPETENCIES COMMON TO ALL PROFESSIONAL BACCALAUREATE DEGREES IN MUSIC

A. Performance

1. Skill in at least one major area of performance must be consistently developed to the highest level appropriate to the particular music concentration. Essential competencies are:

   a. Performance . . . represented in the complete repertory of the particular performance medium,

   b. The development of technical skills adequate to meet the needs of artistic self-expression,

   c. The ability to read at sight,


In 1973 the North Carolina SDPI published Standards and Guidelines for Approval of Institutions and Programs for Teacher Education: Competency-Based Program. The section which lists the guidelines for music teacher training contains a paragraph captioned "Competencies Needed by Teachers"
(SDPI, 1973, p. 45). In an objective under this heading it is stated that a teacher should have the "ability to interpret representative works of the past and to present and perform them with understanding and technical proficiency in the area of specialization" (p. 46). It is also stated that "music theory and history should be considered as an illuminating core of systems ... essential to the ... performance of music" (p. 47).

The North Carolina teacher education standards and guidelines include the suggestion—as did the NASM handbooks of 1974 and 1976—that applied music study can be supported by a taxonomy of study areas. These areas may be described by a systems approach to the statement of objectives. Such objectives are usually stated as observable and measurable competencies.

In agreement with the above accrediting agencies the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools states in its Standards of the College Delegate Assembly that "the curricular offerings of an institution should be clearly and accurately described in published materials. ... Instructional techniques and policies should express ... the specific objectives of an individual course" (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1974, p. 6).

All of the three agencies state that instructional areas should be described in written and published terms of specific tasks consisting of observable and measurable
behaviors. They do not exclude the area of musical performance. Two of the organizations, NASM and the North Carolina SDPI, present specific guidelines for adapting applied music instruction to a taxonomy of study areas that converge into a systems approach of study objectives.

Competency-based instruction has been described as a design for improving the teaching process (Hall & Jones, 1976). It focuses upon systems of performing specific tasks. The performance may be a composite of skills, attitudes, and/or knowledge "derived from explicit conceptualization of the desired outcomes" (p. 11).

Inherent in the concept of competency-based instruction is a system of evaluations that may be used to declare the competency achieved, whether it be at a minimal level of acceptance or at any individual level of mastery above the minimum.

Definition of Terms

Applied music refers to all types of solo music performance that are regulated by written departmental or school objectives. The term may refer also to participation in large or small ensembles when that participation is required as part of the applied music regulations.

Applied music standards include

1. Admissions criteria.
2. Retention and advancement procedures.
3. Technical skills expectancies.
4. Pertinent solo and ensemble literature cognition requirements.
5. Recital participation requirements.
6. Exit requirements.

Quality of performance is defined as the value or worth of an observable behavior which is evaluated by a subjective statement. In this study the evaluation process is limited to those objective procedures used in (a) stating and recording opinions and (b) building guidelines that attempt to standardize areas of competency evaluations.

Evaluation procedures are the objective or subjective tools used to measure the accomplishment of applied music standards. The procedures considered in this study are those which are required, suggested, or permitted by written administrative directives.

Music unit refers either to a department of music or to a school of music.

Administrative directives are policies instigated or endorsed by the administrative head of a music unit. In order to be included as administrative directives in this study the integrity of these policies must be preserved in written form. The directives may be found in

1. Regulatory general handbooks.
3. Printed procedural or competency descriptive syllabi.

4. Administration-approved general requirement handouts.

**Entrance requirements** include any criteria—related either to academic ability, performance skills, or personality traits—which must be met before admission of a prospective student to a music unit.

**Retention practices** are those instructional controls, requirements, and evaluations that are designed to mark a student's progress from the admission level to the exit level of a program of study.

**Exit procedures** are those activities which must be completed satisfactorily by the senior student before he is permitted to graduate.

**Taxonomy** means a system of classification. In the field of education a taxonomy is intended to provide for classification of the goals of our educational system. It is expected to be of general help to all teachers, administrators, professional specialists, and research workers who deal with curricular and evaluation problems. . . . Curriculum builders should find that taxonomy helps them to specify objectives so that it becomes easier to plan learning experiences and prepare evaluation devices (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1971, pp. 1, 2).

**Systems approach** is a design of progressive steps which outline tasks leading to a predetermined conclusion. Objectives within a systems approach are usually stated in observable and measurable competencies.
Competency-based instruction denotes study organized into taxonomies of related skills when those skills are expressed as progressive tasks designed to be observable and measurable. Such instruction may or may not be labeled a systems approach to learning.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Applied Music Instruction

Among listings in dissertation indices there are more studies concerned with general music curricula than with specific areas of applied music practices. Even fewer investigations have been reported that present the implications and influences of printed collegiate evaluation requirements, procedures, and performance progress standards. Carrico (1955) stated, "After diligent search the writer discovered but one dissertation which was entirely devoted to the study of the applied music area" (p. 20).

According to Jones (1949), Yont carried out the first extensive survey of school music performance in 1915. She investigated applied music instruction from elementary grades through the undergraduate college level. Her information was gathered primarily from institutional catalogues.

Randall Thompson's book (1935) was concerned with music in liberal arts colleges and universities. He had received a commission from the Association of American Colleges to study the music programs of its members, and he obtained information from 30 institutions. He reported extensive investigations in the field of applied music, but he was primarily interested in the liberal arts concept of applied music.
which granted no academic credit for performance (Carrico, 1955).

Wolfe (1936) devoted a section of his dissertation to applied music study in the education of music teachers and music supervisors. He suggested that competency and proficiency in applied music study should be independent from the number of hours required for graduation. He stated that applied music was a significant part of the curriculum that builds musicianship, and it was therefore an important factor in the education of music teachers.

Such significance had been recognized earlier by Gehrken who, while developing the music education curriculum at Oberlin Conservatory of Music, stipulated that about one half of students' time should be devoted to applied music and the appropriate related musicianship courses. He made the stipulation soon after he had recommended the same policy to the Educational Council of the Music Educators National Conference in 1918 (Gehrken, 1960).

McEachern (1937) studied the teacher training program of music in 150 four-year colleges. A part of her study was the investigation of practices in applied music. She concluded that the following policies were needed:

1. Adequate statement of entrance requirements.
2. A required major applied area.
3. Credit for applied music to be given on a competency achievement basis.
Kendall (1937) compared the practices of music administrators with practices that had been followed by other academic units of colleges and universities. His data were obtained from catalogues and questionnaires. He found that

1. Recognition of music as an academic study was contingent upon the granting of credit for applied music study.
2. Liberal arts colleges had a tendency to offer more applied music areas than they were able to teach.
3. The range of credit allowed for applied study toward a bachelor of arts degree varied from zero to twenty semester hours.

A dissertation relating entirely to applied music was written by Kuersteiner in 1946. In this study he assumed the existence of objectives in applied music study. He surveyed the administration of applied music objectives in data received from one hundred teachers representing twelve member institutions of NASM and from one hundred fifty graduates of the NASM member institutions. Kuersteiner limited his study to the applied areas of voice, piano, and violin.

Suderman (1947) studied the total music curricula of six liberal arts colleges and questioned some of the graduates of those colleges. Their most frequently mentioned criticisms of the applied music programs were

1. The limited amount of study literature.
Three studies (Marple, 1949; Hinton, 1960; & Burkhalter, 1961) were designed to discover relative importances of various areas of applied music instruction. The investigators obtained opinions from individuals whose recent experiences were regarded as relevant to the problem. In each case the opinions were used in making recommendations concerning changes of emphasis in preparation for musical performance.

Marple (1949) reported the results of questioning which had been used to gather rating statements from music administrators and senior music education students in 25 member institutions of NASM. His findings revealed the belief that if a fifth year of study were to be added to a music education curriculum more than half the additional hours should be in the area of applied music study. His interpretation was that too little applied music was being taught in the four years of undergraduate study.

Investigating hierarchies of competencies considered desirable in voice instruction for public school teachers, Hinton (1960) questioned supervisors of music in cities with populations of 100,000 or more and representatives of colleges that were members of NASM. The survey participants rated a number of given factors in three levels of importance. He reported that pedagogical skills were ranked in highest importance; performing skills of the teacher.
were considered moderately important; of least importance were relationships between singing and speech or languages. Priorities for class voice instruction were established on the basis of the importance levels discerned from this study.

Burkhalter (1961) sought to rank criteria pertaining to competencies, insights, and attitudes relevant to applied music teaching and applied music learning. His proposed criteria were evaluated by directors, applied music teachers, and music education instructors in member institutions of NASM and by music supervisors in cities having populations of 50,000 or more. Burkhalter asked his study populations to assume that a fifth year of music courses was to be added to the music degree program. He also asked for opinions ranking several areas of music instruction in the suggested program. He found that methods in applied pedagogy ranked in first place, with successively lower ranks being given to sight reading, expansion of repertoire, technical facility, and perfecting of limited repertoire.

Both Fritschel (1952) and Carrico (1955) surveyed applied music practices in state-supported institutions. Fritschel gathered information from 97 state teachers' colleges throughout the United States, and Carrico's data were gathered from the 14 state-supported schools of Texas. Fritschel's study related to entrance and exit requirements. He found that although 72 per cent of the music educators questioned were favorable to the concept of
specific requirements for admission to music major curricula only 39.7 per cent of the schools actually had such requirements. He suggested the possibility that many state-supported institutions were obliged to maintain a policy of admitting almost all applicants. The respondents indicated that requirements for graduation usually included

1. Ability to play the piano.
2. Ability to sing.
3. Participation in student recitals.

It was recognized that poorly qualified students would be eliminated by their deficiencies.

Carrico surveyed a wider scope of applied music practices. He found that the offerings for principal applied study in both the Bachelor of Music degree and the Bachelor of Music Education degree conformed to NASM minimum recommendations. He observed:

This may be attributed to healthy competitive spirit among the colleges, as well as the efforts of the state associations and agencies toward minimum standardization. In cases where the recommendations are not met, these are apparently due to college administrative or curricular pressures, rather than the music departments' disinterest (p. 200).

From an investigative view of the practices followed by music administrators Kennedy (1951) found that one of the problems in standardizing applied music instruction was the difficulty in hiring faculty who were competent teachers and who also met the requirements of the institutions' academic hiring policies.
Allen (1954) surveyed applied music procedures in music schools and departments of music. She gathered data from 54 of the 64 institutions that were members of NASM in 1951-52. Part of her investigation was concerned with the weekly teaching load for instructors in musical performance areas. She reported that an average of 24 clock hours per week was spent by applied music instructors in their teaching activities.

Bulgin (1957) used, as did Carrico, relevant standards of NASM as criteria for his evaluation of music education programs. He found that a large number of colleges fell short of the Association standards in the number of credit hours required in applied music. As classified in his study, "the division of applied music consisted of the instruction in the primary performance medium, the secondary performance medium, instrumental techniques, and ensemble participation" (p. 33). Among his findings were the following:

1. Only 12 per cent of the colleges surveyed met the Association requirement in each of the four areas, with 30 semester hours allotted to applied music study.

2. Most of the colleges did require solo experience in one medium.

3. Approximately half the colleges required senior solo recitals.

4. Courses in instrumental techniques were required by 58 per cent of the colleges.

5. Ensemble participation was required by 85 per cent of the colleges.
Chapple (1962) concluded that a well-chosen repertoire representing compositions of all the major stylistic eras should be the materials of study for at least three years of applied music instruction. He added that the cognitive experience gained from representative repertoire would help the student to perform perceptively rather than merely performing notes.

Some of the conclusions of Diehl (1964) contradicted those of Chapple. Diehl stated that there was a lack of significant relationship between concept development and applied music performance, group or solo. He agreed with Chapple in his statement that the lack of significance in performance probably is caused by an overemphasis on technical skill to the detriment of emphasis on conceptual understanding.

Beglarian (1967) was concerned about the possible problem of standardization in applied music instruction leading to loss of the artistry for which music is believed to exist. In a commentary on the aims and processes of music education he stated that university education usually means instruction in a well-defined area, and that the area should be a structure of sequential and systematic accumulations of cognitions and skills. These accumulations should serve the purpose of obtaining wisdom. He added that a musician, having achieved the basis provided by competencies, can progress to become an imaginative performer and teacher.

In a plan for organizing a music education curriculum
at Elizabeth City State Teachers' College in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, Bell (1963) included recommendations that applied music should be structured for more relevancy to elementary and secondary music teaching as well as to the musical needs of the general college student. He further recommended, however, that this structured relevancy was not to be gained by neglecting the growth of total campus cultural life.

Grant (1965) investigated the music curricula of church-related colleges in California. He concluded that there was no significant difference in the type of applied music teaching problems for the music unit administrators as related to the sizes of the institutions.

In an analysis of teacher-training programs in small liberal arts colleges of North Carolina, Dunstan (1965) concluded that

1. The curricula of the small liberal arts colleges compare favorably with the recommendations and requirements of national accrediting agencies.

2. There are many points of similarity and few points of dissimilarity between the curricula of the music programs of state colleges and universities and of private colleges in North Carolina.

3. Music performance is an important part of most college music education curricula.

In an investigation of applied music study in two-year colleges, Kindig (1972) reported that

1. Areas most frequently taught for credit were, in order of relative frequency, voice, piano, trumpet, and clarinet.
2. Applied music instruction was more baccalaureate-oriented than community-service-oriented.

3. Applied music instruction was more often done by full-time generalists than by specialists.

4. When part-time teachers were used they were more often specialists than generalists.

5. Most schools required 60 minutes of instruction each week in the major performance area.

6. Most schools required a jury examination at the end of each term and most required both recital performance and recital attendance.

**Systems Approach**

Since the origin of the present use of the term **systems approach** during World War II, educational interest in the term has not diminished (Ackoff, 1964). From the beginning, the designation **systems approach** was employed in referring to research composed of dynamically interrelated parts that had the capability to change the performance of the system as an entirety and, at the same time, to change the performance of the parts. Researchers in education have discussed common problems and reviewed experimental designs and conclusions related to systems investigations. The May, 1965 issue of *Audiovisual Instruction* was devoted entirely to "The Systems Approach".

The second edition of *College Teaching: A Systematic Approach* (Brown & Thornton, 1971) indicated the magnitude of continued interest in the concept. Labuta (1974) related the systems approach to structured accountability. He proposed that it was "a problem-solving technique that can be applied
Labuta further stated that

The systems approach used for accountability has its roots in common sense and the nature of man's functioning intellect—the cybernetic cycle. Cybernetics in human action refers to control by the mind and central nervous system. Perceptual input through the senses (sight, hearing, etc.) is stored and processed in the brain. Here, on the basis of this information, decisions are made to reach a goal. Then an actual attempt is made to reach the goal. Subsequent action is based upon the success or failure of the attempt. Modification or reinforcement occurs as a result of feedback or knowledge of results. Feedback provides either confirmation of correctness or data necessary for change, modifications and improvement (p. 25).

Accountability is a concern of the contemporary educator. Muller (1973) stated that education needs to be designed for greater precision in the planning of a curriculum. He included the determination of goals, the refinement of instructional processes, and the evaluation of the processes in his design. He suggested that evaluation must include a thoughtful investigation of the determined goals. Muller concluded that the investigation should use experience-based models of processes to identify the elements, relationships, and sequences necessary for creating curriculum materials.

According to Biringer (1974), a curricular design based on the systems approach implies a referent model and procedure by which an individual, when given the desired terminal behavior of a unit of instruction, will be able to dissect the objectives into teachable elementary components and effectively sequence behavior-oriented experiences to enable learners to reach terminal behaviors (p. 5).
Labuta (1974) used the systems approach design in his structure of the accountability approach. In Appendix A (p.163) of his Guide to Accountability in Music Instruction he included "Guitar Instruction in the High School", an accountability approach design.

Learning the guitar provides students with the capacity for independent music making. Satisfying results can be obtained without maintaining a demanding practice schedule.

The guitar lends itself to teaching practical music theory. Because the guitar is a fretted instrument, it provides both an audio and a visual perception of music.

OBJECTIVES OF GUITAR I

1. The student will be able to tune his guitar with the aid of the tuning fork.

2. Students will be able to accompany songs using tonic, subdominant and dominant chords in the major keys of C, G, D, and in the minor keys of a, e, and d.

3. The student will develop fluency in the use of at least six strumming patterns.

4. The student will be able to play accompaniments for at least twelve songs of his own choice.

5. Students will be able to read melody, rhythm, meter signatures, chord symbols, and tablatures at a level of difficulty found in typical folk songs.

6. Students will be encouraged (but not required) to perform original songs (pp. 184, 185).

With the guitar instruction example Labuta appeared to have removed some cybernetic complexities of the systems approach, transforming it into a simpler accountability
approach. The accountability approach seems to be very closely related; by design, to competency-based education.

**Competency-Based Music Education**

Mountford (1976) compiled a synthesis of research related to competency-based teacher education in the field of music, spanning the years from 1964 to 1974. In his conclusion, Mountford stated that much research has been done on curricular needs but that little has been done to establish what competencies music educators actually need.

Essentials of good performance was the theme of an article by Van Bodegraven (1955). He implied that it is an obligation of the performer to transmit the stylistic identity of a composition during performance. In order to meet the obligation, a performer must be taught the total awareness of compositional integrity. Van Bodegraven concluded that thoughtful planning by the teacher is necessary to direct students toward the factors of discrimination of tone quality, intonation, balance, precision, tempo, and style. He stated that it is the teacher's responsibility to separate and concentrate each of the above factors so that development of musical understanding can come through music performance. He believed that musical understanding did not occur accidentally; it had to be structured deliberately. Thus the essentials of good performance can be regarded as achievable through competency-based education.
Hinton (1960) investigated factors related to success in vocal music instruction. He referred to these factors as competencies which were desirable for public school music teachers.

Diehl (1964) believed, as did Van Bodegraven, that musical understandings or concepts are structured and not accidental. Diehl concluded that there was no significant correlation between amount of performing experience and degree of concept development.

The belief that performance is more than just aural and physical skills was expanded by Krath (1964). He stated that

too often the idea of performance is far removed from the academic concept instead of being recognized as the instantaneous application of all that is factual, historical, or theoretical. Quality performance is the ultimate achievement in the academic concept (p. 49).

Woodruff (1970) continued the development of Krath's academic concepts. Woodruff maintained that conceptual functioning is equivalent to human functioning; therefore "it is impossible to understand conceptual development without knowing how fully behavior is tied to one's conceptual patterns" (p. 51). He postulated that it was time to move away from verbal curricula and to move toward "concepts and behavioral competencies that are taken directly from life itself" (p. 52). A next step, Woodruff continued, would be to support conceptual objectives with behavioral competencies in a paradigm of component elements used as stepping stones to achieve a previously identified product.
Music educators have not been unaware of teaching techniques using individuation and behavioral competencies (Kapfer, 1970). Kapfer continued his discussion by presenting a brief review of articles published in recent issues of professional periodicals that presented a dominance of numbers of articles on either the subject of behavioral approach or behavioral objectives in education.

In 1970 MENC published its Task Groups I, II, III, and IV, "Issues and Recommendations" in the Music Educators Journal. This was a report on "Qualities and Competencies for Music Educators." The report included competencies describing personal qualities, musical performance qualities, professional qualities, and general education qualities. The qualities were presented as behavioral tasks expected of educators in each of several specific areas of teaching.

Colwell (1972) expanded the concept of accountability beyond the teacher. He stated that it would be short-sighted to stop in the classroom; he believed that accountability is a responsibility of all concerned, the teacher, the administrators, the school boards or board of trustees, and the community. It is this broad sense of accountability that makes necessary the principle of education supported by a system of behavioral objectives.

A comprehensive survey of literature on competency-based education was made by Moreen (1974). He identified objectives for a competency-based teacher education program.
in music. The following three questions were investigated:

1. What is the nature of competency-based teacher education programs and their relevance to the training of music teachers?

2. What specific competencies are essential for elementary and secondary music teachers?

3. At what stage in their training should music teachers first be able to demonstrate each essential competency? (p. 2).

Moreen's survey of literature covered the years 1968 to 1973. He assumed that his authorities had professional understanding of their topics. The scope of Moreen's survey indicated that much was written during his years of delimitation. He demonstrated also that much of what was written was of an educational philosophical nature, and little of it was derived from experimental design reports.

In recent years academic interest related to actual applications of applied music taxonomies and competency-based designs may have inspired more investigations on the subject than in the past. The Council for Research in Music Education (Jan., 1974; Mch., 1974; Jan., 1976) lists eight studies in various stages of completion which are related to systems designs.

Hall and Jones (1976) stated,

Competency-based education, first of all, is education that focuses on students' acquisitions of specific competencies. In other words, the educational program includes a set of learning objectives that are stated so that their accomplishment can be observed in the form of specified learner behaviors or knowledge. Minimum levels of achievement of these objectives are established as a criterion [Sic] of success. Learning activities are
geared to assist each student in acquiring at least the minimum levels of competence. Getting through the learning experience within a specified period of time has no intrinsic value—acquiring minimum competence, regardless of time, is the valued end. This is a direct application of the concepts of mastery learning and aptitude as described above.

Competencies are composite skills, behaviors, or knowledge that can be demonstrated by the learner and are derived from explicit conceptualizations of the desired outcomes of learning. Competencies are stated so as to make possible the assessment of student learning through direct observation of student behavior. Learning objectives are known to the student as he begins a learning experience. The student also knows in advance the levels of mastery to be used as criteria of successful achievement. Such criteria are always explicit and are based on the specified objectives that contribute to the competencies being learned. Objectivity in assessment of achievement is sought by using the individual learner's performance as the primary source of evidence and by taking into account evidence of the learner's knowledge rather than relying solely on judgements. (pp. 10,11)

Summary

The literature found to be related to this study was focused on the areas of music performance proficiency needed for future music teachers and the procedures for attaining those proficiencies in a college setting. Descriptive statements were made either as results of research or as recommendations expressed by individuals considered to be experts in the field of music.

A recommended curriculum plan proposed in 1918 contained the suggestion that about half of the music education student's time should be spent in applied music study. During the mid-1930's the idea was proposed that the recognition of music as an academic area could be attained by
granting credit for applied music and that credit should be related to competency achievement; prior to that time, particularly in liberal arts colleges, academic credit was not usually given for performance.

The administrative practices of music units were comparable with those in other college departments to some extent. However, administrative problems unique to the standardization of applied music instruction were identified in a 1951 study; it was found that competent applied music teachers were not always able to meet institutional hiring requirements. The nature of music administrative problems was shown to be unrelated to institution size, according to a 1965 investigation.

In the 1950's several studies dealt with college requirements for applied music. One investigator concluded that the requirements in most schools showed good conformity to accrediting agencies' standards, while another reported many colleges falling short. It was reported that in state-supported schools some music administrators did not use entrance performance requirements because they were expected to maintain open admission policies. Poorly qualified students were eliminated by exit performance requirements.

Throughout the time between 1947 and 1965 several investigations resulted in recommendations that more undergraduate study time should be spent in applied music in order to better prepare students for public school music teaching.
In the mid-1960's several commentaries were centered on the theme of preserving the artistry of musical performance even though standardized music instruction is needed to assure the acquisition of technical skills. It was suggested that cognitive understanding achieved through performance of a well-chosen repertoire could help the student to perform perceptively.

During the 1960's and 1970's there was a shift in the focus of academic interest from applied music as such to success of applied music instruction as determined by the systems approach and competency-based education. More was written from the point of view of educational philosophy than of research reports.

The concept of the systems approach was adapted to applied music instruction as a problem-solving technique. Goals were selected and objectives stated in terms of desired terminal behaviors. From the objectives were derived the instructional steps, in effective sequence, needed to achieve the stated goals.

The ultimate application of the systems approach was interpreted as the achievement of sequentially progressive performance competencies. Included among competencies desirable for public school music teachers were several concepts beyond mere technical facility, such as musical understanding and stylistically significant performance. The composite goal was described as a competency which could be
identified in advance, structured deliberately in the instruction process, and evaluated as an observable terminal behavior.
CHAPTER III
METHOD

Selection of Study Population

Preparatory Steps

Prior to the selection of the study population the names and addresses of the 47 North Carolina institutions which offer baccalaureate degrees were obtained from the AACTE Directory 1976 (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976) (see Appendix A). A letter was sent to the Director of Admissions at each institution, requesting a copy of the 1976-77 academic catalogue. A second letter of request was sent to the six officers who had not responded within four weeks (see Appendix B). After another four-week period, telephone requests were used to secure the final two catalogues.

In order that a decision could be made from diverse points of view, the catalogues were studied by a committee chosen by the investigator, composed of (a) the chairman of a department of music, (b) a college instructor from an academic department other than music, and (c) a December, 1976 graduate with a baccalaureate degree in music education.

Selection Criteria

The committee used both positive and negative criteria in selecting the study population.
Positive criteria. Those schools were included which

1. Offered the Baccalaureate degree with a major in music education.

2. Had a department or school of music that functioned independently from a fine arts or humanities department head.

Negative criteria. Eliminated were those institutions in which the catalogue description included music study as any of the following:

1. A dependent division or program of a fine arts or a humanities department.

2. Enrichment opportunities for degree programs other than music when no degree in music was offered.

3. Part of a unique academic plan not related to traditional course distribution.

4. A specialized professional education program for music performers.

It was the consensus of the committee that 28 of the 47 institutions satisfied both of the positive criteria and were not eliminated by any of the negative criteria. The schools of music and departments of music designated as the study population were the music units of the 28 institutions listed in Appendix D.

Collection of Data

There were two sources of information: (a) published catalogue statements and (b) personal interviews with administrative heads of music units.
Catalogue Statements

Inspection of catalogues provided

1. Data for identifying the study population.

2. Data for frequency counts of specific requirements of applied music instruction.

3. The design for numbering and identifying specific levels of applied music study.

4. The systems for admission procedures, retention barriers, exit criteria, and applied music requirements structured for the baccalaureate degree in music education.

Personal Interviews

Plans were made for meeting with the music unit administrators of all but one of the members of the study population. In the one exceptional instance it was arranged by the music unit administrator that the Chairman of the Music Education Division would substitute for him.

A letter was sent to each music unit administrator explaining the study and requesting cooperation (see Appendix C). An itinerary was prepared so that approximate dates for the arrival of the investigator at each location could be predicted (see Appendix D). Appointments were made by telephone prior to the time set aside for visitation.

Information obtained from the personal interviews was recorded by the investigator on a questionnaire (see Appendix E). Each music unit administrator was asked to answer the same questions in the same sequence.
Questionnaire information provided

1. Verification of the music administrator's authority.

2. Evidence of full-time and part-time faculty involvement in applied music teaching.

3. Descriptions of direct or indirect control by the music administrator of applied music instruction.

4. Descriptions of examining juries.

5. Descriptions of policies concerning inclusion of sight singing or sight playing in the jury examination.

6. Determination of applied music requirements for the music education majors as compared to the applied music majors.

7. Descriptions of recital participation and attendance requirements.

The questionnaire was used also to supply details concerning departmental publications, printed statements of requirements and procedures, printed skills examination criteria, and adjudication form standardization for recording objective or subjective evaluations.

Without the knowledge of the individuals being questioned, an attitude survey was included as an extension of the interview. The music unit executives' attitudes toward the study were ascertained through observation by the investigator. In each case, the attitude was recorded on a scale of 1 to 7, which was designed by the investigator and which represented the following criteria: The music unit administrator
1. Was hesitant about granting interview time.

2. Granted interview time but assigned the actual conference to a subordinate.

3. Granted time, but with negative or critical comments.

4. Granted time willingly but raised questions about the worth of the study.

5. Granted time willingly but neither asked questions nor made comments beyond limits of the interview.

6. Granted time willingly; asked questions and encouraged discussion to extend beyond the requested half-hour interview time.

7. Granted time willingly; asked questions, encouraged discussion, and requested a copy of the finished study.

A scale rating of 1 was considered the least desirable and most negative; 2 was considered the most desirable and most positive; 4, with its combination of positive and negative descriptions, served as the average opinion.

Treatment of Data

Compilation Procedures

Representation of study population. All data were collected from 100% of the study population. In no instance was an experimental sample used to represent the total population. Therefore the data from both sources—catalogues and interviews—were presented as arithmetical frequencies, and they were evaluated without statistical tests for sampling significance. Compilation of data was by frequency counts and population compliance percentages. Means were
recorded when means were applicable to the particular frequency. The specific design of the frequency tables emerged from the character of the information as it related to the five divisional representations of the study population (SP). The divisions denoting the investigated institutions were characterized as

1. The total SP.
2. The public (state-supported) institutions SP.
3. The private institutions SP.
4. The NASM-affiliated SP (referred to as NASM).
5. The non-NASM-affiliated SP (referred to as non-NASM).

Figure 1 shows the percentage distribution of the SP divisions by comparison of the parts to the total and by separation of the two compound divisions—public/private and NASM/non-NASM.

**Figure 1**

Percentage Distribution of SP Divisions

|               | Total (100%) | Public (43%) | Private (57%) | NASM (39%) | non-NASM (61%) | Total, N=28 | Public, N=12 | Private, N=16 | NASM, N=11 | non-NASM, N=17 |
Overlapping of the SP divisions is shown in Appendix F, List Equivalents column. Of the 12 public institutions, 5 are NASM and 7 are non-NASM; of the 16 private institutions, 6 are NASM and 10 are non-NASM.

Preservation of institutional anonymity (see Appendix F). The following procedures were used:

1. The 12 public institutions were listed in random order and were then given letter designations A through L. The 16 private institutions were listed in random order and were then given letter designations M through Z, AA, and BB.

2. The 11 institutions which were either associate members or full members of NASM were listed in random order and were then given letter designations (A) through (K). The 17 institutions which did not belong to NASM were listed in random order and were then given letter designations (L) through (Z), (AA), and (BB).

3. The public/private compound list of the 28 SP did not appear in the same group order nor with the same letter designations in the NASM/non-NASM compound list of the 28 SP. While the same 28 SP were used in both compound lists, each single area of SP was treated as a mutually exclusive entity.

4. Only the letter designations were used in tabulating raw data so that institution names were not involved. These designations were reduced further to the five divisions of the SP for use in recording the findings.
Reconciliation of term credit systems. As of the spring term of 1977 there were three institutions represented in the SP in which instruction was organized on the quarter system. Because all of the three were in the process of changing to the semester system, the quarter system data were converted to semester system data. The ratio of three quarter hours to two semester hours was used in computing the conversion.

Evaluation

The criteria used for evaluating compliance were the NASM and North Carolina SDPI standards and guidelines as supported by the SACS. The areas of applied music instructional compliance were identified as the publication of

1. Descriptions of curricular offerings.
2. Specific objectives of individual applied music course competencies.

and as the requirement of

3. Skill in at least one area of music performance.
4. A selection of performance literature representative of past and present eras.
5. Development of technical skills adequate to support the performance of selected literature.
6. Structured performing experiences in theoretical and historical styles.
7. Structured experiences in solo and ensemble performances.
8. The ability to sing or play at sight.
Compliance to agencies' standards was presented as population percentages. The degrees of compliance were named by the investigator as high, medium, low, or unacceptable percentage levels. The percentage identities of the levels were obtained from the averaged opinions of 42 college teachers of all ranks. The opinions represented academic points of view from 14 departmental disciplines.

Each of the 42 teachers responded to an opinionnaire in which they expressed personal views of percentage ranking limits (see Appendix G). The resultant percentage of compliance averages were ranked

1. High, 100% to 83%.
2. Medium 82% to 61%.
3. Low, 60% to 40%.
4. Unacceptable, 39% to 1%.

The ranked averages of compliance were used as evidence in support of qualitative conclusions and recommendations relating to both specific areas of investigation and to general areas of compliance to evaluation agencies' standards and guidelines.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purposes of the study were to

1. Describe undergraduate requirements and evaluation procedures used for
   a. control of music performance quality,
   b. structure of performance progression toward standards established by the institutions, and
   c. achievement of expected competencies at various levels.

2. Show the possible significance of relationships between collegiate curricular practices and the standards and guidelines suggested by three accrediting agencies.

Information was reported in two categories: (a) that which was obtained from academic catalogues and (b) that which was assembled from personal interview questionnaires.

Relationships Computed from Catalogue Information

Control of Performance Quality

Some statements were found in academic catalogues which described entrance, retention, and exit requirements. Others were published in pre-matriculation materials which were mailed upon request to prospective students.

Entrance requirements. An initial assessment of performance quality was made from required auditions in
50% of the total SP for incoming freshmen and in 42% of the total SP for transfer students. Higher percentages of audition requirements were found in public and NASM institutions than in private and non-NASM institutions. Auditions were used either for admission or for placement purposes and in some instances for both. One music unit, classified as private and NASM SP, required a personal interview in addition to an audition for both admission and placement.

Five institutions qualified entrance requirements with statements such as:

1. Admission evaluation is made at the close of a student's second semester.

2. Admission may be of a probationary classification but only for two semesters.

3. Admission evaluation is based on the successful performance of a published list of keyboard and instrumental competencies.

The percentage relationships among the various audition requirements are summarized in Table 1.
### Table 1

**Required Entrance Auditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentages of SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total SP Auditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N=28)</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public (N=12)</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private (N=16)</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NASM (N=11)</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>non-NASM (N=17)</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N=28)</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public (N=12)</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private (N=16)</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NASM (N=11)</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>non-NASM (N=17)</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** In some institutions auditions were required both for admission and for placement; therefore the sums of percentages for the two audition purposes do not equate with total percentages for SP divisions.

Retention practices in applied music included (a) probationary period examinations, (b) first- or second-year barrier examinations, and (c) recital performance.
requirements. Of the SP institutions that had an open admission policy, five required an applied music examination for admission and placement at the end of the freshman year and two required a similar examination at the end of the sophomore year (see Table 2).

Table 2

Percentages of SP Which Use Probationary Period Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>End of 1st Year</th>
<th>End of 2nd Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty institutions required an applied music barrier examination at the end of the sophomore year. The results of this examination were used in deciding whether or not a student would be permitted to continue into upper-level study. Percentage relationships of SP institutions which use this retention practice are shown in Table 3.
Table 3

Percentages of SP Which Use Upper Division Barrier Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recital performance requirements were also included as retention practices. Participation in studio recitals, or informal divisional seminars, was required in 25% of the total SP. Performance in general afternoon or evening recitals consisting of a variety of individual presentations was required in 39% of the total SP. In 18% of the SP music units a solo junior recital was required (see Table 4).

**Exit procedures.** In 22 (78%) of the 28 SP music units a solo senior recital was required before graduation. The percentage distribution of this exit requirement is given in Table 5.
Table 4

Percentages of SP Which Require Recital Performance as Retention Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Types of Recitals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Senior Recital Exit Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structuring Performance Progress Toward Established Standards

Of the 28 academic catalogues representing the total SP, 23 (82%) did not show any description of applied music instruction. Three of the catalogues (11%) included general descriptions of music literature to be studied (see Table 6).
Achievement of Levels of Expected Competencies

The academic catalogues from 2 (7%) of the 28 SP institutions included descriptive information which outlined instructional levels of competencies to be achieved (see Table 6).

Table 6
Catalogue Descriptions of Applied Music Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>No Description</th>
<th>Description of Study Literature</th>
<th>Description of Competency Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships Computed from Interview Information

Distribution of SP Students and Faculty

There were 2495 students enrolled in the 28 music units, 1793 of whom were majoring in music education. The relative proportions of music education majors to other music students are shown in Figure 2.

Of the 451 undergraduate faculty in the 28 music units, there were 68 (48 full time and 20 part time) who did not teach applied music (see Figure 3).
### Figure 2
Student Population Distribution

**Key:**
- Total Music Units Enrollments
- Music Education Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Music Education Majors</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N=2495 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N=1793 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N=1199 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N=1545 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM SP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N=950 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=655 (26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3

Undergraduate Faculty Distribution

Key: /

FT = Full Time
PT = Part Time

Total SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT, N=300</th>
<th>NAM, N=48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT, N=151</td>
<td>NAM, N=20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT, N=204</th>
<th>NAM, N=37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT, N=61</td>
<td>NAM, N=10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT, N=96</th>
<th>NAM, N=11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT, N=90</td>
<td>NAM, N=10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NASM SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT, N=170</th>
<th>NAM, N=32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT, N=92</td>
<td>NAM, N=14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

non-NASM SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT, N=130</th>
<th>NAM, N=16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT, N=59</td>
<td>NAM, N=6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control of Performance Quality

Descriptions of the music unit administrators included (a) their academic degrees, (b) the titles of their positions, (c) the type of secretarial assistance which they used, and (d) their policies concerning direct or delegated control.

Of the 28 unit executives, 4 (14%) held the master's degree and 24 (86%), the doctor's degree; 25 (89%) were music department chairmen and 3 (11%), deans of schools of music. Percentage relationships of the various classifications within the SP divisions are given in Table 7.

Table 7

Descriptions of Music Unit Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty (71%) of the music unit administrators worked with the assistance of professional secretaries. The remaining eight (29%) used paid student helpers whose remuneration may or may not have been subsidized by the Federal Student Work-Study Program. Percentages of administrators with professional secretaries are shown in Table 8.

Table 8
Music Unit Administrators with Professional Secretarial Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 18 (64%) of the total SP the unit administrators maintained direct control of applied music requirements, while in 10 (36%) of the institutions the authority for decisions concerning requirements was delegated to the applied music divisions. Table 9 shows the percentage distributions among the various SP groups.

In some of the music units control of applied music requirements by the administrator was accomplished by the publication of unit handbooks. For further uses of the handbooks see Table 25.
Table 9
Control of Applied Music Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentages of SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Control by Unit Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information concerning control of performance quality was derived from interview questions on (a) entrance requirements, (b) retention practices, and (c) exit procedures.

Entrance requirements. The incidence of differences between catalogue descriptions of admission practices and the practices actually used is shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Admission Practices Different from Catalogue Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The differences are identified as follows:

1. No admission requirements were published in the catalogue but the music unit administrator had the authority to create his own admission standards.

2. College admission requirements were published in the catalogue but music personnel had admission authority over the published procedures.

3. College admission requirements and music unit admission standards were published in the catalogue but music unit admission procedures were mailed to prospective students upon request.

4. College admission requirements and music unit admission standards and procedures were published in the catalogue, but the unit administrator's description of actual practice revealed that the the music unit did not adhere strictly to published procedures.

One of the necessary procedures for the practical application of entrance requirements was the choice of a way to assess musical performance. The percentage distribution of methods for evaluating entrance auditions (Table 11) for the total SP revealed that verbal objective methods were used more often than written objective methods. Two exceptions to the total SP distribution were:

1. The private SP, who used verbal subjective methods more than verbal objective methods.

2. The non-NASM SP, who used written subjective methods as much as they used written objective methods.
Table 11
Percentage Distribution of Methods for Evaluating Entrance Auditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Evaluation Procedures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Subjective</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Written Subjective</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two or more of the evaluation procedures were used in various combinations by some institutions; therefore the sums of percentages for distribution of procedures do not equate with total percentages of SP which require entrance auditions (see Table 1).

Objective procedures (both verbal and written) followed structured critique designs.

Ten music units (36% of the total SP) offered non-credit levels for applied music study to (a) continuing students who were beginning a new secondary area of applied music study, and (b) students who were granted probationary
admission and were not yet placed on an acceptable level of applied music study (see Table 12).

Table 12

Percentages of SP Which Use non-Credit Levels for Beginning Applied Music Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention practices included (a) recital attendance requirements, (b) applied music requirements for music education majors as compared to performance major requirements, (c) required hours of practice for each semester hour of applied music instruction, (d) type and frequency of periodic performance evaluations, (e) required special barrier examinations, (f) requirements of primary and secondary applied music performance areas, (g) opportunities for structured honors levels, (h) ensemble performance, and (i) recital participation requirements.

Recital attendance as a retention procedure was an area which had total SP (100%) participation. All schools required students to attend concerts and recitals; the
schools differed, however, in definition of the word *require* and in statements of the number or description of the recitals to be attended. Statements of exception or reservation accompanying the 100% response were:

1. Students are expected but not required to attend concerts and recitals.

2. Students are expected/required to attend only a certain percentage of the projected total number of recitals or concerts.

3. Students are expected/required to attend only those concerts and recitals that relate to their individual major performance area, as designated by the applied music teacher.

4. Students may be excused from attending performances only by the music unit administrator.

5. The applied music teachers have the authority to make semester grade adjustments if the student is not meeting attendance expectations requirements.

6. The music unit administrator has the authority to add penalty semester hours to the total hours required for graduation if the student is not meeting attendance expectations/requirements.

Four schools (14% of the total SP) reported the same requirements in applied music for music education majors and for music performance majors. All of the four were non-NASM SP; three were private SP and one was public SP. The
remaining 24 music units had different requirements for the two groups. The major reported differences were:

1. Because of the required professional education and student-teaching block semester, the music education major is required to have only seven semesters of applied music study while the performance major is required to have eight semesters.

2. While both receive the same number and the same length of lessons in each semester, the music education major is required to earn one or two semester hours of credit while the performance major is required to earn three or four semester hours of credit for the lessons.

3. Music education majors sometimes spend up to one-half of their study time in private study and the remainder of the time in group, class, or seminar study. This is not true for performance majors.

4. Fewer public performances are required of music education majors than of performance majors.

5. Junior and senior recitals are optional for some music education majors but required of all performance majors.

Twenty-five music units (89% of the total SP) required a specified number of weekly practice hours. The 25 music units reported various number of required practice hours, with an average of 6.1 hours per week for the total
SP. Distribution of the requirement in the various SP divisions is recorded in Table 13.

Table 13
Practice Hours Requirement

| SP Divisions | Distribution of Requirement | Average Weekly Hours Required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hours of required weekly practice are stated per semester hour of applied music credit.

Periodic evaluations of musical performance were used as a retention practice by the 28 music units of the total SP. However, there was variation in the times for evaluation, the types of evaluation, and the composition of the judging teams used. In one institution the assessment was made only by the private teacher. The most frequently used method of evaluating music performance was by a faculty adjudication team at the end of each semester. Both the public SP and the NASM SP reported a 100% use of the semester jury examination.
One institution used level examinations at intervals of readiness by the student, not necessarily related to ends of semesters. Percentage distributions of the various methods are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14
Percentage Distribution of Methods for Evaluating Music Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Semester Evaluations</th>
<th>(Jury) Level Examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By Private Teacher</td>
<td>By Faculty Judging Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Music unit administrators assigned ratings in rank order to a list of eight evaluation criteria for judging the quality of musical performance. The averages of the opinion ratings are given on a scale of 1 (not important) to 7 (most important) (see Table 15).
Table 15


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisionsa</th>
<th>Accomplishment by time or Competency Level</th>
<th>Preconceived Standard of Performance</th>
<th>Estimation of Future Success</th>
<th>Lesson Attendance Record</th>
<th>Student Attitude</th>
<th>Practice Time Record</th>
<th>Previous Performances or Tapes of Performances</th>
<th>Musicality of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=26)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=14)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=15)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSince two of the 28 SP institutions did not use jury examinations the numbers in the SP Divisions are at variance with those used in other tables: Total SP is 26, not 28; Private SP is 14, not 16; and non-NASM SP is 15, not 17.
In the opinion of the administrators, musicality of the performance was the most important criterion, followed by student accomplishment and preconceived standards of performance.

The requirement of sight singing or sight playing as part of the jury examination is shown in Table 16. Of the 28 total SP, 8 (29%) required performance of music at first sight. Percentage distributions are recorded for the various SP divisions.

**Table 16**

**Requirement of Sight Singing or Sight Playing as Part of Jury Examination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applied music barrier examinations were used at different times in the study continuum by the various SP divisions. Of the total SP the largest number, 6 (21%) required a barrier examination prior to the junior year (see Table 17).
Table 17
Percentage Distribution of Applied Music
Barrier Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Annually</th>
<th>Prior to Sophomore Year</th>
<th>Prior to Junior Year</th>
<th>Prior to Student Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the 28 music units required the selection of a principal study area in applied music. Twenty-two (78% of the SP) required students to study in a secondary performance area. Keyboard performers were required to register for vocal study by 20 music units (71%). Non-keyboard performers were required to register for keyboard study also by 71%. Those schools which did not require secondary applied music study structured keyboard and voice performance proficiency standards to be accomplished before a degree would be granted. Secondary instrument requirements are summarized in Table 18.
Table 18
Secondary Instrument Requirements
(Percentages of SP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>for non-Keyboard Performers</th>
<th>for Keyboard Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designated as Piano</td>
<td>Designated as Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight institutions (28% of the total SP) offered honor levels of study for the exceptionally advanced student. (see Table 19).

Table 19
Percentages of SP Which Offer Honor Levels of Applied Music Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ensemble participation was required by 100% of the total SP. Twenty-six (93%) of the 28 music units required students to participate in the ensemble related to their principal performance area. Two institutions (7%) permitted students to choose any ensemble. The ensemble requirement was interpreted to mean performance in large choral or instrumental groups for 26 of the 28 total SP. Two administrators reported that small or chamber ensemble performance was required as part of applied music instructional syllabi.

Table 20 presents the percentage distribution of ensemble performance requirements.

Table 20
Percentage Distribution of Requirement
for Large Ensemble Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Required to be Related to Principal Performance Area</th>
<th>Permitted to be Chosen from any Performance Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-one (75\%) of the total SP required students to participate in informal studio recitals. Twenty (71\%) of the total SP required students to perform a designated number of times in afternoon or evening general recitals. Two units required junior recitals of a half-hour duration, and two units did not require recital performance as a retention practice (see Table 21).

Table 21

Percentage Distribution of Administrators' Statements Concerning Recital Performance Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>None Required</th>
<th>Types of Recitals Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Some institutions required more than one type of recital; therefore the sums of percentages for the various possible types do not equate with total percentages for SP divisions.
Exit requirements. The requirements for graduation described by music unit administrators included the professional block and student-teaching semester, the senior recital requirement, and the scope of choice of applied music study and performance literature. The percentages of these exit requirements used by the various SP divisions are reported in Table 22.

Table 22
Requirements for Graduation
(Percentages of SP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Professional Block Semester</th>
<th>Senior Recital</th>
<th>Performance of Comprehensive Music Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An exit level for vocal study is a proficiency which requires voice principals to be able to sing in the English, Italian, German, and French languages. Of the total SP, 23 (82%) music units used this exit proficiency standard.(see Table 23).
Table 23
Applied Voice Requirement of Performance in Four Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aEnglish, Italian, German, and French.*

Five (18%) of the 28 total SP required a minimum exit level of musical performance competency. Table 24 shows the percentages of the various SP divisions which used this exit procedure.

Table 24
Percentages of SP which Have Minimum Exit Levels of Performance Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structuring Performance Progress Toward Established Standards

The devices used by music units to provide designs for student progress included (a) music unit handbooks, (b) statements of instructional objectives, (c) planned communication methods for informing students of results of performance evaluations, and (d) the use of structured critique forms for performance evaluation.

Departmental or music school handbooks were printed by 13 (46%) of the total SP. These handbooks were made available to both faculty and students (see Table 25).

Table 25
Available Music Unit Handbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourteen (50%) of the total SP administrators reported that applied music instructional objectives were available to the students. Percentage distribution of the SP divisions is given in Table 26.
Table 26

Applied Music Instructional Objectives
Available to Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 shows percentage distribution of methods for communicating results of performance evaluation to the students. Eight (73%) of the 11 NASM SP preferred to communicate in writing from structured critique forms. Fourteen (50%) of the total SP used the same method. Eight (66%) of the 12 public SP, 6 (37%) of the 16 private SP, and 6 (35%) of the 17 non-NASM also used written communications from structured critique forms. Other methods of communication are expressed as percentages of the SP divisions.

The sources for critique form designs are reported in Table 28. Of the 21 music units which provided written forms for use by the evaluation examiners during jury examinations of performance quality, 81% used forms designed by the applied music divisions. Three schools (14%) used critique forms designed by the entire faculty of the music unit. One unit used standardized NIMAC adjudication forms (see Appendix H).
Table 27
Percentage Distribution of Methods for Communicating Results of Performance Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Kept Secret</th>
<th>Shared with the Student</th>
<th>N. A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From Memory</td>
<td>From Unstructured Written Critiques</td>
<td>From Structured Critique Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbally</td>
<td>Verbally</td>
<td>In Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Some institutions used more than one communication method; therefore the sums of percentages for the various methods do not equate with total percentages for SP divisions.

aNot Applicable.
Table 28
Percentage Distribution of Sources for Critique Form Designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Applied Music Faculty</th>
<th>Total Music Unit</th>
<th>NIMAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=21)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=11)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=10)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=9)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=12)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Since 7 of the 28 SP institutions did not use written critique forms the numbers in the SP divisions are at variance with those used in other tables: Total SP is 21, not 28; Public SP is 11, not 12; Private SP is 10, not 16; NASM SP is 9, not 11; and non-NASM SP is 12, not 17.

\(^b\)Forms designed and prepared by the faculty of the applied music division.

\(^c\)Forms designed and prepared by a committee representing the total music unit.

\(^d\)Standardized forms published by the National Interscholastic Music Activity Commission (NIMAC), a committee of MENC (see Appendix H for sample forms).
Achievement of Levels of Expected Competencies

Of the 28 total SP, 17 (61%) reported that applied music teachers used traditional verbal methods of teaching. Five units (18%) provided instructional objectives for student use; and seven (25%) structured teaching methods within a system of behavioral competencies which were observable and measurable (see Table 29).

Table 29

Percentage Distribution of Instructional Designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions</th>
<th>Traditional Methods&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Descriptive Objectives&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Behavioral Objectives&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. In some institutions more than one design was used; therefore the sums of percentages for the various designs do not equate with total percentages for SP divisions.

<sup>a</sup> Traditional verbal methods of studio teaching.

<sup>b</sup> Written objectives descriptive of requirements.

<sup>c</sup> Written objectives designed to represent observable and measurable competencies.
One institution, a private, non-NASM SP, reported using a competency-based level system of applied music instruction that was not dependent upon semester registration for movement from one level to the next. In this situation an examining jury of prescribed faculty was convened whenever the applied music instructor and the student expressed a readiness for the student to pass the competencies structured for a particular level.

The attitudes of the music unit executives toward the interviewer and his investigation are shown in Figure 4. Attitude is expressed on a scale of 1 to 7: 1 represents a least desirable and negative attitude; 7 represents a most desirable and positive attitude; and 4 represents an arithmetical mean of attitudes.

Figure 4
Averages of Attitude Scores of Music Unit Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Divisions (Executives)</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=28)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=12)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=16)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM (N=11)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-NASM (N=17)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Summary
The general purpose of the study was to investigate applied music practices and to evaluate the practices in terms of degrees of compliance to given criteria. Information and data were obtained from three evaluation agencies' handbooks and from 28 college music units in the state of North Carolina.

The information and data were related to the applied music instruction practices for those students who were earning baccalaureate degrees in music education.

The investigator tabulated and classified information from 28 academic catalogues and 28 interview questionnaires. The information from both sources is organized into three general classifications:

1. Control of performance quality.
   a. Entrance requirements.
   b. Retention practices.
   c. Exit procedures.

2. Structure of performance progress toward established standards.

3. Achievement of levels of expected competencies.

The observations and findings from catalogues and interviews are summarized in the same three classifications. Percentages of inclusion, participation, and compliance are ranked
verbally as high (83% to 100%), medium (61% to 82%), low (40% to 60%), and unacceptable or very low (1% to 39%).

The study population (SP) appeared in five overlapping divisions: the total SP represents 100%; public SP, 43%; private SP, 57%; NASM SP, 39%; and non-NASM SP, 61% of the whole. The 28 institutions hire a total of 300 full-time and 151 part-time faculty. Of these numbers only 48 full-time and 20 part-time faculty persons were not teaching some degree of applied music. That meant that 84% of full-time faculty and 87% of part-time faculty were involved, to an unknown degree, in teaching applied music.

In the Spring semester of 1977 the music unit administrators estimated that 2495 students were enrolled in the total SP. Of this number, 72%, or 1793 students are music education majors earning baccalaureate degrees. The proportion of music education majors to non-music education majors changes very little in SP category divisions. In the public institutions music education majors represent 74% of the total public institution music students; in private institutions they represent 69% of the total, in NASM institutions they represent 74% of the total; and in non-NASM institutions they represent 68% of the total.

Among the music unit administrators, 86% of the total SP hold a doctoral degree and 14% a master's degree. Position titles are distributed as 89% chairmen of departments of music and 11% as deans of schools of music. A
medium (64%) of the administrators directly control applied music instruction. The remaining individuals control only indirectly while delegating direct control to the applied music instructional divisions. It is the private institution administrators who maintain direct authority to the greatest degree (88%).

Seventy-one percent of the SP executives function with professional secretarial assistance. Of the public SP, 100% and of the NASM SP, 91% use professional secretaries. The percentages drop to 50% and 57% respectively for private SP and non-NASM SP. The remaining SP administrators use hired student helpers who may or may not be a part of Federal Assistance Work Study Programs.

**Summary of Accrediting Agencies' Standards**

The three agencies used in the study are NASM, SDPI, and SACS.

NASM suggests, in its *Handbook 1976*, that an initial step in music performance quality control is the determination of the level of performance achievement acceptable as an entrance requirement. "Since the high school record does not usually give evidence of competence in performance" (NASM, 1976, p. 23), the organization urges each member institution to require a tape recording or a personal audition to support the applicant's worth for admission.
The admission procedures should be broadly designed in order to include application for advanced standing, and for admission by transfer of credits.

SDPI and SACS define the needs for a published admission policy. They also suggest that the policy should be designed to show how an applicant's previous school record supports his choice of an intended area of study. While they do not require the admissions design suggested by NASM, SDPI and SACS do support designing admissions speciality in those disciplines, such as music, where unique preparation is desirable.

NASM states also that music performance competencies for the music education major should be the same basic competencies required of all musicians. These competencies fall into three categories:

1. Performance ability in at least one major area that must be developed to a highest level of personal skill. Supportive competencies for the development are:
   a. Performance of music from all stylistic eras represented in the literature for the particular performance concentration.
   b. Development of performance skills that will substantiate the literature choices.
   c. "The ability to read at sight" (NASM, p. 26).
   d. Experience in solo performance.

2. Experience in both large and small ensembles related to the area of specialization during the baccalaureate program.
3. Experience in secondary performance areas. For most students, piano proficiency should be encouraged (NASM, 1976).

This investigator makes special use of at least three aspects of the criteria:

1. NASM uses the word competencies to describe applied music criteria, and, in so doing, suggests its approval of music performance instruction supported by a system of objectives designed as observable and measurable tasks.

2. NASM includes music reading at sight as a performance competency which is interpreted in this study to mean sight-singing or sight-playing as a task related to but existing separate from the traditional sight-singing extension of a music theory class. As a skill separate from theoretical exercise, sight-performance is treated as a studied part of applied music performance evaluation.

3. NASM suggests that students must have experience in large and small ensembles. The must have statement gives sufficient reason for investigating small ensemble as well as large ensemble requirements.

The North Carolina SDPI supports competency-based instructional programs. Both SDPI and NASM include music performance as one of the areas of accreditation, and no statement or implication is made that the teaching of applied music is an area separate from competency-based structuring.
SDPI, as does NASM, requires each student to have at least one area of performance specialization in which he can interpret compositions representative of past and present stylistic eras. Small ensemble experience, as suggested by NASM, should be structured into studio-study and not merely related to general large ensemble survival requirements. SDPI, in its competency-based instructional design, further suggests that applied music study should be considered in terms of task-accomplishment standards rather than of time-segment accomplishments.

SDPI also requires that competency proficiency be satisfied by accepted evaluation procedures. NASM describes such procedures as entrance requirements; retention, term, or barrier examinations; and exit requirements and evaluations.

SACS supports the standards of NASM and SDPI in the following requirements:

1. Curricular offerings should be clearly and accurately described in printed materials.

2. Instructional techniques and specific objectives of individual courses should be purposeful, with principal focus on the education of the student.

3. A file of course descriptions should be maintained.

4. Technical programs should clearly define levels of instruction by admission requirements, course content,
and minimal acceptable exit levels of competencies.

5. Process of instruction should be structured so that each student can understand the aims, requirements, and methods of evaluation used for each course.

As did NASM and SDPI, SACS included applied music study within its scope of evaluation by not stating such study to be exceptional.

A synthesis of the agencies' requirement standards for music education majors is stated as the following criteria:

1. Standards may be maintained by structured admission policies, retention procedures, and exit requirements and evaluations.

2. There should be at least one principal area of skilled performance with the same basic competencies in applied music as required of other music majors.

3. Applied study literature should be chosen from all stylistic eras available for the performance medium.

4. Students should have the ability to perform at first sight of musical materials.

5. Students should have experience in solo, small ensemble, and large ensemble performance.

6. There should be a required secondary performance area: piano, voice, or a fretted string instrument are recommended.
7. Applied music instruction should be designed as observable and measurable competencies.

8. Competency levels may be evaluated as task accomplishment independent from term or time durations.

**Summary of Findings As Relationships of Practices to Criteria**

To determine the extent to which applied music practices relate or comply to evaluation criteria established by the accrediting agencies, institutional applied music regulatory standards are related as percentages of compliance to the eight criteria synthesized from agencies' requirements, standards, and suggested competencies.

In this study, to require means that there is a written statement published by the music unit which states that a particular procedure must be complied with before a degree will be granted.

1. Standards may be maintained by music units, structured admission policies, retention procedures, and exit requirements and evaluations.

Structured admission policies are low (50%) for the total SP but moderate for both the public SP (75%) and the NASM SP (64%) as far as requiring entrance auditions are concerned. For incoming transfer students the policies are
a low 42% for the total SP, a low 58% for the public SP, an unacceptable low of 31% for the private SP, a moderate 64% for the NASM SP and an unacceptable low of 29% for the non-NASM SP. The auditions are structured for admissions or placement or both.

All evaluation procedures for entrance auditions show a low or unacceptable degree of structured objectivity. Retention procedures are supported by a high 89% of the total SP requiring semester or level performance evaluation. One hundred per cent of both public SP and the NASM SP require semester music performance examinations. The private SP requires semester examinations by a medium 81%, and the non-NASM SP by a medium 82%. One school requires a jury performance examination at the completion of each competency level regardless of term or semester time. Barrier examinations for each year are used only to a very low degree, but an upper level barrier applied music examination appears moderately used, 65% to 82%.

Recital performances as a retention structure vary with the type of recital. An unacceptable 7% of the total SP have no recital requirement. Informal studio recitals or seminars are required by a moderate 75% of the total SP. General afternoon or evening recital participation is required in 71% of the total SP and 7% of the total SP require a junior recital. A moderate 75% of the public SP
and of the non-NASM SP require students to perform on general recitals, while 69% of the private SP and 71% of the non-NASM SP have the same requirement. A high 87% of the private SP require students to perform in informal studio recitals. The same requirement is made by a low 58% of the public SP, and a moderate 73% and 76% respectively of the NASM SP and the non-NASM SP.

Structured exit procedures are defined as requirements and expected proficiencies that are presented as written music unit directives. All schools operate within an unacceptable percentage of stated minimum exit level of performance competence. Only a very low 18% of the total SP state minimum performance level acceptable for graduation.

There is disagreement between the interview information and the catalogue information regarding senior recitals as an exit requirement. Seventy-eight per cent of the catalogues list a required senior recital, but only 68% of the administrators admit to a senior recital requirement. All administrators report that a senior recital is either required or optional. A music education major may perform a senior recital, if he is so advised by his applied music teacher, in those cases where he is not actually required to perform.

The NASM SP requires by 100% that applied music performance literature be representative of all major musical
eras that apply to the medium of study. High percentages in this area are representative of all the SP with 93% for the total SP, 92% for the public SP, 94% for the private SP and 88% for the non-NASM SP.

A structured requirement that voice majors must be able to sing in English, Italian, German, and French is required by a moderate 82% of the total SP, a high 85% of the public SP, a moderate 81% of the private SP, a moderate 73% of the NASM SP, and a high 88% of the non-NASM SP.

All institutions require either piano and voice proficiency standards to be attained by students or passing grades in stated number of semesters of secondary performance study in piano and voice. Three schools permit a fretted stringed instrument proficiency to substitute for keyboard proficiency.

2. There should be at least one area of skilled performance supported by the same basic competencies in applied music is required of other music majors.

One hundred percent of the administrators require music education majors to develop an optimum skill in the performance of at least one chosen musical instrument or of voice. The requirements are supported by similar catalogue statements. Because of the professional block semester, 82% of the schools require seven semesters of study in the chosen
area rather than the eight semesters required of the non-
music-education majors. The basic requirements are similar
in that (a) recital and ensemble performance are available
as options when not as requirements; (b) a moderate 82% of
voice principals must sing in the same four languages
required of performance majors; (c) a high 93% of students
in their applied music areas must choose music from all
stylistic eras pertinent to available literature; and
(d) all students must be evaluated either at the completion
of a semester, a level, or a recital by a system that is
designed for all applied music performers in a particular
institution.

3. **Performance literature should be chosen from all stylica­
tic eras available for the performance medium.**

   This is complied with by a high 93% of the total SP.
The NASM SP report 100% compliance and the public SP report
92% compliance. The private and non-NASM report high com­
pliance of 94% and 88% respectively.

4. **Students should have the ability to perform at the first
sight of musical materials.**

   Only an unacceptably low 29% of the total SP
structure sight singing or sight playing as part of applied
music evaluation practices. Administrators report that sight
reading was a function of theory instruction, and, as such,
was not included as part of applied music instruction.

5. **Students should have experience in solo, small ensemble, and large ensemble performance.**

All schools provide for (either as a requirement or as an option) classroom and recital experience in solo performance. Only 2 schools, or an unacceptably low 7% of the total SP, require small ensemble experience by structuring such experience within levels of required applied music competencies. One hundred percent of the total SP require large ensemble participation, of which 93% require the participation to be in the principal performance area (or in a secondary area for keyboard and fretted string performance principals) and 7% permit the participation to be in the performance area of the student's choice.

6. **There should be a required secondary performance area: piano, fretted stringed instrument, or voice are recommended.**

This is complied with by a moderate to high degree. A moderate 78% designate that instrument to be either piano or a fretted stringed instrument, or voice. Private SP and NASM SP comply by a high 87% and 91% respectively. The public SP complies by a moderate 67% and the non-NASM SP by a moderate 71%. 
7. **Applied music instruction should be designed as observable and measurable competencies.**

Of the total SP only a very low 18% structure applied music lessons in written descriptions of objectives and a very low 25% structure such lessons in terms of observable and measurable behavioral competencies. In only 11% of the catalogues is there is a description of applied music study literature, and in only 7% of the catalogues are there descriptions of applied music required competency levels. The findings present an unacceptably low degree of compliance to this criterion. However, the administrators contradict these findings by reporting a slightly more acceptable, but still low 50% of the total SP which have written applied music instructional objectives available to the students.

8. **Competency levels may be evaluated as task accomplishment independent from term or time durations.**

Only one institution reported using a competency-based level system of applied music instruction that was not dependent upon collegiate registration for movement from one level to the next. In the reported system, an examining jury of prescribed faculty representation was convened whenever the applied music teacher and his student expressed a readiness to pass the competencies structured for a particular level.
Conclusions

After examining the data presented in this study, the investigator suggests that applied music study is an area that has a capacity for being either highly subjective and unstructured, highly objective and structured, or both in various combinations in problem assessments, problem solving, and evaluation procedures. To what extent, for what purpose, and with what advantages a highly subjective applied music teaching program can function are the materials for other studies. In this study, applied music instruction has been evaluated against criteria that were designed to set standards for the instruction. The standards suggest the use of objective structure, within which subjective decisions can be made according to teacher-student shared delimitations. The findings of the study reveal that the evaluation agencies have designed objective instructional methods as written behavioral competencies to be shared by music unit executives with applied music teachers and students. According to information found in agencies' handbooks, their suggested competencies are intended to regulate admission procedures, retention procedures, exit requirements and evaluation, and systems of instructional design.

The investigation reveals some administrative contradictions in four major areas:

1. Administrators' practices do not agree with catalogue information regarding admissions procedures.
2. Music unit practices do not agree with catalogue requirements regarding barrier examination.

3. Administrators' reports are not in agreement with catalogue requirements regarding senior recital performance.

4. Administrators do not agree with themselves when reporting to what extent written objectives are a required part of applied music instruction.

The percentages of compliance relationships of practices to criteria reveal those practices with a high compliance rating to be:

1. The requirement of at least one area of skilled performance;

2. The required frequency of applied music performance examinations in each semester or level;

3. The requirement that a student's music performance literature must be representative of the available major stylistic eras;

4. Required recital and concert attendance; and

5. Required solo and large ensemble participation.

The percentage of compliance relationships reveals those practices with a medium compliance rating to be:

1. The requirement of studio and general recital participation;

2. The requirement of a senior recital as an exit barrier; and

3. The requirement of studying in a secondary instrument, recommended as piano or voice.
The percentage of compliance relationships reveals those practices with a low compliance rating to be:

1. Structured admission policies that are not in contradiction with themselves;
2. Structured methods of evaluating admission auditions for incoming freshmen;
3. Structured objectives for applied music instruction;
4. Explanatory printed materials available as handbooks, written directives, etc.

The percentage of compliance relationships reveals that practices with an unacceptable compliance rating are:

1. Structured admission practices for transfer students;
2. Structured audition evaluation procedures for transfer students;
3. Published minimum performance exit levels;
4. Sight reading structured into applied music study;
5. Required participation in small ensembles;
6. Instruction designed as competency-based systems which are observable and measurable; and
7. An instructional level system that is not dependent upon term or time durations for completion.

This study shows that, for the investigated schools in North Carolina, the applied music practices such as (a) the number of performance evaluations, (b) the type of literature, (c) the recital participation requirements, (d) the recital attendance expectations, (e) the required solo and large ensemble participation, and (f) secondary instrumental
required proficiencies comply with the criteria to either a high or a moderate degree.

Except for deficiencies in required small ensemble participation and sight reading, the areas of low to unaccept­able compliance pertain to deficiencies in systems of instructional designs.

Structure systems are comparatively new to colleg­iate curricular planning. The SDPI published its competency-based program in 1973; NASM implied the requirement of competencies in its Handbook 1976; and SACS supported the new design in its 1974 manual.

Perhaps it is only those schools who have undergone recent evaluations by any or all of the accrediting agencies which are leading the way into competency-based curricular design which includes applied music instruction. By that logic, if the agencies continue their emphasis on competency-based curricular design, as more institutions prepare for future evaluations by the agencies, the percentages of compliance with structured task-oriented syllabi will rise. The study shows an institutional need for improvement in structured admission policies and audition evaluations; structured teaching objectives of observable and measurable behavioral design; structured institutional directives and guidelines; structured exit performance levels; and structured evaluation times that occur when a competency level is finished regardless of term or semester time duration.
Recommendations

If the raw data from the college catalogues and the personal interview questionnaires were available as a part of the study findings, a quick assessment of the uniqueness of each study institution could be possible. The individuality of institutional philosophies may act as a barrier in expecting standardized instructional practices. Nevertheless, on the basis of relationships of the findings of this study to the standards and guidelines of the evaluation agencies the following recommendations are made:

1. The music unit personnel of the study population should make a greater effort to structure observable and measurable competencies into:

   a. Admission procedures and audition evaluation criteria for incoming freshmen and transfer students;

   b. A system of retention procedures that complies by a high degree to the evaluation agencies' standards and guidelines;

   c. Music performance requirements that include the solo and ensemble opportunities suggested by the evaluation agencies;

   d. Sight reading as a part of applied music instruction;

   e. Minimum music performance exit levels;

   f. An applied music instruction level system that is designed to provide structure for many of the tasks that are left unstructured, and to provide evaluation opportunities at the completion of each level, whenever that may be.
2. Music unit directives should be in agreement with catalogue statements.

3. Each music unit should print a department or school handbook that contains
   a. Admission, retention, and exit procedures;
   b. Schedules of evaluations and barrier examinations;
   c. Course descriptions and requirements;
   d. Acceptable stage deportment; and
   e. Any other pertinent information not included in a college or university general catalogue.

4. Applied music divisions should not hold themselves outside of and separate from general institutional curricular designs and criteria controls. Applied music divisions can be considered examples of a synthesis of the three educational domains (Bloom, et al., 1956): they are cognitive in their attention to languages, literature, and historical style; they are affective in their attention to textual drama and to the affect of interplay between emotions and intellect on tone production and artistic designs; they are psychomotor by virtue of their exercises in performance techniques and skills. The investigator suggests that, as a synthesis of educational domains, applied music divisions have a responsibility to structure deliberate, objective systems of competency-based instruction as an aid to insuring academic recognition of the educational depth of applied music performance.
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APPENDIX A

Names and Addresses of North Carolina Institutions which offer Baccalaureate Degrees

Atlantic Christian College
West Lee Street
Wilson, North Carolina 27893

Barber-Scotia College
145 Cabarrus Avenue
Concord, North Carolina 28025

Belmont Abbey College
Belmont, North Carolina 28012

Bennett College
Greensboro, North Carolina 27420

Campbell College
Buies Creek, North Carolina 27506

Catawba College
Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

Davidson College
Davidson, North Carolina 28036

Duke University
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Elon College
Elon College, North Carolina 27244

Gardner-Webb College
Boiling Springs, North Carolina 28017

Greensboro College
Greensboro, North Carolina 27420

Guilford College
5800 West Friendly Avenue
Greensboro, North Carolina 27410

High Point College
High Point, North Carolina 27262
Johnson C. Smith University
100 Bettiesford Road
Charlotte, North Carolina 28216

Lenoir-Rhyne College
Hickory, North Carolina 28601

Livingstone College
West Monroe Street
Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

Mars Hill College
Mars Hill, North Carolina 28754

Meredith College
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Methodist College
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301

North Carolina Wesleyan College
College Station
Rocky Mount, North Carolina 27801

Pfeiffer College
Misenheimer, North Carolina 28109

Piedmont Bible College
716 Franklin Street
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101

Queens College
1900 Selwyn Avenue
Charlotte, North Carolina 28207

Sacred Heart College
Belmont, North Carolina 28012

Saint Andrew's Presbyterian College
Laurinburg, North Carolina 28352

Saint Augustine's College
1315 Oakwood Avenue
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Salem College
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27108

Shaw University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Box 712  
Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587  

University of North Carolina System  

Appalachian State University  
Boone, North Carolina 23608  

East Carolina University  
Greenville, North Carolina 27834  

Fayetteville State University  
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301  

North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University  
312 North Dudley Street  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411  

North Carolina Central University  
Durham, North Carolina 27707  

North Carolina School of the Arts  
200 Waughtown Street  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27107  

North Carolina State University at Raleigh  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607  

Pembroke State University  
College Street  
Pembroke, North Carolina 28372  

University of North Carolina at Asheville  
Asheville, North Carolina 28804  

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514  

University of North Carolina at Charlotte  
UNCC Station  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28223  

University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
1000 Spring Garden Street  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412
University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Wilmington, North Carolina 28401

Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, North Carolina 28723

Winston-Salem State University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27102

Wake Forest University
Reynolda Station
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109

Warren Wilson College
Swannanoa, North Carolina 28778
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Sample Letters of Request for Catalogues

Letter I

Dear Mr ____________:

Please send me a copy of your 1976-77 undergraduate catalogue.

I am writing a dissertation on the subject of music performance practices in North Carolina four-year colleges and universities. The study must start with collecting information from catalogues of the institutions. Your academic catalogue will have an important place in the study.

Being a department chairman, I am aware of the reluctance with which we mail out expensive publications. I would be willing to pay for your services.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

J. Ross Albert, Chairman
Department of Music
Atlantic Christian College
Letter II

Dear Mr. __________:

Please send me a copy of your 1976-77 undergraduate catalogue.

I am writing a dissertation on the subject of music performance practices in North Carolina four-year colleges and universities. The study must start with catalogue-listed requirements. Of the 48 institutions in the study, 40 have complied with a previous request by sending me catalogues. I still need your catalogue plus seven others.

Being a college person, I am aware of the reluctance we have to mail out expensive catalogues. I assure you that my needs are real. I would be perfectly willing to pay for your catalogue if necessary.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

J. Ross Albert, Chairman
Department of Music
Atlantic Christian College
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Sample Letter of Request for Interview

Lawrence Hart, Dean
School of Music
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412

Dear Dr. Hart:

In connection with a dissertation now in progress I should like to visit you, the head of the music unit of one of the schools included in my study.

The study is concerned with administrative practices relative to admission, retention, and exit requirements and evaluation procedures for applied music. The study population consists of those four-year colleges and universities of North Carolina that offer a music education baccalaureate degree in either a department or a school of music. I hope that the results of this inquiry will be of interest to all the colleges and universities in the state.

All information and data will be coded for the sake of protecting individual and institutional anonymity. The investigation will be based upon information obtained from undergraduate catalogues, unit bulletins, handbooks, syllabi, and interviews with unit administrators.

I should like to visit you sometime during the first ten days of February. I shall call you by telephone to arrange a time. At the interview I hope to be able to pick up copies of the printed materials, other than catalogues, which relate to music practices.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

J. Ross Albert, Chairman
Department of Music
Atlantic Christian College
Appendix D

Locations of Institutions to be Visited

1. Institutions in Order of Visitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>University Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Atlantic Christian College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>Fayetteville State University Methodist College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>Pembroke State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City</td>
<td>Elizabeth City State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mount</td>
<td>North Carolina Wesleyan College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Meredith College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Augustine's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>North Carolina Central University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>Bennett College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greensboro College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem</td>
<td>Salem College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winston-Salem State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>Lenoir-Rhyne College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa</td>
<td>Warren Wilson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars Hill</td>
<td>Mars Hill College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullowhee</td>
<td>Western Carolina University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Johnson C. Smith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Catawba College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livingstone College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map for Itinerary

Total miles traveled: 3041
Total time: 10 days
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Sample Music Unit Administrator Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data code:</th>
<th>J. Ross Albert Dissertation Music Unit Administrator Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. Name and degree

B. Title of Position

C. Title of Music Unit

D. Title of Institution

E. Number of Undergraduate Faculty; Full time ___ Part time __

F. Number of Faculty who do NOT teach Applied Music; Full time ___ Part time __

G. Organization of Applied Teaching (circle appropriate answer)

1. Semester System
2. Quarter System
3. Level System

H. 1. Estimated total number of Music Majors ______
2. Estimated total number of Music Ed. Majors ______

I. 1. Does the administrator have professional secretarial help? Yes ___ No ___
2. Does the administrator compile a music unit handbook? Yes ___ No ___
3. Is recital and concert attendance required of the students? Yes ___ No ___
4. Do the Music Education Majors have a professional block and student teaching semester? Yes ___ No ___

J. Does

1. the music unit head administer the requirements of applied music instruction? Yes ___ No ___
2. the division (voice, piano, string, etc.) administer the requirements of its area of instruction? Yes ___ No ___
3. responsibility of finding a jury for examination belong to a. student ______
   b. applied teacher ______
   c. applied division ______
4. a. the music education major have the same requirements as does the applied major? Yes ___ No ___
   b. If not, how do they differ? ______
5. the applied teacher give written course objectives to the student? Yes ___ No ___
   a. for total time of study ______
   b. at the beginning of each semester or quarter ______
6. the music unit structure a senior recital as an exit requirement? Yes _____ No _____
as an elective? Yes _____ No _____

7. the total literature in all applied divisions represent all stylistic eras available for the particular instrument of study: Yes ____ No ____

8. a voice principal have to sing in four different languages? English, French, German, Italian Yes ____ No ____

9. a voice principal sometimes elect to a. substitute another language for one of the above? Yes _____ No _____
b. add other languages to the above? Yes ____ No ____

10. the piano principal have to participate in ensemble performance? Yes _____ No _____

11. the piano principal count accompanying as an ensemble performance? Yes _____ No _____

12. the piano principal study a secondary instrument? Yes _____ No _____
   Not Required_______
   Required _________
   Particular instrument No_____
   (Name instrument) Yes_____

K. 1. Does the student who has taken no piano previous to college entrance receive credit for beginning piano study? Yes _____ No _____

2. Is this the policy in the case of voice? Yes _____ No _____

3. Is this the policy for the instruments of the orchestra or band? Yes _____ No _____

L. 1. What is the nature of the public performances required of music education majors in their primary performance medium? Check all that apply.
a. _______ No appearances required
b. _______ Participation in student recitals ____ times during the year
c. _______ Participation in informal studio recitals
d. _______ Presentation of junior recital (half recital)
e. _______ Presentation of senior recital (whole recital)
f. _______ Other: __________________________

2. Do you require music education majors to study in a second applied medium? Yes _____ No _____

3. Is this second medium usually specified as piano if not already studied as the primary instrument? Yes _____ No _____
4. Do you have applied music barrier or exit auditions in order to review the progress of all music education students? This is not to be confused with the regular semester examinations in applied music. If so, when are the hearings held?
   a. _______ None
   b. _______ At the end of each year
   c. _______ At the end of the probationary period
   d. _______ Prior to the sophomore year
   e. _______ Prior to the junior year
   f. _______ Prior to the senior year
   g. _______ Prior to student teaching assignment
   h. _______ Other

M. 1. Do you require a performance examination each semester covering the work of that period? If so, how is it administered?
   a. _______ No examination in applied music is given
   b. _______ Examined by a committee of the music faculty
   c. _______ Examination is given at completion of a level regardless of registration
   d. _______ Other

N. 1. On a rating scale of 0 to 7 (0 meaning does not apply and 7 meaning greatly influential) grade the following evaluation criteria:

On which of the following do you base the marks given in applied music?
   a. _______ Accomplishment assigned music
   b. _______ A preconceived standard of attainment
   c. _______ Your estimation of the student's future success in his medium
   d. _______ Attendance at lessons
   e. _______ Student attitude
   f. _______ Practice time record
   g. _______ Comparison of recordings the student made periodically during the semester.
   h. _______ Musicality of jury examination performance

2. For each half-hour lesson how many practice hours per week do you require?
   a. _______ Three
   b. _______ Four
   c. _______ Five
   d. _______ Six
   e. _______ Other
1. Do you require all music education majors to participate in some musical ensemble?  
   Yes ___ No ___

2. If yes, are they required to participate in both choral and instrument groups? Yes ___ NO ___

3. If yes, are they required to participate in only one type of ensemble related to applied music principle study? Yes ___ No ___

4. For how long is participation required?  
   a. ______ During the entire of residence  
   b. ______ Until _____ credits in ensemble are accrued

P. Do you consider a soloist with an accompanist to be an ensemble?  
   Yes ___ No ___

Q. At applied examinations do the jury members keep their evaluation grade criteria secret unto themselves?  
   a. ________ to share verbally, from memory, with the student?  
   b. ________ to share verbally, from critiques written down in unstructured manner, with the student?  
   c. ________ to share verbally, from structured critique forms with the student?  
   d. ________ to share in writing, from critiques written down in unstructured manner, with the student?  
   e. ________ to share in writing, from structured critique forms, with the student?  
   f. ________ not applicable

2. record their evaluation grade criteria as comments in structured competency areas on forms  
   a. ________ designed and prepared by the faculty of the applied division?  
   b. ________ designed and prepared by a committee representing the total unit?  
   c. ________ published by the National Interscholastic Music Activity Commission (NIMAC) a committee of MENC?  
   d. ________ reproduced from NIMAC stencils purchased from MENC  
   e. ________ not applicable

R. Are the evaluation procedures administered on all levels (i.e., the applied teacher to the administrative head) by  
   a. ________ verbal descriptions of teacher's individual opinions of needs.  
   b. ________ verbal descriptions of teacher's individual opinions of applied divisional needs.
c. _____ verbal descriptions of school or departmental needs and objectives.

d. _____ written descriptions of teacher's individual needs and objectives.

e. _____ written descriptions of applied divisional needs and objectives.

f. _____ written descriptions of school or departmental needs and objectives.

g. _____ not applicable

S. Are applied lessons structured on
a. _____ traditional verbal methods of instruction

b. _____ written objectives descriptive of requirements.

c. _____ written objectives designed to represent competencies.

T. If applied lessons are structured on objectives as competencies are they
a. _____ dependent upon semester or quarter registration for completion.

b. _____ dependent upon student readiness for completion regardless of semester's or quarter's end

c. _____ named Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior Study.

d. _____ named level 1, 2, 3, etc.

U. Are there minimal exit levels required at
a. _____ Freshman level

b. _____ Sophomore level

c. _____ Junior level

d. _____ Senior level

e. Level

V. Are there provisions for honor levels? Yes _____ NO _____

W. Are there non-credit levels for beginning students? Yes _____ NO _____

X. 1. Are the admission requirements different from catalogue descriptions? Yes _____ No _____

2. Are admission auditions judged by
a. _____ verbal subjective procedures

b. _____ written subjective procedures

c. _____ verbal objective procedures

d. _____ written objective procedures

e. _____ combination of a and b

f. _____ combination of c and d

Y. Is sight-singing and/or sight-playing a structured part of applied music performance evaluations?

Yes _____ No _______
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Coding System for Preservation of Institutional Anonymity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound List I</th>
<th>List II Equivalents</th>
<th>Compound List II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>(Public/Private)</td>
<td>(NASM/non-NASM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>(O)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Q)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>(K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private</th>
<th>(Public/Private)</th>
<th>(NASM/non-NASM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>(V)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>(O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
<td>(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>(W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>(BB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX G
Opinionnaire for Judging Ranks of Compliance to Standards

In order to verbalize value judgements about degrees of compliance to an agency's standards or guidelines by participating institutions, how would you rate compliance percentages? (Please use the terms high, medium, low, unacceptable)

| Percentage | 100 | 99 | 98 | 97 | 96 | 95 | 94 | 93 | 92 | 91 | 90 | 89 | 88 | 87 | 86 | 85 | 84 | 83 | 82 | 81 | 80 | 79 | 78 | 77 | 76 | 75 |
|------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 100        | 74  | 49 | 24 | 73  | 48 | 23 | 72  | 47 | 22 | 71  | 46 | 21 | 70  | 45 | 20 | 69  | 44 | 19 | 68  | 43 | 18 | 67  | 42 | 17 | 66  | 41 | 16 | 65  | 40 | 15 |
| 99         | 73  | 48 | 23 | 72  | 47 | 22 | 71  | 46 | 21 | 70  | 45 | 20 | 69  | 44 | 19 | 68  | 43 | 18 | 67  | 42 | 17 | 66  | 41 | 16 | 65  | 40 | 15 |
| 98         | 72  | 47 | 22 | 71  | 46 | 21 | 70  | 45 | 20 | 69  | 44 | 19 | 68  | 43 | 18 | 67  | 42 | 17 | 66  | 41 | 16 | 65  | 40 | 15 |
| 97         | 71  | 46 | 21 | 70  | 45 | 20 | 69  | 44 | 19 | 68  | 43 | 18 | 67  | 42 | 17 | 66  | 41 | 16 | 65  | 40 | 15 |
| 96         | 70  | 45 | 20 | 69  | 44 | 19 | 68  | 43 | 18 | 67  | 42 | 17 | 66  | 41 | 16 | 65  | 40 | 15 |
| 95         | 69  | 44 | 19 | 68  | 43 | 18 | 67  | 42 | 17 | 66  | 41 | 16 | 65  | 40 | 15 |
| 94         | 68  | 43 | 18 | 67  | 42 | 17 | 66  | 41 |
| 93         | 67  | 42 | 17 | 66  |
| 92         | 66  | 41 | 16 | 65  |
| 91         | 65  | 40 | 15 | 64  |
| 90         | 64  | 39 | 14 | 63  |
| 89         | 63  | 38 | 13 | 62  |
| 88         | 62  | 37 | 12 | 61  |
| 87         | 61  | 36 | 11 | 60  |
| 86         | 60  | 35 | 10 | 59  |
| 85         | 59  | 34 | 9  | 58  |
| 84         | 58  | 33 | 8  | 57  |
| 83         | 57  | 32 | 7  | 56  |
| 82         | 56  | 31 | 6  | 55  |
| 81         | 55  | 30 | 5  | 54  |
| 80         | 54  | 29 | 4  | 53  |
| 79         | 53  | 28 | 3  | 52  |
| 78         | 52  | 27 | 2  | 51  |
| 77         | 51  | 26 | 1  | 50  |
| 76         | 50  | 25 | 1  |
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MENC-NIMAC Adjudication Forms

1. Vocal Solo.
2. Piano or Harp Solo.
3. Wind Instrument Solo.
4. Percussion Solo and Ensemble.
5. Student Conductor.

*Used by permission of the copyright owner.
# Vocal Solo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order or Time of Appearance</th>
<th>Event No.</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name**

**School**

**City** _State_ _District_

**Selection**

---

Adjudication will grade points as follows: A, B, C, D, or E, or numerals, in the respective square. Comments must deal with fundamental principles and be answered. Music must be marked on music furnished to adjudicator.

---

- **TONE** (beauty, control)
- **INTONATION**
- **DICTION** (clearness of consonants, naturalness, purity of vowels)
- **TECHNIQUE** (accuracy of notes, breathing, posture, rhythm)
- **INTERPRETATION** (expression, phrasing, style, tempo)
- **MUSICAL EFFECT** (artistry, fluency, vitality)
- **OTHER FACTORS** (choice of music, stage presence and appearance)

---

*May be continued on other side.*

**Signature of Adjudicator**
## Piano or Harp Solo

(Choose One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order or Line</th>
<th>Event No.</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name:** Charlie Thorne  
**School:**

**City**  
**State**  
**District**

**Selection:**

---

**Adjudicator will grade principal firms A, B, C, D, or E, or numerals in the respective squares. Comments must deal with fundamentals principles and be constructive. Minor details may be marked on music furnished to adjudicator.**

**PERFORMER'S TONE** (beauty, control)

---

**TECHNIQUE** (finger dexterity, note accuracy, precision, use of pedals)

---

**INTERPRETATION** (contrast, mood, phrasing, rhythm, style, tempo)

---

**MUSICAL EFFECT** (artistry, fluency)

---

**OTHER FACTORS** (choice of music, stage presence and appearance)  
(For Harp: effects, grace, tuning)

---

**MEMORIZING** (when required)

---

*May be continued on other side.*

**Signature of Adjudicator:**
Wind Instrument Solo

Order or time of appearance  | Excel No.  | Class  | Date  | 19  |

Name,________________________

School______________________________

City_____________ State________ District________

Selection__________________________

Instrument________________________

Adjudicator will grade principal items, A, B, C, D, or E, or numerals, in the respective spaces. Comments must deal with fundamental principles and be constructive. Minor details may be marked on music furnished to adjudicator.

TONE (beauty, characteristic timbre, control) __________

intonation________________________

Technique (articulation, auxiliary fingerings, breathing, embouchure, facility, rhythm) __________

Interpretation (expression, phrasing, style, tempo) __________

Musical effect (artistry, fluency) __________

Other factors (choice of music, stage presence and appearance) __________

Memorizing (when required) __________

*May be continued on other sides.

Signature of Adjudicator_________
Percussion Solo and Ensemble

Order or time of appearance: ____________________________
Excm No. ________ Class ________ Date ________

Name of Ensemble: __________________________
Kind of Solo or Ensemble: __________________________

School: ___________________ City: ___________________ State: ___________ District: ___________

Selection: __________________________

Performers Names: __________________________

Adjudicator will grade principal items, A, B, C, D, or E, or numerals, in the respective squares. Comments must deal with fundamental principles and be constructive. Minor details may be marked on music furnished to adjudicator.

TONE: __________________________

RUDIMENTS — TECHNIQUE: __________________________

POSITION (body, hand, instrument): __________________________

INTERPRETATION (balance, dynamics, expression, phrasing, rhythm, tempo): __________________________

SIGHT READING (accuracy, dynamics, tempo): __________________________

MUSICAL AND GENERAL EFFECT (artistry, stage presence and appearance): __________________________

MEMORIZING (when required): __________________________

Signature of Adjudicator: __________________________

*May be continued on other side.
Student Conductor

Order or time of appearance: Date: 5.

Event No. Class

Name:

School: City: State:

Selection (1) Strain (1)
(2) (2)
(3) (3)

Technique (check list): 

(Adjudicator will indicate that these rudiments have been correctly performed. He will request demonstration of time signatures not called for in selections.)

Right hand
Left hand
Both hands
Preparatory beat
Release
2/4 time
3/4 time
4/4 time
6/8 time
Subdivided beats
Entrances

Style and Interpretation (check list): 

Did manner of conducting indicate character of music being played? 
Was point of beat unmistakably indicated? 
Were accents plainly indicated? 
Were attacks plainly indicated? 
Were releases plainly indicated? 
Were tempi in keeping with the character and mood of the movements played? 
Were dynamics clearly indicated?

General comments (check list): 

Confidence—assurance 
Bravado—cockiness 
Timidity—uncertainty 
Did conductor have organization under control?

Signature of Adjudicator: