University of the Pacific
Scholarly Commons

University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations

University Libraries

1977

A Comparison Of Music Programs In California Unified School Districts With And Without Music Leadership

Thomas David Hopkins
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds

 Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

Hopkins, Thomas David. (1977). *A Comparison Of Music Programs In California Unified School Districts With And Without Music Leadership*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation.
https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3218

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

A COMPARISON OF MUSIC PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty of the School of Education

University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

Thomas David Hopkins

May 1977

ABSTRACT

Problem

There was a need to determine if there was any evidence that people in official music leadership positions in school districts had performed a service which had demonstrated effects on various elements of the music program.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not school districts WITH music leaders, as compared to those districts WITHOUT music leaders, have more (1) music students, (2) music classes and performance group opportunities, (3) music staff and development opportunities, (4) adequate financial support and adequate inventories for music, and (5) goal orientation in music. Also, the study was to determine if students, teachers, administrators, and parents in districts WITH music leadership had more positive attitudes toward school music.

Procedures

A review of the literature was conducted to locate studies relevant to the effects of music leadership. Historical background to educational supervision and music leadership was reviewed along with trends in music education.

One hundred one out of 136 school districts responded to the survey which was designed to collect information concerning music programs. There were 36 districts WITH and 65 WITHOUT music leaders. An opinionnaire was submitted to gather data for analyzing opinions of students, teachers, administrators, and parents concerning their music

program. The 705 responses represented twenty school districts.

The instruments were field tested and were deemed reliable and valid. Cross validation and randomization was used in order to allow for generalizations. Comparisons were made between districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership. The data were tested to determine differences between the two district types.

Findings

Districts WITH music leadership were found to have significantly (1) more students involved in music, (2) more music performance group opportunities, (3) more staff development opportunities and more outside help, (4) more adequate musical instrument inventories, and (5) more goal orientation. Respondents to the opinionnaire in WITH districts had more favorable attitudes concerning their school district music programs. There were no differences in per capita expenses or student/staff ratios.

Conclusions

The study indicated that WITH districts displayed more expansive music opportunities. Causation was not determined. The data suggested that music leadership was a useful factor in the education of children. These findings have not been associated with higher per capita expenses or student/staff ratios. School districts might benefit from utilization of music leaders.

Implications for Further Study

Studies are needed (1) to isolate factors of causation per the above findings; (2) to determine more effective roles and methods of

music administration; and (3) to give more in-depth analysis to various parts of music programs which might be affected by music leadership.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is deeply grateful to his wife, Rose, for her patience and help, and especially for the hours of typing. He is thankful to his children, Karen, David, and Kevin, who have missed his attention. The writer is appreciative to all the members of the faculty and committee who have assisted and encouraged him through his studies. He would like to thank Dr. Thomas Cy Coleman for his advice and encouragement towards completing the Doctoral program, and Dr. Louis P. Nash for his valuable assistance in the distribution of the instruments. Special thanks are extended to Dr. Michael B. Gilbert, chairman of this dissertation committee, and to Dr. William C. Theimer for their hours of assistance and guidance toward the completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1971, at least sixty different titles were given to people who held positions in music coordinating, supervising, and consulting in the State of California.[1] These people were directly responsible to school officers that fell under thirty-four titles, such as Superintendent and Coordinator of Curriculum.[2] In the McQuerrey study, music supervisors responded that they functioned in at least seventy-six sub-function duties of budget, materials, facilities, personnel, curriculum, students, professional, community and administration.[3] Dawson also referred to the diffuse nature of the role of music leadership in the public schools.[4] Thus, the role of music leadership has been of a heterogeneous nature. McQuerrey categorized these roles under the basic titles of Coordinator, Consultant, Supervisor, Director, Specialist, and others.[5] Snyder[6] and

---

[1]Lawrence McQuerrey, Marian Hansen, and Lawrence Durflinger, "A Report of the Duties and Activities of the Music Supervisory Personnel in the State of California." (Stockton, California: The Department of Music Education, Conservatory of Music, University of the Pacific, 1971), pp. 40-41. (Xeroxed.)

[2]Ibid., p. 42. [3]Ibid., pp. 5-38.

[4]Norman E. Dawson, "Roles of Music Supervisors in Selected School Districts," Journal of Research in Music Education, XIX (Summer, 1971), 50-52.

[5]McQuerrey, op. cit., pp. 40-41.

[6]Keith D. Snyder, School Music Administration and Supervision (2d ed.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965), p. 7.

Weyland[7] referred generally to the title, Supervisor. For the purposes of this dissertation, the terms "leader" and "leadership" have been used. The author has defined the district music "leader" as the person who is musically trained and directly responsible for the district music program. "Leadership" was defined as the state of being a leader, or the act of directing human energy within an organization.[8] These terms were used because they included all titles and roles of directing music education, whereas other terms did not. Whatever the title or role, the music leader acted in a capacity to help facilitate a total music program; he existed to assist people in developing and/or maintaining music programs.

In this study, the exact function of music leadership was not the primary focus. The focus was on the effects of music leadership. The main questions asked were: "Has music leadership been a necessary and useful force in music programs?" "Have schools with music leadership displayed more music opportunities for children than schools displayed without this leadership?" "Have the people in schools with music leadership reflected more positive opinions of their music programs than the people in schools without music leadership?"

A national conference on state music supervision suggested that supervision should be expanded.[9] The recommendations included expansion

---

[7]Rudolph H. Weyland, A Guide to Effective Music Supervision Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co. Pub., 1968), p. 3.

[8]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (3d ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1975), pp. 48-52.

[9]Roger P. Phelps, National Conference to Improve the Effectiveness of State Supervision of Music, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, January 1966. (ERIC ED 010 412)

of music supervision not only at the state level, but also in local districts. Marsh pointed out a need for not only county supervision but general expansion of this administrative function.[10] Teacher associations and unions have attacked supervision as being financially burdensome and have recommended cutbacks of administrators.[11] Music leaders have been among those on lists of suggested cutbacks. Otherwise, a review of the literature seems devoid of comments opposing music leadership. The literature has been heavy with reports, texts, and recommendations for supervision of music. The music leader and his job have been analyzed in great detail. However, statistical studies on the effectiveness of music supervision on children and curriculum are difficult to find. Thus, a need to determine the effectiveness of music leadership exists. If districts with such leadership did reflect more effective programs, this would warrant the inclusion and/or continuance of that office.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In a time of financial and educational accountability, many programs (including curricula and materials) and personnel have been cut from education.[12] Many educational programs and personnel that have

---

[10]Warren C. Marsh, "The Role of the County Music Consultant in California" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1967), p. 170.

[11]Stockton Federation of Teachers, "Administrative Overhead," in open letter to Superintendent William Carey, (Stockton, California, March 17, 1976). (Mimeographed.)

[12]Music Educators National Conference, "Music Survival," Music Educators Journal, LXIII (February, 1977), pp. 45-50.

not been cut are now under scrutiny and their merit in terms of priority is now being questioned. As mentioned above, the office or job often headed under the name "music supervision" has been one of these. The problem was to determine if there was any evidence that people in these positions had performed a service which demonstrated effects on various elements of the music program.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Specifically, the problem was to determine whether or not school districts WITH music leaders, as compared to those WITHOUT music leaders, had (1) more students in the music program, (2) more music classes, performance groups, programs, festivals and other performance opportunities, (3) more music staff and workshops for the staff, (4) more adequate amounts of financial support, musical instruments, facilities, and other equipment needed to run a music program, and (5) specifically stated district music goals. Qualitatively, there existed a need to pool students, teachers, administrators, and parents to see if districts WITH music leadership had reflected more positive attitudes toward school music programs.

Rationale for the Problem

Mark Shedd suggested that music has had a positive place in our society and our school curriculum. He suggested the importance of music within "the whole of the school experience."[13] Sommers stated that five

---

[13]Mark Shedd, (Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia). Excerpt from "Music Outside the Schools." (Stockton, California: reprinted courtesy Dr. Gaylord A. Nelson, Superintendent San Joaquin County Schools), (September, 1968), p. 3. (Mimeographed.)

qualities are instilled in children through music. He listed concentration, mental discipline, mathematical precision, perseverance, and cooperation.[14] Snyder[15] and Weyland[16] have made very positive comments about music in the schools. The absence of statements in opposition to music in the schools seems to place it as an important element in the school curriculum. Labuta outlined methods of illustrating the accountability of music instruction.[17] The writers of the Music Framework pointed out the relevancy of music education as a basis for lifelong enrichment.[18]

Snyder spoke of administrative functions in music supervision and said, "No organization can operate efficiently and effectively unless it lays thorough and systematic plans."[19] Part of this planning includes a systematic gathering of data to determine the effectiveness of the program. The Music Educators National Conference detailed the need for music supervision, and spelled out specific suggestions for implementation.[20]

---

[14]H. H. Sommers, (Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Chicago). "The Spring Musicale." (Ephraim, Utah: printed on the program for a school concert, April 29, 1963), cover. (Mimeographed.)

[15]Snyder, loc. cit.

[16]Weyland, loc. cit.

[17]Joseph A. Labuta, Guide to Accountability in Music Instruction (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1974).

[18]California State Department of Education, Music Framework (Sacramento: Bureau of Publications, 1971), pp. 48-49.

[19]Snyder, op. cit., p. 13.

[20]Music Educators National Conference, "Position Papers," Music Educators Journal, LXI (November, 1974), pp. 68-70.

Significance of the Problem

If the above people were correct, then the results of this study should have shown that the administration of district music has had positive effects. Empirical evidence supporting this positive effect should have pointed toward the significance of (1) maintaining music leaders in those districts which have them, and improving their situations so that children would be better served, and (2) incorporating music direction in those districts which do not have this leadership.

Further studies would then be implied to explore more effective utilization of music administration. In turn, children would be more positively affected by the more expansive opportunities provided by districts with music leadership.

METHODOLOGY

To determine the effectiveness of district music leadership, the following research hypotheses and methods were used.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: School districts WITH music leadership, as compared to districts WITHOUT music leadership, will show evidence of having more (1) music students, (2) music organizations, classes and performance opportunities, including higher ratings and more recognition of these groups, (3) music staff and workshops, (4) financial support, facilities, and equipment for music programs, and (5) specifically stated district music goals.

Hypothesis 2: Students, parents, teachers, and administrators

will reflect better attitudes toward school music programs in districts WITH music leadership, as compared to districts WITHOUT music leadership.

Population and Sample

People involved in California schools were used as the target population. The sub-population was delimited to all unified school districts in the State whose student enrollments were 5,000 or more. Unified districts tend to be easier to study since they include all grade levels. Central music leadership was rare in districts of less than 5,000, thus they were not surveyed. There were 136 unified school districts (see Appendix F) which were sent surveys. Data were gathered by a survey and analyzed to test Hypothesis 1.

Cross validation was also done with districts which did not respond.[21] This was done by contacting each nonrespondent by telephone and asking if they might yet respond to the survey and to try to determine why they did not respond earlier. The data obtained from this follow-up group was to be compared to the data from the original respondents. If differences did not exist, they were to be pooled. Otherwise, further comparisons would have had to be made.

A second sample was taken from the 136 districts in order to test Hypothesis 2. The first ten districts WITH music leadership and the first ten districts WITHOUT music leadership (see Appendix F) who volunteered their assistance in the survey were given opinionnaires. Ten students, ten parents, ten teachers, and ten administrators in each

---

[21]Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (San Diego: Robert R. Knapp, Publisher, 1971), p. 93.

district were sought for selection by a local school official to respond with their opinions of district music programs. Thus, a total of 800 individuals were asked to assist in this phase.

In order to generalize to the total population, rather than to only those groups of people who were selected by local officials, the same opinionnaire was sent again to the same districts. This time twelve respondents were selected randomly from each district. A total of 240 were asked to assist in this second phase of the opinionnaire. The data from the two opinionniare samples were to be compared. If no differences existed, they were to be pooled. Otherwise, further comparisons would have had to be made.

Research Design

The research design was causal-comparative, or ex post facto,[22] because it utilized existing data derived from a survey and an opinionnaire. The instruments were designed in accordance to information derived from Best.[23] The first instrument (see Appendix A) was a survey which was sent to one superintendent or music leader in each of the 136 school districts. The survey included quantitative questions, such as, "How many students are enrolled in one or more music classes?" The survey also contained questions to determine district status as to being a district WITH music leadership or WITHOUT music leadership. Attempts were made to deduce whether there had been a correlation

---

[22]Irvin J. Lehman, and William A. Mehrens, Educational Research: Readings in Focus (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971), pp. 251-257.

[23]John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), pp. 140-186.

between more expansive music programs and music leadership. This was done by applying the statistical tests as stated later.

The second instrument (see Appendix C), an opinionnaire, involved the use of semantic differential concepts, such as "interesting" through "boring".[24] The opinionnaire was used to obtain qualitative attitudes and opinions of students, parents, teachers and administrators. This second instrument had three general areas identified as (1) attitudes toward school music, (2) opinions of extrinsic influences affected by school music, and (3) attitudes toward out-of-school music compared to in-school music.

The surveys were mailed with post-paid return envelopes to each of the 136 district offices. The opinionnaires were also mailed with post-paid return envelopes to each of the twenty volunteering districts. Letters of transmittal were individually typed to facilitate response. Follow-up letters (see Appendices B and D) and phone calls were used as needed.

Validity and Reliability

The survey questions were objective and were to be answered by fixed numbers depending on existing data for the first hypothesis. Records were checked and officials in several schools were interviewed in order to check for accuracy. A cross validation of the nonrespondents to the survey was also to be undertaken if response was lower than 80 percent. Questions pertaining to the second hypothesis were to be

---

[24] Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy M. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957), p. 190.

answered with ordinal data, such as: (4) strongly agree, (3) agree, (2) disagree, and (1) strongly disagree. Reliability has been demonstrated by Osgood's semantic differential concept.[25] Crawford also used the same concept for opinions concerning music education,[26] which adds to the reliability of the Opinionnaire. The survey instrument for the first hypothesis was critiqued for clarity by a panel of eight people (see Appendix H), including superintendents, principals, professors, and music educators. Those determining clarity for the opinionnaire were a panel of twelve persons (see Appendix H), including students, parents, teachers and administrators.

The instruments were redesigned based on the input of these panels so that they measured the quantitative data and the general opinion of individual respondents toward an accurate accounting of the school district music program. The opinionnaire was retested for reliability by giving a group of students and teachers a pretest and a posttest to determine if their answers tended to be the same. Two samples of the opinionnaire were used for comparative data. In the final analysis, the instruments were considered by the panels to measure the opinions for which they were designed.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT

This section will deal with the specific hypotheses and the

---

[25] Ibid.

[26] James D. Crawford, "The Relationship of Socioeconomic Status to Attitude toward Music and Home Musical Interest in Intermediate-Grade Children" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1972), pp. 145-148.

procedures used to test each hypothesis.

Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of each of the five sub-hypotheses listed below. In each of the sub-hypotheses the independent variable is the school district status of either WITH or WITHOUT music leadership. The dependent variables are shown in each of the sub-hypotheses.

H1.1: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of the proportions of students taking music classes and the total district population.

H1.2: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) the average number of students per music class and performance organization, (2) the number of students per musical performance, and (3) the average ratings received in festival adjudications.

H1.3: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) district student enrollment/music staff ratio and (2) the number of music workshops for staff and attendance at these meetings.

H1.4: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) the amount of money spent per music student and per total district

enrollment for the music program and (2) the adequacy of the numbers of instruments, uniforms, instructional space, and other factors pertinent to the support of music programs.

H1.5: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) having board adopted goals for music education and (2) having a clearly delineated method as to who formulates and evaluates the attainment of these goals.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no difference between respondents' attitudes and opinions concerning school music programs in districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership. This hypothesis has three sub-hypotheses listed below. In each case the independent variable is the school district status of either WITH or WITHOUT music leadership. The dependent variables are shown with each sub-hypothesis.

H2.1: There will be no difference between respondents' opinions of school music in school districts WITH compared to school districts WITHOUT music leadership.

H2.2: There will be no difference between respondents' opinions of extrinsic influences attributed to school music in school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership.

H2.3: There will be no difference between respondents' attitudes toward out-of-school music compared to in-school music in school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership.

Hypothesis 1 coincides with the survey as follows: H1.1 coincides with the data requested in the sruvey indicated in the 100

series (see Appendix A); H1.2 coincides with the 200 series; H1.3 coincides with the 300 series; H1.4 coincides with the 400 series; and H1.5 coincides with the 500 series. The 600 series is not identified with any hypothesis but was used to identify and categorize districts into WITH or WITHOUT status.

Hypothesis 2 coincides with the opinionnaire as follows: H2.1 coincides with data requested in the opinionnaire numbered 01 to 30; H2.2 coincides with numbers 31-36; and H2.3 coincides with numbers 37-42. The pooled hypothesis deals with numbers 01-42.

Statistical Analysis

The Mann-Whitney U-test was used when the data were ranked in such instances that proportions and per capita relationships were used.[27] This test was used in H1.1, H1.2, H1.3, and H1.4 utilizing data from survey questions 101, 102, 105, 106, 201, 202, 207, 211, 301, 309, and 401.

The chi-square test for independent samples was used when the data could be distributed into two-by-two or larger categorical blocks.[28] This test was used in H1.1, H1.2, H1.3, H1.4, and H1.5 utilizing data from survey questions 103, 104, 203, 204, 205, 208, 209, 302 to 308, 310, 402, and 501.

The data from the opinionnaire were pooled in two independent samples of ten school districts each. The t-test for independent

---

[27] John T. Roscoe, Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (2d ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971), pp. 230-236.

[28] Ibid., pp. 254-263.

samples was used because the scores were summed and were in an interval scale, and random assignment was done in order to provide normality of data.[29] In all the testing, the .05 level of significance was used because it was determined that in this study it would be most appropriate.[30]

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions were used in this study:

Music Leader:

Inclusive of music supervisor, coordinator and consultant, the title was used to designate an individual who was officially the head of a district music education program.[31] This person was a musically trained official in a central administration position with the responsibilities of coordinating, planning, organizing, and controlling music instruction.[32]

Music Leadership:

Knezevich defined leadership as the act of directing human energy within an organization.[33] In this study it referred to the act and state of directing music education.

---

[29]Ibid., pp. 217-223. [30]Ibid., pp. 167-186.

[31]Norman E. Dawson, "A Study of the Roles of Music Supervisors in Selected School Districts" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1969), p. 7.

[32]Robert W. House, Administration in Music Education (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 22.

[33]Knezevich, op. cit., pp. 48-52.

Unified School District:

This is a school district that has the total K-12 school program in one administrative unit.

WITH:

This refers to districts with a music leader. Districts included in the WITH category were placed there if they met the following criteria: (a) The district music leader had been spending an average of 50 percent or more of his time in an official administrative role in music education over the past five years; (b) the district music leader has had both elementary and secondary responsibilities in music education; (c) the responsibilities of the music leader included vocal, instrumental and general music curricula; (d) the music leader has not had to spend 50 percent or more of his time in teaching; (e) the music leader has not had to administer more than one other subject; and (f) the music leader has been trained in music education. Districts WITH music leadership are subsequently referred to as WITH districts.

WITHOUT:

This refers to districts without a music leader. Districts WITHOUT music leadership are subsequently referred to as WITHOUT districts.

LIMITATIONS

This study was limited by the following:

(1) Titles and roles of music leadership vary widely.[34] The

---

[34] McQuerrey, op. cit., p. 15

amount of time put into actual leadership differs from 0% to 100%. Thus, arbitrary lines must be drawn in order to separate districts into WITH and WITHOUT categories.

(2) As the population of school districts included 5,000 or more students, generalizations can apply only to districts of that size, and not to districts that are any smaller.

(3) Generalizations will be limited to comparisons of school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leaders as defined.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

Succeeding chapters of this study are organized in the following manner:

Chapter II contains a review of related literature pertaining to educational supervision and music leadership.

Chapter III discusses the methodology involved in the study.

Chapter IV is an analysis of the data found in the returned survey and opinionnaire.

Chapter V includes a summary, conclusions and implications for further study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The first part of this chapter deals with general administration and supervision. Needs, titles, and roles of supervision are discussed, and an overview of the evolution of supervision in the United States is outlined. Next is a section dealing with the evolution of music leadership, the organizations that were influential in the development of music leaderhip, a brief on music leadership in Californa schools, some of the philosophical bases for continued leadership of music in our schools, and some ideas concerning the nature of music leadership. The final section deals with learning theories, goals, objectives, accountability and innovations and programs and how they affect music administration.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

The Need for Administration and Supervision

In order to achieve organization, there must be a process. The process of managing, controlling, directing, and organizing is referred to as administration. Thousands of years ago Socrates indicated a need for order and organization in social affairs.[1] He pointed out that the administration of an army and a family differed only in magnitude. The ancient Jewish people have recorded in the Bible their means of social

[1]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (3d ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 25.

organization and administration. The ancient civilizations of China, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, Mexico, and South America had intricate organizations for the control of social matters including administrative processes. Administration, liked or disliked, useful or burdensome, is nothing new.

The purpose of leadership and management of both public and private systems is to produce an end result and the processes through which to achieve that result. The private sector has been identified as corporations and other organizations under private ownership. The public sector is under public dominion. Education and other governmental agencies fall under the public sector. Educational supervision has been concerned with processes which should lead toward an end-result or product, and that product is the education of children.[2]

Some type of work, energy, and process must take place in order to achieve a product. In education, this process is generally referred to as teaching. Teaching has been done in many ways and learning, or lack of learning, has taken place regardless of any intentional planning. However, as population has grown and as man's existence has become more technological, happenstance learning has become insufficient. As orderliness has been needed in order to produce masses of modern-day commodities, orderliness has also become necessary in the organization of education. The variance in human individuality has presented man with infinite problems, compared to our most complex technologies.

Education has been faced with vast complexities of assisting

---

[2]Katharyn V. Feyereisen, A. John Fiorino, and Arlene T. Nowak, Supervision and Curriculum Renewal: A Systems Approach (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 33.

children with opportunities to learn. Technology has demanded a greater variety of things to learn, a more detailed and complex knowledge, and a faster rate of learning. Teachers have been faced with the responsibilities of keeping up with the individual differences and needs of children, technological data, and pedagogical technique in order to bring the individual and the technology together. Going back to Socrates' concept of magnitude of management, organization begins with the teacher as a single individual. Education is faced with more and more organization, management, and administration, as the number of people, subjects, innovations, and organizations increases.

Administration and Supervision Defined

Administration has become an indispensable function.[3] School administration has been defined as:

> ...a social process concerned with identifying, maintaining, stimulating, controlling, and unifying formally and informally organized human material energies within an integrated system designed to accomplish predetermined objectives.[4]

Supervision is an outgrowth and part of administration. Supervision of instruction is an administrative device used for control and coordination.[5] Eye and Netzer have summarized supervision in an historical perspective and have emphasized, "(1) administrative inspection, (2) efficiency orientation, (3) coordination through cooperative efforts, and (4) research orientation."[6]

There have been trends away from the use of the word supervision

---

[3]Knezevich, op. cit., p. 3. [4]Ibid., p. 12. [5]Ibid., p. 366.

[6]Glen G. Eye and Lanore A. Netzer, Supervision of Instruction (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), p. 14.

because of the negative connotation that teachers often associate with it.[7] Closely connected to supervision are titles for comparative roles such as director, coordinator, consultant, helping teacher, and resource teacher. Titles and roles have not been fixed with set definitions and boundaries. These various titles have been used synonymously. At the same time, the roles of two persons with the same title have been quite different. However, the definitions of administration and supervision quoted above are broad enough to incorporate the roles of any of the above titles.

The Evolution and Supervision in the United States

Supervision of instruction has gone through several stages. Marks, Stoops, and Stoops divided this evolution into five stages.[8]

The first stage comprised the Colonial period through the Civil War, or roughly 1647-1865. Inspection was the key to supervision. Laymen, such as clergy, school wardens, trustees, selectmen, and citizens' committees, acted as overseers. They were to inspect schools and classrooms and to see that teachers were sound in the faith and unscandalous as individuals. Courses of study and techniques of classroom instruction were inspected. The general concern was for control and maintenance of standards.

In the second stage, or nineteenth century, inspection continued,

---

[7]Martha L. King and Reba M. Burnham, Supervision in Action (Washington Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1965), p. 45.

[8]James R. Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, Handbook of Educational Supervision (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), pp. 8-13.

but the supervising party underwent a gradual change. The "super-teacher" or principal was given authority to inspect with emphasis on regulations. The laymen were not easily persuaded to give up their control, but they saw a need for professional administrators. The job of superintendent and the use of state and county units emerged during this stage. The stress was on school improvement through leadership.

From 1910-1935 (the third stage) more attention was applied on instruction and teacher weaknesses. Coinciding with industrial trends, education placed an emphasis on efficiency. Supervision of classrooms became routine and mechanical. Tests and rating systems were employed. More consideration was given to the funding of supervisorial staff. Special supervisors and helping teachers were utilized. The effort was sincere and worthy, but improvement and guidance during this stage was looked upon as questionable.

In the mid-twentieth century (1935-1963), a more democratic spirit was evident. During this fourth stage principals and special supervisors shared in a division of responsibilities with coordinators, curriculum directors and consultants. Cooperation was central to activities such as research, curriculum development, and inservice courses. Scientific method was supported by federal grants, which gave rise to the establishment of an emphasis on goals rather than on administrative dominance.

In the current stage, especially since the mid-Sixties, there has been a trend toward cooperation of all concerned parties. The involvement of community and shared decision making have become very important. Federal influence and funding has played a large role. Evaluation of scientific methods has been employed, and the trend has

been toward systems analysis and accountability. Creativity and innovation have played key roles. Outside consultation has often been used to determine effectiveness of programs, finances, and personnel. In general, the trend has been more positive in the use of coordination, shared decisions and constructive evaluations. This trend has taken the place of the former negative feelings that come from control and "snoopervision," as many teachers have called it.[9] The emphasis has been less on the process and more on the product.[10]

MUSIC LEADERSHIP IN THE SCHOOLS

In the previous section, five stages of the evolution of supervision of instruction were outlined. School music leadership had its beginnings in the second of these stages, when professional supervisors began to replace lay inspectors. Specialization in various subjects of school curriculum emerged in the nineteenth century. As school populations increased, teachers became less prepared to teach subjects that were expanding in scope and technology. Personnel were needed to see to the adequate coverage of individual subjects. Music had already been taught in the schools and it became one of the first subjects to use specialization and supervision.[11]

The Evolution of Music Leadership

Music was a part of education in the earliest stages of colonization when the Puritans printed America's first song book, the

---

[9]Knezevich, op. cit., p. 372. [10]Eye, op. cit., p. 30

[11]Knezevich, op. cit., p. 370.

Bay Song Book, in 1640.[12] John Tufts produced music books and methods, and came close to the organization of music instruction when his activities helped to develop the singing school movement around 1720.[13] In 1809, Joseph Neef opened a school in Philadelphia. He espoused the direct sense experience ideas of Johann Pestalozzi and felt that children needed first hand experiences in music.[14]

Music was important to the lives of the people of the early United States, and singing was common in the schools. However, music was not officially taught in the schools until 1829, when it was offered in the common school program of New York City. By the 1830's New England, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, Illinois, Tennessee, and Maryland had music well established in their schools.[15] Perhaps the biggest impact on music instruction in the public schools came through Lowell Mason, who established the Boston Academy of Music in 1832. In his classes, he stressed his views of the Pestalozzian system to teachers. In 1838, Mason oversaw the authorization of this system in the Boston schools. Through musical conventions his influence was spread, and his desire to bring music to the masses was realized.

The first official music supervision was probably realized in 1838 when Mason was named as Boston's Superintendent of Public School

---

[12]Neal E. Glenn, William B. McBride, and George H. Wilson, Secondary School Music (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 13.

[13]Ibid., p. 15.

[14]Charles Leonhard and Robert W. House, Foundations and Principles of Music Education (2d ed.; New York: mcGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1972), p. 13.

[15]Glenn, op. cit., p. 18. [16]Ibid.

Music.[17] Birge reported that the trend was toward the inclusion of singing in the grammar school (grades five through eight). Following this, music gradually began to be included as a formal part of the elementary curriculum, and later into the high school. The schools of Cincinnati claim to have appointed the first music supervisor over primary grades in 1857.[18] Boston's schools appointed an elementary music supervisor in 1864 and a high school music supervisor in 1869.[19] N. Coe Stewart was appointed supervisor of music in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1870.[20]

Instrumental music was incorporated into the schools by Will Earhart in Richmond, Indiana, in 1898, while he was working as a music supervisor. Other supervisors followed this expansion of the music program, which not only included bands but orchestras as well.[21] Kennard pointed out that early music supervisors were trained in conservatories. With some assistance, they did all the music teaching. As schools grew in size, it became apparent that more assistance was needed. Luther W. Mason developed a plan for the regular classroom teachers to give daily music lessons. The music supervisor would assist the teacher in the classroom by occasional visits.[22] This plan is still being used by many schools today. There has been an increased interest and a

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Edward B. Birge, History of Public School Music in the United States (Boston: Oliver Ditson Company, 1928), p. 75.

[19] Ibid. [20] Ibid., p. 93. [21] Ibid., p. 162.

[22] F. Ralph Kennard, "The Role of State Music Supervision" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1974), p. 15.

renewed emphasis on this approach.[23]

Music conventions, contests, and professional organizations have had a substantial impact on the growth of music programs. The convention movement came out of the mid-nineteenth century for the purpose of gathering people together to sing and to share pedagogical techniques. The American spirit of competition created a desire to promote opportunities to compete in contests and to bring children together in a community or several communities to share musical talents. These occasions required careful planning and management that could not be taken care of by the music teachers, whose time was occupied in the classroom.

The third stage in the evolution of supervision of instruction in the first third of this century coincides with music education's emphasis on rating systems and the desire to produce the best performing groups. Emphasis was placed on music leaders to push the music program forward. Professional organizations grew out of these conventions as the need arose to communicate and share problems and ideas.

The fourth stage of supervision of instruction coincides with the mid-twentieth century spirit of cooperation and competition. Musicians seem to have arrived at this stage much earlier through the use of conventions and contests.

The first professional music education group was organized in Boston, in 1830, to train music leaders. The first national group met in 1869 at the New England Conservatory of Music (Boston) and was called the National Music Congress. This was the forerunner of the Music

---

[23]Edward J. Hermann, Supervising Music in the Elementary School (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 4.

Teachers National Association (1876), which was primarily made up of private teachers of music. The National Education Association had included some music committees and by 1890 had taken over national leadership of school music.[24]

In Keokuk, Iowa, in 1907, Philip C. Hayden invited a group of music supervisors to meet together. With the leadership of Frances E. Clark, the Music Supervisors National Conference was organized in 1909. Thus, it was through music supervision that the national organizing of music education got its start. This Conference published the Music Supervisors Bulletin and then the Music Supervisors Journal. In 1934, the name of the organization became the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), and it retains that name today. The official journal became the Music Educators Journal. The development of MENC has provided vast opportunities for music and for music leadership.[25] These professional organizations have been directly involved in the development of school music leadership.

The division of responsibilities of the supervision of music instruction created more jobs for music leadership during the mid-twentieth century. Moving into the present stage of evolution, one might see in music education the growth of community involvement. Federal funding, evaluation, scientific research, systems analysis, and accountability have become the dominant themes.

Supervision has also been expanded to other governmental agencies. Marsh gave an excellent account of county roles in music

---

[24] Glenn, op. cit., p. 19.

[25] Ibid., pp. 18-19.

supervision in California.[26] Music supervision has also been strongly recommended at the state level. Phelps' report on state supervision in the 1960's provided information about the expansion of music leadership into the state level.[27] Kennard pointed out the growth of state music supervision and reinforced the need for state level leadership.[28]

Music Leadership in California Schools

The schools in the State of California grew rapidly during World War I and during the years after the war. World War II brought a great influx of people into the coastal metropolitan areas. The post-war baby-boom resulted in greater growth in the Fifties and Sixties filling and overflowing the schools. Music education was desired by many, and music programs flourished. In the late Sixties, school enrollments declined, finances tightened, and education had to face the questions of priority and relevance.

In 1971, a committee of California music educators produced the Music Framework in order to further stress the importance of music in a time of accountability. The importance of music in our schools was reinforced by the adoption of the Music Framework by the California State Board of Education. In the forward to this book, Wilson Riles, California's Superintendent of Public Instruction, said that his "own

---

[26]Warren C. Marsh, "The Role of the County Music Consultant in California" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1967), p. 170.

[27]Roger P. Phelps, National Conference to Improve the Effectiveness of State Supervision of Music, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, January 1966, (ERIC ED 010 412)

[28]Kennard, op. cit., p. 199.

life is fuller, more meaningful, and richer because of the music" he has known.[29] He warned against dropping music programs in the schools and concluded that parents, teachers and administrators must teach students "the value of musical experience," or the loss to the students, "and the loss to future generations will be incalculable."[30]

California's trends in music education and music leadership have been similar to that of the nation in the twentieth century (the last three steps of supervision). Though many states have state music supervisors, California does not. Currently, California has a Consultant in Arts Education, whose responsibilities include state leadership in music education. Also, an Ad Hoc Committee of the California Music Educators Association (CMEA) is providing state leadership by organizing a statewide music administrators group.[31] More information about music education and music leadership in California will be presented under Trends in Music Education and Music Leadership.

Philosophy of Music Leadership Toward the Future

With many recent studies, dissertations, and conferences, the MENC has come out with the following recommendations:

(1) When a district music staff includes five or more music teachers, one should be designated as the music supervisor.

(2) When there are nine music teachers, the music administrator

---

[29]California State Department of Education, Music Framework (Sacramento: Bureau of Publication, 1971), p. iii.

[30]Ibid.

[31]California Music Educators Association, "Music Administrator Representative" CMEA News, XXX (September/October, 1976), p. 5.

should act in that capacity 60 percent of the time. When there are twelve, that percentage should be 80 percent. When there are fifteen teachers, he sould be on a full-time basis.

(3) The music administrator should have musical training and see the broad outline of music education and the total educational program of education. He should be trained and experienced as an administrator.

(4) The above are minimum figures, and for a quality program, there should be more administration than listed above.

(5) When a music staff increases, additional music administrators should be employed at a rate of one-third time for each seven teachers.

(6) The rationale for cutbacks of music supervisors has been based on finances. Cutting corners may be more expensive in the long run. Cutbacks may produce problems in a music program due to the lack of direction, continuity, stability and momentum for growth. Thus, cuts in music leadership represent "misguided savings."[32]

Musicians who felt that music had its rightful place in the schools have had to show something more concrete to support their positions. Lloyd Sunderman outlined some philosophical concepts supporting music education as a major portion of the curriculum, and not as a frill. His comments included the importance of feeling, emotion, and aesthetics in music. Personal involvement in rhythm, movement, discrimination of musical sound, song-singing, and creativity were outlined as important elements of the music curriculum. Music classes provided

---

[32]Music Educators National Conference, "Position Paper, Music Educators Journal, LXI (November, 1974), pp. 68-70.

functional, social, moral, spiritual and disciplinary values that may not necessarily be attained in other subjects.[33]

With the recommendations described above the need to develop and maintain music education programs in the schools is apparent. Leadership of music, under whatever title it may fall, must be used to direct music education to succeed in its goal of providing valuable musical experiences for our children. Landon pointed out that such leaders must acquire:

> ...specific skills of musicianship, educational philosophy and practice, communication, group leadership, and be able to lead effectively in helping members of the Music Curriculum Team reach their human potentials in planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating products of the music curriculum in action.

The Nature of Music Leadership

The heterogeneous nature of music supervision began out of the early events listed above. Sometimes special music teachers were appointed to assist classroom teachers with music, and although they were titled supervisors, they acted more in a role of a consultant or visiting teacher. No line-administrative authority was given to them.[35] In other locations, music supervisors were appointed to strong authoritative and inspection roles. Thus, there has been a polarity of supervisors acting solely as teachers of music, on one hand, and as supervisors and administrators on the other. In between these two extremes, there are many

---

[33] Archie N. Jones, Music Education in Action (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1960), pp. 4-13.

[34] Joseph W. Landon, Leadership for Learning in Music Education (Costa Mesa, California: Educational Media Press, 1975), p. 231.

[35] Birge, op. cit., p. 70.

variations. There has been a variety of titles for music leadership. These titles have mainly been used for identification purposes and have depended upon community size, needs, and philosophies. As stated before, these titles have not created any set job descriptions. There has been an even greater variation in the roles under each title. Often these roles and titles dovetail and set no boundaries between them. There have been many interpretations of single titles. Many persons have had a specific title such as supervisor, but have claimed a role as coordinator or teacher.

Klotman has outlined some useful descriptions that have been of assistance in defining several titles. These are by no means meant to be the final word in classifying music leadership.

(1) A Director of Music implies full responsibility over a music program, whether there is a large staff or a single individual.

(2) A Supervisor of Music implies a line function of authority, full responsibility, and direct contact with subordinates. Often, a supervisor may be assigned to a specific part of a music program, such as vocal, string, instrumental, elementary, or secondary. In larger districts, there may be several supervisors subordinate to the Director of Music.

(3) The Coordinator of Music usually lacks line authority; however, in some cases he may have some supervisorial duties. A coordinator is usually a resource person or an advisor.

(4) A Consultant serves as a resource person and as an advisor but lacks authority in decision making. Often he is a teacher of classroom music or a teacher of teachers. Use of consultants, in the latter sense, is common and useful in the elementary school, where non-

music classroom teachers can receive direction, and in turn, implement and broaden the music program.

(5) The title Music Department Chairman is more likely to be associated with a single building or school plant. Sometimes this role can be on a district scope, and may or may not carry any authority.

(6) A Music Specialist does not carry any authority but indicates either specialization in music or, more likely, specialization in a more narrow aspect of music.[36]

Whatever the title or role, all the above are used to give the music program some direction. Leader has been a useful term to denote a person directing energy within an organization.[37] This can easily be interpreted as any person who causes the music program to move in any direction. As defined in Chapter One, the use of the term leader has been used to include authoritative responsibility in either a line or staff function.

There are many factors that affect music programs. Weyland gave some in-depth examples of some of the problems that affect the outcome of music in schools.[38] A community may have a person in an official music leadership position who has the ability to build a program but lacks community support. A district may not have a music official, but may have a music teacher with a very charismatic personality who may

---

[36]Robert H. Klotman, The School Music Administrator and Supervisor (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), pp. 19-20.

[37]Knezevich, op. cit., p. 12.

[38]Rudolph H. Weyland, A Guide to Effective Music Supervision (2d ed.; Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Publisher, 1968), pp. 53-80.

bolster an excellent music program. On the other hand, there may be music leaders who do not have the drive or interest or may be waiting to retire, which can cause problems in a music program. Finances can also have positive or negative effects on music programs. School district size and ratio of staff to students may have varying effects. Facilities have effects on music programs. There are communities that feel a need for a music program and communities that do not.

TRENDS IN MUSIC EDUCATION AND MUSIC LEADERSHIP

So many new things are taking place in music education today that listing them would be voluminous. Details of each are not intended to be covered, nor is the list intended to be complete. The purpose of listing and discussing some of these is to point out that there are many areas in which music administrators must deal.

Learning Theories

As pointed out previously, man has often searched for means by which to improve himself. All five stages of supervision have been concerned with the improvement of instruction. The early stages were concerned with subject and method, whereas today the concerns are more with the individual. Education is for the benefit of the individual, and he is being studied in order to determine his needs, how subjects may best suit him, and which methods might best help him to achieve his needs.

Studies of the mind, brain, intellect, and how learning takes place have been of paramount importance. Understanding the learning process would help man to develop processes of teaching so that more

learning could take place. Consequently, many new theories have been developed. Educational leaders, including music leaders, should be as aware as possible of these theories in order to keep abreast of developments that might lead to the improvement of instruction.

Bloom and Krathwohl have developed taxonomies that are useful toward the classification and achievement of educational goals. The first, the cognitive domain, deals with "the recall or recognition of knowledge, and the development of intellectual abilities and skills."[39] The second, the affective domain, includes objectives which reflect attitudes, interests, values, and appreciations that may assist educators in helping students toward adequate adjustment.[40] The third is the psychomotor domain, which deals with the muscular or motor domain which deals with muscular, or motor skill, and manipulation of material objects.[41] This domain is very relevant to music education. One example of the use of psychomotor skills in music is the constant use of eye and hand coordination used in reading music.

George Biggs has specifically suggested the use of taxonomies for meeting goals and objectives in music.[42] In 1971, a music committee in California developed a study of goals and objectives in music

---

[39]Benjamin S. Bloom, ed., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956), p. 7.

[40]David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram B. Masia, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook II: Affective Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964), p. 7.

[41]Ibid.

[42]George B. Biggs, Jr., "A Suggested Taxonomy of Music for Music Educators," Journal of Research in Music Education, XIX (Summer, 1971), pp. 168-182.

education, with emphasis on statements of objectives, in behavioral terms, and with evaluative criteria.[43] Melody, rhythm, harmony, form, style, tempo, dynamics, and tone color are dealt with in terms of hierarchical steps in learning.

There are many other notable theories of learning and educational processes. Some of the most notable theories are listed below. B. F. Skinner's ideas about the process of learning have produced many forms of learning packages and programmed systems of instruction, such as Joseph Landon's music learning activity packages.[44] Jean Piaget's theories of conservation have made an impact on education and Betty Thorn has used his ideas in the teaching of melody and rhythm.[45] One of the major interests of the CMEA State Music Administrator's Group has been the studies of the hemispheres of the Brain. On October 6, 1976, this administrator's group met to discuss this subject as one of five subjects selected as the most important.[46]

Accountability

As industry is interested in the final production of a useful product, education must also direct itself toward specific outcomes.

---

[43]Frances Cole and others, "Goals and Objectives in Music Education," Prepared by the Music Committee of the California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Southern Section, Spring, 1971.

[44]Joseph W. Landon, How to Write Learning Activity Packages for Music Education (Costa Mesa, California: Educational Media Press, 1973).

[45]Betty A. Thorn, "An Investigation of Piaget's Conservation Theory and His Application for Teaching and Developing Melodic and Rhythmic Concepts," Council for Research in Music Education, VL (Winter 1976), 21-25.

[46]California Music Educators Association "Music Administrators to Meet" CMEA News, XXX (September/October, 1976), p. 5.

Achievement of goals and objectives, as previously discussed, is one part of evaluating music education. Achievement of goals is dependent upon processes that include some form of initiation and systematic procedure. Browder, Atkins, and Kaya pointed out that the initial step is an "educational inventory-taking...called needs assessment."[47]

There are many studies listed in Dissertations Abstracts International that have dealt with the roles of music supervisors. Such roles are important to analyze, provided that they fit into a systematic scheme, which includes a needs assessment. Planning, organizing, directing, and controlling are administrative processes which take place after needs are determined.[48] These are carried on in a logical and directional sequence in order to achieve the goal-needs of children.

The inclusion of systems in education is to assist in producing positive results. Evaluations are occurring today which have placed education under close scrutiny. Questions are being raised as to the usefulness and relevance of education. This usefulness and relevance has been the basis for a movement toward accountability. The general trend has been to make sure that the systems for determining usefulness include a human framework that is not locked into mechanical steps.[49]

The majority of articles in the Music Educators Journal of September, 1972, dealt with uses of accountability in music education.

---

[47]Lesley H. Browder, Jr., William A. Atkins, Jr., and Esin Kaya, Developing an Educationally Accountable Program (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973), p. 77.

[48]William B. Castetter, The Personnel Function in Educational Administration (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971), p. 45.

[49]Kenneth H. Hansen, "Accountability is a Premise, Not a Promise," Music Educators Journal, LXI (December, 1974), pp. 40-41, 75-76.

Colwell related the use of industrial performance contracting to music education.[50] Articles by Smith[51] and Barnum[52] dealt with the Planning, Programming, and Budgeting Systems (PPBS) that were instituted by federal institutions in the early 1970's. Much of this systematic approach had to do with placing a price tag on aspects of education and determining their value and priorities. PPBS switched the emphasis in education from the input (expenditures) to the output.[53] CMEA produced a four-page outline using PPBS in the early 1970's in order to assist music education toward demonstrating financial accountability.[54]

Livingston, Poland, and Simmons tied objectives, accountability, and the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains together when they outlined methods of writing instructional objectives relative to music education[55] by using the style of Robert Mager.[56] In 1974, Labuta produced a book that serves not only as a guide to achieving accountability in music education but also as evidence that accountability can

---

[50]Richard Colwell, "Industry Goes to School," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), pp. 56-60.

[51]Ronald O. Smith, "The McNamara Syndrome in Music Education," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), pp. 60-64.

[52]Walter K. Barnum, "PPBS In Action," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), pp. 64-70.

[53]Castetter, op. cit., p. 75.

[54]Frances Cole and others, PPBS Set to Music. Leaflet Prepared by California Music Educators Association, no date

[55]James A. Livingston, Michael D. Poland, and Ronald E. Simmons, Accountability and Objectives for Music Education (Costa Mesa, California: Educational Media Press, 1972).

[56]Robert F. Mager, Preparing Instructional Objectives (Belmont, California: Lear Siegler, Inc./Fearon Publishers, 1962).

be built into music programs.[57] This places music in a positive position in education. Music can be treated as a subject that can be evaluated by the same formulae that are used on the concrete subjects. In April, 1976, Leslie Frankel said, "...let's stop talking about whether we should have accountability in music. It's here! Let's do something about it."[58] Music teachers should want to be able to stand behind music and say that it is useful and worth selling to the public.

Innovations and Programs

Revolutionary changes and reawakenings of all types of music have been occurring for at least twenty years. There are renaissances occurring each year. Some are new, and some are reawakenings of ideas that may be centuries old. The music leader must be knowledgeable and active in research in order to keep abreast of the many new developments.

The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project of the mid-1960's emphasized involvement of elementary and junior high students in music composition.[59] In this project, traditional notations were secondary to new devices. Laboratory groups, experimentation, and contemporary idioms were stressed. Klotman pointed out the challenge to music administrators to keep up with change.[60] The Tanglewood Symposium report said music education has not kept pace with most changes that have occurred in

---

[57]Joseph A. Labuta, Guide to Accountability in Music Instruction (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1974).

[58]Music Educators National Conference, "Point of View: Accountability," Music Educators Journal, LXII (April, 1976), pp. 90-93.

[59]Landon, Leadership, op. cit., pp. 114-115.

[60]Klotman, op. cit., p. 135.

society; therefore, there is a need to revitalize music in our schools.[61] Accepting and using today's popular music in order to meet the needs of modern children has become increasingly necessary.[62]

Research in administration has pointed out a gap of fifty years, from the time something was accepted until it was initiated in the schools.[63] For example, electronic music was used in the 1920's but excluded from the schools until almost 1970. Music creativity has been no exception, as people have been creating their own music only to have it rejected by schools for many years. Creative music teachers have often helped to close the gap and widen opportunities for children. In districts that are quite large, creativity may depend on one with "administrative courage."[64]

Creativity has been strongly encouraged, especially by programs such as the Contemporary Music Project (CMP) and the Composers in Public Schools Project (CPS). The March, 1968 edition of the Music Educators Journal emphasized CMP, and stressed creativity in music education and composition in the public schools.[65] In 1969, Dawson dealt with a study of music supervision in districts involved in CPS, compared to districts not involved. CPS districts used composers in the schools, who wrote

---

[61] Robert A. Choate, "Tanglewood at Seattle," Music Educators Journal, LV (September, 1968), pp. 39-42.

[62] Wiley L. Housewright, "Rock: Opinions Differ," Today's Education, LIX (May, 1970), pp. 34-36.

[63] Klotman, loc. cit.

[64] Ibid., p. 136.

[65] Music Educators National Conference, "The Contemporary Music for Creativity in Music Education," Music Educators Journal, LIII (March, 1968), p. 41-72.

music for their schools' musical performing groups. Significant differences were found showing that "excellence of music programs" in CPS schools rated higher than the non-CPS schools.[66] Music supervisors were considered to have shown more participation, understanding, competencies, and responsibilities in the CPS schools.

Use of rock music, electronic music equipment, instruments, and media have had a profound effect upon the responsibilities of music leaders.[67] Open education situations have provided many new ways of teaching, utilizing space, and providing for instruction.[68] This, among many other innovations outlined by Unruh and Alexander, broadens the horizons for music education and expands the need for coordination of musical activities by administrative personnel.

Integration of subjects has become increasingly important. Aesthetic experiences are more apt to be placed together in an interdisciplinary arts program. Guenther has written about arts in the core of the curriculum and in more open situations where they are pupil-directed, rather than subject-oriented.[69] Among federal grants, the arts have been given more impetus in offering children aesthetic experience.[70]

---

[66]Norman E. Dawson, "A Study of the Roles of Music Supervisors in Selected School Districts" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1969), pp. 159-160.

[67]Landon, Leadership, op. cit., pp. 115-117.

[68]Glenys G. Unruh and William M. Alexander, Innovations in Secondary Education (2d ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974), p. 216.

[69]Annette R. Guenther, "Open Education Places the Arts in the Core of the Curriculum," Music Educators Journal, LX (April, 1974), pp. 78-80.

[70]Mary Lou Merrill, "Making the Arts an Integral Part of the School Experience," Music Educators Journal, LXII (April, 1976), p. 94.

Reimer has called for the uniting of the arts in education and has reported that American schools are relatively barren of art.[71]

In 1974, The California Alliance for Arts Education Committee submitted a proposal that would give more funds to arts in general education.[72] In addition to this, it provided for arts for the handicapped. The field of educating the handicapped has widened in the attempt to provide more opportunities for these people and to give them a normal place in life. Rosenkranz has provided information concerning perceptual-motor development, disabilities, and the use of music in these programs.[73]

The growth of civil liberties and equal education opportunities for all people has found its way into music education. Ethnic music is being used to help people of the many ethnic groups develop more sense of awareness of themselves and of other people. The October, 1972, issue of the Music Educators Journal is devoted to the subject of ethnic music.

Two programs have developed in the 1970's. Early Childhood Education (ECE) has had national significance and has been strongly pushed in California schools. Gelvin spoke of the use of arts experiences in ECE.[74] The second program was based on the Report of the

---

[71]Bennett Reimer, "Putting Aesthetic Education to Work," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), pp. 29-33.

[72]California State Department of Education, Promising Programs in Arts Education, (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1976).

[73]Peggy A. Rosenkranz, "Perceptual Motor-Development," Music Educators Journal, LXI (December, 1974), pp. 57-59.

[74]Miriam P. Gelvin, "Arts Experience in Early Childhood Education," Music Educators Journal, LX (March, 1974), pp. 27-31.

California Commission for Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education (RISE). After pointing out some alarming statistics, the report called for some drastic changes and improvements in California schools. Point thirteen, under "The New Emphasis in Learning," called for more aesthetic experiences as an essential part of the instructional program. The RISE report also suggested the promotion of appreciation of beauty and included music experiences among the arts and humanities.[75]

One aspect of music leadership that is reaching new and wide dimensions is within the field of management. The music leader, whether supervisor, coordinator, consultant, chairman, or specialist has had to become more of a human relations specialist than was formerly required of the older inspector-supervisor role. Perhaps it may be more difficult for some to fill the humanitarian role than to play the more absolute role of inspector. Bennis spoke of group "synergy," which is that point where the group and administrator are working together.[76] The official is not only an official but a leader and a co-worker. Goodman said that "Administrators must realize first, last, and always that only through other people is it possible for them to succeed."[77] Weyland said a supervisor's greatest strength lies in his being able to develop leadership in others and to make the worker feel like he is

---

[75]California Commission for Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education, The RISE Report (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1975), p. 18.

[76]Warren G. Bennis, "Post Bureaucratic Leadership," Trans-Action (July-August, 1969), pp. 41-61.

[77]A. Harold Goodman, Music Administration in Higher Learning (Provo, Utah: Press Publishing Limited, 1975), p. 67.

"playing first chair."[78]

Effective use of manpower in various situations are of the utmost importance. One form of personnel usage has been the differentiated staff structure that has been used in some organizations. In the elementary school, consultant type positions in music may be the most useful in some local situations. The consultant may be most beneficial when the self-contained classroom teacher must provide the majority of experiences for the children.[79] An MENC position paper pointed out the need for music specialists in the elementary school.[80] One recent development in California is the passage of a collective bargaining bill (SB 160), which has placed the music administrator in a middle management position. At the CMEA conference, in April, 1976, music administrators were asked how many were assigned by their districts as management. All present at that meeting indicated that they were assigned that position. Further discussion indicated that many new complications had already arisen from the passage of SB 160.

The main point of this section on trends in music education is that the music administrator is faced with many concerns. Teachers can not handle all these problems and situations. There is such a large list of things that must be done in order to keep music programs moving that

---

[78]Rudolph H. Weyland, Personal Interview. (Visalia, California: December 30, 1975).

[79]Edward J. Hermann, Supervising Music in the Elementary School (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 5.

[80]Music Educators National Conference National Commission on Instruction, "The Music Specialist in the Elementary School," Music Educators Journal, LIX (November, 1972), pp. 60-62.

the need for music leadership is apparent.

For example, at the May 17, 1976 meeting of the California State Music Administrators Group, the concerns of those present were listed. The following is not a complete list, but these are the topics that were listed in the minutes: ECE, RISE, SB 160, Decentralization, Declining Enrollment, Title IV-C, Grant Writing, State Department, Comprehensive Acts, Arts Councils, Hemispheres of the Brain, Position Papers and Music Framework, Statewide Leadership, Southwest Regional Laboratories (SWRL), Tap Master, Individualized Basic Musicianship, Community Support, Lease of Instruments, Teacher Education, In-Service Education, Legislation, Proficiency Testing, Optional Physical Education, Textbook Funding, and Trends of the Twelfth Grade Situation.[81]

Five of these topics were separated out as being of the most concern. These were discussed at the followup meeting on October 6, 1976. The first of these topics was Grants. The concensus was that music leaders need to know what funds are available and how to go about getting them for their district's music program. Declining Enrollment was another major concern, because of its effect on personnel and other facets of educational problems. ECE, Textbook Selection and Funding, and the Implications of the Brain Hemisphere Study concluded the list of five.

The composite list was referred to by the Ad Hoc Committee as the "laundry list." This list has been presented in light of the central theme: the effects of district music leadership. If all districts are

---

[81] Ad Hoc Committee of the California Music Educators Association, "Music Administrators' Group Minutes," Letter from James R. Clemens to Committee Members, (Santa Rosa, California: May 17, 1976).

faced with such a list, which is not complete, then they must have someone at the helm to direct, coordinate, plan, organize, and control aspects of the music program. This leaves music instruction to the teachers who will benefit from the input and direction of the leader. The leader in turn benefits from the input and talents of the staff.

SUMMARY

This chapter has reviewed what various authors have said about the need for administration and supervision in our schools. Administration was defined as the organizing of human and material energies to accomplish predetermined objectives. Supervision was defined as a device for control and coordination. The evolution of educational supervision in the United States was divided into five stages. These were basically, (1) inspection by lay citizens (1647-1865), (2) inspection by professionals during the nineteenth century, (3) efficiency of instruction (1910-1935), (4) division of responsibilities (mid-century), and (5) scientific and systematic method (the last decade).

The next section of this chapter discussed music leadership in the schools. First, the evolution of music leadership was outlined and compared with the stages of general supervision. Some basic points concerning music leadership in California schools were presented. Philosophies and basic positions, as developed by professional music organizations, were discussed. Music was shown to be a useful and relevant part of the curriculum. Some of the recent emphasis on music education was pointed out, particularly in the face of financial cutbacks and stresses on accountability. The need for efficient music leadership was emphasized. The heterogeneous nature of music leadership was shown

from its early roots in nineteenth-century supervision. Various titles such as director, supervisor, coordinator, consultant, chairman, and specialist were discussed in view of their dovetailed nature. Other factors, such as size of district, finances, facilities, personalities, numbers of administrators, teachers, and students and other variables were shown to have an effect on school music programs.

The final section of this chapter pointed out: (1) learning theories, (2) goals, objectives, and accountability, and (3) a few of the numerous innovations and programs that have affected music education and broadened the scope of music leadership. This section pointed out the need, in the face of mountainous duties and roles, for leadership in district music programs.

This concludes the review of the pertinent literature. There are theoretical bases discussed in many books and periodicals supporting the need for district music leadership. Dissertations, along with other sources, have analyzed the various roles and titles of music supervision. The literature contains little or no opposition to the inclusion of music leaders in school districts. At the same time, many districts do not have and other districts are eliminating the positions of music leadership. This study has attempted to open an area of research which can be used to determine factors that may affect music education. By doing research to analyze the effects of certain variables (such as music leadership status) on school music programs, some specific factors may be determined that may broaden musical opportunities for our children. This chapter has attempted to show the need to analyze the effects of music leadership. The following chapter will present research procedures that this study has used to analyze the use of school music leadership.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

During the past decade, schools have faced cutbacks. Music leadership positions in the school districts have often been eliminated in the face of financial stress. The focus of this study was to determine if there was any evidence that people in these positions have performed a service which has demonstrated effects on various elements of the music program. If positive effects were evidenced, then this would support establishing and/or maintaining music leadership positions. This chapter will deal with the methodology employed to determine the effects of leadership on school music programs.

The following topics will be discussed in this chapter: the population and sample, measurement instruments, procedures, and statistical analysis used in this study. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section deals with the selection of a population and sample. The second section discusses the development of the two instruments to be used to collect the data. The third section is concerned with the reliability and the validity of the instruments. Section four deals with the statistical treatment including the detailed hypotheses and the tests that were used. The research design was causal comparative or ex post facto, involving a treatment-control group survey.[1]

---

[1] Irvin J. Lehman and William A. Mehrens, Educational Research: Readings in Focus (2d ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), pp. 251-257.

Prior to the implementation of this project, some ideas were formulated concerning a study of music leadership. These ideas were included in the prospectus of this dissertation and taken to music educators, music supervisors, authors of books on music supervision, and university professors. Encouragement was received to pursue the investigation as outlined in the prospectus with some modifications. A California state official endorsed the study.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The main concern of this study dealt with an analysis of the effects of music leadership on music programs in the school districts of the State of California.

Selection of the Subjects to be Surveyed

The target population included students, teachers, administrators and parents in the schools of the State of California. In 1972-1973, California had over 1,000 school districts.[2] This population was so large that it was necessary to limit this group to a smaller, more manageable sub-population. First, all non-unified school districts were omitted, leaving 250 unified school districts. Unified districts were selected because they encompass a full K-12 program under one administration. Second, all unified districts with fewer than 5,000 students were omitted because none of the unified districts with fewer than 5,000

---

[2]United State Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Educational Directory, 1972-73: Public School Systems (Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1973).

students listed music officials.[3] There were music officials listed for some districts of 5,000 - 6,000 population. There was a total of 136 unified school districts with 5,000 or more enrollment in the State of California.[4]

This entire group of 136 unified school districts was selected as the sub-population. Data were obtained by mailing one survey to each district. The 1975 California Public School Directory was used to obtain the names of the music leaders and superintendents in each district.[5] The survey was personally addressed to the music leaders in districts where they had been identified. The survey was personally addressed to the superintendent in districts which had not listed music leaders.

Selection of the Subjects for the Opinionnaire

The study included a second phase. This was an opinionnaire to collect information about attitudes related to school district music programs. Selection of the subjects for the opinionnaire was done as follows.

The official who had filled out the survey had been asked if he would be willing to coordinate the distribution of 40 opinionnaires (see question 611 in Appendix A). The first ten districts WITH music leaders

---

[3]California State Department of Education, California Public School Directory (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1975).

[4]California Agency for Research in Education, Class Sizes in California School Districts: 1974-75: (Burlingame, California Agency for Research in Education Document, 1975).

[5]California State Department of Education, loc. cit.

and the first ten districts WITHOUT music leaders that responded with a "Yes" answer were selected to receive the opinionnaire. These first twenty districts were selected for the following reasons:

(1) The school year end was approaching and the opinionnaires needed to be mailed before it was too late for the task to be completed.

(2) The number of districts indicating their willingness to assist was not anticipated to be much larger than twenty.

(3) A representative sample was desired and hoped to be attained on a first-return basis. Geographical distribution was also desired and hoped to be attained by random return.

(4) If interaction effects of selection bias were introduced by the fact of districts being first to respond, then that bias would have been equal in both WITH and WITHOUT districts.[6]

The school official who had filled out the survey was sent a package of 40 opinionnaires. The name of that person was derived from the survey and mailing was directed to him personally. Each district official was asked to distribute the opinionnaire to people who were aware of the music program in the district. People who were not aware of the music program were not used because of the possibility that they may not have been familiar enough to make relevant responses. The 40 opinionnaires were to be distributed to ten students, ten teachers, ten administrators, and ten parents in each of the twenty districts. This phase was completed in the Spring of 1976. Randomization was not requested.

---

[6]Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1963), p. 19.

Second Selection of
Opinionnaire Subjects

A second selection of opinionnaire subjects was undertaken in the Fall of 1976. This was done in order to collect data from a randomized sample representative of the total school population and not just persons who were familiar with the music program. These results were to be compared with the data found in the first, or Spring mailing.

The twenty school districts which were used for the Spring sample were used again with the exception of those districts that did not respond. Addidional districts were selected as replacements. The same first-to-respond method was used in selecting these districts.

The school official who had filled out the survey was sent a package of opinionnaires. Twelve people were asked to participate. Strict random selection of individuals was requested. A random numbers table[7] was used to select three students, three teachers, three administrators, and three parents. The school official was instructed to carry out the following steps.

(1) Select a distributor in each of three high schools.

(2) The distributor was to select one student, one teacher, one administrator and one parent.

(3) This selection was done by using random numbers that were assigned. For example, if student number 470 was requested, the distributor was to give the opinionnaire to the 470th student on the school's alphabetical list of students. Teacher number X was to be

---

[7] John T. Roscoe, Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (2d ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975), pp. 410-437.

selected from the alphabetical list of teachers at that school. Administrator number Y was to be selected from the alphabetical list of administrators. The parent of student Z was selected by finding student Z on the alphabetical list of students (see Appendix E).

RESEARCH DESIGN

Development of the Survey Instrument

The first instrument (see Appendix A) was a survey which was given to one superintendent or music leader, as determined above, in each of the 136 school districts. Music education objectives were analyzed to determine what facets of the music programs might be examined. A review of the literature and interviews with music educators provided the basic rationale for the selection of items to be analyzed. There were basically two kinds of items included: those that required responses primarily quantitative and those that required responses that were primarily qualitative.

Most questions in the survey called for quantitative answers. These included questions concerning numbers of students, music classes and groups, music staff and goals for music education. Questions were also asked dealing with amounts of money spent on the music program.

A small number of items in the survey was qualitative as subjective judgements were solicited. Music festival ratings were included wihch required the opinions of the festival adjudicators. The administrator who filled in the survey was also asked to judge the adequacy of musical inventories. These inventories included musical instruments, uniforms, software, audio-visual materials, hardware, instructional space, and field trips.

Questions were also asked in order to separate districts into the two categories: WITH music leadership and WITHOUT music leadership. Arbitrary lines had to be drawn in order to make this separation. Districts included in the WITH category were placed there if they met the following criteria: (1) The district music leader had been spending an average of 50 percent or more of his time in an official administrative roll in music education over the past five years; (2) the district music leader had both elementary and secondary responsibilities in music education: (3) the responsibilities of the music leader included vocal, instrumental and general music curricula; (4) the music leader has not had to spend 50 percent or more of his time in teaching; (5) the music leader has not had to administer more than one other subject; and (6) the music leader has been trained in music education.

The guidelines suggested by Best were followed in the development of the survey and the opinionnaire.[8] Closed questions were used to facilitate ease of response and data tabulation. One open question was provided in the survey to give the respondent an opportunity to express specific strengths or weaknesses.[9]

Development of the Opinionnaire

The music program is for the benefit of the student. The attitudes of students concerning their music opportunities in school is

---

[8] John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 151.

[9] Deobald B. Van Dalen and William J. Meyer, Understanding Educational Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1966), p. 302.

relevant. An opinionnaire was formulated in order to analyze the opinions of students, teachers, administrators, and parents relative to the school music program (see Appendix B).

The opinions were solicited in three general areas: (1) attitudes toward school music and performing groups, (2) opinions of extrinsic influences affected by school music, and (3) attitudes toward out-of-school music compared to in-school music. Semantic differential concepts were used as the bases for developing the opinionnaire and for deriving measurement of attitudes.[10]

The same guidelines were followed in the development of the opinionnaire as were outlined in the survey. Both instruments were field tested, as discussed later under Validity and Reliability.

Procedures for Distribution and Collection of the Instruments

The surveys were mailed to the district music administrators or superintendents of the 136 school districts. A letter of transmittal (see Appendix A), and a letter of endorsement (see Appendix G) were included. The transmittal letters and addresses were individually typed and personalized to encourage response. Postpaid return envelopes were included. The officials were asked to respond within three weeks, but they were allowed two months. In order to encourage responses from those officials who had not responded, a followup mailing took place after four weeks. The followup included a letter and a prepaid postcard (see Appendix B). After eight weeks a phone call was made to all

---

[10]Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy M. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), p. 190.

district officials who had not yet responded. This call was used as a followup and also to facilitate cross validation of the nonrespondents.[11] This cross validation is explained in the section on Validity. One additional month was allowed to facilitate the cross validation.

The opinionnaire was mailed five weeks after the mailing of the survey. The opinionnaires were mailed to persons from the first twenty districts (ten WITH and ten WITHOUT) that volunteered to coordinate the distribution (see Appendix C). The letters of transmittal were typed individually and addressed to the school district official who had completed the survey. Instructions were included and a postpaid return envelope provided. A followup of this second instrument was made four weeks after it was mailed, and included a prepaid postcard for response (see Appendix D). Phone calls were made to the nonrespondents eight weeks after the original mailing. Opinionnaires were requested to be returned within three weeks, but they were accepted for two months.

The survey and the first opinionnaire were mailed and the follow-ups occurred during the Spring semester and early Summer of 1976. In the Fall of 1976, the randomized mailing of the opinionnaire took place. The districts which had responded to the Spring mailing were included in this sample, along with replacements for the nonrespondents to bring the total to twenty districts.

The second mailing was distributed to twelve people in each of the twenty districts (see Appendix E). In each district, they were to be given to three students, three teachers, three administrators, and three parents. All twelve were mailed in a large envelope to the central office

---

[11]Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (San Diego: Robert R. Knapp, Publisher, 1971), p. 93.

administrator. Inside were three packets, each to be given to a distributor at three high schools (except where there were less than three, in which case a high school would get two or three packets). In each packet there were four opinionnaires to be given out by the predetermined randomization process to one student, one teacher, one administrator, and one parent. The parent opinionnaire was prepared for mailing to the home of the parent and a return envelope provided. When each opinionnaire was completed, it was to be returned to the distributor who would return each packet to the central office. The central office was provided a postpaid return envelope in which to return all twelve opinionnaires.

Due to the additional time needed to facilitate the distribution of these opinionnaires, returns were requested within six weeks. A followup letter to the nonrespondents was mailed during the sixth week and included a prepaid postcard (see Appendix E). During the eighth week, a phone call was made to each nonrespondent. Acceptance of responses was terminated during the tenth week because it was assumed this would be adequate time for response.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Validity and Reliability of the Survey

Validity is regarded as the most important requisite needed for good measurement.[12] In order to assure the validity of the survey instrument, a panel of field testers was selected. Persons who were

---

[12]Victor H. Noll and Dale P. Scannell, Introduction to Educational Measurement (3d ed.; New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972), p. 135.

most likely to receive and fill out the survey would be assistant superintendents, curriculum coordinators, music leaders, or music teachers. The panel selected included eight persons representing all of these positions (see Appendix H). The panel also included university professors of music education and education administration.

Before mailing, the survey was evaluated and rewritten. The panel checked the survey for completeness, clarity, usefulness, logic, sequence, and appearance. This was done by reading it and marking items that were not clear or were questionable. Each panel member critiqued and discussed problems with the researcher and made suggestions for adjustments. The survey was rewritten and critiqued again. Prior to its mailing, the survey was evaluated by the panel as being usable.

Most questions in the survey dealt with fixed numbers such as: numbers of students, teachers, classes and amounts of funds. These details were generally available to district officials in their central offices. Other questions involved semantic differential concepts which will be discussed later. Fixed numbers are subject to error but generally are consistent because they are fixed. Thus, the survey was considered to be reliable because of the consistency of the fixed data that was requested. With fixed data it did not matter who completed the survey providing that the data were available.

In order to determine the accuracy of the survey data, the researcher compared survey responses against other available data. In the case of total student populations, school directories were consulted. Staff members of twelve districts were consulted concerning correctness of the survey responses. If no substantive discrepancies were discovered in these comparisons, the figures found in the survey responses were

considered to represent the current status of the district enrollment and music program.

Cross validation of the nonrespondents has been recommended if the response was less than 80 percent.[13] Two months after mailing the surveys, a cutoff date was observed. If the percentage of respondents was less than 80 percent, a cross validation of the nonrespondents was planned as follows: the district officials of those districts which had not responded were phoned and asked if they would still participate. A comparison of the original respondents to the later respondents was analyzed to determine any differences. If there were no differences between the two, then generalizations could be made to the complete target population, with reservations.

In order to determine any differences between original responses and cross validation responses, the following was done: a comparison was made to see if any data were markedly different. Where differences appeared to be substantial, standard deviation scores were determined in the original data. Then the average data were determined form the cross-validation districts. Finally, the cross validation means were checked to see if they were significantly different from the original sample. If there were no differences between the two, then generalizations were made to the complete target population. If differences were found, they were noted and discussed.

Validity and Reliability of the Opinionnaire

The opinionnaire questions were exclusively semantic differential

---

[13] Isaac, loc. cit.

scales using numbers to measure attitudes and opinions. The survey also used ordinal scales reflecting opinions concerning attendance at concerts and staff meetings, and the adequacy of music program inventories. In both instruments, the scales included four ranks, numbered 4, 3, 2, and 1. This created a forced choice situation in that there was no middle ground.[14] The 4 and 1 were the extremes, while the 3 and 2 tended toward the center.

Blood and Budd pointed out that one of the major aspects of validity has to do with subject relevancy.[15] Three areas concerning opinions and attitudes toward school music were used in the opinionnaire. These were (1) attitudes toward school music and performing groups, (2) opinions of extrinsic influences affected by school music, and (3) attitudes toward out-of-school music compared to in-school music. All of these dealt with the opinions of students and others for whom music programs are created and are relevant.[16] Further breakdown of the opinionnaire was done by using parts of the curriculum that people would recognize, such as: band, orchestra, chorus, guitar, concerts, music in general, and the uses and effects of music on students. Thus, the relevancy of the opinionnaire was considered to have had a positive effect on its validity.

The adjectives used in the opinionnaire were derived from a list of evaluative words only, since it has been suggested that only

---

[14]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (2d ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), p. 506.

[15]Don F. Blood and William C. Budd, Educational Measurement and Evaluation (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972), p. 9.

[16]California State Department of Education, Music Framework (Sacramento: Bureau of Publications, 1971), p. 48.

evaluative types are needed to measure attitudes. Only five pairs of adjectives were used in order to achieve brevity. The following are the pairs that were selected:

interesting.....boring

good.....bad

important.....unimportant

excellent.....poor

beautiful.....ugly

Relevance in music programs is reflected by evaluations such as being interesting, good, important, excellent, and beautiful. Each work reflects a different attitude, such as a musical group may sound ugly to someone, yet be important. It may be interesting, even though it is of poor quality. Excellent was used to indicate a value judgement reflecting quality, whereas good was used as a more general overall opinion. Each person would have his own view of the meaning of each of these words. The important point is not the exact meaning, but that a measurement of attitude was reflected by the responses.[17]

To determine and support the validity of this instrument, a field test panel was selected. The instrument was to be filled in by students, teachers, administrators, and parents, because these are the people most involved with school music. The panel included three in each category. The total of twelve people also included professional research people who were able to add comments important to sound research instrument construction. Criticisms were observed and adjustments made to the opinionnaire, as was done to the survey. The criticisms dealt with

---

[17]Osgood, op. cit., p. 143.

sentences that sounded as if they were directed only to students. Non-students felt they should not answer these. Thus, the sentences were rewritten to call for responses by non-students as well as students.

Osgood has supported the reliability of the semantic differential concept. Crawford supported this reliability in his dissertation.[18] The opinionnaire was tested for reliability by giving a pretest and a post-test using the opinionnaire. A group of seven of the field testers underwent this procedure with a time period of over one month between pretest and posttest. Using the Pearson product moment correlation, as suggested by Roscoe, each person's total score was ranked and the correlation was found to .929. A group of 27 students participated in the same procedure (with a one week time lapse in order to prevent historical contamination).[19] The correlation was found to be .972. A second group of 25 students participated in the same pretest and posttest procedure with one week time lapse in which the correlation was found to be .871. The high correlations indicate the reliability of the opinionnaire.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT

This section will deal with the specific hypotheses and the procedures used to test each hypothesis.

Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There will be no difference between school

---

[18]James D. Crawford, "The Relationship of Socioeconomic Status To Attitude Toward Music and Home Musical Interest in Intermediate-Grade Children" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1972), pp. 145-148.

[19]Campbell and Stanley, op. cit., p. 7.

districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of each of the five sub-hypotheses listed below. In each of the sub-hypotheses, the independent variable is the school district status of either WITH or WITHOUT music leadership. The dependent variables are shown in each of the sub-hypotheses.

H1.1: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of the proportions of students taking music classes and the total district population.

H1.2: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) the average number of students per music class and performance organization, (2) the number of students per musical performance and (3) the average ratings received in festival adjudications.

H1.3: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) district student enrollment/music staff ratio and (2) the number of music workshops for staff and attendance at these meetings.

H1.4: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) the amount of money spent per music student and per total district enrollment for the music program and (2) the adequacy of the numbers of instruments, uniforms, instructional space, and other factors pertinent to the support of music programs.

H1.5: There will be no difference between school districts WITH

and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) having board adopted goals for music education and (2) having a clearly delineated method as to who formulates and evaluates the attainment of these goals.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no difference between respondents' attitudes and opinions concerning school music programs in districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership. This hypothesis has three sub-hypotheses listed below. In each case the independent variable is the school district status of either WITH or WITHOUT music leadership. The dependent variables are shown with each sub-hypothesis.

H2.1: There will be no difference between respondents' opinions of school music in school districts WITH compared to school districts WITHOUT music leadership.

H2.2: There will be no difference between respondents' opinions of extrinsic influences attributed to school music in school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership.

H2.3: There will be no difference between respondents' attitudes toward out-of-school music compared to in-school music in school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership.

Hypothesis 1 coincides with the survey as follows: H1.1 coincides with the data requested in the survey indicated in the 100 series (see Appendix A); H1.2 coincides with the 200 series; H1.3 coincides with the 300 series; H1.4 coincides with the 400 series; and H1.5 coincides with the 500 series. The 600 series is not identified with any hypothesis but is used to identify and categorize districts into WITH and WITHOUT status.

Hypothesis 2 coincides with the opinionnaire as follows: H2.1

coincides with data requested in the opinionnaire numbered 01 to 30; H2.2 coincides with the numbers 31-36; and H2.3 coincides with the numbers 37-42. The pooled hypothesis deals with the numbers 01-42.

Statistical Analysis

In this section the tests and procedures used for each survey and opinionnaire question are outlined. The .05 level of significance was used. In each case the independent variable was the school district status of either WITH or WITHOUT music leadership.

Hypothesis 1.1 The data collected from question 105 was divided by the data from question 101 in order to determine the percentage of elementary students in each school district that were enrolled in the music program. The percentages from each district were ranked and the Mann-Whitney U-test was used.[20]

The data from question 106 was divided by the data from question 102 in order to determine the percentage of secondary students in each school district that were enrolled in the music program. The percentages from each district were ranked and treated in the same manner.

The data from questions 105 and 106 were totalled for each district and divided by the data totals from questions 101 and 102 in order to determine the total percentage of students enrolled in the district music program. The percentages from each district were ranked and the Mann-Whitney U-test was used.

The data from question 103 was placed in a two-by-two table and tested by the chi-square test for independent samples.[21] The independent

---

[20]Roscoe, op. cit., pp. 230-236. [21]Ibid., pp. 254-263.

variables were the numbers of districts responding with a "Yes" or "No" to the question concerning use of music in the self-contained elementary classrooms and the status of WITH or WITHOUT. The data from question 104 was placed in a two-by-four table with the independent variables being four quartiles and the status of WITH or WITHOUT. The quartiles were based on the amount of self-contained elementary classrooms that included music in their curriculum.

Hypothesis 1.2 In each of the following procedures that illustrate averages of students per music class and performance group, and concert, the district enrollment figures were used rather than music student enrollments. These figures were used to represent the numerical relationship of classes available to all students, as music is important to all students in a school district[22] and not only to an elite few.

The number of elementary students (question 101) was divided by the data from question 201 (Part 1) to determine the average number of students per each elementary non-performance music class. This was done for each district and then ranked and tested by using the Mann-Whitney U-test. The same procedure was repeated for question 102 (secondary students) divided by the data from question 201 (part 2). The total student enrollment (questions 101 and 102) was divided by the data from question 201 (parts 1 and 2) to determine the average number of students per each non-performance music class. This data was also ranked and tested using the Mann-Whitney U-test.

The data from question 101 was divided by the data from question

---

[22]California State Department of Education, op. cit., p. 1.

202 (part 1) to determine the average number of students per each elementary performance group. This was done for each district and then ranked and tested by using the Mann-Whitney U-test. The same procedure was repeated for question 102 (secondary students), divided by the data from question 202 (part 2). The total student enrollment (101 and 102) was divided by the data from question 202 (parts 1 and 2) to determine the average number of students per each performance group. These data were also ranked and tested using the Mann-Whitney U-test.

The total elementary enrollment (101) was divided by the total number of elementary music classes and performance groups (201 part 1 and 202 part 1). This was done to determine the average number of students per each elementary class and performance group. Likewise, the total secondary enrollment (102) was divided by the total number of secondary music classes and performance groups (201 part 2 and 202 part 2) to determine the average number of music students per music class and performance group. The districts were ranked and the Mann-Whitney U-test was used.

The total student enrollment (101 and 102) was divided by the total number of music classes and performance groups (201 and 202). This was done to determine the overall average number of students per music class and performance group. Each district was ranked and then tested by using the Mann-Whitney U-test.

The chi-square test for independent samples was used to test the data from question 203. A two-by-two table was created with the independent variables being the answers "Yes" or "No" as to whether concerts were presented to the general public and the status of WITH and WITHOUT. The data from question 204 dealt with performances in school

events and was treated the same way as was the data from question 203. The data from question 205 dealt with performances between separate schools and also was treated with the chi-square test for independent samples.

The purpose of question 206 was to allow each district an explanation as to why their performance groups were not able to perform, if such were the case. The percentage of WITH districts and WITHOUT districts responding to question 206 were compared.

The total student enrollment (101 and 102) was divided by the data from question 207 in order to determine each district's average number of students per district concert. This was done for each district and then ranked and tested by using the Mann-Whitney U-test.

Question 208 dealt with audience support of music performances. Four categories of attendance (from well-attended to poorly-attended) were provided. These four categories were one of the independent variables and were placed in a two-by-four chi-square table. The WITH and WITHOUT status was the other independent variable.

The chi-square test for independent samples was used to test the data from question 209. A two-by-two table was used with the independent variables being the answers "Yes" and "No" as to whether groups performed in music competition festivals, and the WITH or WITHOUT status.

The purpose of question 210 was to allow an explanation as to why each district's performance groups were not able to compete in music festivals if such were the case. The percentages of WITH districts and WITHOUT districts responding to question 210 were compared.

Question 211 involved festival ratings. "Command Performance" was weighted as four points, "Superior" as three, "Excellent" as two

"Good" as one, and "Lower" as zero. Each district's ratings were averaged and ranked. These ranks were compared for the WITH and WITHOUT groups by using the Mann-Whitney U-test.

Hypothesis 1.3 The data from question 101 was divided by the data from question 301 (part 1) to determine elementary student-staff ratios. These ratios were ranked by district and tested by the Mann-Whitney U-test. The data from question 102 was divided by the data from question 301 (part 2) to determine secondary student-staff ratios. These ratios were ranked by district and tested by the Mann-Whitney U-test.

The data from questions 101 and 102 were totalled and then divided by the total from question 301 (parts 1 and 2) to determine the overall student-staff ratios. These ratios were ranked by district and tested by the Mann-Whitney U-test.

A two-by-four table for chi-square test for independent samples was used for question 302. The independent variables were the WITH and WITHOUT status and the four categories of numbers of workshops, clinics and in-service training sessions for music teachers.

A chi-square two-by-three table was used for question 303 with the independent variables being the WITH and WITHOUT status and the three categories of attendance requirement. The data from question 304 was placed in a two-by-four table for chi-square test for independent samples. The independent variables were the four categories of opinions of music teacher attendance at workshops (well-attended to poorly-attended) and the WITH and WITHOUT status.

A two-by-four table for chi-square test for independent samples was used for question 305. The independent variables were the four

categories of numbers of workshops, clinics, and in-service training sessions for elementary classroom teachers and the WITH and WITHOUT status.

A chi-square two-by-three table was used for question 306 with the independent variables being the WITH and WITHOUT status and the three categories of attendance requirement. The data from question 307 was placed in a two-by-four table for chi-square test for independent samples. The independent variables were the four categories of opinions of elementary classroom teacher attendance at workshops (well-attended to poorly-attended), and the WITH and WITHOUT status.

Question 308 dealt with the use of outside assistance for the district music program. A chi-square two-by-two table was used with the answers "Yes" and "no" and the WITH and WITHOUT status as the independent variables.

The sum of the data from questions 101 and 102 was divided by the data from question 309 in order to determine the average number of students (district enrollment) per outside helper. These figures were ranked by district and tested with the Mann-Whitney U-test.

A two-by-four table was used for the WITH and WITHOUT status and the four categories of music staff turnover found in the data from question 310. The chi-square test for independent samples was used to test this data.

Hypothesis 1.4 The Mann-Whitney U-test was used to test the data derived from question 401. The total amount of funds was divided by the number of students (101 and 102) to determine per capita expenditures. These were ranked for use in the above test.

A two-by-four chi-square table was used with each of the eight parts of question 402 since each part provided four response categories. For example, the Adequacy of Musical Instruments item was ranked on a scale from 4 to 1. The ranks assigned by each district were then tallied in the appropriate cell and the chi-square test applied. This procedure was repeated for each of the eight inventory items. Responses were averaged for the total WITH and the total WITHOUT and these means were compared.

Hypothesis 1.5 The data from question 501 was tested by using a two-by-two table for chi-square test for independent samples. The number of "Yes" and "No" answers dealing with district goals for music education and the WITH and WITHOUT status were the independent variables. In question 502, each district was asked to check any of ten music education goals that were listed, or to add in any other goals that were not listed. The number of goals for each district were counted and then districts were averaged so that WITH and WITHOUT averages could be compared.

Question 503 was used to determine various methods of goal formulation. Question 504 was used to determine what people were responsible for evaluation of goal attainment. In both questions 503 and 504, the answers provided for a view of the role of the district music leader in goal formulation and evaluation. The procedure used in questions 503 and 504 was to compare percentages of WITH and WITHOUT responses to each category of persons responsible for goal formulation and goal attainment.

Other Questions Questions 001 and 002 were used to determine if the

district was a K-12 district. Questions 101 and 102 also determined if the district met the 5,000 minimum student enrollment required of sampled districts and to determine per capita data. All 600 series questions were designed to determine WITH or WITHOUT status. The criteria for categorizing districts as WITH or WITHOUT was outlined on page 53.

Opinionnaire Hypotheses Questions 1-30 from the opinionnaires were totalled and averaged to determine the overall district average concerning attitudes toward school music and performance groups. An average score of 4.00 was the most favorable, and a score of 1.00 was the least favorable. These average scores for each WITH and WITHOUT district were subjected to the t-test for independent samples.[23]

Questions 31-36 dealt with opinions concerning extrinsic influences affected by school music. The data from these questions were tested in the same manner as described in the above paragraph. Questions 37-42 dealt with attitudes toward out-of-school music compared to in-school music. The average scores for each WITH and WITHOUT district were subjected to the t-test for independent samples.

Questions 1-42 were pooled in order to determine an overall opinion concerning school music. The data from each district were averaged and placed in their respective columns. The t-test for independent samples was applied to these pooled data.

---

[23]Roscoe, op. cit., p. 217-223.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The major purpose of this study was to determine if there were any differences between school districts WITH music leaders and school districts WITHOUT music leaders. Two instruments (the Survey and the Opinionnaire) were used in order to obtain data that would be indicative of any differences. This chapter will present the data from a) the Suevey and the Cross Validation of the Survey, and b) the Opinionnaire.

Data concerning numbers of responses will be presented first. Comparisons will be made between the original survey responses and the cross validation responses. The responses from the two mailings of the opinionnaire will be compared. Then the Survey data for testing the first hypothesis and its five sub-hypotheses will be presented. The final section will show the Opinionnaire data used for testing the second hypothesis and its three sub-hypotheses.

SURVEY AND OPINIONNAIRE RESPONSE

Survey Response

Table I illustrates data concerning responses to the survey. Tabulation of the data revealed that 44 districts were classified as districts WITH music leadership according to the criteria outlined in Chapter 3; 92 districts were classified as districts WITHOUT music leadership according to the same criteria. Of these, a total of 106 districts responded to the survey. Thirty school districts did not complete the survey. Five of the respondents were not used in the

analysis because they were found to have fewer than 5,000 students. Table I shows that a response of 74 percent was obtained for use in this survey. Kerlinger has stated that a percentage return of this magnitude is adequate for analysis.[1]

TABLE I

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY

District Type	Number Sampled	Number Used in Analysis	Percentage Used in Analysis
WITH	44	36	82%
WITHOUT	92	65	71%
TOTAL	136	101	74%

Opinionnaire Responses

Table II shows the data concerning the numbers of districts that were involved in the coordination of the opinionnaire. Officials in all ten WITH districts coordinated the Spring, 1976 distribution of the opinionnaire. When the same ten districts were solicited in the Fall of 1976, nine completed the task. Of the ten WITH districts, officials in all ten completed the task during either the Spring or Fall or both.

[1]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (2d ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), p. 414.

TABLE II

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP COORDINATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE OPINIONNAIRES

District Type	Spring 1976			Fall 1976			Total Sampled in Either Spring or Fall or Both		
	Number in Sample	Number Responding	Percentage Responding	Number in Sample	Number Responding	Percentage Responding	Number in Sample	Number Responding	Percentage Responding
WITH	10	10	100%	10*	9	90%	10*	10*	100%
WITHOUT	10	6	60%	6* 4**	4* 4**	80%	10* 4**	6* 4**	71%
TOTAL	20	16	80%	16* 4**	13* 4**	85%	20* 4**	20	83%

* Original District
** Replacement District

Of the ten officials in the ten WITHOUT districts, six coordinated the Spring, 1976 distribution of the opinionnaire. These six were solicited again in the Fall of 1976 along with four replacements for those who had declined to respond in the Spring. Of these ten, four of the originals and all four replacements assisted. Officials from fourteen WITHOUT districts had been asked to complete the task in either the Spring or Fall or both. Ten of these fourteen completed their task in one or the other testing period. A total of twenty school districts were represented in the opinionnaire data.

Table III shows the numbers and percentages of people in all twenty districts that completed an opinionnaire. A total of 1040 individuals were asked to complete the opinionnaire during the Spring and Fall of 1976. Seven hundred five responses, or 68 percent, were completed. The first sample of the opinionnaire was not randomized. The second sample was a random sample which was compared to the first.

Survey Cross Validation and Opinionnaire Comparisons

Thirty-two WITH districts and 54 WITHOUT districts responded to the survey. Four WITH and eleven WITHOUT districts responded to the cross validation. The original 32 WITH districts' data were compared with the four cross validation WITH districts' data. The original 54 WITHOUT districts' data were compared to the eleven cross validation WITHOUT districts' data.

In general, the cross validation data from both the WITH and the WITHOUT districts were the same. Appendix J illustrates all comparisons for the cross validation of the survey and the two opinionnaire samples. In one case (marked with an asterisk, in Appendix J, H1.2) the data

TABLE III

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF PERSONS RESPONDING TO THE OPINIONNAIRE FROM DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP

District Type	Spring or Fall Sample	Persons in Sample	Persons Responding	Percentage of Response
WITH	Spring 76	400	335	84%
	Fall 76	120	92	77%
	Total	520	427	82%
WITHOUT	Spring 76	400	190	48%
	Fall 76	120	88	73%
	Total	520	278	53%
WITH AND WITHOUT	Total	1040	705	68%

were very skewed but was within one standard deviation from the mean in the original sample. The Fall Opinionnaire responses were compared to the Spring responses and were found to be the same.

In conclusion, all original survey and cross validation survey responses were pooled and treated in their respective WITH and WITHOUT categories. The Spring and Fall opinionnaire responses were also pooled and treated in the WITH and WITHOUT categories.

HYPOTHESIS ONE AND THE FIVE SUB-HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of each of the five sub-hypotheses listed below.

Significant differences were found in fourteen of the tests used in the five sub-hypotheses. School districts WITH music leaders had (1) higher percentages of student involvement in music, (2) more music performance opportunities, (3) more in-service opportunities in music for teachers, (4) more adequate inventories of musical instruments, and (5) more use of board adopted goals for music education. These differences will be shown in the tables and discussions listed under each sub-hypothesis.

Music Student Data

Hypothesis 1.1 stated: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of the proportions of students taking music classes and the total district population. Five tests were used to test this hypothesis.

TABLE IV

HYPOTHESIS 1.1: A COMPARISON OF DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF THE PERCENTAGES OF 1) STUDENTS INVOLVED IN MUSIC EDUCATION, AND 2) ELEMENTARY SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOMS INVOLVED IN MUSIC EDUCATION

1. (101, 105)* Elementary Student Involvement in Music

District Type	Number of Districts	U**	z	p
WITH	36	391	-5.52	<.001
WITHOUT	65	1949	--	--

2. (102, 106) Secondary Student Involvement in Music

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	36	513	-4.66	<.001
WITHOUT	65	1927	--	--

3. (101, 102, 105, 106) Total District Student Involvement in Music

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	36	335.5	-5.84	<.001
WITHOUT	65	2004.5	--	--

*Numbers corresponding to the Survey which is found in Appendix A.

**Mann-Whitney U-test.

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

4. (103) Number of Districts with Elementary Self-Contained Classrooms Involved in Music

District Type	Number of Districts	Number not Involved	Chi-Square	p
WITH	28	8	1.67	>.05
WITHOUT	41	24	--	--

5. (104) Numbers of Districts in Each Quartile of Elementary Self-Contained Classroom Involvement in Music

District Type	0%-24%	25%-49%	50%-74%	75%-100%	Chi-Square	p
WITH	8	6	10	12	2.97	>.05
WITHOUT	25	10	14	16	--	--

Table IV shows that some differences did exist. There were significant differences in the first three tests. In the last two tests, there were no significant differences. Therefore, it may be said that districts WITH music leadership had higher percentages of (1) elementary, (2) secondary, and (3) total district student involvement in music education. These differences were highly significant. The average percentage of WITH districts for total district student involvement was 21 percent compared to 13 percent for WITHOUT districts.

Music Classes and Performance Group Data

Hypothesis 1.2 stated: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) the average number of students per music class and performing organization, (2) the number of students per musical performances, and (3) the average rating received in festival adjudications. Sixteen tests were used to test this hypothesis.

Table V shows that some differences did exist. There were significant differences in three of the tests. These three tests dealt with performance groups which indicated that WITH districts have put emphasis on performance groups, more so than in other areas of curricula. There were no significant differences in all of the other tests.

In the first nine tests, average numbers of each district's students per music class and/or performance groups were determined. Availability of classes and performance groups was determined by smaller numbers of students in the district per each class. Performance groups were more available for students in elementary schools, secondary schools and the total K-12 program. These differences were highly

TABLE V

HYPOTHESIS 1.2: A COMPARISON OF DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF 1) THE AVERAGE NUMBERS OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN MUSIC CLASSES AND PERFORMANCE GROUPS, AND 2) MUSIC PERFORMANCE OPPORTUNITIES

1. (201.1) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each Elementary Non-Performance Music Class

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	15	141.5	-1.74	>.05
WITHOUT	28	278.5	--	--

2. (201.2) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each Secondary Non-Performance Music Class

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	30	848.5	0.51	>.05
WITHOUT	53	741.5	--	--

3. (201) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each Non-Performance Music Class

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	15	153	-1.14	>.05
WITHOUT	26	237	--	--

4. (202.1) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each Elementary Music Performance Group

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	29	334	-4.06	<.001
WITHOUT	51	1145	--	--

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

5. (202.2) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each Secondary Music Performance Group

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	31	649.5	-2.72	<.01
WITHOUT	64	1334.5	--	--

6. (202) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each Music Performance Group

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	28	342	-3.81	<.001
WITHOUT	51	1086	--	--

7. (201.1-202.1) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each Elementary Music Class and Performance Group

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	13	98	-1.70	>.05
WITHOUT	23	201	--	--

8. (201.2-202.2) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each Secondary Music Class and Performance Group

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	24	328.5	-0.35	>.05
WITHOUT	29	367.5	--	--

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

9. (201-202) Ranking of Districts' Average Numbers of Students per Each District Music Class and Performance Group

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	13	108	-1.37	>.05
WITHOUT	23	191	--	--

10. (203) Numbers of Districts in which Performance Groups Perform for Public Concerts

District Type	Yes	No	Chi-Square	p
WITH	36	0	0	>.05
WITHOUT	65	0	--	--

11. (204) Numbers of Districts in which Performance Groups Perform for In-School Performances

District Type	Yes	No	Chi-Square	p
WITH	36	0	0	>.05
WITHOUT	65	0	--	--

12. (205) Numbers of Districts in which Performance Groups Perform for Intra-School Performances

District Type	Yes	No	Chi-Square	p
WITH	36	0	0	>.05
WITHOUT	63	2	--	--

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

13. (207) Ranking of Districts by Ratio of Total District Enrollment per Each Performance Experience

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	28	699.5	-0.15	>.05
WITHOUT	51	728.5	--	--

14. (208) Numbers of Districts per Category of How Well Concerts are Attended

	Well Attended		Poorly Attended			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	17	17	2	0	3.24	>.05
WITHOUT	28	26	8	3	--	--

15. (209) Numbers of Districts in Which Performance Groups Perform in Competitive Festivals

District Type	Yes	No	Chi-Square	p
WITH	35	1	0	>.05
WITHOUT	65	2	--	--

16. (210) Ranking of Districts by the Average Festival Ratings of Performance Groups

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	26	492.5	-1.49	>.05
WITHOUT	48	755.5	--	--

significant. No significant differences were found in any of the other tests.

Music Staff Data

Hypothesis 1.3 stated: There will be no difference between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) music student/music staff ratios, and (2) the number of music workshops for staff and attendance at these meetings. Thirteen tests were used to test this hypothesis.

Table VI shows that some differences did exist. The data from six of these tests were significant. WITH districts offered more music staff development meetings for music teachers than did WITHOUT districts. Sixty-four percent of the WITH districts recommended music staff development meetings for music teachers while 69 percent of the WITHOUT districts did not recommend or require these meetings for music teachers. WITH districts offered more music staff development meetings for elementary teachers than did WITHOUT districts. One-half of the WITH districts recommended music staff development meetings for elementary teachers while 78 percent of the WITHOUT districts did not recommend or require these meetings for elementary teachers. These differences indicate that WITH districts placed more emphasis on music staff development meetings for music teachers and elementary teachers. These differences were highly significant.

There were significant differences between districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of using outside helpers (such as university interns, student teachers, aides, and volunteers). When comparing WITH and WITHOUT districts' ratios of students per outside

TABLE VI

HYPOTHESIS 1.3: A COMPARISON OF DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF 1) STUDENT/MUSIC STAFF RATIOS, 2) STAFF DEVELOPMENT MEETINGS, 3) USE OF OUTSIDE HELP, AND 4) STAFF TURNOVER

1. (301.1) Ranking of Districts by Elementary Student/Music Staff Ratios

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	36	949.5	-0.75	>.05
WITHOUT	58	1138.5	--	--

2. (301.2) Ranking of Districts by Secondary Student/Music Staff Ratios

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	36	970	-1.42	>.05
WITHOUT	65	1370	--	--

3. (301) Ranking of Districts by Total District Student/Music Staff Ratios

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	36	930.5	-0.88	>.05
WITHOUT	58	1157.5	--	--

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

4. (302) Numbers of Districts Reporting in Each Category of Numbers of Music Teacher Staff Meetings per Month

District Type	5 and More Meetings	3 - 4 Meetings	1 - 2 Meetings	No Meetings	Chi-Square	p
WITH	2	3	26	5	20.11	<.001
WITHOUT	1	3	22	39	--	--

5. (303) Numbers of Districts Reporting in Each Category of Staff Meeting Requirement for Music Teachers

District Type	Required	Recommended	Not Required	Chi-Square	p
WITH	6	23	7	21.85	<.001
WITHOUT	4	16	45	--	--

6. (304) Numbers of Districts Reporting in Each Category of Attendance at Music Staff Meetings When NOT Required

	Well Attended		Poorly Attended			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	7	19	3	1	3.52	>.05
WITHOUT	8	11	5	3	--	--

7. (305) Numbers of Districts Reporting in Each Category of Numbers of Elementary Teacher Staff Meetings for Music Education per Month

District Type	5 and More Meetings	3 - 4 Meetings	1 - 2 Meetings	No Meetings	Chi-Square	p
WITH	0	2	22	12	14.27	<.01
WITHOUT	1	3	16	45	--	--

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

8. (306) Numbers of Districts Reporting in Each Category of Elementary Teachers' Staff Meeting Requirement for Music Education

District Type	Required	Recommended	Not Required	Chi-Square	p
WITH	6	18	12	19.80	<.001
WITHOUT	4	10	51	--	--

9. (307) Numbers of Districts Reporting in Each Category of Attendance at Elementary Staff Meetings for Music Education When NOT Required

	Well Attended		Poorly Attended			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	3	12	9	0	6.39	>.05
WITHOUT	4	4	6	3	--	--

10. (308) Numbers of Districts Reporting Use of Outside Help for Music

District Type	Use Outside Help	Do Not Use	Chi-Square	p
WITH	31	5	5.78	<.02
WITHOUT	37	28	--	--

11. (309) A Comparison by Ranking Districts WITH and WITHOUT Music Leadership in Terms of Ratios of Districts' Student Enrollment per Each Outside Helper. (Only those Districts Reporting Use of Outside Help).

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	29	431.5	-0.66	>.05
WITHOUT	33	525.5	--	--

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

12. (309) A Comparison by Ranking of Districts WITH and WITHOUT Music Leadership in Terms of Ratios of Districts' Student Enrollment per Each Outside Helper. (All 101 Districts)

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	36	774.5	-2.81	<.01
WITHOUT	65	1565.5	--	--

13. (310) A Comparison of Districts WITH and WITHOUT Music Leadership in Terms of the Number of Districts Reporting Various Percentages of Staff Turnovers

District Type	0%-5%	6%-10%	11%-15%	16% and More	Chi-Square	p
WITH	32	4	0	0	2.77	>.05
WITHOUT	51	10	2	2	--	--

helper and ranking all of the responding districts, the WITH district ratios were much smaller. This indicates that WITH districts used outside help more than did WITHOUT districts.

No differences were found in any of the other tests. There were no significant differences between WITH and WITHOUT districts in terms of student/staff ratios. This indicated that WITH districts have achieved student participation, performance opportunities, and staff development opportunities in music education without having to hire more music personnel than were employed in WITHOUT districts.

Financial Data

Hypothesis 1.4 stated: There will be no differences between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) the amount of money spent per music student and per total district enrollment for the music program, and (2) the adequacy of the numbers of instruments, uniforms, instructional space, and other factors pertinent to the support of music programs. Nine tests were used to test the above hypothesis.

Table VII shows that there was one difference. The data from one test was significant and the data from eight tests were not significant. Officials in WITH school districts reported more adequate inventories of musical instruments than did officials in WITHOUT districts. No significant differences were found in the adequacies of any of the other inventory categories.

No significant differences were found in expenditures per capita based on total district enrollment. No significant differences were found in expenditures per capita based on music student enrollment.

TABLE VII

HYPOTHESIS 1.4: A COMPARISON OF DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF 1) PER CAPITA EXPENDITURES, AND 2) INVENTORY ADEQUACIES

1. (401) Ranking of Districts by Expenditures Per Capita for Music Education (Based on Total District Enrollment)

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	27	584.5	-1.22	>.05
WITHOUT	52	819.5	--	--

2. (401) Ranking of Districts by Expenditures Per Capita for Music Education (Based on Music Student Enrollment)

District Type	Number of Districts	U	z	p
WITH	27	633	-0.41	>.05
WITHOUT	52	741	--	--

3. (402) Adequacies of Music Instruments

	Adequate		Inadequate			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	11	14	11	0	8.53	<.02
WITHOUT	8	24	26	7	--	--

TABLE VII (CONTINUED)

4. (402) Adequacies of Music Uniforms and Robes

	Adequate		Inadequate			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	11	17	7	1	4.31	>.05
WITHOUT	13	26	18	8	--	--

5. (402) Adequacies of Software Used in Music Programs

	Adequate		Inadequate			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	11	20	5	0	3.61	>.05
WITHOUT	14	36	10	5	--	--

6. (402) Adequacies of Audio Visual Equipment for Music Programs

	Adequate		Inadequate			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	5	12	17	2	1.88	>.05
WITHOUT	10	21	25	9	--	--

7. (402) Adequacies of Music Hardware

	Adequate		Inadequate			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	9	19	5	3	2.25	>.05
WITHOUT	20	26	15	4	--	--

TABLE VII (CONTINUED)

8. (402) Adequacies of Field Trip Opportunities in Music

	Adequate		Inadequate			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	9	12	12	3	2.09	>.05
WITHOUT	19	17	17	12	--	--

9. (402) Adequacies of Instructional Space for Music

	Adequate		Inadequate			
District Type	4	3	2	1	Chi-Square	p
WITH	5	22	5	4	6.41	>.05
WITHOUT	10	24	21	10	--	--

WITH districts have shown significant differences in higher numbers of (1) students involved in music, (2) music performance opportunities, (3) staff development opportunities, and (4) musical instruments. At the same time, there have been no significant differences in per capita expenditures. Thus, districts WITH music leaderhsip had more involvement and opportunity in music education than did WITHOUT districts without having higher expenses.

Goal Data

Hypothesis 1.5 stated: There will be no difference between districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership in terms of (1) having board adopted goals for music education and (2) having a clearly delineated method as to who formulates and evaluates the attainment of these goals. One test was used to test this hypothesis, and three other comparisons were done as illustrated in Table VIII.

WITH districts' boards of education adopted goals for music education more than did WITHOUT districts' boards. Eighty-three percent of the WITH districts reported use of goals compared to 51 percent in WITHOUT districts. Districts (WITH and WITHOUT) that reported goal adoption showed little variation in the number of goals or which individual goals they checked.

Music leaders in WITH districts were the persons most likely to have formulated and evaluated music education goals. Only half of the WITHOUT districts used goals, and goal formulation and evaluation was carried out by various district officials as shown in Table VIII. When there were part-time music leaders in WITHOUT districts, they were the persons that were most likely to formulate and evaluate goals. Twelve

TABLE VIII

HYPOTHESIS 1.5: A COMPARISON OF DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF THE ADOPTION, FORMULATION, AND EVALUATION OF GOALS FOR MUSIC EDUCATION

1. (501) Numbers of Districts that Have District Adopted Goals

District Type	Goal Adoption	No Goal Adoption	Chi-Square	p
WITH	30	6	9.02	<.01
WITHOUT	33	32	--	--

2. (502) A Comparison of the Average Numbers of Goals Reported by School Districts

District Type	Number of Districts	Average Number of Goals per District	% of Districts Using Goals
WITH	36	7.36	83%
WITHOUT	65	3.63	51%

3. (503) Numbers and Percentages of Districts in Which Various Officials Formulated District Goals

	With Music Leadership		Without Music Leadership	
Board/Administration	2	5%	7	11%
Music Leaders	23	64%	12	19%*
Music Teachers	4	11%	10	15%
Parents and Students	1	3%	4	6%
No District Goals	6	17%	32	49%
Total Number of Districts	36	100%	65	100%

*Part-time Music Leaders

TABLE VIII (CONTINUED)

4. (504) Numbers and Percentages of Districts in Which Various Officials Evaluated Goal Attainment

	With Music Leadership		Without Music Leadership	
Music Leaders	21	58%	8	12%
Superintendent and/ or Principal	6	17%	17	26%
Outside Consultation	0	0%	0	0%
Testing	0	0%	0	0%
Music Teachers	3	8%	7	11%
Students	0	0%	1	2%
No District Goals	6	17%	32	49%
Total Number of Districts	36	100%	65	100%

WITHOUT districts had part-time leaders and seven of these reported use of goals. Five of these reported that goal formulation and evaluation was done by the music leader. Five part-time music leaders reported having trouble fulfilling their duties due to part-time assignments and expressed a need for more time in administrative roles.

As pointed out under financial data, WITH districts have allowed for more opportunity and involvement in music education without higher expenses. WITH districts showed more goal orientation which may account for the significant differences in music programs.

In summary, the data showed that WITH districts were more likely to formulate, adopt, and evaluate goals for music education. Music leaders in WITH districts and part-time music leaders in WITHOUT districts were most often the official who formulated and evaluated these goals. This illustrates the importance of music leadership in giving direction to music education.

The Open Question (610)

One open question was asked in order to give districts an opportunity to express opinions that were not covered by the survey. Some generalizations are shown below:

There were only three WITH districts that made negative comments: (1) money, time, staff and scheduling for music related activities were reported as being inadequate; (2) music teachers were assigned non-music duties; and (3) music leaders were fearful of job elimination.

In WITH districts positive statements far outnumbered the negative by fifteen to one. The positive comments included: (1) excellent cooperation, communication, interaction, involvement and

commitment existed between administration, students, parents, staff and community; (2) general music education activities were enhanced by utilizing Kodaly, Orff and Suzuki methods of instruction, recorders, strings, wind instruments, rhythm instruments and activities, and exploration programs in schools, and with emphasis in the elementary schools; (3) pilot programs and music programs in general were imporving and expanding; (4) music experiences were provided in summer programs, district festivals, solo and ensemble opportunities, other performance opportunities, federal grants (up to $200,000 in one district), and involvement with professional symphonies; (5) excellent and cooperative staffs and steering committees assured coordination and vertical structuring; (6) aides, university student help, retired teachers and parents as helpers were being utilized; (7) a community talent bank, and a strong central library controlled by teachers were in operation and (8) unusual activities in specific districts included trips across the nation and abroad, a Guiness record for one band performing for over 40 hours, and Rose Parade performances.

WITHOUT districts reported many positive things including; (1) some districts have had a positive board, good parent support, and involvement with the arts community; (2) good elementary programs, use of song flutes, Orff, ECE, and general music programs were being undertaken; (4) specific districts have had excellent choral festivals, a bicentennial program and a superior jazz band; (5) music staffs were committed to music education, teacher committees provided for coordination and vertical structures, and resource teachers were used; (6) a new unified district was seeking more music leadership and one district reported a new music coordination job in 1976-77; and (7) music groups

were involved in field trips and the Rose Parade.

WITHOUT districts also reported many negative things including: (1) there were problems of lack of board support, poor facilities, and no money; (2) there was no support for classroom music, no elementary music program and the elementary music programs were being eliminated; (3) others complained about poor music programs, negative reports on music programs in general, and that some music departments were almost extinct; (4) schools had no marching bands, no orchestra, no vocal and some were dropping music altogether; (5) understaffing, no coordination, no goal direction, no objectives, no feeder programs, and aimlessness in general was reported; and (6) performing groups were poor.

Twenty-two WITH districts made a total of 44 positive comments, and 3 WITH districts made a total of 3 negative comments. Twenty-three WITHOUT districts made a total of 35 positive comments and 16 WITHOUT districts made a total of 26 negative comments.

Titles and Roles of Music Leaders

Questions 602 and 603 in the survey were used to determine the titles and roles of district music leaders. Of the 36 WITH districts, six reported the title and role of supervisor; three reported the title, consultant; and 27 were listed as coordinators. These titles suggest that music leaders most often serve in a staff rather than a line function. WITHOUT districts with part-time music leaders also reported that their roles were of a staff function, such as coordinator and consultant.

HYPOTHESIS TWO AND THE THREE SUB-HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated: There will be no difference between respondents' attitudes and opinions concerning school music programs in districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership. This hypothesis is the pooled hypothesis from each of the three sub-hypotheses listed in this section.

Significant differences were found in the data used to test Hypothesis 2. As illustrated in Table IX, people (students, teachers, administrators, and parents) in WITH districts had an overall more favorable opinion of the music programs in their districts than did people in districts WITHOUT music leadership. The above differences were highly significant.

Hypothesis 2.1

Hypothesis 2.1 stated: There will be no difference between respondents' opinions of school music in school districts WITH compared to school districts WITHOUT music leadership.

People in WITH districts had more favorable opinions of their school music programs (band, orchestra, chorus, guitar, and school music in general) than did people in WITHOUT districts.

Hyptohesis 2.1

Hypothesis 2.2 stated: There will be no difference between respondents' opinions of extrinsic influences caused by school music in school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership.

People in WITH districts had more favorable opinions about the

TABLE IX

HYPOTHESIS 2: A COMPARISON OF DISTRICTS WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF THE OPINIONS OF STUDENTS, TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND PARENTS, CONCERNING THEIR DISTRICT'S MUSIC PROGRAM

1. (H2.1 Questions 1-42) Overall Opinions of School Music

District Type	Number of Districts	Mean	s.d.	t	p
WITH	10	3.319	.0253	4.99	< .001
WITHOUT	10	2.963	.0257	--	--

2. (H2.1 Questions 1-30) Opinions of School Music Groups

District Type	Number of Districts	Mean	s.d.	t	p
WITH	10	3.365	.0198	5.52	< .001
WITHOUT	10	2.991	.0260	--	--

3. (H2.2 Questions 31-36) Opinions of Extrinsic Influences Caused by School Music

District Type	Numberof Districts	Mean	s.d.	t	p
WITH	10	3.520	.0388	3.51	< .01
WITHOUT	10	3.194	.0467	--	--

4. (H2.3 Questions 37-42) Opinions of In-School Music Compared to Out-of-School Music (*skewed distribution)

District Type	Number of Districts	Mean	s.d.	t	p
WITH	10	2.892	.0874*	2.73	< .02
WITHOUT	10	2.598	.0289	--	--

extrinsic influences caused by school music than did people in WITHOUT districts. People in WITH districts scored higher in their opinions that school music helped students to understand and enjoy music, and to feel that school music was necessary, useful, and adequate in their school district.

Hypothesis 2.3

Hypothesis 2.3 stated: There will be no difference between respondents' attitudes toward out-of-school music compared to in-school music in districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership.

People in WITH districts had more favorable opinions in terms of out-of-school music than did people in WITHOUT districts. People in WITH districts scored higher in their opinions that in-school music was enjoyable, useful and satisfying, and that it utilized enough music styles and ethnic music when compared to out-of-school music. People in WITH districts had more tendency to feel that in-school music had helped students to participate more fully in out-of-school music.

SUMMARY

Significant differences do exist between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership. The data supported that WITH districts have: (1) higher percentages of student involvement; (2) more opportunities for students to be involved in music performance groups; (3) more staff development experiences in music education for music teachers and elementary teachers; (4) more adequate musical instrument inventories; and (5) more goal direction and orientation.

Students, teachers, administrators, and parents had more

favorable opinions of district music programs in districts WITH music leadership. School officials were more positive and much less negative about their music programs in WITH districts than were officials in districts WITHOUT music leadership.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

A summary of the statistical results pertaining to each hypothesis will be presented in this chapter. Conclusions will be summarized in the next section. The final section will list implications for further study.

Thirty-six districts WITH music leadership and 65 districts WITHOUT music leadership completed the survey representing district enrollments of 2,240,000 students and 357,000 music students. Opinionnaires were received from 705 respondents from twenty school districts.

SUMMARY

Hypothesis 1: The Survey

Forty-four tests were used to determine if differences existed between school districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership. Fourteen of these tests showed differences favoring WITH districts. The differences are outlined under each sub-hypotheses below. No tests showed differences favoring districts WITHOUT music leadership.

Music Students (H1.1)

School districts WITH music leadership had larger percentages of students involved in school music programs. The overall average in WITH districts was 21 percent compared to 13 percent in WITHOUT districts. WITH districts have larger percentages of students involved

in music programs in (1) the elementary schools, (2) the secondary schools and (3) the total K-12 programs. All these differences were statistically significant.

Music Classes and Performance Groups (H1.2)

WITH districts provided more opportunities for students in performance groups. Significant differences were found in the ratios of students per performance group. WITH districts reported a smaller ratio of district students per performance group. This student/performance group ratio did not represent the average number of music students in performing groups, but the average number of district students per performing group. This statistic was used to indicate the availability of performance group experiences for all district students and not just music students. The smaller ratio in WITH districts indicated that performance group experiences were more available. These differences were found in the total K-12 program and were highly significant.

No differences were found in non-performance music classes between WITH and WITHOUT districts. This pointed out that WITH districts put more emphasis on performance groups, since that was the only area showing significant differences.

Music Staff (H1.3)

There were no significant differences between WITH and WITHOUT districts in terms of student/staff ratios in either of the elementary, the secondary, or the total K-12 program.

Significant differences were observed between WITH and WITHOUT districts in the numbers of staff development opportunities in music

education. WITH districts responded that they held an average of one or two of these meetings per month, while most WITHOUT districts reported having none. These differences were observed for music teachers and for elementary classroom teachers.

The majority of school districts WITH music leadership reported recommending attendance at music staff development meetings. The majority of WITHOUT districts indicated that music staff development meetings were not recommended or required. These differences were observed for music teachers and for elementary classroom teachers. WITH districts offered more staff development experiences in music education for music teachers and elementary teachers.

Significant differences were observed in terms of the numbers of districts reporting the use of outside help. WITH districts reported more use of University interns, student teachers, aides and volunteers. The ratios of outside help for district students were much smaller in WITH districts.

Finances for Music Education (H1.4)

No significant differences were found in per capita expenditures when comparing districts WITH and WITHOUT music leadership. Per capita expenditures were compared in terms of the total district enrollment and the music student enrollment.

Significant differences were found in the adequacies of musical instruments indicative that WITH districts' instrument inventories were more abundant than they were in WITHOUT districts. No significant differences were found in any of the other inventory categories used for music education.

Goals for Music Education (H1.5)

Only one test was used concerning district board adopted goals and significant differences were found. Thirty of the 36 WITH districts reported use of board adopted goals, compared to only 33 of the 65 WITHOUT districts in the sample.

Goals were formulated by the music leaders in 64 percent of all the WITH districts compared to 19 percent of the WITHOUT districts (part-time music leaders). Forty-nine percent of the WITHOUT districts did not use board adopted goals. Evaluation of goal attainment was done by music leaders in 58 percent of all the WITH districts compared to 12 percent of the WITHOUT districts.

The above information supported the prominent role of music leadership in WITH districts. Even part-time music leaders in WITHOUT districts were given a prominent role in goal formulation and evaluation.

Hypothesis 1.4 indicated no significant differences in per capita expenditures, while other tests revealed more music opportunities and involvement in WITH districts. WITH districts showed more goal orientation which may account for the significant differences in music programs.

The Open Question (Survey 610)

When officials were given an opportunity to express anything else about music education in their school districts, the following observations were made: Officials in WITH districts tended to be much more positive about their music programs than did officials in WITHOUT districts; the ratio of positive comments between WITH and WITHOUT

districts (respectively) was 5:2; the ratio of negative comments was 1:5; the ratio of positive to negative comments in WITH districts (respectively) was 15:1, and in WITHOUT districts it was 4:3.

The Roles of Music Leadership

Thirty out of 36 WITH districts' respondents reported that their roles were a staff and not line function. Titles of these jobs were coordinator and consultant. WITHOUT districts with part-time music leaders also reported that their roles were a staff function. Only six of the WITH districts reported the line function of music supervisor.

Hypothesis 2:
The Opinionnaire

Pooled data from the three sub-hypotheses revealed that the respondents (students, teachers, administrators, and parents) in districts WITH music leadership had more favorable opinions of their music programs than did the respondents in WITHOUT districts. The differences are outlined under each sub-hypotheses and in each case they were highly significant.

The Three Sub-Hypotheses

Hypothesis 2.1: Respondents in WITH districts had more favorable opinions of their school music groups (band, orchestra, chorus, guitar, and school music in general).

Hypothesis 2.2: Respondents in WITH districts had more favorable opinions of extrinsic influences caused by school music. In other words, they tended to feel that school music helped students to understand and enjoy music, and to feel that school music was necessary, useful, and adequate in their school district.

Hypothesis 2.3: Respondents in WITH districts had more favorable opinions of in-school music compared to out-of-school music. In other words, they tended to feel that in-school music was enjoyable, useful, and satisfying, and that it utilized enough music styles and ethnic music when compared to out-of-school music.

CONCLUSIONS

The focus of this study was on the effects of music leadership. The data has supported that significant differences existed favoring districts WITH music leadership. Thus, the purposes of this study have been fulfilled. The data have supported that WITH districts have displayed more opportunities for children. WITH districts had (1) more students in the music program, (2) more performance group opportunities, (3) more staff development opportunities in music education, (4) more adequate musical instrument inventories, and (5) more goal orientation.

Significant differences were shown in WITH districts in performance group opportunities. No significant differences between WITH and WITHOUT districts were shown in non-performance areas. Districts WITH music leadership emphasized performance groups in both elementary and secondary schools.

Opinions of students regarding their music programs is a relevant factor in music education.[1] The data demonstrated a key factor in school districts WITH music leadership: the students, teachers, administrators, and parents have reflected a more positive attitude toward their school

---

[1]Don F. Blood and William C. Budd, Educational Measurement and Evaluation (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972), p. 9.

music programs than did the people in schools WITHOUT music leadership.

The literature has supported the utilization of music administration. The results of this study suggest that music leadership may be a key factor in effective music programs, which is in agreement with the literature. Roles of music leadership have been discussed in the literature, while the effects of music leadership have been neglected.

The data suggested that music leadership was a key factor in providing more expansive opportunities in music education for children. The data indicated that there were no significant differences in the amounts of money spent on music programs and in the numbers of music staff needed. These two items of information support that more opportunities in music education can be provided without additional cost and staff. The data also indicated that more goal orientation is provided by music leadership which may be an important element in producing the significant differences demonstrated by WITH districts. The study supports the Music Educators National Conference position that cutting music supervision is a misguided savings.[2]

The results of this study supported that school districts could benefit from the adoption of music leadership in districts which do not have these positions, and maintenance of this role in districts that already have them. The data supported that the staff function of coordination and consultation in music education has been a useful role.

This study has been in agreement with the "Position Papers" of

---

[2]Music Educators National Conference, "Position Paper," Music Educators Journal, LXI (November, 1974), pp. 68-70.

the Music Educators National Conference.[3] Further studies concerning the effectiveness of specific leadership roles are needed to give more credence to future position papers. Specific suggestions in position papers would be more useful when backed by empirical evidence.

Systematic planning includes the gathering of data concerning causes and effects on programs.[4] The gathering of existing data supplies administrators with facts relevant to needs assessment and systems analysis. This study has attempted to open an area of investigation into factors that will assist in improving the effectiveness of music programs. The data provided some information which may be useful toward analyzing the needs and directions of systematic leadership in music education.

Educational supervision has been concerned with processes which should lean toward the education of children.[5] The data suggested that music leadership has been a factor in this process.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The results of the present study suggested the following areas for further study.

1. Since this study has shown that districts WITH music leadership have demonstrated positive data concerning music education,

---

[3]Ibid.

[4]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (3d ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1975), pp. 48-52.

[5]Katharyn V. Feyereisen, A. John Fiorino, and Arlene T. Nowak. Supervision and Curriculum Renewal: A Systems Approach (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 33.

other studies might be undertaken to isolate the causes of these effects. The causes have not been determined. One cannot claim that music leadership has been the factor behind more effective music programs; however, the data presented this as a significant possibility. The fact that WITHOUT districts were not favored by any of the data indicated that the absence of music leadership was not a favorable factor.

2. More in-depth studies might be made in order to try to isolate specific patterns of music leadership that influence music programs.

3. The variables used to examine the sub-hypotheses of the present study might be isolated and investigated in more depth in order to further analyze the effects of music leadership.

4. Universities, music education associations, and other agencies might pool students, professors, and other researchers into broad studies that can be divided up into various parts, in order to accomplish more meaningful and directed studies in music education and music leadership.

5. Since a large amount of research has gone into roles of music leadership and very little has been done on the effects of music leadership, more emphasis might be placed on the effects rather than the roles of music leadership. While cause and effect relationships have not been discussed, the study has shown significance toward further studies which may or may not support various administrative roles in music education. While there was no evidence to favor one role over another, further studies are implied for the purpose of determining what roles and methods of manpower deployment might be more effective.

6. Since this study showed that music leadership was not associated with higher costs, studies might be undertaken to analyze and determine methods of money management that would give support to music education.

7. Since this study has been in agreement with the "Position Papers" of the Music Educators National Conference, further studies might be made to give position papers more empirical support, or in which to develop position papers so that they are more valid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Bessom, Malcolm E. Supervising the Successful Music Program. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.

Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1959.

Birge, Edward B. History of Public School Music in the United States. Boston: Oliver Ditson Company, 1928.

Blood, Don F., and William C. Budd. Educational Measurement and Evaluation. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972.

Bloom, Benjamin S., ed. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Borg, Walter R. Educational Research. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965.

Browder, Lesley H., Jr., William A. Atkins, Jr., and Esin Kaya. Developing an Educationally Accountable Program. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1963.

Castetter, William B. The Personnel Function in Educational Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971.

Eye, Glen G., and Lanore A. Netzer. Supervision of Instruction. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Feyereisen, Katharyn V., A. John Fiorino, and Arlene T. Nowak. Supervision and Curriculum Renewal: A Systems Approach. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Gary, Charles L. Music Education: Supervision in the Schools, ed. Lee C. Deighton. The Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. VI. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971.

Getzels, Jacob, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968.

Glenn, Neal E., William B. McBride, and George H. Wilson. Secondary School Music. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Goodman, A. Harold. Music Administration in Higher Learning. Provo, Utah: Press Publishing Limited, 1975.

Harrison, Raymond H. Supervisory Leadership in Education. New York: American Book Company, 1968.

Hermann, Edward J. Supervising Music in the Elementary School. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

House, Robert W. Administration in Music Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Isaac, Stephen, and William B. Michael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp, Publisher, 1971.

Jones, Archie N. Music Education in Action. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1960.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Klotman, Robert H. The School Music Administrator and Supervisor. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. 3d ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975.

Krathwohl, David R. How to Prepare a Research Proposal. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1966.

Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964.

Labuta, Joseph A. Guide to Accountability in Music Instruction. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.

Landon, Joseph W. How to Write Learning Activity Packages for Music Education. Costa Mesa, California: Educational Media Press, 1973.

Landon, Joseph W. Leadership for Learning in Music Education. Costa Mesa, California: Educational Media Press, 1975.

Lehman, Irvin J., and William A. Mehrens. Educational Research: Readings in Focus. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Leonhard, Charles, and Robert W. House. Foundations and Principles of Music Education. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1972.

Livingston, James A., Michael D. Poland, and Ronald E. Simmons. Accountability and Objectives for Music Education. Costa Mesa, California: Educational Media Press, 1972.

Lyman, Howard B. Test Scores and What They Mean. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Belmont, California: Lear Siegler, Inc./Fearon Publishers, 1962.

Marks, James R., Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops. Handbook of Educational Supervision. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Noll, Victor H., and Dale P. Scannell. Introduction to Educational Measurement. 3d ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy M. Tannenbaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Popham, W. James, and Eva L. Baker. Establishing Instructional Goals. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Roscoe, John T. Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Sachs, Curt. Our Musical Heritage. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Snyder, Keith D. School Music Administration and Supervision. 2d ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Unruh, Glenys G., and William M. Alexander. Innovations in Secondary Education. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

Van Dalen, Deobold B., and William J. Meyer. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1966.

Walker, Helen, and Joseph Lev. Statistical Inference. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1953.

Weyland, Rudolph H. A Guide to Effective Music Supervision. 2d ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Publishers, 1968.

PERIODICALS

Barnum, Walter K. "PPBS In Action," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), 64-70.

Belcheff, Koste A. "Costing Out the Music Program," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), 71-73.

Bennis, Warren G. "Post Bureaucratic Leadership," Trans-Action, (July-August, 1969), 41-61.

California Music Education Association. "Music Administrator Representative," CMEA News, XXX (September/October, 1976), p. 5.

Choate, Robert A. "Tanglewood at Seattle," Music Educators Journal, LV (September, 1968), 39-42.

Colwell, Richard. "Industry Goes to School: Performance Contracting," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), 56-60.

Dilmore, Ward. "Parent Drop-Ins," Music Educators Journal, (April, 1973), 48-50.

Dorman, Phyllis E. "Grassroots Accountability," Music Educators Journal, LX (November, 1973), 43-46.

Gaines, Joan B. "SOS From Chicago," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), 74-77.

Gelvin, Miriam P. "Arts Experience in Early Childhood Education," Music Educators Journal, LX (March, 1974), 27-31.

Guenther, Annette R. "Open Education Places the Arts in the Core of the Curriculum," Music Educators Journal, LX (April, 1974), 78-80.

Hansen, Kenneth H. "Accountability is a Premise, Not a Promise," Music Educators Journal, LXI (December, 1974), 40-41, 75-76.

Hayes, Margaret S. "Freedom Within Order," Music Educators Journal, LIX (November, 1972), 40.

Housewright, Wiley L. "Rock: Opinions Differ," Today's Education, LIX (May, 1970), 34-36.

Labuta, Joseph A. "Accent on the Output," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), 42-49.

Livingston, J. Sterling. "Myth of the Well-Educated Manager, Harvard Business Review, LXIX (January/February, 1971), 70-89.

Merrill, Mary Lou. "Making the Arts an Integral Part of the School Experience," Music Educators Journal, LXII (April, 1976), 94-96.

Music Educators National Conference. "Ethnic Music," Music Educators Journal, LIX (October, 1972).

Music Educators National Conference. "Music in American Society," Music Educators Journal, LIII (November, 1967).

Music Educators National Conference. "Music Supervisor/Administrator," Music Educators Journal, LXIII (March, 1977), 131-132.

Music Educators National Conference. "Music Survival," Music Educators Journal, LXIII (February, 1977), 45-50.

Music Educators National Conference. "Point of View: Accountability." Music Educators Journal, LXII (April, 1976), 90-93.

Music Educators National Conference. "Position Papers," Music Educators Journal, LXI (November, 1974), 68-70.

Music Educators National Conference. "The Chicago Crisis: A Chronology," Music Educators Journal, LIX (December, 1972), 34-36.

Music Educators National Conference. "The Contemporary Music Project for Creativity in Music Education," Music Educators Journal, LIII (March, 1968), 41-72.

Music Educators National Conference Commission on Instruction. "The Music Specialist in the Elementary School," Music Educators Journal, LIX (November, 1972), 60-62.

O'Keeffe, Vincent. "What Are Behavioral Objectives All About?," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), 50-55.

Poolos, James G. "Music Education: Success or Failure," Music Educators Journal, LX (September, 1973), 70-74.

Radocy, Rudolf E. "Behavioral Objectives: Shall We Continue?," Music Educators Journal, LX (March, 1974), 38-40.

Reimer, Bennett. "Putting Aesthetic Education to Work," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), 29-33.

Rosenkranz, Peggy A. "Perceptual-Motor Development," Music Educators Journal, LXI (December, 1974), 57-59.

Schwadron, Abraham. "Are We Ready for Aesthetic Education?," Music Educators Journal, LX (October, 1973), 37.

Smith, Ronald O. "The McNamara Syndrome in Education," Music Educators Journal, LIX (September, 1972), 60-64.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT AND LEARNED SOCIETIES

Biggs, George B. Jr. "A Suggested Taxonomy of Music for Music Educators," Journal of Research in Music Education, XIX (Summer, 1971), 168-182.

Bracht, Glenn H., and Gene V. Glass. "The External Validity of Experiments," American Educational Research Journal, V (November, 1968), 437-474.

California Agency for Research in Education. Class Sizes in California School Districts: 1974-1975. Burlingame, California: California Agency for Research in Education Document, 1975.

California Commission for Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education. The RISE Report. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1975.

California State Department of Education. Music Framework. Sacramento: Bureau of Publications, 1971.

California State Department of Education. Promising Programs in Arts Education. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1976.

Cole, Frances, and others. "Goals and Objectives in Music Education." Prepared by the Music Committee of the California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Southern Section, Spring, 1971.

Cole, Frances, and others. PPBS Set To Music. Leaflet Prepared by California Music Educators Association, no date.

Cooksey, John. "An Accountability Report for Music Education," Council for Research in Music Education Bulletin, XXXVI (Spring, 1974).

Dawson, Norman E. "Roles of Music Supervisors in Selected School Districts," Journal of Research in Music Education, XX (Fall, 1972), 397-402.

Ernst, Karl, and Charles Gary, eds. Music in General Education. Washington: Music Educators National Conference, 1965.

Gaines, Joan. "What the Principal Says When Music is Threatened," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, No. 393, (October, 1975), 13-17.

Henke, Herbert H. "Report of An Information Symposium on the Organization and Administration of Music Education Degree Programs," Journal of Research in Music Education, XVII (Fall, 1969), 301-308.

King, Martha L., and Reba M. Burnham. Supervision in Action. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1971.

Leeper, Robert R., ed. Changing Supervision for Changing Times. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1965.

Leeper, Robert R., ed. Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1965.

Leeper, Robert R., ed. Supervision: Emerging Profession. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1969.

McQuerrey, Lawrence. "Duties and Activities of Music Supervisory Personnel in California," Journal of Research in Music Education, XX (Fall, 1972), 379-384.

McQuerrey, Lawrence. "The Status of Elementary Special Music Teachers in California Public Schools," Journal of Research in Music Education, XVII (Winter, 1969), 416-422.

Music Educators National Conference. Guidelines in Music Education: Supportive Requirements. Washington: Music Educators National Conference Publications, 1972.

Phelps, Roger P. National Conference to Improve the Effectiveness of State Supervision of Music. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, January, 1966 (ERIC ED 010 412).

Picerno, Vincent J. "The Role of the Elementary Classroom Teacher and the Music Specialist: Opinions of the Music Supervisor," Journal of Research in Music Education, XVIII (Summer, 1970), 99-111.

Tatarunis, Alphonse M., and Malcolm E. Bessom. "How Musical is the Principal?," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, No. 393 (October, 1975), 23-30.

Thorn, Betty A. "An Investigation of Piaget's Conservation Theory and Its Application for Teaching and Developing Melodic and Rhythmic Concepts," Council for Research in Music Education, VL (Winter, 1976), 21-25.

United States Department of Health Education, and Welfare. Educational Directory, 1972-73: Public School Systems. Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1973.

UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

Ad Hoc Committee of the California Music Educators Association. "Music Administrators' Group Minutes," Letter from James R. Clemens to Committee Members. Santa Rosa, California: May 17, 1976.

Author unknown. "A Note About Objectives in Music Education." Provo, Utah: A handout from a Brigham Young University class in Music Administration and Supervision, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

Carlton, Patrick W., and Lloyd K. Bishop. "Professional Manpower Deployment in Urban Schools: A Case for Differentiated Teacher Staffing," New York: New York University, 1972. (Xeroxed).

Crawford, James D. "The Relationship of Socioeconomic Status to Attitude Toward Music and Home Musical Interest in Intermediate-Grade Children." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1972.

Dawson, Norman E. "A Study of the Roles of Music Supervisors in Selected School Districts." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1969.

Ervine, Max T. The Function of An Administrator. Kenosha, Wisconsin: G. Leblanc Corporation, 1957.

Good, Melvin L. "Music in Selected Virginia Elementary Schools Having No Music Specialist or Supervisor," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1961.

Henderson, Stanley L. "Factors, Differences, Trends and Relationships in the Administration and Supervision of Music in Fourteen Selected School Systems." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1959.

Kennard, F. Ralph. "The Role of State Music Supervision." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1974.

Landon, Joseph W. "Music Supervision in California City Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1959.

McQuerrey, Lawrence, Marian Hansen, Lawrence Durflinger. "A Report of the Duties and Activities of the Music Supervisory Personnel in the Public Schools of California." Stockton, California: The Department of Music Education, Conservatory of Music, University of the Pacific, 1971. (Xeroxed.)

Marsh, Warren Charles. "The Role of the County Music Consultant in California." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California. 1969.

Mills, Ellis W. "The Role of Music Supervisors in the Public School Systems in Georgia." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1975.

Shedd, Mark. (Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia). "Music Outside of the Schools." (Stockton, California: reprinted courtesy Dr. Gaylord A. Nelson, Superintendent San Joaquin County Schools), September, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Sommers, H. H. (Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Chicago). "The Spring Musicale." Ephraim, Utah: program for a school concert, April 29, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

Stockton Federation of Teachers. "Administrative Overhead," in open letter to Superintendent William Carey, Stockton, California, March 7, 1976. (Mimeographed.)

Stockton Teachers Association. "Lay Offs," Hot Wire, Stockton, California. March 10, 1976. (Mimeographed.)

Walters, David H. "Music Report Card" for Stockton Unified School District, Stockton, California, 1975.

Weyland, Rudolph H. Personal Interview. Visalia, California, December 30, 1975.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY AND LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stockton, California Founded 1851
95204

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

April 9, 1976

Dear

Over the past several years many books have been written about music supervision in our public schools. Studies have been undertaken concerning the roles of school district music leadership, but little has been done to show the effects of this leadership. In this time of accountability, a survey of the current data on music education may show the tendency that where there are more expansive opportunities in music for our children, there is also a district music leader. If such a trend is found, then we may be able to affect more musical experiences for our children, by expanding district music leadership.

Your school district has been selected to help in such a survey. Your input is essential to providing data with which the effects of music education leadership can be determined.

The enclosed survey covers quantitative questions about student enrollments, performing groups, music classes, staff, budget and facilities. Questions include district goals for music education and types of music leadership. It will take about 20 minutes to complete.

When you have finished the survey, please return it in the enclosed, postpaid envelope. If you find that your responsibilities prohibit your participation, please fill in the name of your school district on the first page and return the survey incomplete. The survey is coded, but all responses will be kept strictly confidential and utilized collectively. No reference will be made to school districts or individuals. It would be appreciated if you would return the survey by April 30, 1976, the deadline for this phase of the study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Hopkins

Thomas D. Hopkins

TDH:rc
Enclosures

SURVEY ON THE EFFECTS OF DISTRICT MUSIC LEADERSHIP

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each question as directed. Continuums are sometimes provided with 4 being one extreme and 1 the other extreme. 3 and 2 are not as extreme as 4 and 3. If you do not have information pertaining to a specific question, please indicate with a question mark.

FULL NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT_____

001 Which best describes your school district? Circle one.

1) K-12, 2) Elementary, 3) Secondary.

002 Which grade organization best describes your school district? Circle one.

1) K6-6, 2) K6-3-3, 3) K6-2-4, 4) K5-3-4, 5) Other (Specify) _____

STUDENTS

101 How many students are enrolled in your Elementary schools? _____

102 How many students are enrolled in your Secondary schools? _____

103 Is music a regular part of the self-contained Elementary Classroom Curriculum? Circle one. 1) Yes 2) No

104 What percentage of your self-contained Elementary Classrooms include music instruction? Circle one.

1) 0%-24%, 2) 25%-49%, 3) 50%-74%, 4) 75%-100%.

105 How many Elementary students are involved in music classes outside of their self-contained classroom? (Such as in band, orchestra, chorus, etc.). _____

106 How many students are enrolled in one or more music clsses in Secondary Schools? _____

PERFORMING GROUPS AND MUSIC CLASSES

201 How many music classes (which do little to no performing) do you have in the district? 1) Elementary _____ 2) Secondary _____

202 How many performing groups (which perform in a moderate to large amount) do you have in the district? 1) Elementary _____ 2) Secondary _____

203 Do your groups perform concerts for the general public? 1) Yes 2) No

204 Do your groups perform for school assemblies, sports events, and rallies? Circle one. 1) Yes 2) No

205 Do your groups perform for other schools? (Inside and outside the school district). Circle one. 1) Yes 2) No

206 If NO is circled in numbers 203, 204, or 205, which best describes why they do not perform publicly? Circle those that apply. If YES, skip to number 207.

1) Lack of finances or transportation or equipment.

2) Lack of support by audiences.

3) Groups are exclusively learning groups and do not need to perform.

4) Performance is prohibited by school policy.

5) Other. (Please specify) _____

207 If YES is circled in numbers 203, 204, or 205, how many performances were done by your groups during March, 1976? _____

208 Audience support of your programs is which of the following? Circle one number.

Well Attended 4 3 2 1 Poorly Attended

209 Do your groups perform in music competition festivals? Circle one. 1) Yes 2) No

210 If NO is circled in number 209, which reason best describes why they do not? Circle those that apply.

1) Lack of finances or transportation, or equipment.

2) Festivals are not considered important.

3) Groups are exclusively learning groups and do not need to perform.

4) Performance is prohibited by school policy.

5) Other. (Please specify) _____

211 If YES is circled in number 209, indicate the number of Festival ratings your groups received in the most recent

music competition festival that they attended.

1) Command Performance _____ 2) I-Superior _____

3) II-Excellent _____ 4) III-Good _____

5) Lower _____

STAFF

301 How many teachers teach music half to full time? 1) Elementary ____

2) Secondary ____

302 How many music workshops, clinics, and in-service training sessions are held in one month (average) for Music Teachers? Circle one.

1) None, 2) 1-2, 3) 3-4, 4) 5 or more.

303 Attendance at the above by Music Teachers is: Circle one.

1) Required 2) Recommended 3) Not Required

304 If attendance is 2) Recommended or 3) Not Required, how well are they attended? Circle one number.

Well Attended 4 3 2 1 Poorly Attended

305 How many music workshops, clinics, and in-service training sessions are held in one month (average) for Elementary Classroom Teachers? Circle one.

1) None, 2) 1-2, 3) 3-4, 4) 5 or more.

306 Attendance at the above by Elementary Classroom Teachers is: Circle one.

1) Required, 2) Recommended, 3) Not Required.

307 If attendance is 2) Recommended, or 3) Not Required, how well are they attended? Circle one number.

Well Attended 4 3 2 1 Poorly Attended

308 Do you have University Interns, Student Teachers, Aides, Volunteers, and/or Others assisting in district music programs? Circle one. 1) Yes 2) No

309 If YES, approximately how many assisted during the month of March, 1976? (Include both elementary and secondary). _____

310 What approximate percentage turnover do you have in your certificated music staff? Circle one.

1) 0%-5%, 2) 6%-10%, 3) 11%-15%, 4) 16% or more.

SUPPORT

401 Indicate the total funds provided by district allotment/outside sources for music during the 1975-76 school year. Please fill in both spaces if possible. Indicate zero where applicable. Exclude salaries and fringe benefits.

District Allotment _____, Outside Sources (PTA, Candy Sales etc. _____

402 Describe your inventory in terms of present needs. Circle one number for each category.

	Adequate			Inadequate
1) Instruments.	4	3	2	1
2) Uniforms, Robes, Etc.	4	3	2	1
3) Software (Music, Books, Libraries)	4	3	2	1
4) Audio Visual.	4	3	2	1
5) Hardware (Stands, Risers, Etc.)	4	3	2	1
6) Field Trips, Road Trips.	4	3	2	1
7) Instruction Space for Music.	4	3	2	1
8) Other. (Please specify). _____	4	3	2	1

GOALS

501 Does your district have board adopted goals for music education? 1) Yes 2) No

If NO in number 501, skip to number 503.

502 If YES in number 501, circle as many below as are representative of your goals.

01) To develop positive attitudes and appreciations in music.

02) To improve the quality of responses to aesthetic experiences.

03) To provide creative experiences in music.

04) To provide music experiences for all children, and not just the musically talented.

05) To provide more in-depth experiences for the musically talented (but not excluding others).

06) To develop skills in singing, playing, listening, moving, reading and writing music.

07) To improve literacy in such things as histories, styles, forms, elements, and instruments of music.

08) To develop qualities of concentration, perseverance and cooperation.

09) To improve social skills and an awareness of cultural idioms.

10) To improve aural discrimination.

11) Other. (Please specify) _____

503 Who provides the major impetus in the formulation of the board adopted district goals for music education. Circle the one that is most applicable.

1) The school board and/or administration.

2) The music leader (supervisor, coordinator, etc.)

3) The music teacher.

4) Parents and students.

504 Which of the following is most responsible for the evaluation of the attainment of these goals. Circle the one that is most applicable.

1) Observations by District Music Leadership.

2) Observations by other Supervisor and/or Principal.

3) Outside Consultation.

4) Administration of standardized or other tests.

5) Peer (Teacher) evaluation.

6) Student evaluation.

MUSIC LEADERSHIP

601 Does your school district have a musically trained leader in an official administrative position that

involves coordination, planning, organizing, and/
or controlling of the music curriculum? Circle one. 1) Yes 2) No

602 What is the name and title of the person directly responsible for the district music program? This will be treated confidentially.

NAME_____ TITLE _____

603 Which best describes his role? Circle one. 1) Supervisor,

2) Coordinator, 3) Consultant, 4) Other. (Please specify).

_____

604 Please indicate the percentage of time the music leader applied to leadership over the past 5 school years.

	0%-24%	25%-49%	50%-74%	75%-100%
1) 1975-1976				
2) 1974-1975				
3) 1973-1974				
4) 1972-1973				
5) 1971-1972				

Check one for each year.

605 What percentage of the time does the music leader spend directly in teaching students?

	0%-24%	25%-49%	50%-74%	75%-100%
1) 1975-1976				
2) 1974-1975				
3) 1973-1974				
4) 1972-1973				
5) 1971-1972				

Check one for each year.

606 The duties of the Music Leader include which of the following? Circle those that apply.

1) Elementary
2) Secondary
3) Vocal
4) Instrumental
5) General
6) Art
7) Dance
8) Drama
9) Other, (Specify) _____

607 If you have more than one, how many other Music Administrators do you have that operate on a district-wide (or part of a district) basis? _____

608 Please list names and titles of persons in these positions. This will be treated confidentially. If more space is needed, please use the reverse side.

NAME	TITLE
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

609 Name and title of person filling in this survey.

NAME _____ TITLE _____

610 Describe unique things about your music program that were not covered, or anything else that is not adequately described in this survey. Use the reverse side if necessary.

611 Would you be willing to coordinate the distribution of a short opinionnaire to be circulated among 40 persons in your district subsequent to this survey? Circle one. 1) Yes 2) No

APPENDIX B

SURVEY FOLLOWUP LETTER AND CARD

UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stockton, California Founded 1851
95204

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

May 6, 1976

Dear Superintendent/District Music Leader:

On April 9, 1976, a survey was sent to you concerning the effects of district music leadership. I am hoping that you will respond. If you do not have a district music leader, please respond to the survey anyway. Your response is imperative to the success of my project regardless of your music leadership status. If our mail has crossed, I thank you for your cooperation. Please check in the appropriate space of the attached card and return it to me, as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Hopkins

Thomas D. Hopkins
University of the Pacific
Dept. of Educational Administration

TDH:rc
Enclosure

Dear Mr. Hopkins:

_____ I have completed/am completing your questionnaire, and it should be in your hands shortly.

_____ I have received your questionnaire, but will not be able to complete the task at this time.

_____ Please send another and I will complete it.

Signed _____

Title _____

School District _____

APPENDIX C

OPINIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stockton, California Founded 1851
95204

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

May 12, 1976

Dear

Your early response to the Survey of the Effects of District Music Leadership, and willingness to coordinate the opinionnaire, is highly appreciated. Enclosed are 48 opinionnaires. Please distribute these to people in your district who are aware of the district's music program. If you do not have a district music leader, please complete the opinionnaire anyway.

Please divide these opinionnaires as follows:
10 to High School Students.
10 to Teachers.
10 to Administrators.
10 to Parents or Community Members.
8 extra to be used only if needed.

The opinionnaires will take each person about 5 minutes to complete. Please collect them from your respondents no later than 5 days from the time of distribution so that there is not too much delay. When they are completed, please return them in the enclosed postpaid envelope. If you find that they can not be completed for any reason, please return them immediately so that I may select another district. The information on the opinionnaires will be kept strictly confidential. No reference will be made to school districts or individuals. The data will be used collectively.

It would be appreciated if you would return these by June 4, 1976. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Hopkins

Thomas D. Hopkins

TDH:rc
Enclosures 48

OPINIONNAIRE SCHOOL DISTRICT MUSIC PROGRAM

INSTRUCTIONS

It is not necessary to put your name on this paper. All answers are to be completed by circling the response that you think best describes your school district's music education program. A word such as interesting appears on one side of the numbers 4, 3, 2, and 1. On the opposite side is the word boring. If you think the school band does things that are interesting you would circle the 4, if boring, circle the 1. A 3 would lean toward the interesting side, and a 2 toward the boring side. 3 and 2 are not as interesting and boring as are 4 and 1. There should be one response for each of the categories: Interesting, Good, Important, Excellent, and Beautiful. Try to respond to each item, however, if that item does not exist in your school, you may omit it. Please return this as soon as possible to the person from whom you received it.

Thank You.

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT _____

Which category do you fit? Circle one.

1) Student, 2) Teacher, 3) Administrator, 4) Parent/Community Member.

A	The things the school band does are:	01) Interesting	4	3	2	1	Boring
		02) Good	4	3	2	1	Bad
		03) Important	4	3	2	1	Unimportant
		04) Excellent	4	3	2	1	Poor
		05) Beautiful	4	3	2	1	Ugly
B	Musical concerts by the school band are:	06) Interesting	4	3	2	1	Boring
		07) Good	4	3	2	1	Bad
		08) Important	4	3	2	1	Unimportant
		09) Excellent	4	3	2	1	Poor
		10) Beautiful	4	3	2	1	Ugly
C	Musical concerts by the school orchestra are:	11) Interesting	4	3	2	1	Boring
		12) Good	4	3	2	1	Bad
		13) Important	4	3	2	1	Unimportant

C	Musical concerts by the school orchestra are:	14) Excellent	4	3	2	1	Poor
		15) Beautiful	4	3	2	1	Ugly
D	Musical concerts by the school choruses are:	16) Interesting	4	3	2	1	Boring
		17) Good	4	3	2	1	Bad
		18) Important	4	3	2	1	Unimportant
		19) Excellent	4	3	2	1	Poor
		20) Beautiful	4	3	2	1	Ugly
E	The use of guitar classes in school is:	21) Interesting	4	3	2	1	Boring
		22) Good	4	3	2	1	Bad
		23) Important	4	3	2	1	Unimportant
		24) Excellent	4	3	2	1	Poor
		25) Beautiful	4	3	2	1	Ugly
F	The music that students learn in this district is:	26) Interesting	4	3	2	1	Boring
		27) Good	4	3	2	1	Bad
		28) Important	4	3	2	1	Unimportant
		29) Excellent	4	3	2	1	Poor
		30) Beautiful	4	3	2	1	Ugly

INSTRUCTIONS

In the following, please respond to each statement by circling the appropriate degree of agreement:
4--you strongly agree
3--you agree
2--you disagree
1--you strongly disagree

31)	School music helps students to understand music.	4	3	2	1
32)	School helps students to enjoy music.	4	3	2	1
33)	School music gives students something that they can use in life.	4	3	2	1
34)	Music classes are very important to have in school.	4	3	2	1

35) It is important to have bands, orchestras, choruses, and other musical groups in school. 4 3 2 1

36) Music classes that are available in this school district are adequate. 4 3 2 1

37) In-school music is more enjoyable than out-of-school music. 4 3 2 1

38) In-school music helps students to participate more fully in out-of-school music. 4 3 2 1

39) In-school music is more useful to students than out-of-school music. 4 3 2 1

40) In-school music uses enough of the styles that are found in out-of-school music. 4 3 2 1

41) In-school music is more satisfying to students than out-of-school music. 4 3 2 1

42) In-school music uses enough of the ethnic styles of music. 4 3 2 1

43) Are you involved in the music program? 1) Yes

2) No

APPENDIX D

OPINIONNAIRE FOLLOWUP LETTER AND CARD

UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stockton, California Founded 1851
95204

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

June 16, 1976

Dear Superintendent/District Music Leader:

On May 12, 1976, an opinionnaire was sent to you concerning the effects of district music leadership. This particular opinionnaire was to be distributed to 40 people in your district. If you do not have a district music leader, please respond to the opinionnaire anyway. The completion of this phase is imperative to the success of my project regardless of your music leadership status. If our mail has crossed, I thank you for your cooperation. Please check in the appropriate space of the attached card and return it to me, as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Thomas D. Hopkins

Thomas D. Hopkins
University of the Pacific
Dept. of Educational Administration

TDH:rc
Enclosure

Dear Mr. Hopkins:

_____ I have completed/am completing the distributing of your opinionnaires, and they should be in your hands shortly.

_____ I have received your opinionnaires, but will not be able to complete the task at this time.

_____ Your opinionnaires never reached me, please send more.

Signed _____

Title _____

School District _____

APPENDIX E

LETTERS AND INSTRUCTIONS USED IN THE SECOND MAILING OF THE OPINIONNAIRE

UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stockton, California Founded 1851
95204

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

September 13, 1976

Dear

Last Spring (April 9, 1976) you completed a survey concerning your School District's Music Program. Thank you very much for your response. Your input has been very useful. I have had a 77% return. In the survey you indicated your willingness to coordinate a short opinionnaire.

Twenty districts only, are being sampled. Consequently your help in completing this task is imperative to the success of the study.

Twelve opinionnaires only need to be completed. These have been divided into three packets. Each packet is to go to one High School. If you have less than 3 High Schools, give 2 or 3 packets to a High School.

Each packet contains opinionnaires to be filled out by 1 student, 1 teacher, 1 administrator, and 1 parent. When all 3 packets are completed, 3 students, 3 teachers, 3 administrators, and 3 parents will have responded, making a total of 12.

A secretary, student, teacher, parent or any volunteer, at each school can carry this out by following the instructions. Instructions are provided with each packet, and one extra set of instructions is enclosed for you. Each packet is in an envelope, ready to be used by the person at the High School who agrees to assist. When they have completed the task, they should return them to you.

When you receive them from the High School, please mail them to me in the enclosed postpaid envelope. If you can not complete this task, please return all the material to me blank, so that I will know that you can not participate.

I sincerely hope that you can assist me with the completion of this project. The State Department Consultant in Arts Education has endorsed this study and the results will be very useful to music education in California Schools. Six weeks have been allowed from the time of mailing so that all might be mailed from your office to me by Oct. 24. The results will be mailed to you when complete. I sincerely appreciate your time, patience and help.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Hopkins

Thomas D. Hopkins

TDH:rc

UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Stockton, California Founded 1851
95204

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

September 13, 1976

Dear

Last Spring (May 12, 1976), I sent to you 40 opinionnaires concerning your School District Music Program. Thank you very much for your response. Returns were very useful. The total response was 85%.

After analysis by my doctoral committee and research specialists, a question was raised. This question concerned the lack of randomization and use of only those who were familiar with the music program. This would not be representative of a total population, but would be a biased sample. This was not your fault.

I regret that a follow-up is necessary in order to validate the original sample. This follow-up will be used to test the validity of the original 40 opinionnaires.

Twenty school districts only are being sampled. Consequently, your help in completing this follow-up is imperative to the success of the study. This follow-up should be much easier due to the smaller number of persons that will be involved. Careful instructions have been supplied for you to make it as simple as possible and not too time consuming.

Twelve opinionnaires only need to be completed. These have been divided into three packets. Each packet is to go to one High School. If you have less than 3 High Schools, give 2 or 3 packets to a High School.

Each packet contains opinionnaires to be filled out by 1 student, 1 teacher, 1 administrator, and 1 parent. When all 3 packets are completed 3 students, 3 teachers, 3 administrators and 3 parents will have responded making a total of 12.

A secretary, student, teacher, parent or any volunteer, at each school can carry this out by following the instructions. Instructions are provided with each packet, and one extra set of instructions is enclosed for you. Each packet is in an envelope, ready to be used by the person at the High School who agrees to assist. When they have completed the task, they should return them to you.

When you receive them from the High School, please mail them to me in the enclosed postpaid envelope. If you can not complete this task, please return all the material to me blank, so that I will know that you can not participate.

I sincerely hope that you can assist me with the completion of this project. The State Department Consultant in Arts Education has endorsed this study and the results will be very useful to music education in California Schools. Six weeks have been allowed from the time of mailing so that all might be mailed from your office to me by Oct. 24. The results will be mailed to you when complete. I sincerely appreciate your time, patience and help.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Hopkins

Thomas D. Hopkins

TDH:rc
Enclosures

INSTRUCTIONS

Enclosed are four opinionnaires, plus one extra. Please give them to 1 student, 1 teacher, 1 administrator and 1 parent by following the instructions below. If you receive 2 or 3 packets, please follow the same instructions for each packet.

RANDOMNESS IS OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE!

Random numbers have been assigned for each respondent. The random numbers are different in each packet. For example, if student #75 is called for, the 75th student found in the alphabetical school file of currently enrolled students should be determined and asked to fill out the survey (teacher #12 on the alphabetical list of teachers, administrator #2 on the alphabetical list of administrators). Parent #150 would be the parent of student #150 on the alphabetical list of students. If the student or parent number exceeds your enrollment, subtract 100 from their assigned random number. Subtract 10 from the teacher number if it is too large.

Parent distribution and collection will be more involved as they will have to be mailed. Each packet contains one postpaid envelope in which the opinionnaire is already contained for mailing to a parent. A postpaid return envelope is also included so that the parent can return it to you. Please address one envelope to the parent and address the return envelope so that it will be returned to you (the distributor).

A phone call to the parent should be made to confirm that this person will respond to the opinionnaire and a follow-up phone call should be made within one week. If they decline, move to the parent of the next student in the alphabetical list.

You, as the distributor at your school, should see to the distribution and collection of the four opinionnaires. (This might be eight or twelve if you receive more than one packet).

The distributor should return the opinionnaires to the central office administrator from whom they were received by OCTOBER 15, 1976.

If one person can not respond, such as student #75, give it to student #76, or #77, etc. as needed. Please maintain randomness so that no bias is introduced. By using random numbers, a random sampling of 240 people who are representative of California people will be achieved. Do NOT give these to music people only (unless that happens strictly by chance).

Thank you for your cooperation. Your help is imperative to the success of this project, and will be valuable to Music Education in California Schools. The project has the endorsement of the State Department of Education, Consultant in Arts Education.

If you have any questions call station to station collect (209) 477-7515, Thomas D. Hopkins, or secretary will assist you.

APPENDIX F

LIST OF DISTRICTS SURVEYED

LIST OF DISTRICTS SURVEYED

CODE	SCHOOL DISTRICT	CITY
**001	A B C Unified	Cerritos, California
002	Alameda City Unified	Alameda, California
003	Alhambra City Elementary High	Alhambra, California
*004	Alvord Unified	Riverside, California
*005	Antioch Unified	Antioch, California
**006	Arcadia Unified	Arcadia, California
*007	Azusa Unified	Azusa, California
*008	Baldwin Park Unified	Baldwin Park, California
*009	Barstow Unified	Barstow, California
*010	Bassett Unified	La Puente, California
*011	Bellflower Unified	Bellflower, California
012	Berkeley City Unified	Berkeley, California
*013	Beverley Hills Unified	Beverley Hills, California
*014	Bonita Unified	San Dimas, California
015	Burbank Unified	Burbank, California
*016	Capistrano Unified	Capistrano Beach, California
*017	Castro Valley Unified	Castro Valley, California
018	Charter Oak Unified	Charter Oak, California
*019	Chico Unified	Chico, California
020	Chino Unified	Chino, California
*021	Claremont Unified	Claremont, California
**022	Clovis Unified	Clovis, California
*023	Coachella Valley Unified	Thermal, California
**024	Colton Joint Unified	Colton, California
*025	Compton Unified	Compton, California
026	Conejo Valley Unified	Thousand Oaks, California
*027	Corona-Norco Unified	Corona, California
028	Covina Valley Unified	Covina, California
*029	Culver City Unified	Culver City, California
*030	Davis Joint Unified	Davis, California
*031	Desert Sands Unified	Indio, California
*032	Downey Unified	Downey, California
*033	El Rancho Unified	Pico Rivera, California
*034	Elk Grove Unified	Elk Grove, California
*035	Eureka City Elementary and High	Eureka, California
*036	Fairfield-Suisun Unified	Fairfield, California
*037	Folsom-Cordova Joint Unified	Folsom, California
038	Fontana Unified	Fontana, California
*039	Fremont Unified	Fremont, California
*040	Fresno City Unified	Fresno, California
*041	Garden Grove Unified	Garden Grove, California
*042	Gilroy Unified	Gilroy, California
*043	Glendale Unified	Glendale, California
044	Glendora Unified	Glendora, California
045	Hacienda-LaPuente Unified	La Puente, California

*Districts used in Data Analysis
**Districts which coordinated the Opinionnaire

CODE	SCHOOL DISTRICT	CITY
**046	Hayward Unified	Hayward, California
*047	Hemet Unified	Hemet, California
048	Inglewood Unified	Inglewood, California
049	Irvine Unified	Irvine, California
**050	Jurupa Unified	Riverside, California
*051	Kings Canyon Unfied	Reedley, California
052	La Canada Unified	La Canada, California
*053	Las Virgenes Unified	West Lake Village, California
**054	Lincoln Unified	Stockton, California
*055	Livermore Valley Joint Unified	Livermore, California
*056	Lodi Unified	Lodi, California
*057	Lompoc Unified	Lompoc, California
058	Long Beach Unified	Long Beach, California
*059	Los Angeles Unified	Los Angeles, California
*060	Lucia Mar Unified	Pismo Beach, California
*061	Lynwood Unified	Lynwood, California
*062	Madera Unified	Madera, California
063	Manteca Unified	Manteca, California
064	Marysville Joint Unified	Marysville, California
065	Milpitas Unified	Milpitas, California
**066	Modesto City Elementary and High	Modesto, California
*067	Monrovia Unified	Monrovia, California
**068	Montebello Unified	Montebello, California
069	Monterey Peninsula Unified	Monterey, California
*070	Morena Valley Unified	Sunnymead, California
071	Morgan Hill Unified	Morgan Hill, California
*072	Mt. Diablo Unified	Concord, California
*073	Napa Valley Unified	Napa, California
*074	New Haven Unified	Union City, California
*075	Newark Unified	Newark, California
**076	Newport-Mesa Unified	Newport Beach, California
*077	Norwalk-La Mirada City Unified	Norwalk, California
*078	Novato Unified	Novato, California
079	Oakland City Unified	Oakland, California
*080	Oceanside City Unified	Oceanside, California
*081	Orange Unified	Orange, California
*082	Pajaro Valley Joint Unified	Watsonville, California
*083	Palm Springs Unified	Palm Springs, Unified
**084	Palo Alto City Unified	Palo Alto, California
**085	Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified	Rolling Hills, California
*086	Paramount Unified	Paramount, California
*087	Pasadena Unified	Padadena, California
**088	Petaluma City Elementary and High	Petaluma, California
*089	Pittsburg Unified	Pittsburg, California
*090	Placentia Unified	Placentia, California
091	Pleasanton Unified	Pleasanton, California
*092	Pomona Unified	Pomona, California
093	Poway City Unified	Poway, California

CODE	SCHOOL DISTRICT	CITY
094	Redlands Unified	Redlands, California
*095	Rialto Unified	Rialto, California
096	Richmond Unified	Richmond, California
097	Riverside Unified	Riverside, California
*098	Rowland Unified	Roland Heights, California
*099	Sacramento City Unified	Sacramento, California
*100	Saddleback Valley Unified	Laguna Hills, California
*101	San Bernardino City Unified	San Bernardino, California
**102	San Diego City Unified	San Diego, California
*103	San Francisco Unified	San Francisco, California
*104	San Jose Unified	San Jose, California
*105	San Juan Unified	Carmichael, California
*106	San Leandro Unified	San Leandro, California
*107	San Lorenzo Unified	San Lorenzo, California
**108	San Luis Coastal Unified	San Luis Obispo, California
**109	San Rafael City Elementary and High	San Rafael, California
**110	San Ramon Valley Unified	Danville, California
111	Sanger Unified	Sanger, California
112	Santa Ana Unified	Santa Ana, California
113	Santa Barbara City Elementary and High	Santa Barbara, California
114	Santa Clara Unified	Santa Clara, California
115	Santa Cruz City Elementary and High	Santa Cruz, California
**116	Santa Monica Unified	Santa Monica, California
**117	Santa Rosa City Elementary and High	Santa Rosa, California
118	Sierra Sands Unified	Ridgecrest, California
*119	Simi Valley Unified	Simi, California
*120	South San Francisco Unified	South San Francisco, California
*121	Stockton Unified	Stockton, California
*122	Torrance Unified	Torrance, California
123	Tracy Elementary	Tracy, California
	Tracy Joint Union High	Tracy, California
**124	Turlock Unified	Turlock, California
*125	Tustin Unified	Tustin, California
*126	Ukiah Unified	Ukiah, California
*127	Vacaville Unified	Vacaville, California
*128	Vallejo City Unified	Vallejo, California
*129	Ventura Unified	Ventura, California
*130	Visalia Unified	Visalia, California
*131	Vista Unified	Vista, California
132	Walnut Valley Unified	Walnut, California
133	Washington Unified	West Sacramento, California
134	West Covina Unified	West Covina, California
*135	Woodland Joint Unified	Woodland, California
*136	Yuba City Unified	Yuba City, California

APPENDIX G

LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT

WILSON RILES
Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Director of Education

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE EDUCATION BUILDING, 721 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO 95814

April 9, 1976

Dear Educator:

Thomas Hopkins is doing a study concerning the supervision of music education in the public schools of California. It is hoped that the results of this study will give us more information regarding district music leadership. In turn, it is hoped that this will assist in improving music education for the children of the State.

The task of developing and maintaining school music programs is gigantic. Studies, such as this one, are very important to the future of music education in California. Your careful response to this survey will be very helpful to the cause of music education and will be well appreciated.

Sincerely,

Louis P. Nash

Louis P. Nash
Consultant in Arts Education
(916) 322-4015

LPN:dm

APPENDIX H

PANELS FOR FIELD TESTING

FIELD TEST PANEL FOR SURVEY

Arch Brown	Principal and Central Office Administrator Stockton Unified School District
Thomas Cy Coleman	Chairman, University of the Pacific, Department of Educational Administration
Donald DaGrade	Music Educator, University of the Pacific Conservatory
Leo Gloria	Assistant Superintendent Secondary Education, Stockton Unified School District
Grant Hull	Music Educator, Stockton Unified School District
John Muzio	Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Education Stockton Unified School District
Roger Schneider	Principal, Stockton Unified School District
Patricia Van Sant	Music Educator, Stockton Unified School District

FIELD TEST PANEL FOR OPINIONNAIRE

Anita Bennett	Student
Mary Jean Bennett	Student
Arch Brown	Administrator
Diane Gauthier	Teacher
Everette King	College Student
Jeff King	Student
June Nethercut	Parent
Roger Schneider	Administrator
Patricia Van Sant	Teacher
Rosemary Vlaovich	Parent
William Witzke	Teacher

APPENDIX J

CROSS VALIDATION COMPARISON TABLE

APPENDIX J

HYPOTHESIS 1

A COMPARISON OF WITH DISTRICTS' ORIGINAL RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY COMPARED TO WITH DISTRICTS' CROSS VALIDATION RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY AND WITHOUT DISTRICTS' ORIGINAL RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY COMPARED TO WITHOUT DISTRICTS' CROSS VALIDATION RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY

H1.1	The Average Percentages of Students Involved in School District Music Programs			Music in the Self-Contained Elementary Classroom	
District Type Original or Cross Validation	Elementary	Secondary	Total K-12	Percentages of Districts That Use:	Average Quartile of Classrooms That Use:
WITH Original	21.6%	20.5%	20.9%	78%	2.7
WITH Cross Validation	20.5%	20.1%	20.3%	75%	3.2
WITHOUT Original	12.5%	13.6%	13.2%	63%	2.4
WITHOUT Cross Validation	10.0%	11.9%	10.5%	64%	2.1

H1.2

District Type Original or Cross Validation	Average Numbers of Students per Non-Performance Class or Performance Group: Non-Performance Class Elementary	Non-Performance Class Secondary	Non-Performance Class Total K-12	Performance Group Elementary	Performance Group Secondary	Performance Group Total K-12	Combined Non-Performance and Performance Elementary	Combined Non-Performance and Performance Secondary	Combined Non-Performance and Performance Grand Total K-12	Percentage of Districts in Which Groups Perform For: General Public	School	Other Schools	Concerts: Ratio of Students in the District per each Concert	Concerts: Audience attendance at Concerts. 4=Well, 1=Poor	Festivals: Average Festival Rating. 4=High, 1=Low	Festivals: Percentage of Districts in which Groups Perform at Festivals
WITH																
Original	523	921	571	462	374	401	213*	239	221	100%	100%	100%	1011	3.41	2.81	97%
Cross Validation	518	891	628	480	343	440	328*	241	261	100%	100%	100%	1124	3.50	2.80	100%
WITHOUT																
Original	817	805	709	1102	716	720	320	236	259	100%	100%	100%	1196	3.22	2.65	98%
Cross Validation	965	949	923	1156	550	549	382	305	288	100%	100%	97%	1113	3.18	2.53	91%

*Skewed distribution, but within one standard deviation (see page 76).

APPENDIX J (CONTINUED)

H1.3	Ratio of District Students per each Staff Member			Items dealing with Attendance at Staff Development Meetings for Music. (See Survey, Appendix A for each question Number listed below).						Outside Helpers		
				Music Teachers			Elementary Teachers					
District Type Original or Cross Validation	Elementary	Secondary	Total K-12	Question 302 4=High, 1=Low	Question 303 3=High, 1=Low	Question 304 4=High, 1=Low	Question 305 4=High, 1=Low	Question 306 3=High, 1=Low	Question 307 4=High, 1=Low	Percentage of Districts That Use:	Average Number of Students Per:	Staff Turnover 4=High, 1=Low
WITH												
Original	1484	932	1054	2.06	1.97	3.04	1.69	1.81	2.65	84%	4639	1.09
Cross Validation	1285	893	1066	2.00	2.00	3.25	2.00	2.00	3.25	100%	3935	1.25
WITHOUT												
Original	1478	929	1057	1.52	1.39	2.83	1.41	1.30	2.40	59%	4483	1.15
Cross Validation	1939	1276	1490	1.27	1.27	2.33	1.27	1.18	3.50	45%	6383	1.36

APPENDIX J (CONTINUED)

District Type Original or Cross Validation	H1.4 District Music Expenditure Per:			H1.5 District Board Adopted Goals for Music Education		
	District Music Student Enrollment	District Total Student Enrollment	Adequacy of Inventory 4=Adequate 1=Inadequate	Percentage of Districts that Have:	The Average Number of: (Per districts that reported having goals).	The Average Number of: (Per all districts in the samples).
WITH						
Original	$15.35	$2.92	3.0	81%	8.69	7.06
Cross Validation	$33.23	$6.96	3.0	100%	9.75	9.75
WITHOUT						
Original	$13.81	$1.82	2.66	52%	.7.32	3.80
Cross Validation	$15.91	$1.32	2.74	45%	6.20	2.85

APPENDIX J (CONTINUED)

HYPOTHESIS 2

WITH DISTRICTS' SPRING NON-RANDOMIZED OPINIONNAIRE SAMPLE COMPARED TO WITH DISTRICTS' FALL RANDOMIZED SAMPLE AND WITHOUT DISTRICTS' SPRING NON-RANDOMIZED OPINIONNAIRE SAMPLE COMPARED TO WITHOUT DISTRICTS' FALL RANDOMIZED SAMPLE

District Type Original or Cross Validation	H2 Pooled Opinions and Attitudes Concerning School Music	H2.1 Opinions of School Music Groups	H2.2 Opinions of Extrinsic Influences Caused by School Music	H2.3 Opinions of In-School Music Compared to Out-of-School Music
WITH				
Original	3.35	3.35	3.55	2.90
Cross Validation	3.32	3.33	3.50	2.82
WITHOUT				
Original	3.02	3.04	3.28	2.67
Cross Validation	2.98	3.00	3.18	2.60