

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF UNDERGRADUATE SACRED MUSIC CURRICULUM
CONTENT IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCREDITED BY THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

A Document

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Musical Arts

By

WILLIAM F. DE SANTO

Norman, Oklahoma

2005

UMI Number: 3203312



UMI Microform 3203312

Copyright 2006 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

AN ANALYSIS OF UNDERGRADUATE SACRED MUSIC CURRICULUM
CONTENT IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACCREDITED BY THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

A Document APPROVED FOR THE
SCHOOL OF MUSIC

By

Edward Gates, Chair

Jane Magrath, Chair

Barbara Fast

Kae Koger

Ken Stephenson

© Copyright by WILLIAM F. DE SANTO 2005
All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to many people for the assistance and inspiration they have provided while developing and writing this document. Space does not permit mention of the numerous teachers, colleagues, and friends who supported my work and helped to bring it to a higher level of understanding and organization.

I am especially grateful to Dr. Jane Magrath and Dr. Ed Gates for the guidance they offered throughout this project. Their assistance, wisdom, and encouragement have been invaluable to my work. I also thank Dr. Ken Stephenson, Dr. Barbara Fast, and Dr. Kae Koger for taking time to serve on my committee.

I am indebted to my parents, who not only instilled in me a love of music and of learning, but offered inspiration and support over the years. I thank my two beautiful children, Jonathan and Breanna, for their endless affection and smiles. Unknowingly, their cheerfulness carried me through the arduous task of writing. Special thanks, however, is expressed to my wife, Jennifer, for her loving support during my educational endeavors. It would have been difficult to envision the completion of this project without her help.

Finally, my deepest gratitude is expressed to God for His blessings and for the opportunity to complete my doctoral studies.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	xiii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Need for the Study.....	2
Procedure of the Study	10
The Population.....	10
Content Analysis of Catalogues	11
Questionnaire.....	12
Collection of the Data.....	13
Analysis of the Data	14
Comparison to Earlier Studies.....	15
Limitations.....	15
Definition of Terms	15
Organization of Study.....	16
II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED LITERATURE.....	18
History of Church Music Education in America.....	18
Studies on Sacred Music Curricula	27

Other Studies Related to Church Music Curricula	36
The Quality of Church Music Education.....	36
Competencies for the Church Musician	39
Student Proficiency	42
Church Music Degrees	43
Core Church Music Courses.....	45
General-Music Courses	48
Revisions to Church Music Programs	49
Experience of the Sacred Music Faculty	50
Employment Outlook	50
Nonmusical Competencies	52
Summary.....	53
III. FINDINGS OF THE CONTENT ANALYSIS	54
Sacred Music Degrees	55
Curricular Components of the Sacred Music Degrees	57
Music Courses Offered.....	59
IV. FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY	54
The Institutions	82
The Sacred Music Curriculum.....	87
The Open-Ended Questions.....	130
Summary.....	138
The Institutions	138
The Sacred Music Curriculum.....	139

	The Open-Ended Questions.....	144
V.	SUMMARY, FINAL COMMENTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	146
	Summary and Comparison of Findings with Related Literature.....	147
	Findings of the Content Analysis	147
	Sacred Music Degrees	147
	Curricular Components of the Sacred Music Degrees	148
	Music Courses Offered.....	149
	Findings of the Survey.....	150
	The Institutions.....	150
	The Sacred Music Curriculum.....	151
	The Open-Ended Questions.....	155
	Final Comments.....	160
	Recommendations for Future Research.....	162
	REFERENCE LIST	164
	APPENDICES	169
A.	List of the Seventy NASM Institutions in Population.....	169
B.	Music Course Titles Offered in Academic Catalogs of Seventy NASM Sacred Music Programs	170
C.	Questionnaire	210
D.	Cover Letter to Pilot Study Participants	217
E.	E-Mail to Department Chairs	218
F.	Cover Letter to Sacred Music Professors	219
G.	Complete Responses from Open-Ended Questions of Survey	221

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Titles of Sacred Music Degrees Offered	56
2. Mean Number of Semester Hours of the Curricular Components from all Institutions	58
3. Church Music Courses Offered by Respondent Schools	60
4. Music Theory and Composition Courses Offered by Respondent Schools	63
5. Music History and Literature Courses Offered by Respondent Schools	65
6. Applied Music Courses Offered by Respondent Schools	67
7. Conducting Courses Offered by Respondent Schools.....	71
8. Performance Organizations Offered by Respondent Schools	73
9. Literature Courses Offered by Respondent Schools	74
10. Methods and Materials Courses Offered by Respondent Schools	76
11. Technology Courses Offered by Respondent Schools	79
12. Proficiency Courses Offered by Respondent Schools.....	79
13. Miscellaneous Courses Offered by Respondent Schools	81
14. Total Enrollment of Undergraduate Music Majors	83
15. Total Enrollment in Church Music Program	84
16. Five-Year Enrollment Trend for Church Music Program	85
17. Number of Church Music Graduates in 2003-2004 Academic Year	85

18. Percentage of Church Music Graduates Placed in Full-Time Positions.....	87
19. Total Clock Hours Required for Internship.....	88
20. Number of Students Completing a Church Music Internship	89
21. Activities Required for the Internship	90
22. Church Music: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	92
23. Church Music: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	93
24. Church Music: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	95
25. Music Theory: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	96
26. Music Theory: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	97
27. Music Theory: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	98
28. Music History: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	99
29. Music History: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	100
30. Music History: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	101
31. Applied Music: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	102
32. Applied Music: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	103
33. Applied Music: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	104

34. Conducting: Amount of Emphasis Placed on course Topic by Responding Institutions	105
35. Conducting: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	106
36. Conducting: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	106
37. Ensemble: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	107
38. Ensemble: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	108
39. Ensemble: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	109
40. Literature: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	110
41. Literature: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	111
42. Literature: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	112
43. Methods and Materials: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions.....	113
44. Methods and Materials: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions.....	114
45. Methods and Materials: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	115
46. Functional Keyboard Skills: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions.....	116
47. Functional Keyboard Skills: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions.....	117
48. Functional Keyboard Skills: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance.....	118

49. Pedagogy: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	118
50. Pedagogy: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	119
51. Pedagogy: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	120
52. Popular Music: Amount of Emphasis Placed on course Topic by Responding Institutions	120
53. Popular Music: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	121
54. Popular Music: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	122
55. Technology: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	123
56. Technology: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions	124
57. Technology: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	125
58. Other Courses and Topics: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions.....	126
59. Other Courses and Topics: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions.....	127
60. Other Courses and Topics: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance.....	128
61. Final Projects: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions.....	128
62. Final Projects: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions.....	129
63. Final Projects: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance	130
64. Topics Receiving the Highest Emphasis	140

65. Topics Receiving the Lowest Emphasis	141
66. Topics Considered Most Important in Sacred Music Curriculum.....	141
67. Topics Considered Least Important in Sacred Music Curriculum	142
68. Topics with the Greatest Positive Difference in Mean from Each Major Grouping	143

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze undergraduate sacred music curriculum content in colleges and universities accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. The study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What course topics are offered in the undergraduate sacred music curriculum among NASM schools?
2. To what extent are the course topics offered?
3. What value do church music faculty place on each course topic in the curriculum?
4. What do church music professors at these schools indicate is necessary to keep the church music degree in North America vital?
5. How do the findings of this study compare with findings of previous studies?

The research was conducted by means of a content analysis of academic catalogs and a survey questionnaire mailed to undergraduate sacred music faculty at seventy NASM schools in the United States. For the content-analysis portion of the study, required course titles from each institution were categorized into major groupings and subgroupings. The survey component sought information relative to the institution and to the sacred music curriculum. Open-ended questions focused on the preference for a master's degree in sacred music, the preference for an undergraduate music education degree, and strengthening the sacred music program in North America. The data in this component of the study are compiled from fifty-one responses, representing 73% of the population.

The topics that received the highest emphasis in sacred music programs among NASM schools were applied voice, choral ensemble, organ literature, music theory, aural skills, and senior recital. Topics that were rated as most important included music theory, aural skills, applied voice, choral conducting, choral ensemble, and hymnology/congregational song. Seventeen of the respondents indicated that in order to keep the undergraduate sacred music degree vital in North America the curriculum should be revised to include the study of additional musical styles, including popular music. However, these respondents also stated that the inclusion of other musical styles in the curriculum should be a supplement, not a substitute, to the traditional curriculum.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of western music, musicians have always been an integral part of Christian worship services. This association remains strong today as many churches employ music directors as well as full-time instrumentalists and vocalists to complement the rituals of their worship traditions. Numerous musicians employed by churches receive their training within the context of a sacred music degree. Approximately 188 institutions of higher education throughout the United States offer the sacred music degree, including university schools of music, state colleges, church-related colleges and universities, and theological seminaries. Although undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate levels offer church music degrees, the majority of church music students receive their training in an undergraduate sacred music degree program. The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) provides accreditation for approximately seventy of these programs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze undergraduate sacred music curriculum content in colleges and universities accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. The following research questions guided this study:

1. What course topics are offered in the undergraduate sacred music curriculum among NASM schools?
2. To what extent are the course topics offered?

3. What value do church music faculty place on each course topic in the curriculum?
4. What do church music professors at these schools indicate is necessary to keep the church music degree in North America vital?
5. How do the findings of this study compare with findings of previous studies?

This analysis contributes to the existing knowledge in the area of sacred music curricula and provides church music professors with data regarding courses and course topics currently offered in sacred music programs. The findings of this study will serve as an important resource for institutions planning to revise their undergraduate sacred music curricula.

Need for the Study

Over the past thirty years a number of complex issues in church music have surfaced in the United States. These issues involve the quality of church music, the impact of popular culture on church music, sacred music enrollment trends, the preference for a master's degree in sacred music over an undergraduate degree, the preference for a music-education degree over a sacred music degree, the interrelationship of sacred music to other art forms, the need for theological training, and the importance of nonmusical competencies. In addition to creating debate among churches of all traditions, the multifarious web of issues has sparked intense discussion among church music professors and has ultimately affected the curricula of undergraduate sacred music programs.

The first issue, musical quality, has been a significant concern for musicians, church music educators, theologians, and scholars. Archibald Davison expressed his

concern over the low state of church music in his books *Protestant Church Music in America* (Davison 1933) and *Church Music: Illusion and Reality* (Davison 1952). Erik Routley, respected English theologian and church musician, also made pleas for the improvement of church music education in several writings published in the mid-twentieth century (Routley 1950, 1959, 1968, 1970).

In 1963 Farrier noted that “all over the United States unqualified people are still being coaxed, wheedled, and pressured into directing the music programs of the smaller churches—people whose average level of musical and organizational competence is so abysmally low that in many cases it is ethically scandalous for them to attempt to lead others in rendering musical praises to God” (Farrier 1963, 138-139).

Pflueger made a similar observation in 1964, stating that apathy deters musical quality in the church: “Most Protestant denominations require specialized training for their clergy, but for the important posts of organists and choir directors, many churches are content with anyone who is able to play or sing” (Pflueger 1964, 4). Subsequent studies showed that those involved in church music recognized the need to improve musical quality in the church and that this improvement would come with more effective church music education along with an understanding of the purpose of church music for contemporary society (Dunbar 1970).

One of the most significant issues today is the impact of popular culture and music on sacred music curriculum. Since the first NASM church music program was approved in 1945, a revolution in the worship styles of the church has permeated virtually all denominations and worship traditions. A panel discussion from the 1989-

1990 NASM Proceedings focused on the topic “The Impact of Popular Culture on Church Music.” In the report on the panel discussion, Dr. Marvin Lamb states:

The Church has, for the most part, acted as a strong preserver and patron of serious musical values and study. While they generally have resisted and even decried popular cultural influences, churches nonetheless are increasingly altering traditional forms of worship in favor of popular cultural expressions. The ramifications of such cultural change are not limited to Church-related school and church music programs; rather, they affect all institutions that train musicians. (Lamb 1990, 91)

Discussions and presentations at NASM conferences suggested that sacred music curricula were obsolete and should include popular music in order to offer a broad, diverse music training (Baskerville 1971; Pierce 1994; Carson 1995). Martin Jean, a presenter at the 2002 University of Iowa Institute for Sacred Music, observed that congregations consist of individuals with many different backgrounds, both culturally and denominationally (Dickinson 2002).

On the other side of the controversy, church musicians, church music professors, clergy, and laity alike have argued that borrowing from popular culture threatens previously established values and compromises the breadth of training (Routley 1968, 1977; Licon 1989; Marshall 1997). Concerns over quality create apprehension over contemporary popular music. Licon states:

Sacred music set to poorly written, watered down liturgical texts created out of a personal whim of fancy because it fits a particular mood or feeling, loses the substance upon which its power to truly edify and sanctify is built. Without this substance which is the liturgy itself, untainted or manipulated by superficial trends and fads, it ceases to maintain its true liturgical function as it was promulgated by Church fathers throughout the history of the Church. Ambiguous texts cannot become the basis for the true expression of faith (Licon 1989, 94-95).

Although some embrace the use of popular worship music and others oppose it, a third dimension to this issue also exists. This dimension is represented by those who

postulate a blending of both the traditional and popular styles as long as musical quality and excellence are safeguarded and as long as students are taught to identify this quality (Sharp 1977; Carson 1995; Dawn 1995; Wicker 1999; King 2002; Cobb 2003). Gary Cobb (2003) encapsulates this view in his address at the NASM conference in 2002:

Are the curricula of colleges and universities providing the tools to equip those engaged in contemporary worship practices to make aesthetic judgments about what is good or bad about such music? . . . Music curricula in church related institutions need to be restructured to provide not only courses that would teach a viable musical language so that students could function as musicians in a contemporary, blended, or traditional style, but also courses that would enable students to make legitimate aesthetic judgments (Cobb 2003, 265).

Cobb challenged the assembly “to develop a curriculum that fosters thoughtful reflection that seeks after excellence” (Cobb 2003, 266).

Another issue that has surfaced over the years relates to enrollment trends in sacred music degree programs. From 1945 through 1972, exponential growth took place in the establishment of church music degrees in the United States (Breland 1974). Only five NASM accredited schools offered such a degree in the mid 1940s. By 1960 there were thirty-four approved church music degrees and by 1972 a total of eighty-four NASM accredited church music programs. However, Ball (1994) provided statistical data indicating that from 1982 through 1992 enrollment in undergraduate sacred music programs declined by 25%. In addition, the National Association of Schools of Music reported a 40% decline in church music enrollment from 1990 through 2000 with 45 undergraduate sacred music programs being eliminated within that span of time (Brady 2002).

Professors of sacred music speculated as to the cause of this decline in enrollment. Many thought that students, recognizing how few churches hired full-time

music directors, were discouraged with the employment outlook after graduation. However, Wicker (1999) viewed this issue from a different angle when he stated that full-time positions, still readily available, are increasingly combined with other areas of ministry. Others think that the shift in musical trends has had an impact on the enrollment in church music programs. In response to the declining enrollment, many church music programs developed composite majors combining sacred music with Christian education or youth ministry as a way of making their graduates more marketable.

Since the early 1960s, the issue of whether a sacred music degree should be framed within the context of a master's degree has existed. Several church music professors have expressed the view that a four-year undergraduate program in sacred music is an insufficient amount of time to train church music directors effectively. According to Stephens (1964), some faculty suggested a five-year degree to compensate for the lack of time in an undergraduate program. To increase the competency of graduates for their posts as choral directors and ministers of music, approximately 38% of schools in Melton's 1987 study actually expanded the church music program to a five-year degree. Those who strongly feel that a sacred music degree is too specialized for the undergraduate level propose that the student pursue a bachelor's degree in music followed by a master's degree in sacred music. The graduate-level training would allow students to focus on theological studies in worship along with church music history and repertoire (Robinson 1982). Seminarians agree, according to Hooper's study, that the following skills would be acquired by graduates in a master's program: "(1) thorough musicianship, (2) the ability to work with people, (3) the ability to do individual

research, (4) the understanding of the term ‘ministry,’ and (5) a thorough grounding in theological studies” (Hooper 1965, 209-210).

The issue of whether a music-education degree would be more effective than the sacred music degree in preparing church musicians emerged in studies prior to 2002. In spite of the suggestions, however, most faculty seem reluctant to implement this change primarily because the music-education program is an already overburdened curriculum. They believe there would be very little, or no, room for electives in church music (Brady 2002).

Another issue over the years has been renewed interest in the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms. Best (1982) suggested that "a good church music curriculum must extend into the other arts. . . . Perhaps we should now begin to think of preparation for ministries of fine arts, or beyond this, a ministry of artistic creativity" (Brady 2002, 26). In a personal interview with Brady, Best stated, “The contemporary minister of worship and the arts is to be skilled in one of those art forms but deeply cognizant of how the other art forms work and to be a good administrator and communicator. . . . The church is no longer just about music” (Brady 2002, 26). As a result of the inclusion of the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms in the 1993-1994 NASM Handbook, Brady noted that some institutions responded by developing degree programs in the fine-arts ministry or worship arts.

The issue of theological training has also emerged over the years. Several church music scholars are advocates of including theology as part of the program of study. Erik Routley in 1977 voiced his view of the importance of theology to church musicians and to the laity:

For the lay Christian, theology is almost entirely communicated through worship. Not many lay Christians read theology; only the zealous talk of it or discuss it. But all who go to church are exposed to it, not only in the actual words used in church, but in the overtones which the spiritual ear picks up and which give those words their real force (Routley 1977, 23).

Best (1982) believes that church music programs should teach theologies unique to the use of the arts in worship.

A good church music curriculum must first of all provide the theological, procedural, and artistic ways out of this long-term dilemma. Excellent church music training must be embedded, not primarily in the nature of music and musical types, standards of practices, and scholarly excellence, but in a *bed-rock* of theological perspective. By this, I do not mean the usual outlay of theology courses and studies of liturgies, as necessary as they are. Rather, I mean the articulation of a theology of creativity, a theology of worship, a theology of communication and response, and a theology of excellence (Best 1982, 137).

Melton (1987) found that 100% of the pastors in his study characterized theological studies as desirable for a prospective minister of music and choral director. Similarly, Emch (1986) found that pastors within the Christian Missionary Alliance denomination preferred to hire ministers of music with a music degree from a Bible college, where theology is required for all degrees.

A final issue in church music has surfaced in the context of two separate addresses to NASM. Cynthia Uitermarkt spoke of the importance of nonmusic classes and noncurricular elements contributing to the development and training of church music leaders. She believes that students must be exposed to theology, language, sociology, ethics, and human relations (Uitermarkt 1995, 1997). Closely tied to Uitermarkt's beliefs is Miller's 1989 study which indicated that ministers of Nazarene churches placed a high priority on ministry and relationship skills as significant criteria in hiring potential ministers of music. According to Kemp, churches have complained

about the lack of interpersonal skills on the part of their music director. In response, he states:

The isolation and the competitive nature of the average music conservatory is not conducive to the development of a well-rounded personality. A musician, to be able to relate to lay people, must develop the skill of appreciating the variety of personalities and individual abilities (not necessarily musical) of the persons with whom he or she works. Such awareness needs to be encouraged (Kemp 1981, 5).

Since 1964 only four studies have focused solely on sacred music curriculum in the United States. These studies have addressed some of the issues discussed in this chapter, including the quality of church music, the use of popular music, enrollment trends, the preference for a master's degree, the preference for a music-education degree, and the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms. The first dissertation, "A Study of Selected Undergraduate Programs in Protestant Church Music and Implications for Improved Curricula," was completed in 1964 by Pfleuger; the second dissertation, "A Study of the Church Music Curricula of Selected Religiously Oriented Liberal Arts Colleges," was completed by Dunbar in 1970; "A Survey of Church Music Curricula in Accredited Non-Church Controlled Colleges and Universities" was completed by Breland in 1974; and in 2002 Brady authored "An Investigation of the Use of Contemporary Congregational Music in Undergraduate Sacred Music Programs."

While all four of these studies have contributed positively to research on sacred music curricula, a serious gap exists in all the data collected to date. Of the four studies completed, only Pfleuger (1964) and Breland (1974) focused exclusively on NASM schools. In the most recent study, Brady (2002) included only twenty-two of the sixty five NASM schools. Since institutional membership in NASM is purported to represent

artistic and academic excellence, data from all NASM schools are critical to obtaining a clear picture of sacred music curricula in North America. The unclear status of NASM schools on the issues outlined in this chapter necessitates a study of the changes and trends that have taken place within NASM institutions since 1974. The findings of this analysis will provide a more comprehensive and inclusive understanding of current undergraduate church music programs and will also guide those in higher education who must make critical decisions regarding the future of undergraduate sacred music curricula.

Procedure of the Study

This study involved a content analysis of academic catalogues as well as distributed questionnaires. The catalogues were collected from NASM schools offering an undergraduate sacred music program, and the questionnaires were sent to one undergraduate sacred music professor at each institution. The data were collected, analyzed, and compared to earlier studies on sacred music curricula.

The Population

The population of this study consisted of seventy-seven colleges and universities in North America that offered an undergraduate program in sacred music and who were members of the National Association of Schools of Music. In order to obtain a comprehensive representation, all sacred music degrees were included in the study. These programs, framed within the context of various undergraduate degree nomenclatures (B.A., B.S., B.M.), included titles such as church music, liturgical music,

and music ministry. Programs that offered a music degree with an emphasis in sacred music were also considered in the study.

The institutions offering an undergraduate degree in church music were identified using the 2004 National Association of Schools of Music *Directory*. Since the NASM *Directory* does not identify institutions that offer an emphasis in church music, the researcher identified NASM institutions that listed sacred music faculty in the *Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, US and Canada, 2004-2005*, published by the College Music Society (CMS). Institutions who listed sacred music faculty in this directory were likely to offer some courses in church music. The researcher then accessed the institution's web site to determine whether the school offered a specialization or emphasis in sacred music. If the website did not provide this information, the researcher telephoned the music department chair of that institution to seek clarification regarding its programs. During this process, it was discovered that seven of the seventy-seven schools in the population had eliminated their church music program. Consequently, the total population of this study consists of seventy NASM institutions (appendix A).

Content Analysis of Catalogues

A portion of the information needed for this study was acquired by means of a catalogue-content analysis, with the purpose of obtaining the titles of general-music and core sacred music courses required in each program. The researcher accessed the website of each institution to download a copy of the current catalog or bulletin. If the document was unavailable online, the researcher contacted the institution by telephone to request a copy through the mail.

Required course titles from each institution were tabulated. The list of required courses is presented in appendix B as a table and categorized by major groupings and subgroupings. The table reports the numerical frequency of courses among the schools in the population.

Questionnaire

Additional information for this study was gathered through the use of a questionnaire. The survey items were constructed following a thorough analysis of the related literature, NASM guidelines, and current issues related to the sacred music curriculum. The researcher also consulted three books to assist in the preparation of the survey (Alreck 1995; Dillman 2000; Fowler 1995).

The questionnaire sought information on the institution and the sacred music curriculum. Sixteen types of questions comprised the survey, including multiple choice, 4-point Likert scale, and open-ended. A copy of the questionnaire is found in appendix C.

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to gather information on each institution offering a sacred music degree. Seven questions were constructed to collect information on type of institution, length of terms, total undergraduate music major enrollment, total church music enrollment, five-year enrollment trends, number of graduates in church music, and the percentage of graduates placed in a full-time church position.

The second part of the questionnaire gathered information on the sacred music curriculum, including internship requirements and the emphasis and importance of church music course topics. Information was obtained concerning the extent to which

course topics were offered and the extent to which faculty felt the course topics should be offered in the curriculum. The topics were listed in a table containing two columns. Respondents were instructed to indicate in column A the amount of emphasis they place on each topic by circling the appropriate response (4-point Likert scale). Column B, also a 4-point Likert scale, allowed the respondents to rate the importance of each course topic based on the value they place on each item in preparing students for church music leadership. Topics were organized according to the following major groupings: church music, music theory, music history, applied music, conducting, ensemble, literature, methods and materials, functional keyboard skills, pedagogy, popular music, technology, other courses and topics, and final projects. The topics in this part of the survey were selected based on the standards and guidelines specific to the undergraduate degree in sacred music from the NASM 2003-2004 Handbook. Additionally, the topics selected were those that are most often included in the curricula of undergraduate sacred music programs.

The final section of the survey consisted of open-ended questions. The questions were designed to elicit information on the preference for a master's degree in sacred music, the preference for an undergraduate music-education degree, and strengthening the sacred music degree in North America.

Collection of the Data

Prior to mailing the questionnaire to the target population, it was submitted for critiquing to university sacred music professors currently teaching in, or retired from, NASM institutions. The researcher telephoned and secured five individuals willing to participate in the pilot study. The subjects received a cover letter (appendix D),

questionnaire, and a stamped self-addressed envelope. Additionally, they were asked to note the time required to complete the survey. Their suggestions for revisions were considered in the final version of the questionnaire.

To determine who would receive the final version of the survey, the researcher sent an e-mail to the department chair of each NASM institution to request the name of a professor who was most knowledgeable in the undergraduate sacred music curriculum (appendix E). The refined survey materials, accompanied by a cover letter (appendix F) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope, were mailed to the sacred music professors at all seventy NASM institutions on January 31, 2005. This mailing yielded thirty-six usable returns. On February 26, 2005, a second mailing, consisting of follow-up letters and additional questionnaires, were sent to those instructors from whom a response had not yet been received. Finally, telephone calls were made on March 22, 2005, to those who still had not responded to the previous mailings. These efforts produced another fifteen responses, for a total of fifty-one valid surveys (73% return). Forty-four of the fifty-one faculty who returned the survey requested a summary report of the results of this study.

Analysis of the Data

Results from the collected data were tabulated by using simple frequency, percentage tables, and mean. Additionally, narrative was used to report the responses to the open-ended questions.

Comparison to Earlier Studies

The results of this study were compared to earlier studies on sacred music curricula, including those of Smith (1949), Morrison (1957), Farrier (1963), Pflueger (1964), Stephens (1964), Dunbar (1970), Breland (1974), Bearden (1980), Leach (1983), Melton (1987), and Brady (2002).

Limitations

1. This study was restricted to undergraduate programs in sacred music at institutions who are members of NASM.
2. The content analysis covered the academic catalog of each institution, but did not include the music department handbook.
3. The researcher worked from the assumption that the information in the current catalog of each institution was accurate.
4. Only one professor from each institution was surveyed.
5. The study included programs with an emphasis or specialization in sacred music but did not include the minor in church music.
6. The study was limited to Catholic, Protestant, Evangelical, and State colleges or universities.

Definition of Terms

Church Music Director. The person who administers a music program at a church. This individual may function as pianist, organist, choir director, or worship leader. The roles of the church music director may vary among denominations and the term is used interchangeably with minister of music.

AABC. The Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges. This organization, now called The Association for Biblical Higher Education (ABHE), exists to provide accreditation and services for institutions and programs of biblical higher education in North America.

Sacred Music Degree. The undergraduate program that trains church music directors. Other terms used for sacred music degree among NASM schools include church music, parish music, and music ministry. This term will also be used to include programs with an emphasis in sacred music.

CCCU. The Council of Christian Colleges and Universities. An international association of intentionally Christian colleges and universities founded in 1976 in order to integrate scholarship and faith. Membership has grown to 107 institutions in North America.

Contemporary Congregational Music. The modern praise and worship styles used in the churches of North America. This popular music is often accompanied by guitar, bass guitar, and drum set as well as other instrumentation.

Curricular Components. The broad groupings of courses that comprise an undergraduate degree in sacred music, including the church music core, the music core, and the general-education core.

Organization of Study

Chapter II of this study presents the background of church music education and provides a review of related literature. This review includes the background and history of church music education, church music curriculum studies, and general-music program studies that incorporate research on the sacred music degree.

Chapter III reports the results of the content analysis of catalogues in tabular and narrative form. The information includes data regarding the sacred music degrees, the curricular components of the church music degrees, and the course offerings among institutions.

Chapter IV reports the results of the survey of sacred music professors in tabular and narrative form. Divided into three main sections, this chapter presents findings on the institution, the sacred music curriculum, and the open-ended questions. An analysis of the course topics are presented according to the major groupings and categories outlined in the questionnaire.

Chapter V presents a summary and comparison to earlier studies related to sacred music curricula. This chapter also includes final comments as well as recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND RELATED LITERATURE

Numerous books on church music in the United States provide a comprehensive review of the history of church music education in America. Many dissertations focus on church music curricula, while other dissertations provide studies of general-music curricula in church-sponsored colleges and universities and include research on the sacred music degree. Consequently, this chapter is divided into three sections. The first section traces the history of church music education in America, the second section is a review of four research studies on sacred music curricula, and the third section is a review of all general-music curriculum studies that include research on sacred music degrees. This final section is organized according to the following topics: the quality of church music education, competencies for the church musician, student proficiency, the church music degrees, core courses in church music, general-music courses, revisions to church music programs, experience of sacred music faculty, employment outlook, and nonmusical competencies.

History of Church Music Education in America

The history of church music education in America may be traced to the early 1700s with the emergence of singing schools, which were formed in response to an ever-increasing lack of musical quality in the colonial churches. This lack of quality surfaced because the professional choirs from Europe did not necessarily travel with the

early settlers when they came to America. Consequently, as amateur choirs were formed within the colonial churches, the absence of professional singers created a serious decline in the overall quality of the music being sung (Ellinwood 1953).

The earliest reference to singing schools in colonial America goes back to Boston, Massachusetts, in the year 1714 (Hamm 1983). These schools were not official educational institutions but rather loosely organized establishments often led by an amateur musician who had a strong voice and some knowledge of music theory (Chase 1987). Hamm (1983) describes the singing schools in some depth:

Organized usually among members of the congregation of a church, these schools were conducted by a 'Singing Master.' The 'scholars' were instructed in the rudiments of music notation—the staff, the names of notes and of their location on the staff, the several clefs (“cliffs”), scales, intervals, sharps and flats, solmization, the various meters (times), and the application of all these in the singing of scales and simple melodies (Hamm 1983, 39).

In an attempt to help improve the crude musical sound being produced in the worship services, some ministers took the initiative to organize what was referred to as “regular singing.” The concept of regular singing was introduced in order to encourage singers to adhere to the rules of musical notation rather than to their own devices. A number of publications were even made available on this subject in the early part of the eighteenth century. The first such publication, “The Reasonableness of Regular Singing or, Singing by Note,” appeared in 1720 and was written by the Rev. Thomas Symmes, a graduate of Harvard College in 1698. The purpose of Symmes’ discourse was to prove that regular singing was the only proper way to sing; however, this writing created further debate and eventually prompted ministers to preach on the topic in order to persuade congregations that regular singing was the biblical precedent for worshipping God.

In 1721 two practical publications were printed that focused on the basic elements of musical notation: “An Introduction to the Singing of Psalm Tunes” by Rev. John Tufts (1689-1750) and “The Grounds and Rules of Musick Explained” by Rev. Thomas Walter (1696-1725) (Hamm 1983). The publication of these documents laid the groundwork for future education in church music as it sparked public interest in learning musical language and technique. In some communities, regular singing was readily accepted; however, in other towns and villages several decades went by before regular singing was fully embraced (Crawford 2001). Although there was some opposition to regular singing, the overall quality of music in the church in the second half of the eighteenth century had greatly improved (Hamm 1983).

After the Civil War, numerous colleges, schools of music and conservatories were established and began to provide instruction in sacred music (Howard and Bellows 1957). In the year 1834 specific church music training was offered when Lowell Mason began teaching at the Boston Academy of Music (Ellinwood 1953). At Oberlin College in 1835, Elihu Parsons became one of the first sacred music professors; however, his tenure only lasted for one year as he was replaced by George Nelson Allen in 1836 (Thompson 1935). In 1837, Abner Jones was appointed professor of sacred music at Union Theological Seminary in New York City (Weadon 1993). This was a significant appointment as it marked the beginning of a rich tradition of church music education in America.

Although Harvard University was founded in 1636, music did not become a part of the curriculum until 1855. In that year, a special emphasis in vocal music instruction was offered to all undergraduates and was designed to correspond with the sacred music

being sung in Harvard's chapel services (Thompson 1935). Significant to the history at Harvard and to the history of church music education, was the faculty appointment of John Knowles Paine as instructor of music in 1862. Paine was an outstanding musician and composer who was eventually promoted to a full professor at Harvard and was responsible for the growth and development of the music department during his tenure (Hamm 1983).

While Oberlin and Harvard made significant advances in the development of their sacred music offerings, most secular conservatories and music schools in the latter part of the 19th century did not provide specific training in the necessary skills required to play for a church service. Instead, much emphasis was placed on the study and performance of the organ. In the same fashion, conducting and vocal skills were not given the specialized attention necessary to effectively train church music leaders (Ellinwood 1953).

There were, however, exceptions to this trend as Bible colleges and church-related institutions also began to appear. These schools played a significant role in the training of church musicians. For example, in 1889 D. L. Moody founded the Moody Bible Institute where students could study church music to develop skills appropriate in assisting evangelists and pastors. In those early days of Moody Bible Institute much emphasis was placed on the gospel song (Dean 1988). The school eventually expanded its music curriculum to offer three optional majors in 1906. Currently, Moody Bible Institute is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music and offers a degree in sacred music (Dean 1988). The Bible Institute of Los Angeles (BIOLA) was

founded in 1908 and based its curriculum on that of the Moody Bible Institute (Dean 1988).

In 1896, under the leadership of Peter Lutkin, a Department of Church Music was established at Northwestern University, and years later in 1906 Wallace Goodrich established the New England Conservatory of Music. Although a department of church music did not yet exist at the New England Conservatory, organ and choral instruction were geared towards the needs of church musicians (Ellinwood 1953).

In 1912 Felix Lamond established Trinity School of Church Music, the first independent Conservatory for church music in the United States. The school obtained its faculty from the Trinity Parish in New York and offered a three-year curriculum emphasizing the liturgy and music of the Episcopal Church (Ellinwood 1953). Faculty were hired in the areas of organ, choirboy training, mixed choir training, theory, vocal training, and composition (Ellinwood 1953).

In 1918, the first Catholic Church music institution was established at the Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart in New York. The Pius X School of Liturgical Music was founded by Mother Giorgia Stevens and Mrs. Justine Bayard Ward “to devote its primary attention to the training of church musicians” (Ellinwood 1953, 147).

As an outgrowth of his work at the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Dayton, Ohio, John Finley Williamson founded the Westminster Choir College in 1926. Three years later, the College moved to Ithaca, New York, and revised its curriculum to a four-year Bachelor of Music degree program. In 1932 Westminster Choir College made its third and final move to Princeton, New Jersey (Ellinwood 1953).

In 1928 one of the most influential schools of sacred music was founded by Clarence Dickenson. Under the auspices of the Union Theological Seminary, Dickenson established the School of Sacred Music after serving on the faculty there for sixteen years (Ellinwood 1953). The school was founded to equip choir directors and organists with the necessary skills to function in Christian worship (Weadon 1993). Several notable names in church music served on the faculty over the years including George Root, Lowell Mason, Thomas Hastings, and Gerrit Smith (Dean 1988).

The Gregorian Institute of America, founded in 1941 by Clifford A. Bennett, was another school affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church. However, unlike the other church music schools, the Gregorian Institute of America was correspondence-based and held summer sessions throughout the United States (Ellinwood 1953).

In addition to the institutions of higher education, there were professional organizations that also contributed significantly to the education of church musicians. One such organization was the American Guild of Organists. Six years after its founding in 1896, the American Guild of Organists instituted a series of annual exams to help raise professional standards:

Examinations are given in organ playing, theory, and general musical knowledge. More specifically, the organ-playing examination calls for performance, before a regional examiner, of certain specified organ works, of sight reading with the various music clefs, and of transposition. The theory examinations are written and cover harmonization of figured and un-figured basses as well as work in strict counterpoint. A third examination covers music history and literature. Three sets of examinations are given: satisfactory work in the first earns the degree of Associate of the American Guild of Organists (A.A.G.O); in the second, the degree of Fellow of the American Guild of Organists (F.A.G.O); in the third, the degree of Choir Master (Ch.M.). While there has been some criticism of the conservative character of these examinations, there has never been any suggestion that the degrees were not well earned. They have afforded adequate academic recognition to a number of

talented church musicians who have preferred to study under an outstanding teacher rather than at a college or university (Ellinwood 1953, 150-151).

The single most important professional organization that has profoundly impacted the structure and development of sacred music in America is the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). NASM was founded in 1924 “for the purpose of securing a better understanding among institutions of higher education engaged in work in music; of establishing a more uniform method of granting credit; and of setting minimum standards for the granting of degrees and other credentials” (NASM 2003, 6). One of the general statements of aims and objectives of NASM is "to provide a national forum for the discussion and consideration of concerns relevant to the preservation and advancement of standards in the field of music in higher education" (NASM 2003, 6).

In 1943 an important step was taken when the NASM Commission on Curricula began to recognize and acknowledge church music curricula (NASM 1943). For the first time, NASM published an official statement recognizing church music as a field of study (NASM 1944). In that same year, the NASM Commission on Curricula officially recognized two masters programs in church music: the Master of Arts degree from Boston University and the Master of Music degree from Northwestern University (NASM 1944).

In 1945 NASM listed a total of five degree programs in church music that had been approved:

1. Alverno College of Music,
Bachelor of Music in Liturgical Music;
2. Boston University College of Music,
Master of Arts in Church Music;

3. DePaul University School of Music,
Bachelor of Music in Church Music;
4. Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart,
Bachelor of Music in Gregorian Chant; and
5. Northwestern University School of Music,
Master of Music in Church Music (NASM 1945).

The year 1953 was particularly critical in the history of church music education. It was in this year that the NASM's Church Music Committee from the Commission on Curricula submitted a proposal for the Bachelor of Music degree in Church Music. This proposed degree was approved as follows

(NASM 1953):

<u>Subject Classification</u>	<u>Hours</u>
1. Academic, Bible and Philosophy courses	30
2. Applied music in --principal instrument or voice -- secondary instrument or voice	24
3. Church music courses such as conducting, chant, chironomy, hymnology, etc.	12
4. Theory and counterpoint	20
5. Music history and literature	8
6. Electives	<u>26</u>
	120

In 1957 NASM announced that the Church Music Committee would be a permanent subcommittee of the Commission on Curricula. The stated purpose of this subcommittee was to evaluate institutions that were seeking approval for a church music degree (NASM 1957).

The church music degree became one of the fastest-growing degrees in colleges and universities. In 1962, there were twenty-one Church music programs approved by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM 1962) and by 1972 there were

eighty-four programs approved (NASM 1972). Farrier (1963) suggested possible reasons for this growth:

It should be pointed out here that at least three factors may have contributed to the sudden surge of new degree offerings in church music, found to begin about 1946. . . . Church membership increased sharply around 1941, bringing new attention to church music. Another reason for the sudden nature of the rise may be the relative conservatism regarding new degree offerings during World War II, which may have allowed a kind of ‘back pressure’ for a church music degree program to build up within music departments over the war years. A third reason may be the influx of returning military men with their ‘G.I. Bill’ educational subsidies making it easier for institutions to reach full enrollment and thereby helping to loosen funds for faculty addition in this field (Farrier 1963, 133-134).

In February of 1960, the NASM bulletin No. 48 reported the Church Music Committee’s recommended changes for the B.M. curriculum, originally approved in 1953. However, these changes were not published until 1965 in a document titled *By-laws and Regulations*. The Report of Committee on Church Music recommended sixteen credit hours in the following categories (NASM 1960):

1. Conducting, literature, repertoire
2. Hymnology, liturgies
3. Administration, methods, fieldwork
4. Service playing and other organ related courses

From 1970 through 1993 the NASM general standards for all baccalaureate degrees and the specific standards for the sacred music degree remained the same. However, in the 1993-1994 Handbook, new standards were outlined. Under the general competencies common to all baccalaureate degrees in music, improvisation was now emphasized. Brady states:

Improvisation received a greater emphasis in the 1993-1994 standards. Improvisation moved from performance category to integration in composition and general musicianship. Improvisation also changed from a connection to traditional styles, such as Baroque era figured bass exercises used in music theory classes. Improvisation could flourish in multiple styles (Brady 2002, 21).

Under the standards and guidelines specific to the bachelor degree in sacred music, several changes took place in the 1993-1994 Handbook:

1. As in the general competencies, improvisation was now integrated into the major performance area. Conducting was also added to the guidelines.
2. In addition to knowledge of liturgies, hymnology, and church music, the new standards required a “relationship between sacred music and music of the general culture” (NASM 1993, 84).

Brady clarifies that "the language of the phrase ‘general culture’ allowed a breadth of interpretation that could include ethnomusicology, indigenous music, music of the popular culture, and other areas" (Brady 2002, 22-23).

3. The guidelines also called for "an understanding of the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms” (NASM 1993, 85).
4. Finally, an internship experience was recommended in addition to the senior recital.

From 1994 to the present no changes have been made to the general competencies or to the standards and guidelines specific to the bachelor degree in sacred music.

Studies on Sacred Music Curricula

Several studies have specifically been concerned with undergraduate sacred music curriculum between 1964 and 2002. Of these writings, those by Pfleuger (1964), Dunbar (1970), Breland (1974), and Brady (2002) are in-depth surveys encompassing a broad spectrum of schools. In 1964 Pfleuger explored the undergraduate sacred music curricula of NASM colleges, universities, and conservatories in the United States. His purpose was "to provide information concerning current practices in the education of church musicians through noting how universities, colleges, and conservatories of music with undergraduate programs in church music are attempting to meet the needs of

prospective church musicians" (Pfleuger 1964, 5). As part of his analysis, Pfleuger inquired as to "common patterns, significant variations, and possible shortcomings" within these programs (Pfleuger 1964, 5). To accomplish his goals, Pfleuger analyzed the catalogues of the institutions and also developed a questionnaire which was sent to 44 NASM schools. Twenty-eight usable surveys (63.6%) were returned and included in the study.

Pfleuger observed that among the institutions surveyed there was a wide variance in terms of school type, school size, and nature of the academic requirements. Of particular interest was the lack of consistency in the degree requirements between the institutions, as evidenced in the variable number of credits required for core church music classes and general-music classes. Inconsistencies were found in the requirements for church music, liturgies, history of church music, chant, hymnology, administration, internship, service playing, organ construction, applied music, recital performance, composition, arranging, orchestration, pedagogy, and conducting.

Conversely, Pfleuger also noted many areas of similarities among the church music programs in his study. These included "a low number of graduates; offering the bachelor of music degree for church music majors; the use of semester hours; requirement of a secondary performance medium; attendance at student and faculty recitals; and participation in musical organizations" (Pfleuger 1964, 189). The study also noted the courses that all programs had in common. These included "English; religion; physical education; music theory; history and literature of music; courses in liturgies, chant, and hymnology; and church music literature" (Pfleuger 1964, 189).

In 1970 Dunbar studied non-NASM Protestant, interdenominational liberal arts colleges holding regional accreditation. These schools, all having an enrollment of under 2,500 students, were studied

1. To examine patterns of church music curricula in the selected religiously oriented liberal arts colleges;
2. To survey current trends in church music in these colleges;
3. To examine the need for an undergraduate degree in church music; and
4. To suggest basic curricula for undergraduate degrees with church music majors in colleges of the type studied (Dunbar 1970, 3).

To assist in accomplishing the stated purposes, Dunbar reviewed catalogues from all the institutions and also developed a questionnaire. The questionnaire sought data on faculty members, current music majors and church music majors, graduates serving in salaried church music positions, salaries of church music directors, and curriculum content, while the open-ended questions sought information on faculty opinions regarding the need for an undergraduate sacred music degree. Respondents were also asked to comment on current issues in church music and offer possible solutions concerning these issues.

Of the ninety-eight college catalogues reviewed, ninety-one offered a major in music and only thirteen schools offered a major in church music. During the 1967-1968 academic year, fifty-five church music courses were offered with the most common course titles being Church Music, Music and Worship, and History of Church Music. Dunbar found that the course most frequently offered by nine of the thirteen colleges with church music degrees was Hymnology. After Hymnology, the courses most frequently offered were titled Church Music I, Church Music II, Internship, Church Music Internship, Church Music Administration, and Church Music History. The

courses offered less frequently were Introduction to Church Music, Service Playing, and Liturgies (Dunbar 1970).

This study also indicated that some of the course titles and course content were consistent among institutions. These consistencies were found in courses such as Church Music Administration, Church Music Internship, Liturgies, and Service Playing. All thirteen schools required the study of theology, with fifteen credit hours being the median.

Forty-two percent of schools felt that the church music degree was appropriate for the undergraduate level; however, fifty-one percent of schools favored the graduate level for a church music degree. Those who embraced this view felt that the church music program was too specialized for the bachelor's level and that a broad background in general music should first be attained. Additionally, the schools felt that low enrollments and a lack of church music positions did not warrant a need for the undergraduate program in church music. This group also felt that the music-education degree, or any other music degree, would provide sufficient training for the majority of church music positions.

The survey in Dunbar's study showed that approximately 20% to 33% of music graduates held full-time church music positions and that remuneration for church music directors was contingent on a number of factors. These included need and demand, the experience of the musician, and the church budget. Some respondents indicated that there were not enough graduates to fill the demand of church positions. Consequently, Dunbar recommended that churches increase their remuneration in order to attract more individuals into the field.

Respondents expressed the urgent need for the overall quality of church music to be improved. Dunbar suggested that music departments continue to dialogue with their church music graduates in order to assess program strengths and define areas that need improvement. Faculty members in the study felt that students needed to have a deeper understanding of the purpose of church music and how that purpose could assist the needs of local congregations.

In 1974 Breland surveyed undergraduate and graduate church music curricula in all NASM accredited non-church-controlled colleges and universities. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the published curricular outlines for church music degrees?
2. What courses constitute the curricula?
3. How are the surveyed church music curricula similar and dissimilar?
4. To what extent are the surveyed church music curricula either ecumenical in their approach or denominationally slanted?
5. As nearly as can be determined, what are the reasons of each institution for the continuation of degrees in church music? (Breland 1974, 1-3).

In addition to examining the catalogues of each institution, Breland used three questionnaires in the study. The first questionnaire was designed for the registrar in order to gather historical and statistical data. The two remaining questionnaires were designed for the person overseeing the church music degree to gather information on ecumenical aspects of the program. The survey included questions on "curriculum, philosophy, goals, teaching materials, future plans, and other items related to the programs" (Breland 1974, 86). Of the thirty-five non-church-controlled NASM institutions offering undergraduate and graduate curricula in church music, thirty-one usable returns were received (88.6%).

Breland reported course requirements for the sacred music program in terms of general-music classes, core church-music classes and liberal-arts classes. Under general-music classes, Breland stated that Music History and Literature, along with Music Theory, were required at all institutions. Approximately half of the schools required undergraduate church music majors to take a general survey course in music literature, which encompassed choral music, solo vocal music, organ music, and instrumental music.

In the category of church music courses, Breland indicated that the applied area required more credits than the core church music courses. The average number of hours required in church music courses was seventeen, whereas the average number in applied music was 25.8 credits. Only half of the schools required choral conducting, with the average ranging from two to twelve credits. Seventy-five percent of the schools required a course in hymnology and only five schools required students to complete a supervised internship in local churches. Sixteen institutions required a course in organ service playing, regardless of their primary instrument and just a few schools required improvisation, but for most it was optional.

All of the institutions in Breland's study indicated that organ or voice were the only primary applied areas for church music majors. Although applied piano was not required of church music majors, the piano proficiency was required of all majors at all institutions.

The ecumenical component of sacred music degrees was of great interest to Breland. The majority of church music professors participating in the study were active in Protestant churches but had sufficient ecumenical experiences in other traditions to

the point that they were able to provide ecumenical training for their students. All of the instructors in the survey indicated their attempts to comprehensively review Protestant hymnals as well as the current Roman Catholic hymnals in their classes. Some schools even offered instruction in the Jewish tradition.

As part of his conclusion, Breland reported that NASM schools were concerned about the future of church music education at the undergraduate level. Most college teachers, theologians, and practicing church musicians felt that the undergraduate degree in sacred music did not serve the student well. The study revealed that the majority of undergraduate schools were planning to revise their church music programs at some point in the near future. On the other side of the spectrum, some schools discontinued the degree and several others were seriously considering the possibility of eventually phasing out of the program. Financial pressures and low student enrollments were the reasons given for this decision. Although some of the degree programs were discontinued, Breland's study indicated that several schools were planning to keep some of their church music courses in the curriculum for those students who would find them useful.

In 2002 Brady investigated the use of contemporary congregational music in undergraduate sacred music programs of colleges affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). As in previous studies, Brady completed a content analysis of school catalogues and also designed a questionnaire. These survey instruments were based on NASM standards and guidelines for the undergraduate sacred music program outlined in the NASM 2001 handbook.

A total of sixty-seven catalogues were reviewed to determine the frequency of course elements among the CCCU schools. Brady discovered that sixteen of the twenty-one course elements being evaluated were present in more than two-thirds of the population. The course elements included in less than 33% of the schools were:

1. Comparative Religions (4.5%)
2. Interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms (20.9%)
3. Relationship between sacred music and the music of the general culture (23.9%)
4. Contemporary congregational music ensemble (25.4%)
5. Improvisation (31.3%)

The course elements included at all sixty-seven CCCU institutions were:

1. Vocal performance
2. Piano performance
3. Choral ensemble
4. Conducting

The course elements included in 66%-99% of the CCCU catalogues included:

1. Jazz ensemble
2. Orchestra ensemble
3. Senior recital
4. Orders of worship
5. Church history
6. Administrative structures and procedures
7. Organ performance
8. Band ensemble
9. Guitar performance
10. Hymnology
11. Piano proficiency requirement
12. Internship

The survey indicated that the majority of church music programs did not include popular-music skills as part of the curriculum. Approximately 54% of the CCCU schools indicated that praise and worship choruses were not included, or included only to some extent, in their programs. While the use of popular-music skills was not present in the majority of schools surveyed by Brady, about half of the programs

included an internship that provided students with experiences in contemporary congregational music. Conducting and vocal training received the overall highest ratings in terms of current usage among CCCU schools, while guitar performance, improvisation, and arranging music for contemporary ensembles received the lowest ratings.

The survey also sought information on the extent to which professors felt certain course items should be included in the curriculum (desired use). This portion of the questionnaire revealed that conducting and vocal training received the highest rating for desired use, with the faculty ranking these two areas higher than church administrative structures and planning for the order of worship. Only 25% of faculty members preferred to have guitar included in their programs, or just included to a small extent:

In general, the professors consulted wished to include the following elements to a moderate extent: reading and playing from musical charts, arranging music for contemporary ensemble, song leading, praise and worship choruses included in hymnology or worship repertoire course, interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms, practicum experience in worship services that use praise and worship choruses, and improvisation (Brady 2002, 113).

Although approximately 91% of the population supported the teaching of the relationship between sacred music and music of the general culture, Brady observed that support for teaching the skills of popular music was weak. The professors indicated a desire to include contemporary elements to some extent in the sacred music program, but were unwilling to provide the necessary skills in allowing the students to be successful at those elements. She stated that the current programs in sacred music among CCCU schools are primarily geared to train students who will work in churches that use traditional hymnody and choral repertoire. In view of this, Brady recommended that several of the contemporary elements be incorporated into existing courses to add

relevancy. However, according to Brady, NASM representatives have identified barriers to the inclusion of popular music in the curricula. These barriers include the following:

1. A lack of developed pedagogy for popular music skills;
2. A lack of popular music skills in faculty;
3. A lack of standard repertoire in contemporary congregational music;
4. A lack of standards for judging excellence in popular music styles and contemporary congregational music; and
5. Strong moral, aesthetic, theological, and philosophical biases against popular music forms and contemporary congregational music (Brady 2002, 39).

Consequently, Brady concluded that because of strong moral, aesthetic, theological, and philosophical biases against contemporary music, combined with the fact that most faculty lack contemporary music skills and pedagogy, the majority of sacred music programs do not provide training in the highly developed contemporary congregational music styles.

Other Studies Related to Church Music Curricula

In addition to these dissertations on sacred music curricula, several other studies related to church music have been completed since 1949. Most of these studies focused on the general-music curricula in church-related colleges and universities. However, within the context of these general-music curricula studies, the sacred music curriculum was also evaluated. This important group of literature provides valuable information regarding the state of church music education over the past fifty-three years.

The Quality of Church Music Education

As discussed earlier, the quality of church music has always been a concern in the United States, even as far back as colonial times. This perpetual lack of quality

existed not only within the church but also among institutions that offered a sacred music curriculum. One example of the lack of quality in church music education was reported by Stephens in 1964. He discovered weaknesses in the curricula of Southern Baptist colleges in the areas of music theory, aural skills, conducting, and graded choir methods. The graduates in Melton's 1987 study identified weaknesses in the areas of internship, choral literature, and keyboard proficiency.

In assessing their college preparation to serve as music directors, respondents in Klassen's 1990 study indicated they were inadequately prepared in various areas of church work. The study showed that respondents lacked skills in directing a children's choir, youth choir, gospel choir, and an instrumental ensemble. When asked to comment on their preparedness in organ construction and repair, respondents did not feel their training gave them the necessary skills to deal with technical issues that could potentially surface in this related area of their position. Participants in the study also indicated that their skills in planning for worship services were not as strong as they should be. This is an interesting finding especially since worship planning is considered to be an essential role of a church music director.

One possible reason for the lack of quality among church musicians was the apparent lack of consistency among church music programs. As previously discussed, Pflueger (1964), Dunbar (1970), Breland (1974), and Brady (2002) all found sacred music curricula to be inconsistent. Stephens (1964) reported that core classes in church music at the Southern Baptist colleges varied greatly in terms of course offerings and also in terms of the number of credits required for each course. He reported that ten out

of the fourteen Southern Baptist schools did not even offer a course in Music and Worship as part of their curricula.

In view of these inconsistencies, department chairs at Southern Baptist institutions recognized the need to have a uniform curriculum and consequently offered the following recommendations:

1. More space for vocational courses in church music.
2. Provision of guided internship as a means of professional development for the student.
3. Better balance between required music and required general culture, both in liberal arts and in music degree programs.
4. Space for electives
5. Inclusion of instrumental training.
6. Extending the church music curriculum possibly to a five-year program (Stephens 1964, 202).

In some cases, different teaching styles and techniques resulted in a lack of consistency in the curriculum. For example, Stephens's study revealed numerous approaches to the teaching of Church Music Administration and Hymnology classes. In fact, he discovered that teachers of Hymnology classes among Southern Baptist schools had a limited concept of the subject matter:

1. A single textbook, single hymnal approach with little or no required parallel reading.
2. Presenting brief biographical data about hymn authors and composers in chronological order, followed by singing their hymns; no parallel reading required.
3. Confining the study to a single denominational approach, including the exclusive use of a Baptist hymnal, there being no other hymnals in multiple copies for class use (Stephens 1964, 102-103).

Hooper (1965) asserted that the field of church music requires more than just a level of proficiency:

Church music is a scholarly field of study, but the inadequacy of statements of purpose have obscured this fact. Until the seminaries define the purposes of

church music studies in terms of scholarship and skill, the clergy and laity will continue to think only in terms of proficiency (Hooper 1965, 205).

Hooper also challenges church musicians by stating: "If the seminary exists to serve the church, then church musicians must determine how church music serves the church" (Hooper 1965, 205).

Competencies for the Church Musician

Competencies, as rated important by church music directors, appear in several of the studies of the related literature. As far back as 1949, church music directors placed significant importance on conducting and singing with choral groups. They also valued vocal training, instrumental study, music history and literature, orchestral and choral conducting, sight reading, hymnology, and the opportunity to sing under a competent choir director (Smith 1949).

In Bearden's study of 1980, the ministers of music in the Southern Baptist denomination perceived the following competencies to be of highest importance: choral performance and rehearsal methods, choral conducting, vocal methods and pedagogy, and worship planning and leading. In addition, Southern Baptist ministers of music felt that competency in children's music, instrumental music, and administrative skills were also vital to the success of a church music director. The results of Bearden's study indicated that ministers of music valued the emphasis on practical aspects of the church music program.

As in Bearden's study, Klassen (1990) reported that Mennonite ministers of music placed great importance on church music administration and organization. Additionally, value was placed on the following competencies for a church music

student: "pipe organ skills, church history, music office management, youth training, introduction to contemporary Christian music (also suggested by one professor, who stated, 'I think we need a course in contemporary gospel techniques including the selection of choruses and hymns that will complement both types of congregational singing'), choir recruitment techniques, copyright information, poetic analysis of texts, ethnic styles, technique of modern keyboards, PA systems, media, and drama" (Klassen 1990, 60). Of special interest in the preceding list, is the attention given to informal idioms with the mention of items such as "gospel music," "ethnic styles," and "modern keyboards." This suggests that in the Mennonite tradition, popular music trends were important at the time of Klassen's study. Leach (1983) also found that the content of church music courses at participating Bible colleges "focused on contemporary church music developments and trends within a historical perspective" (Leach 1983, 38). Klassen supports this finding in his study by reporting that ministers of music within the Mennonite churches desired the inclusion of new hymns in the context of hymnology courses.

When asked to rate the importance of specific courses in their undergraduate church music training, ministers of music serving as choral directors rated choral ensemble as the most valuable course in their curriculum. Also rated very high were Applied Music instruction and Conducting, followed by Church Music, Music History, and Music-Education classes.

Pastors have also been given the opportunity to express their views as to the competencies that ministers of music should possess. In 1949, pastors felt strongly that church music directors should be competent in church organization, church history,

Bible, and theology (Smith 1949). Emch (1986) reported that within the Christian Missionary Alliance denomination, pastors rate the top competencies of a minister of music to be the following:

1. Ability to demonstrate an understanding of the role of music in worship, fellowship and evangelism and the methods by which this role is fulfilled.
2. Ability to organize and administer the total church music program.
3. Ability to select and plan music for worship services.
4. Ability to formulate music goals and objectives consistent with the overall principles and goals of the local church.
5. Ability to conduct choral groups (Emch 1986, 30).

Likewise, the least important competencies as reported by the pastors in Emch's study included the following:

1. Ability to prepare and preach a sermon.
2. Ability to play piano at a performance level sufficient to perform difficult solo material.
3. Ability to compose and arrange music that is appropriate for church services.
4. Knowledge of basic organ techniques sufficient to instruct the organist in selecting appropriate organ stops (settings) for congregational singing and choral accompaniments.
5. Ability to perform as a vocal soloist (Emch 1986, 30-31).

It is interesting to note that Christian Missionary Alliance pastors placed little value on the ability to perform as a vocal soloist. Bearden (1980) also found this to be true among the Southern Baptist ministers of music who felt that performance skills were important, but secondary in the overall training of church music directors.

When asked to rank certain competencies, college professors and church music graduates in the Mennonite denomination generally agreed on skills they felt were most important for the minister of music (Klassen 1990, 43).

College Professors

1. Conducting
2. Choral Ensemble
3. Private Instruction
4. Music Education
5. Music History
6. Church Music
7. Instrumental Ensemble
8. Hymnology
9. Church History
10. Church Choir Administration
11. Christian Education

Church Music Graduates

1. Choral Ensemble
2. Conducting
3. Private Instruction
4. Music Education
5. Music History
6. Church Music
7. Instrumental Ensemble
8. Church History
9. Christian Education
10. Instrumental Ensemble
11. Church Choir Administration

On the other hand, in the Southern Baptist denomination, there was a discrepancy between the ratings of competencies when comparing data of church leaders and church music professors. Traditional musical skills were valued more by church music professors than by denominational leaders or ministers of music (Bearden 1980).

Student Proficiency

Student proficiency levels were also a concern among the church-related institutions. Stephens (1964) recommended that each music department establish proficiency requirements in the areas of aural skills, sight-singing, solo performance, conducting, score reading, choral arranging, and keyboard facility. He observed that proficiency standards were also needed in functional harmony, voice, knowledge of orchestral instruments, and a method for choosing appropriate music for worship. While most colleges did not have proficiency requirements in each of these areas, Emch (1986) reported that approximately half of the Christian Missionary Alliance colleges required their students to pass a piano proficiency exam.

The significance of the role of the piano in schools and churches is indicated by the many courses offered among institutions. Leach (1983) found courses in piano pedagogy, group piano, piano service playing, accompanying, applied piano, duo piano ensemble, and piano tuning and maintenance. Approximately 62% of schools in Leach's study offered a service playing course that covered functional piano skills for the church musician. These skills included "improvisation, transposition, modulation, ensemble playing, etc., together with the application of these skills for use in services and activities of the church" (Leach 1983, 41). In addition, there were a number of specialized piano courses titled "fundamentals of hymn playing, congregational hymn playing, service playing, basic keyboard skills, hymn transcriptions, improvisation, evangelistic piano, improvisational techniques, evangelistic keyboard, hymn playing, piano service playing, and hymn playing and improvisation" (Leach 1983, 41-42). With all these specialized courses being offered at church-related institutions, it is not surprising that students attending these institutions felt prepared in the area of functional piano (Klassen 1990).

Church Music Degrees

A variety of sacred music degrees were reported as being offered in the related studies over a forty-four year period. In 1949, Smith found that the Bachelor of Sacred Music degree was offered among colleges, universities, seminaries, and bible institutes. In 1957, Morrison identified degrees such as the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science in sacred music, Bachelor of Music degree in sacred music, and the Bachelor of Music Education degree with a major in church music. Some schools in his study also offered the Bachelor of Sacred Music degree. Farrier (1963) reported that among the

schools offering a bachelor's program in church music, four institutions had a major in Organ and Church Music while several others used nomenclature such as Religious Music, Liturgical Music, Gregorian Chant, and Sacred Music. Just one year later, Stephens (1964) identified both the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Music degrees in church music among Southern Baptist Colleges. In 1983, Leach indicated that the church music programs were framed within the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Religious Education, or the Bachelor of Music degree among AABC schools. A few years later, Melton (1987) reported that all Bible colleges in his study offered at least one bachelor of music degree with an emphasis in church music or sacred music. Among this population, the majority of schools offered an emphasis in church music. Graham (1993) found that some NASM schools offered both organ degrees and church music degrees to prepare church music directors. However, organ study was so closely tied to the church music degree that in a few of the schools there was no distinction between the two. Seven NASM schools in Graham's research offered organ study within the context of the church music degree.

Several schools developed compositedegree programs combining church music with another professional area such as Christian education, missions, pastoral ministry, and youth ministry (Leach 1983). Emch (1986) also found that approximately 20% of church music graduates developed a secondary professional area of study.

The literature indicates that although several programs in church music were not well-structured or defined, efforts were still made among church-sponsored colleges to provide at least some training for prospective church musicians. In 1963, Farrier found that 29% of the schools in his study offered courses in church music outside the context

of a sacred music degree. F.M. Williams (1969) found that even in the absence of a church music curriculum, Lutheran schools provided potential church musicians with exposure to vocal and ensemble instruction. The underlying assumption on the part of church-sponsored colleges was that all music majors may eventually work in a church setting at some point in their musical careers (Crocker 1985). This concept was corroborated by Klassen (1990) when he reported that church music courses were required of all music majors at Mennonite colleges.

The schools that offered church music classes outside the context of a church music degree sometimes made claims beyond the scope of their programs. In 1963 Farrier reported that the course offerings in some schools would not have sufficiently prepared students to meet the stated objectives of the institution. Leach (1983) and Melton (1987) also found this to be true in their studies as well. Both reported an inadequate number of church music courses, with one school only offering one church music course and advertising that their graduates would be qualified for a church music position.

Core Church Music Courses

Significant variety was observed in the core sacred music courses offered over the past 52 years. In 1949, Smith found courses titled Choral Conducting, (elementary and advanced), Liturgies, Choral and Song Literature, Music and Worship, Hymnology, Church Music Administration, Music in Religious Education, Courses in Religion, Youth Choir Methods, Vocal Methods, Seminars in Church Music, Church Music Problems, Church Architecture, Oratorio Repertoire, History of Sacred Music, Boy Choir, Improvisation, and Fine Arts in Religion.

In 1957 Morrison reported diverse titles given to core church music courses. These titles included Hymnology, Service Playing, Church Music, History of Church Music, Beginning and Intermediate Gospel Song and Hymn Playing, Evangelistic Song Leading, Evangelistic Playing and Hymn Transcription, Music in Worship, Graded Choirs, Liturgical Music, Church Music Administration I, Church Music Administration II, Sacred Vocal Literature, Ministry of Music in the Church, History and Literature of Church Music, Introduction to Church Music, Practical Church Music, Music Ministries, Sacred Choral Literature, Appreciation of Sacred Music, Repertoire of Church Music, Music in the Bible, Ecclesiastical Forms, Youth Choir Methods and Materials, and Boy Choir training. The courses most frequently offered in Morrison's study were Hymnology, Liturgies, and Service Playing.

Two other studies reported significant diversity within the professional core. While Farrier (1963) did not list specific course titles, he found that church music requirements ranged from 0-30 credits, with nine credits being the median. Melton (1987) discovered that Choral Arranging, Choral Literature, Choral Procedure, and Elementary/Secondary methods were offered sporadically among schools within his population.

On the other hand, several core courses in church music were found to be consistent among church-related institutions. Stephens (1964) reported that the most common church music classes among institutions were Hymnology, Church Music Literature, Graded Choir Methods and Materials, and Church Music Administration. Twenty years later, some of the same courses existed in Leach's (1983) study. She found that the most common core church music courses among AABC schools were

Hymnology, Church Music Administration, and Conducting. In 1986, Emch reported Conducting, Music Ministry, Literature, and Pedagogy classes to be among the regularly offered courses in church music. Melton (1987) indicated that Choral Literature, Elementary Methods, Secondary Methods, and Hymnology were required by 75% of the schools in his study, while all schools required Philosophy of Church Music, Church Music Administration, and Conducting.

Conducting was found to be a consistent core requirement in the training of church music directors. Stephens (1964) explained that the majority of Southern Baptist schools required two or three credits of conducting for the church music major. Among the AABA schools, conducting classes were present at the majority of the institutions, suggesting the value of this skill in the context of the sponsoring churches (Leach 1983). Melton (1987) reported that approximately 90% of the responding institutions also offered advanced levels of conducting as part of the sacred music program. While the majority of church-related colleges required conducting, Graham (1993) found that this course was not a requirement for organ majors at many of the NASM schools. This is an interesting finding since organ study is so closely tied to the church music degree at many NASM institutions (Graham 1993).

The supervised internship has also steadily emerged as a core sacred music requirement. Stephens (1964) indicated that the Southern Baptist faculty favored an internship experience, yet only two out of fourteen schools in the denomination included this component as part of the sacred music degree. By 1980, Bearden reported that Southern Baptist schools had established an internship requirement and that faculty were generally pleased with its addition to the program. Leach (1983) found that while

the majority of schools in her study offered a church music degree, less than one-third of the schools offered an internship experience. Crocker (1985) went as far to suggest that the preparation and retention of a minister of music would significantly improve among Nazarene music directors if a greater emphasis were placed on the supervised internship. By 2002, Brady discovered that the majority of institutions required an internship for the sacred music degree.

General-Music Courses

Great diversity was also found in the area of general-music courses required for a sacred music degree. Farrier reported that music theory requirements among institutions ranged from 15-34 credits. These credits were fulfilled through courses titled Theory, Harmony, Sight-Singing, Dictation, Solfege, Keyboard Harmony, Analytical Techniques, Form and Analysis, Modal Analysis, Counterpoint, Fundamentals of Music, and Musicianship. There were varying requirements in languages, applied music, orchestration, choral literature, voice pedagogy, keyboard pedagogy, and variations in requirements for senior projects. Like Farrier, Stephens (1964) found that general-music courses were often inconsistent from one institution to another.

As with core church music courses, consistencies were also found among general-music courses. Farrier (1963) reported that primary applied areas within the undergraduate degrees in church music included organ, voice and piano, while secondary applied areas were almost exclusively piano or voice. Leach (1983) commented that the frequency of applied voice, piano and organ at AABA schools implied that these instruments had significant value in the religious services of the

supporting churches. Other applied instruments, including orchestral and guitar, were also offered among responding institutions. Leach (1983), Emch (1986), and Melton (1987) indicated that Music Theory, Music History, ensembles, and applied music were present at all schools in their studies.

Revisions to Church Music Programs

Previous research has revealed that educators are sensitive to the concept that courses in sacred music must be relevant in order to meet the needs of future church music directors (Stephens 1964; Leach 1983; Melton 1987; Brady 2002). Consequently, revisions within church music programs were not only encouraged but also implemented. Stephens (1964) suggested that a committee comprised of eminent church music leaders from within the Southern Baptist churches and colleges be established to study the musical needs of the denomination. Leach (1983) echoed the sentiments of other church music historians when she said: “The music curriculum of the Bible College must be improved in order to keep pace with contemporary church developments. The effectiveness of music graduates in their music professions must remain a primary concern of curriculum designers as they engage in curriculum revision” (Leach 1983, 81).

Both Leach (1983) and Melton (1987) found that over 75% of respondents planned to make curricular changes and that several church music programs were included in the revision process. Efforts were made to “redesign the music program to support the college philosophy of training adults for church-related vocations” (Leach 1983, 48). Approximately 90% of the schools in Leach’s study planned to contact their alumni for input relative to curricular revisions. The decision to include alumni in the

revision process is reflective of the value that faculty place on feedback from their graduates.

Experience of the Sacred Music Faculty

Since practical training is of value in the preparation of church music directors, it is essential that sacred music faculty bring as much professional experience to the classroom as possible (Bearden 1980). Among the Southern Baptist faculty in the 1960s, it was reported that 50% of the educators had previously served as church music practitioners prior to teaching on the college level. In addition, approximately half of the music faculty had teaching experience ranging from five to fourteen years (Stephens 1964).

When compared to other regionally accredited institutions, faculty at Southern Baptist colleges had a much higher percentage of masters degrees and a lower percentage of doctoral degrees (Stephens 1964). Leach (1983) found that over one-third of faculty members had not even earned a master's degree in music; however, 88% of the music faculty did have significant church music experience, primarily by serving as minister of music earlier in their careers.

Employment Outlook

The employment outlook for ministers of music among the church-related studies indicates that, on average, approximately half of the graduates served in church leadership positions. Respondents in Smith's (1949) study indicated that job placement ranged from 20% to 98%. Emch (1986) reported that about 54% of all church music graduates of the Christian Missionary Alliance colleges over a five-year period held

church music positions. Crocker (1985) indicated that 87% of Nazarene music graduates assumed a leadership role in church music at some point in their lives and that approximately 46% were currently serving in the Nazarene churches at the time of his study. Although the employment outlook among the Nazarene and Christian Missionary Alliance colleges were fair, F.E. Williams (1969) indicated in his study of the Lutheran colleges that only 0.2% of alumni who responded to his survey were employed as full-time church organists.

There are a number of issues that contribute to the poor employment outlook of church music graduates. Some of the most frequently mentioned frustrations on the part of Nazarene ministers of music in Crocker's (1985) study were a lack of competence among other musicians, musical challenge, salary and benefits, poor funding, and inadequate facilities. In the same study, Crocker identified five factors that played a role in the lack of retention among Nazarene ministers of music. These included time limitations, lack of musical challenge, salary and benefits, church doctrine and rules, and job security. It is interesting to note that the issues of low salaries and poor benefits appeared on both lists and were not unique to the Nazarene churches. Klassen (1990) discovered that Mennonite church leaders were not satisfied with the current remuneration of ministers of music within their churches, fearing that low remuneration had the potential to discourage a career in church music. One Mennonite church leader acknowledged: "Very few churches pay even part-time persons" (Klassen 1990, 74).

Many churches have historically struggled with their budgets. Bynum (1975) notes that "although the churches give a prominent place to the Ministry of music in their services, few churches provide more than 2 percent of the total church budget for

the operating of music programs (exclusive of salaries and the purchase of major equipment)" (Bynum 1975, 146). Klassen (1990) discovered that 58% of the responding churches in his survey budgeted less than \$1000 per year for the music department.

Nonmusical Competencies

The nonmusical competencies of a church music director have always been valued over the past fifty-three years. Even back in 1949 ministers of music expressed their disappointment in not having the opportunity to enroll in a course on interpersonal skills. Pastors also felt this was an important skill for church music students to acquire (Smith 1949). Faculty at Southern Baptist colleges strongly believed that the personality of a minister of music should be pleasant and attractive (Stephens 1964), while the Southern Baptist music directors valued communications and human relations skills (Bearden 1980). Great value was placed on interpersonal relationships with the pastor, church staff, congregation and community. Pastors in the Nazarene church consistently selected ministers of music who exemplified greater ministry and relationship skills than musical skills (Miller 1990).

The highest rated nonmusical competencies in a minister of music include the ability to get along with people, to submit to leadership, to grasp corporate worship, and to cooperate with the staff (Emch 1986). These findings are similar to those listed in Melton's 1987 study. When pastors were invited to list competencies or qualities they felt important for a minister of music, the list was almost exclusively comprised of nonmusical items. These included the ability to be flexible, to relate well with people, to implement and carry out plans made, to be more disciplined and productive, to compromise high musical standards to involve more people, to work together with

others, to be teachable, to be creative, to evoke a spirit of worship, to use traditional and contemporary instruments, to be sensitive to the needs of others, to communicate effectively, to select music to reach a variety of people, and to control his own ego (Melton 1987). It is apparent that personal attributes are greatly valued in church work.

Summary

Numerous studies have been completed in the area of sacred music curriculum. While many researchers have focused on sacred music programs, only four of the studies were in-depth writings on church music curricula. Several of the studies have also included the sacred music curriculum within the context of a general-music program evaluation. While all related studies discussed in this chapter have significantly contributed to an understanding of the sacred music degree in North America, the body of literature does not include current data on sacred music programs within NASM schools. Information needs to be sought from NASM institutions regarding current enrollments, required courses, emphasis and importance placed on the required courses, internships, job placement, and overall relevancy of the undergraduate church music program. None of the studies since Breland (1974) has focused exclusively on this very important group of schools.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS OF THE CONTENT ANALYSIS

This chapter presents a description of the content analysis of the academic catalogs from the NASM schools that offer an undergraduate sacred music program. The information includes data regarding the sacred music degrees, the curricular components, and the course offerings among institutions. The findings are presented in narrative and tabular forms.

According to the 2004 National Association of Schools of Music *Directory* and the *Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, US and Canada, 2004-2005*, there were seventy-seven schools that offered an undergraduate sacred music program during the 2004-2005 academic year. In the process of collecting data, the researcher learned that seven schools eliminated their church music program, leaving a total of seventy schools in the population. Consequently, the findings of the content analysis are based on seventy academic catalogs obtained either online at the institution's website or through the mail. While this analysis was based on the most current versions of the academic catalogs, it should be noted that institutions are continuously revising their curricula and that some of these revisions may not have been reflected in the most current editions of the bulletins.

Sacred Music Degrees

The sacred music programs of the seventy NASM institutions are framed within the following three types of undergraduate music degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music, and Bachelor of Science. All three degrees offer the option of either a major or a concentration (emphasis) in church music. Across all three degree types, fifty-two schools offered a major in sacred music and eighteen schools offered a concentration or emphasis. Table 1 lists the distribution of majors and concentrations as well as the number and percentage of schools offering the three types of degrees. The numbers in parentheses in table 1 correspond to the number of schools offering that particular program.

Fifteen schools (21.4%) offered sacred music instruction within the context of a Bachelor of Arts degree. Within this degree, the most common program was the concentration in church music which was offered by six schools. This was followed by the major in church music, certificate in parish music, concentration in music ministry, concentration in sacred music, emphasis in church music, and emphasis in worship and music ministry.

Fifty-three schools (75.7%) offered the sacred music program within the context of a Bachelor of Music degree. The nomenclature, major in church music, was the most common title and was offered by thirty-two schools. Another fourteen schools offered a similar title, major in sacred music, and three schools offered the sacred music program as a concentration within another major. Two of these three schools offered a major in performance with a concentration (emphasis) in sacred music while the third school offered a keyboard pedagogy major with an emphasis in sacred music. Other titles

within the Bachelor of Music degree included concentration in church music, concentration in sacred music, emphasis in church music, and major in parish music.

Table 1. Titles of Sacred Music Degrees Offered
(N = 70)

Degree Title	Number of Schools	Percentage
Bachelor of Arts in Music	15	21.4
Concentration in church music (6)		
Major in church music (4)		
Certificate in parish music (1)		
Concentration in music ministry (1)		
Concentration in sacred music (1)		
Emphasis in church music (1)		
Emphasis in worship and music ministry (1)		
Bachelor of Music	53	75.7
Major in church music (32)		
Major in sacred music (14)		
Concentration in church music (1)		
Concentration in sacred music (1)		
Emphasis in church music (1)		
Major in parish music (1)		
Major in performance/concentration in sacred music (1)		
Major in performance/emphasis in sacred music (1)		
Major in keyboard pedagogy/emphasis in church music (1)		
Bachelor of Science	2	2.9
Concentration in church music (1)		
Major in church music (1)		

Two schools (2.9%) offered the sacred music program within the framework of a Bachelor of Science degree. In this group, one school offered a concentration in church music, while the other school offered a major in church music.

Of the fifty-two schools across all three degree types that offered a major in church music, several required specific tracks that were appropriate to the student's major applied area. These tracks were vocal/choral, keyboard, and instrumental. Voice students were required to follow the vocal/choral track, while organ and piano students followed the keyboard track, and orchestral instrumental students (including guitar) followed the instrumental track. Among the distinguishing features of the three tracks were pedagogy, methods, and literature courses, all specific to the major applied area. The choice of one track was required in programs with an emphasis in sacred music as well as in programs with a major in church music. One school even offered a sacred music degree with a track in composition.

Curricular Components of the Sacred Music Degrees

A wide range of credit hours existed within the curricular components among the NASM institutions offering an undergraduate sacred music program. The curricular components in this study include the church music core, the music core, and the general-education core. The church music core, specifically required for church music majors, includes the following groups of classes: administrative structures and procedures, history and philosophy of church music, hymnology, church music, internship, service playing, diction, choral and instrumental conducting, church music literature, organ and choral literature, choral methods, church music methods, elementary and secondary methods, instrumental methods, and pedagogy. In determining which courses would comprise the music core, the author chose classes that would be required of all undergraduate music students, regardless of their specific major. These include courses in music theory, composition and arranging,

counterpoint, form and analysis, orchestration, sight-singing and ear-training, music history and literature, basic conducting, applied music, ensembles, piano proficiency, recital attendance, and technology. The general-education core includes non-music courses such as religion and philosophy, theology, fine arts, health and physical education, natural and social sciences, quantitative reasoning, and writing.

The data presented in table 2 indicates the range of semester credit hours and mean for each curricular component at the seventy NASM institutions. The research revealed that four of the seventy schools operated under the quarter system. For consistency, the quarter hours at these institutions were converted to the semester credit hour system by multiplying the number of quarter hours by four.

Table 2. Mean Number of Semester Hours of the Curricular Components from all Institutions (N=70)

Curricular Component	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Church music core	6-48	19.0
Music core	27-94	60.1
General education core	30-95	51.9
Total credit hours for degree	120-161	130.9

A wide range of credits represented the seventy schools within the population. The total number of semester hours for an undergraduate degree in church music was between 120 and 161 credits, with the mean being 130.9 credits. The range of the church music core (6-48 credits) was reflective of the differences in requirements for

the concentration in church music and the major in church music. Schools with a concentration usually required fewer credits in the church music core, while schools offering a major in church music required more credits in the church music core. The music core, (27-94 credits), and the general-education core (30-95 credits) also varied greatly among the NASM schools.

Music Courses Offered

Courses offered in the catalogs of the seventy NASM schools have been categorized into major groupings and subgroupings. The major groupings include church music, music theory and composition, music history and literature, applied music, conducting, performance organizations, literature, methods and materials, technology, proficiency, and miscellaneous. The subgroupings within each major grouping are listed in the following tables first by rank, then in alphabetical order. Each table lists the number of schools that offer courses in that subgrouping, the range of credit hours per course, and the mean of the range of credits. Appendix B is a comprehensive list of specific course titles within each group and subgrouping from the institutions that were included in the study. All courses listed in this appendix were offered as part of the undergraduate sacred music program and included electives specific to a particular track (vocal/choral, keyboard, and instrumental).

Church Music

The church music courses at NASM schools were divided into eight subgroupings and are listed in table 3. These subgroupings include internship, hymnology, church music, service playing, administrative structures and procedures,

introduction to church music, history and philosophy of church music, and relationships between sacred music and the music of general cultures. A total of 193 church music courses were offered among the NASM schools in all eight subgroupings, with the most common titles being Hymnology, Church Music Administration, and Service Playing. Church Music was the largest subgrouping with forty-five different course titles.

Table 3. Church Music Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Internship	52	0-6	1.7
Hymnology	47	2-4	2.6
Church music	42	1-4	2.4
Service playing	36	1-3	1.6
Administrative structures and procedures	30	1-4	2.5
Introduction to church music	19	0-3	2.0
History and philosophy of church music	18	2-4	2.4
Relationships between sacred music and the music of general cultures	7	1-3	2.2

Fifty-two schools offered an internship in church music ranging between zero and six credits. This relatively high number is reflective of institutions that are in compliance with the specific internship guidelines outlined in the 2004-2005 NASM Handbook. While NASM strongly recommends an internship experience, it acknowledges that this function may be met in a variety of other ways. This would probably explain the absence of an organized internship requirement in the remaining eighteen schools. As listed in appendix B, the most common titles given to internship courses were Church Music Internship and Practicum in Church Music. These titles

were followed by Internship, Sacred Music Internship, Church Music Practicum, Field Study, Field Work, and Internship in Church Music. One school combined the internship with a course in church music administration.

The titles of Hymnology courses varied among institutions; however, the most common course in this subgrouping was titled Hymnology and was offered by thirty schools. Variations in titles included Christian Hymnody, Congregational Song, Hymnody and Psalmody, Chant and Liturgics, Worship and Hymnology, and Survey of Congregational Song (see appendix B). It appeared that several schools offering Hymnology courses aimed to be creative in their choice of the course name. This is illustrated by one school that used the title Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs. Although course titles varied among institutions, the course content was similar.

Service Playing, the second largest subgrouping under church music, encompassed a variety of areas. These included piano and organ service playing as well as improvisation, accompanying techniques, and hymn playing. One school even offered a course in organ construction and design. Although approximately half of the schools included courses in service playing, the other institutions incorporated this competency into the applied lessons.

Nineteen schools offered introductory courses in church music. In addition to the general overview of church music ministry, several schools offered courses specific to their denominational affiliation. Course titles included Introduction to Baptist Denomination, Introduction to Baptist Ministry, Lutheran Service, Southern Baptist Church Music Conference, and Work of the Minister. One school offered an

introductory course titled Foundations of Christian Theology, illustrating the value that many institutions place on theological training for church musicians.

Of particular interest is that only seven schools offered courses on the relationships between sacred music and the music of general cultures. The lack of offerings in this subgrouping is surprising in view of NASM's requirement that this area be included as part of the sacred music curriculum. Since NASM does not accredit institutions based on course titles, but on content and competencies, it may very well be that institutions incorporate this component into other church music, or general-music courses.

Music Theory and Composition

The music theory and composition courses were divided into seven subgroupings and are shown in table 4. These subgroupings, listed by rank, include music theory, sight-singing and ear-training, form and analysis, counterpoint, orchestration, composition and arranging, and introduction to music. There were a total of 224 courses offered in this major grouping during the 2004-2005 academic year. The most common titles were Form and Analysis, Orchestration, Theory I, Theory II, Music Theory I, Music Theory II, Music Theory III, Music Theory IV, and Counterpoint. The most variety in course titles were found under the subgroupings of music theory and sight-singing and ear training. Nine schools offered introductory courses in music theory; however, these courses were remedial and did not count towards the sacred music degree.

It is not surprising that all seventy schools offered courses in music theory and sight-singing and ear training. However it was surprising to see the significant lack of

consistency in course titles within these two subgroupings. At the seventy schools there were ninety-five different course titles for music theory and eighty-five different course titles for sight-singing and ear-training (see appendix B). Although the content was consistent among schools, it seemed that each institution intentionally developed creative course titles.

Table 4. Music Theory and Composition Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Music theory	70	2-4	2.7
Sight-singing and ear-training	70	0-3	1.3
Form and analysis	42	2-4	2.5
Counterpoint	33	2-4	2.4
Orchestration	32	1-3	2.2
Composition and arranging	20	0-4	2.2
Introduction to music	9	1-3	2.2

A few institutions combined music theory and aural skills into one course rather than separating them into two distinct courses. While music theory courses are usually offered for three credits, this combined class was offered for four credits to include the aural skills component. Another school offered four levels of a unique course titled Theory, Form and Counterpoint, combining all three components into one class. In addition to the traditional music theory classes, one institution required students to enroll in two levels of American Popular Music and Jazz Theory with a corresponding lab. This requirement was part of the music core for all undergraduate music majors regardless of their major or emphasis.

With one exception, under the sight-singing and ear training subgrouping all course titles seemed to clearly indicate that the course was indeed a sight-singing and/or ear-training class. However, one school named their sight-singing and ear-training courses Music Theory I and Music Theory III. This is not a misplaced title in appendix B, but rather another illustration of the lack of consistency and standardization among institutions.

As illustrated in table 4, many schools have dedicated courses for form and analysis, counterpoint, orchestration, and composition and arranging. These courses help to fulfill the NASM guidelines for the general standards leading to baccalaureate degrees in music. The schools that do not have a dedicated course for these areas incorporate the competencies and skills into other theory classes. Although the mean of credits for schools offering courses in composition and arranging is 2.2, one institution did offer a composition course for zero credits. It should be noted that this course was called Beginning Composition with the Computer and may have been a lab class or an elective to meet a proficiency requirement in technology.

Music History and Literature

Six subgroupings of courses comprise the Music History and Literature category. These subgroupings, outlined in table 5, include music history, world music, literature, introduction to music history, music of the general culture, and music in the United States. A total of 129 courses were offered, with all seventy schools requiring courses in the history of western music. The most common titles included Music History I, Music History II, History of Music I, and History of Music II. The greatest

variety of course titles (ninety-seven) were found under the music history courses and may be viewed in appendix B.

Although these titles greatly varied among institutions, the content of the courses was very similar. All schools required at least two semesters of music history encompassing the major stylistic periods through the twentieth century. In addition to the required traditional survey courses, several music history electives were offered as part of the sacred music programs at NASM institutions. These included electives which focused on a specific period such as the Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, Romantic, and Twentieth Century.

Table 5. Music History and Literature Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Music history	70	2-4	2.8
World music	20	1-4	2.5
Literature	14	1-3	2.4
Introduction to music history	7	1-3	1.9
Music of the general culture	5	1-4	2.6
Music in the United States	3	2-3	2.6

Twenty schools offered a dedicated course in the area of world music and only five schools offered a specific course in music of the general culture. These are unexpectedly low numbers in view of NASM's recommendation that students should be familiar with music from various cultures of the world. Aside from offering a course dedicated to world music, or to music of the general culture, it would be a great

challenge to provide a comprehensive treatment of these areas within the context of another course.

Fourteen schools offered courses in music literature. Thirteen of these institutions required literature courses in addition to the usual two-semester music history sequence. These additional literature courses focused on the traditional study of the masterpieces of Western music literature from the Middle Ages to the present. One of the fourteen institutions offered four levels of Music Literature, combining the music history sequence as part of the class. Consequently, this institution did not require additional music history courses to fulfill the sacred music degree requirements. Some schools even included literature of popular music, jazz and world music as part of their literature class. Particular emphasis was placed on listening, writing, and thinking about music.

Seven schools in the population offered introductory courses in music history. These classes were overview courses of music history and literature encompassing major composers and styles from antiquity through the twentieth century. One school included a brief treatment of non-western music and popular music, while another school emphasized basic terminology and knowledge of standard musical works.

Applied Music

Table 6 outlines the following subgroupings under applied music: applied organ, applied voice, applied piano, recital attendance, junior and senior recital, applied guitar, applied orchestral instruments (strings, brass, percussion, woodwinds), diction, senior project, studio class, applied conducting, applied composition, and applied harpsichord. All seventy schools offered applied music and required a primary and a secondary area

of instruction. As expected, the most common primary applied areas for the sacred music degree were organ, voice and piano. If the primary applied area was an instrument other than piano or voice, most NASM institutions required either piano or voice to be declared as the secondary applied area. All but one school offered the option of applied organ and three schools required the organ to be the primary applied instrument. Seven schools in the population only permitted the organ or voice to be declared as the primary applied area, while all other institutions permitted any applied area, including orchestral instruments. Sixty-seven schools offered applied voice and sixty-six schools offered applied piano as primary and secondary areas of instruction.

Table 6. Applied Music Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Applied Organ	69	1-4	1.9
Applied Voice	67	1-4	1.7
Applied Piano	66	1-2	1.5
Recital Attendance	58	0-2	0.1
Junior/Senior Recital	51	0-4	0.3
Applied Guitar	41	1-2	1.8
Applied Orchestral Instruments			
Strings	41	1-2	1.8
Brass	40	1-2	1.8
Percussion	40	1-2	1.8
Woodwinds	39	1-2	1.8
Diction	30	1-4	1.4
Senior Project	12	1-4	2.0
Studio Class	5	0	0
Applied Conducting	2	2-3	2.5
Applied Composition	1	1	1.0
Applied Harpsichord	1	1	1.0

As illustrated in table 6, many schools permitted church music students to declare orchestral instruments as their primary or secondary applied areas. However, in all cases students with a primary area in an orchestral instrument were required to declare piano or voice as their secondary applied area. Once the piano proficiency requirements were met, the student had the option of declaring any instrument as their secondary area.

The number of credit hours in applied music varied from one to four credits per semester. All but fourteen schools required church music students to enroll in two credits of applied music in their primary area each semester. The majority of other institutions required one credit hour per semester, while one school required three credits and another school required four credits.

Some catalogs offered information on the amount of time students were required to practice per week. The following requirements were outlined by the institutions that published this information:

- 1 credit hour = minimum of 5 hours of practice per week
- 2 credit hours = minimum of 10 hours of practice per week
- 3 credit hours = minimum of 15 hours of practice per week

A few schools required applied studies in areas other than organ, voice, piano, or instruments. One school required students in their church music program to enroll in applied composition in order to fulfill the requirements for a track in composition; another school required one semester of applied harpsichord in addition to the primary and secondary areas of applied organ and applied piano; and two schools required applied conducting as part of the sacred music degree.

Closely tied to the applied music instruction was the recital-attendance requirement. Fifty-eight schools indicated a requirement in their catalogs that church music students must attend a specified number of recitals and concerts each semester. Several schools combined this requirement with weekly studio or performance classes. The average number of recitals required per semester by NASM schools was nine.

The greatest variety of courses offered in applied music fell under the applied piano subgrouping. The forty-five courses offered were group piano classes designed primarily for students whose secondary instrument was the piano. These courses (listed in appendix B) were designed to develop the necessary skills and competencies needed to pass the piano proficiency requirements outlined by each institution.

Thirty schools offered separate courses in diction as part of the church music degree. These courses included diction in English, French, German, Italian, and Latin. However, not all thirty schools required the study of diction in all five languages. Some required only two, others required three, and one institution required four languages. Although not specified in the catalogs, it may be fair to assume that the institutions that did not offer a specific class in diction cover this material as part of the applied voice instruction.

The NASM handbook strongly recommends that all church music students perform at least one recital as part of their degree requirement. While this function may be met in a variety of ways, fifty-one schools indicated a course titled Junior or Senior Recital, which students enrolled in during the semester they fulfilled these requirements. Some institutions required a one-hour recital in the primary applied area (full recital), while other institutions required a thirty-minute recital (half recital). One

of the schools offering a concentration in church music only required a fifteen-minute senior recital; however, the majority of half recitals were thirty minutes in length. One school even required both a junior and a senior recital. The credit hours for recitals ranged from zero to four credits, with a mean of 0.3. Three schools offered one credit for recitals, two schools offered three credits and four schools offered four credits.

Closely related to the junior and senior recital was the senior project. Thirteen schools offered a class of this nature in the last semester of study. Some of these courses were titled Senior Seminar, Senior Project, Church Music Project, and Senior Capstone. Regardless of the title, the purpose of these capstone experiences was to provide the student with an opportunity to synthesize the undergraduate learning experience by combining capabilities from various areas of study within the program. These projects primarily took the form of a research paper written under the supervision of a faculty member. As part of the capstone project, one school required each church music student to formulate a personal artistic philosophy relating to his or her mission as an active Christian musician. At another school the senior project consisted of a recital and a research paper approved by the faculty jury committee. Yet another creative approach to the senior project was to give students the option of presenting a recital or lecture recital, or designing and presenting a hymn festival.

Conducting

The conducting group was divided into four subgroupings: basic conducting, choral conducting, instrumental conducting, and intermediate/advanced conducting. Conducting courses, encompassing forty-five different titles, were offered by all seventy schools. The most common titles included Choral Conducting, Instrumental

Conducting, Basic Conducting, and Advanced Conducting. As outlined in table 7, the basic conducting courses ranged from zero to four credit hours; however, only one school offered a course for zero credits. The zero-credit course was titled Conducting Lab and was more practical in nature allowing students the opportunity for “hands-on” conducting experiences within a lab setting. Two schools combined choral conducting with choral literature and one school offered a rare course titled Conducting from the Console.

Table 7. Conducting Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Basic Conducting	59	0-4	1.5
Choral Conducting	37	1-4	1.9
Intermediate/Advanced Conducting	30	1-3	1.9
Instrumental Conducting	19	1-3	1.8

All schools offered at least one course in conducting, but the majority offered at least two semesters for church music majors. The two courses would most often consist of a basic conducting class and a choral or instrumental conducting class. Other institutions required choral conducting and instrumental conducting, while others offered the choice of either choral or instrumental conducting followed by an intermediate or advanced level conducting class. Several possible combinations were available to students at the NASM schools.

Performance Organizations

Performance organizations were categorized into two main groupings and subgroupings. These included choral groups and instrumental groups. Each group was divided into two subgroupings (primary ensembles and secondary ensembles) based on the information published by the NASM institutions and by the manner in which each school organized their ensembles. With few exceptions, each school distinguished between a primary ensemble and a secondary ensemble. A primary ensemble was typically a large performance organization, while a secondary ensemble was generally a smaller performance organization. Most NASM schools required church music majors to participate in both a large and small ensemble, eight semesters in a large ensemble and four to six semesters in a small ensemble. Consequently, appendix B is a comprehensive list of all choral and instrumental ensembles that church music students may participate in to fulfill their ensemble requirements. A total of 225 choral and instrumental ensembles were offered among the seventy NASM schools.

Ensembles were offered for either two credits, one credit, or one-half credit per semester. Although two schools did not offer any credit for ensembles, students were still required to participate in these performance organizations for all eight semesters of their undergraduate studies. Two schools offered ensembles for an unusual number of credits. One school offered their performance groups for .25 credit while another school offered ensembles for .7 credit.

All institutions required participation in an ensemble that was appropriate to the student's primary applied area. Consequently, voice and organ students enrolled in choral ensembles, instrumental students enrolled in instrumental ensembles and piano

students generally had the option of enrolling in either choral or instrumental groups. At all schools, church music students whose primary applied area was an orchestral instrument were required to enroll in choral ensembles in addition to instrumental ensembles. Some schools encouraged piano students majoring in church music to enroll in an accompanying class as a way of fulfilling the secondary ensemble requirement. Pianists who enrolled in this class were required to participate in the weekly applied lesson, as well as the recitals, of the student they were accompanying. Table 8 reveals that more ensemble options are available in the choral groups than in the instrumental groups among NASM schools. This proportion would make sense in a church music program where the majority of students would either be organists, vocalists, or pianists.

Table 8. Performance Organizations Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Choral groups			
Primary Choral Ensembles	70	0-2	0.9
Secondary Choral Ensembles	48	0-2	0.9
Instrumental Groups			
Primary Instrumental Ensembles	52	0-1	0.9
Secondary Instrumental Ensembles	24	.5-1	0.8

Literature

A total of fifty-six different literature courses were offered in sacred music programs under the following subgroupings: choral/vocal literature, church music literature, organ literature, piano literature, instrumental literature, guitar literature, and

unspecified. The majority of courses were offered in choral/vocal literature among NASM schools with the most common course title being Choral Literature. Two courses, offered by the same school, were designated as unspecified because they could not be placed in any one category. These two course titles were Technique and Literature of the Major Instrument I and Technique and Literature of the Major Instrument II. The school that offered these two literature courses intended for all church music majors to enroll in the literature course specific to their primary applied area. One school also offered two levels of a guitar literature class; however, these courses were only required of students whose primary applied area was guitar.

Table 9. Literature Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Choral/Vocal Literature	26	1-4	2.2
Church Music Literature	22	1-4	2.3
Organ Literature	16	1-4	2.0
Piano Literature	7	1-3	2.0
Instrumental Literature	5	1-2	1.8
Guitar Literature	1	1	1.0
Unspecified	1	1	1.0

Although the majority of literature courses offered were under choral/vocal and church music literature, many schools also required organ literature, piano literature, and Instrumental literature (see table 9). Due to the nature of church music it is not surprising that the majority of schools would offer more organ literature than piano or instrumental literature courses. The piano literature classes were only required of

students whose primary applied area was the piano. Two schools required two levels of piano literature in order to adequately cover all the materials up through the twentieth century.

Methods and Materials

In addition to methodology classes, the methods and materials group encompasses organ and piano pedagogy, voice pedagogy, and instrumental pedagogy. A total of 134 courses in this category were divided into the following subgroupings found in table 10: voice pedagogy; church music methods; elementary and secondary methods; organ and piano pedagogy; instrumental methods (general, handbell, brass, string, woodwind, percussion, combined); choral methods; instrumental pedagogy; and unspecified. The unspecified course titles were Applied Principle Pedagogy, Directed Study in Area Pedagogy and Literature, and Pedagogy. All three of these classes were placed in this subgrouping because their titles did not indicate a specific applied area. The most common title in the methods and materials group was Vocal Pedagogy.

As indicated in table 10, several schools required pedagogy courses. A total of twenty-eight schools offered voice pedagogy, seventeen schools offered organ and piano pedagogy, and seven schools offered instrumental pedagogy. It is not surprising that the majority of pedagogy courses in a church music program would be in the area of voice. Two institutions combined voice pedagogy with choral pedagogy and techniques, while one school combined voice pedagogy with vocal literature.

The next highest offerings of pedagogy courses were in the area of organ and piano. Seventeen schools required piano pedagogy and eleven schools required organ

pedagogy, depending on the primary applied area. One institution combined the piano pedagogy class with accompanying techniques.

Table 10. Methods and Materials Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Voice pedagogy	28	1-3	2.0
Church music methods	23	1-4	2.5
Elementary/secondary methods	17	1-4	2.6
Organ/Piano pedagogy	17	1-3	2.0
Instrumental methods			
General	11	1-4	2.0
Handbell	7	1-2	1.4
Brass	6	1-2	1.3
String	6	1-2	1.3
Woodwind	6	1-2	1.3
Percussion	4	1-2	1.4
Combined	3	1	1.0
Choral methods	9	1-2	1.9
Instrumental pedagogy	7	1-3	1.5
Unspecified	3	2-3	2.3

Instrumental pedagogy courses were not as common among NASM schools. Only seven institutions required them as part of the sacred music program. One school even required three instrumental pedagogy courses: woodwind pedagogy, string pedagogy, and percussion. This school also required vocal pedagogy for their church music students.

Methods and materials courses were offered by many of the NASM schools. The majority of the methods courses were found in the church music subgrouping with twenty-three schools offering twenty-one different courses. These included courses in

church music education, pre-school methods, children's methods, youth and adult methods, and music and drama methods. The complete list of titles is found in appendix B. The courses titled Church Music Education under the church music sub-group covered pre-school and children's choir through the senior adult choir, instrumental music ministry, scheduling, promotion, and planning. Although choral methods is listed as a separate sub-group, the course contents are closely associated with the materials found in the church music methods.

While elementary and secondary methods are generally associated with the music-education degree, seventeen schools offered these courses as part of their sacred music programs. The classes were required because they provided the church music student with necessary methods and materials needed to function in their role as minister of music. The content of these courses included methods for teaching choral and instrumental music to elementary, junior high, and senior high students. This parallels the content of courses found in the church music methods sub-group. Consequently, most of the schools that offered church music methods courses did not require church music students to take elementary and secondary methods courses since the content was very similar.

Although courses in instrumental methods were not as common as church music and elementary/secondary methods courses, some schools still required them if the student's primary applied area was an orchestral instrument. One school required vocal track students to also enroll in one instrumental methods class. Several of the schools that required students to enroll in instrumental methods courses also required the same students to enroll in either choral, church music, or elementary/secondary methods.

Technology

Nineteen courses in technology were divided into four subgroupings: general technology, introductory courses, software courses, and advanced technology courses. The most common title was Introduction to Music Technology, which was offered by seven of the NASM schools. Although specialized technology courses were not as prevalent, one advanced technology course and three software courses were found at a few schools. These titles included Advanced Music Technology, Computer Music Editing, Finale, and Introduction to Music Software. The advanced technology course covered advanced MIDI topics including SMPTE, audio for video, and introduction to multimedia as applied to the church. One school required two music technology courses as part of the church music degree, and another school even required three technology courses. This institution may have required additional technology instruction because of its particular focus on popular music.

As illustrated in table 11, most of the courses offered were either general technology or introductory courses. The introductory courses were titled Introduction to Music Technology, Basics of Sequencing and Computer Notation, and Beginning Composition with the Computer. The nine general technology courses (found in appendix B) covered a wide range of areas such as music notation, sequencing, computer-assisted instruction, internet, and administrative software.

Table 11. Technology Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
General technology courses	9	0-4	1.7
Introductory courses in technology	9	0-2	1.2
Software courses	3	1-2	1.3
Advanced technology courses	1	4	4.0

Proficiency

While the most common area of proficiency was in piano, the NASM schools offering a sacred music program also required proficiencies in conducting, computer, guitar, sight-singing and ear-training, and voice. Additionally, a general-music proficiency was also required by some institutions in the study (see table 12).

Table 12. Proficiency Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Piano	70	0-1	0.04
Voice	17	0	0
General	7	0	0
Computer	3	0	0
Sight-singing/ear-training	3	0	0
Conducting	1	0	0
Guitar	1	0	0

As expected, all seventy schools required a piano proficiency for the sacred music program. Some schools allowed students to meet this requirement by enrolling in

three or four semesters of secondary applied piano lessons, while other schools required group piano for a three-or four-term sequence. The institutions that offered group piano classes as a way of fulfilling the piano proficiency requirement considered the requirement fulfilled as long as students passed all courses in the sequence. The complete list of group piano courses offered at NASM schools may be found under the applied piano sub-group in Appendix B.

Only seventeen schools indicated that they required a voice proficiency for students whose primary instrument was not voice. This requirement was either met through course work, or by examination and generally needed to be fulfilled prior to the senior recital hearing. It would seem that more schools would require a voice proficiency in view of the role that vocal music plays in church music, however, this was not the case.

The general proficiency exams, offered by seven schools, consisted of either a comprehensive examination in music or an exam to admit the student into the upper division of the sacred music program. The comprehensive exams in music covered repertory, history, synthesis, aural skills, analysis, and technology. The exams for the upper division were titled Sophomore Hearing, Sophomore Platform, Sophomore Technical, and Upper Division Admission Exam. One school even required a music vocabulary proficiency.

Miscellaneous

Two unique courses were offered in the sacred music program by two different schools. These courses, shown in table 13, were titled Music Orientation and Introduction to Music Study. According to the catalog, the Music Orientation class

covered a variety of issues facing the music student in the college environment. Although the published information was not specific, these issues probably covered general topics geared toward advising new students on how to be successful in the church music program. The Introduction to Music Study course dealt with topics including time management, library and listening center orientation, and music technology. These courses would undoubtedly have great value, not only for the undergraduate sacred music student, but for all music majors.

Table 13. Miscellaneous Courses Offered by Respondent Schools

Courses	Number of Schools	Range of Credit Hours	Mean
Music Orientation	1	1	1.0
Introduction to Music Study	1	1	1.0

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

This chapter presents the findings of the survey of sacred music professors at NASM institutions within the United States. One survey per institution was mailed to the seventy schools that offered an undergraduate sacred music program. The questionnaires were addressed to sacred music professors who were recommended by their department chairperson as the most knowledgeable faculty member in undergraduate sacred music curriculum. A total of fifty-one questionnaires were received from the population, representing a 73% return. Divided into three main sections, this chapter will report findings on the institutions, the sacred music curriculum, and the open-ended questions. The results are presented in narrative and tabular forms.

The Institutions

The first section of the survey instrument was designed to gather information about the institutions that hold membership in NASM. Seven questions were formulated to generate data regarding type of institution (public or private), length of terms, total undergraduate music major enrollment, total church music enrollment, five-year enrollment trends, number of graduates in church music, and the percentage of graduates placed in a full-time church position. Of the responding institutions, forty-seven (92%) were identified as private and four (8%) as public. The large majority of

institutions (forty-six or 90%) favored a division of the academic year into semesters, while four schools (8%) operated in quarters and one school in trimesters.

The total number of undergraduate music majors at these institutions ranged from fewer than eighty to more than 400 students. Forty-nine percent of schools reported an enrollment between one and eighty students and over three-quarters (76%) had an enrollment distribution between one and 160 students. Only 24% of the responding institutions had an enrollment of more than 160 undergraduate music majors, with four schools (8%) reporting a total of more than 400 majors. Enrollment figures are provided in table 14.

Table 14. Total Enrollment of Undergraduate Music Majors
(N=51)

Number of Music Majors	Respondents	Percent
1-80	25	49%
81-160	14	27%
161-240	2	4%
241-320	4	8%
321-400	2	4%
401 or more	4	8%

As illustrated in table 15, total enrollment in undergraduate church music programs ranged from fewer than ten to more than forty-one students. The largest number of institutions (thirty-two or 64%) reported fewer than ten enrollees majoring in church music, while twelve respondents (24%) noted enrollments of more than eleven but fewer than twenty students. Forty-four (88%) reported an enrollment between one

and twenty students and only four institutions (8%) enrolled more than twenty church music majors on the undergraduate level. Two schools indicated they did not have any students currently enrolled in the sacred music program.

Table 15. Total Enrollment in Church Music Program
(N=50)

Church Music Enrollment	Respondents	Percent
1-10	32	64%
11-20	12	24%
21-30	1	2%
31-40	1	2%
41 or more	2	4%

When asked to report the church music enrollment trend over the past five years, approximately half of the institutions (53%) reported that enrollment in the undergraduate church music program remained relatively constant. Fourteen respondents (27%) indicated that during this five-year period enrollment increased, while ten respondents (20%) reported a decrease in enrollment. The data in table 16 shows that the enrollment at forty-one schools (80%) either increased or remained relatively constant over the past five years. This is certainly a surprising, yet welcome, trend in view of the declining enrollment within church music programs reported over the past twenty years.

Table 16. Five-Year Enrollment Trend for Church Music Program
(N=51)

Enrollment Trend	Respondents	Percent
Increased	14	27%
Decreased	10	20%
Remained Relatively Constant	27	53%

The number of undergraduate students who completed a degree in church music (or emphasis) in the 2003-2004 academic year varied widely among schools. The largest number of respondents (thirty-two or 65%) reported one to four graduates in church music. Twelve respondents (23%) indicated there were no graduates, three respondents reported five to eight graduates (6%), and two professors reported that nine to twelve students completed the program (4%). None of the schools in the population had more than twelve graduates in church music that year (see table 17).

Table 17. Number of Church Music Graduates in 2003-2004 Academic Year
(N=49)

Number of Graduates	Respondents	Percent
None	12	24%
1-4	32	65%
5-8	3	6%
9-12	2	4%
13 or more	0	0%

The percentages of graduates placed in a full-time church music position also varied widely among institutions. More than half of those who responded to this question were on opposite ends of the spectrum. Thirteen schools (33%) indicated that none of their church music majors were placed in a position. However, equally as many (33%) indicated that 100% of their graduates were placed in a full-time church position. Five respondents (13%) placed 25% of their sacred music students in a full-time position, and two schools (5%) placed 1% of their graduates. Four schools reported church music placement to be 50%, and one each reported placements of 33%, 60%, and 75%. Table 18 shows the distribution of these percentages.

Several sacred music professors wrote comments to clarify their responses to this question. Three professors indicated that the majority, if not all, of their graduates went on to graduate school. One of these three reported that their placement was 50%; however, the remaining students at this institution all went on to graduate school. Another professor, who had reported a 0% placement, explained that all of his graduates either went on to graduate school or seminary. Two of the schools that reported a placement of 0% and 25% respectively, indicated that in addition to going to graduate school, the remaining students in their program secured part-time positions in church music. The institution that reported a placement of 75% explained that the remaining 25% were not seeking a full-time position. Taking into account that many of the students either went on to graduate school or were not seeking full-time positions in church music, it is clear that the placement results are higher than they appear in table 18.

Table 18. Percentage of Church Music Graduates
Placed in Full-Time Positions
(N=40)

Percentage of Graduates Placed	Respondents	Percent
0	13	33%
1	2	5%
25	5	13%
33	1	3%
50	4	10%
60	1	3%
75	1	3%
100	13	33%

The Sacred Music Curriculum

The second section of the survey was designed to collect information on the sacred music curriculum. The first part of this section will discuss the internship requirements and the second part will discuss the emphasis and importance of course topics in the church music programs.

Four questions were formulated to collect information on whether an internship was required, the number of church music majors who completed an internship, internship hours, and activities or responsibilities required for the experience. Thirty-eight schools (74%) indicated that an internship was required as part of the undergraduate church music program, while thirteen schools (25%) did not require this component. One school indicated that the internship was optional.

Of the thirty-eight schools that did require an internship, the number of total clock hours to complete this field work varied greatly among institutions. Ten schools

(30%) reported the total internship to be more than twenty-five, but fewer than sixty-five hours. However, the large majority of schools (twenty-one or 63%) required more than sixty-six hours (see table 19). One institution did not count clock hours but required four semesters of an internship, one credit per semester. Another school expected students to complete 186 or more hours to fulfill their field work experience.

Table 19. Total Clock Hours Required for Internship
(N=33)

Total Clock Hours	Respondents	Percent
25-65	10	30%
66-105	7	21%
106-145	8	24%
146-185	5	15%
186 or more	1	3%

The total number of church music majors who completed an undergraduate internship during the 2003-2004 school year varied. Eight respondents reported that no students completed an internship that year, while the majority of respondents (twenty-six schools or 51%) reported between one and four students. Two respondents each indicated that 5-8 and 9-12 students completed an internship. None of the institutions had more than twelve church music majors complete their fieldwork during the 2003-2004 academic year (see table 20).

Table 20. Number of Students Completing a Church Music Internship (N=51)

Number-Internship Completed	Respondents	Percent
None	8	16%
1-4	26	51%
5-8	2	4%
9-12	2	4%
13 or more	0	0%

A wide variety of activities was required as part of the undergraduate internship in the church music programs of NASM institutions. Observing church music directors was the most frequent activity required, as reported by thirty-six respondents (72%). This was followed by rehearsal planning (thirty-five or 70%), directing choral ensemble rehearsals (thirty-two or 64%), worship planning (thirty-one or 62%), conducting ensembles during church services (twenty-eight or 56%), and worship leading (twenty-three or 46%). A complete listing of activities and responsibilities required as part of the undergraduate internship may be found in table 21. The table is arranged by rank, in descending order, and includes other activities listed by respondents.

Table 21. Activities Required for the Internship
(N=50)

Internship Activities	Respondents	Percent
Observing Church Music Directors	36	72%
Rehearsal Planning	35	70%
Directing Choral Ensemble Rehearsal	32	64%
Worship Planning	31	62%
Conducting Ensemble During Church Service	28	56%
Worship Leading	23	46%
Directing Instrumental Ensemble Rehearsal	18	36%
Service Playing	14	28%
Assisting with Technology in the Church	12	24%
Contemporary Worship Band Participation	8	16%
Assisting with Drama or Musical	6	12%
Attend Staff Meetings	3	6%
Music Library Assignments	3	6%
Directing Children's Choir	2	4%
Directing Youth Choir	2	4%
Interviewing Pastor	2	4%
Meetings with Church Supervisor	2	4%
Accompanying Choirs	1	2%
Budgeting	1	2%
Journaling the Internship Experience	1	2%
Keeping a Resource Notebook	1	2%
Meetings with University Advisor	1	2%
Mentoring by Minister of Music	1	2%
Ordering Music	1	2%
Pastoral Skills (hospital visitation/grief/conflict)	1	2%
Reading Assignments	1	2%
Teaching Private Lessons	1	2%
Time Management	1	2%

In this next part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to evaluate the amount of emphasis their institution currently placed on course topics most often found in the sacred music curriculum. All topics were rated from one to four, with one indicating no emphasis and four indicating much emphasis. Additionally, respondents were asked to rate the importance of each course topic according to the value they

placed on each item in preparing students for church music leadership. Once again, the rating was from one to four, with one indicating the topic was not important and four indicating the topic was very important. All of the topics were organized according to fourteen major groupings. These groupings included church music, music theory, music history, applied music, conducting, ensemble, literature, methods and materials, functional keyboard skills, pedagogy, popular music, technology, other courses and topics, and final projects.

Table 22 presents a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on church music topics. This table indicates that a majority of respondents placed moderate to much emphasis on seven items. These included hymnology/congregational song (fifty or 98%), orders of worship/worship planning (forty-six or 90%), philosophy of church music (forty-five or 88%), current trends in church music (forty-two or 82%), administrative structures and procedures (thirty-eight or 74%), introduction to church music (thirty-seven or 72%), and liturgies (thirty-five or 68%). A majority of the respondents placed little to moderate emphasis on the relationship between sacred music and the music of the general culture (thirty-eight or 74%), the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms (thirty-six or 71%), and ecumenical training (thirty-four or 66%). The two topics that were given a rating of no emphasis to little emphasis by a majority of the respondents were pipe organ construction/repair (forty-six or 90%) and worship music from non-western cultures (thirty-six or 70%). Approximately half of the responding institutions placed no emphasis on pipe organ construction/repair (twenty-six or 51%).

Table 22. Church Music: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic
by Responding Institutions
(N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Hymnology/congregational song	0	0%	1	2%	14	27%	36	71%	
Orders of worship/worship planning	0	0%	5	10%	13	25%	33	65%	
Philosophy of church music	0	0%	5	10%	20	39%	25	49%	1
Introduction to church music	6	12%	5	10%	14	27%	23	45%	3
Current trends in church music	1	2%	6	12%	22	43%	20	39%	2
Administrative structures and procedures	4	8%	9	18%	20	39%	18	35%	
Liturgies	2	4%	14	27%	17	33%	18	35%	
Relationship between sacred music and the music of the general culture	4	8%	14	27%	24	47%	9	18%	
Interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms	10	20%	25	49%	11	22%	5	10%	
Ecumenical training	13	25%	20	39%	14	27%	4	8%	
Worship music from non-western cultures	15	29%	21	41%	12	23%	2	4%	1
Pipe organ construction/repair	26	51%	20	39%	4	8%	1	2%	

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data concerning the importance of church music course topics are presented in table 23. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to eight of the church music course topics. Hymnology/congregational song and orders of worship/worship planning were ranked first with fifty respondents each (98%), this was followed by philosophy of church music (forty-nine or 96%), current trends in church music (forty-six or 90%), administrative structures and procedures (forty-three or 84%), introduction to church music (thirty-eight or 74%), the relationship between sacred music and the music of the general culture (thirty-eight or 74%), and liturgies (thirty-seven or 72%). A rating of moderately important to important was applied by a majority of respondents to worship music from non-western

cultures (forty-one or 80%) and the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms (thirty-seven or 72%). Ecumenical training was evenly split with twenty-five respondents (49%) rating this topic as not important to moderately important and twenty-six respondents (51%) rating it as important to very important. Pipe organ construction/repair was given a rating of not important to moderately important by the majority of respondents (forty-two or 82%).

Table 23. Church Music: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Hymnology/congregational song	0	0%	1	2%	10	20%	40	78%	
Philosophy of church music	0	0%	1	2%	11	22%	38	74%	
Orders of worship/worship planning	0	0%	1	2%	14	27%	36	71%	
Current trends in church music	1	2%	3	6%	20	39%	26	51%	1
Administrative structures and procedures	2	4%	6	12%	21	41%	22	43%	
Introduction to church music	3	6%	6	12%	16	31%	22	43%	4
Liturgies	2	4%	12	23%	17	33%	20	39%	
Relationship between sacred music and the music of the general culture	2	4%	11	22%	25	49%	13	25%	
Interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms	3	6%	17	33%	20	39%	11	22%	
Ecumenical training	8	16%	17	33%	18	35%	8	16%	
Worship music from non-western cultures	5	10%	26	51%	15	29%	4	8%	1
Pipe organ construction/repair	18	35%	24	47%	8	16%	1	2%	

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

To facilitate a better understanding of the relationship of the ratings between the emphasis and importance of course topics, a second analysis of the data was made by comparing the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each topic. A

positive difference in means indicated that the mean of the importance was greater than the mean of the emphasis for that topic. A negative difference in means indicated that the mean of the importance was less than the mean of the emphasis for that topic. To determine which differences were statistically significant, a paired t-test (two-tailed) was used with a .01 significance level and a 99% confidence interval. Based on this test, course topics with differences of .20 and greater (positive or negative) were shown to be statistically significant. A professional statistician confirmed the results of the t-test after reviewing the data.

As seen in table 24, the mean of the importance of all church music course topics were greater than the mean of the emphasis for each corresponding topic. The differences in mean ranged from .07 to .54, exhibiting a wide range of variability. The five topics with the lowest differences in mean—hymnology/ congregational song, liturgies, introduction to church music, current trends in church music, and orders of worship/worship planning—show that the emphasis of these topics is consistent with the level of importance that church music faculty place on them. With the exception of these five topics, all differences in mean were statistically significant. The topic with the largest difference, the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms (.54), suggests that this item is not only important to sacred music faculty, but should also receive greater attention in the curriculum. It is interesting to note that the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms is one of the newest competencies outlined by NASM. It was added to the standards and guidelines specific to the bachelor degree in sacred music in the 1993-1994 NASM Handbook.

Table 24. Church Music: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms	2.22	2.76	.54
Worship music from non-western cultures	2.02	2.36	.34
Ecumenical training	2.18	2.51	.33
Philosophy of church music	3.40	3.67	.27
Pipe organ construction/repair	1.60	1.84	.24
Administrative structures and procedures	3.02	3.24	.22
Relationship between sacred music and the music of the general culture	2.74	2.96	.22
Orders of worship/worship planning	3.55	3.69	.14
Current trends in church music	3.24	3.35	.11
Introduction to church music	3.13	3.21	.08
Liturgies	3.00	3.08	.08
Hymnology/congregational song	3.69	3.76	.07

Table 25 contains a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on music theory course topics. This table indicates that a majority of respondents placed much emphasis on music theory and aural skills (forty-five or 88%). This high rating is not surprising since music theory and aural skills classes are considered to be fundamental courses in any undergraduate music program. However, it is surprising that as many as 12% of the institutions did not rate theory and aural skills with much emphasis, but instead indicated a moderate emphasis at their institution. Perhaps these respondents felt that their curricula did not offer enough electives in these areas for church music majors. The majority of responding institutions placed moderate to much emphasis on form and analysis (forty-one or 80%), while four topics were given a rating of little to moderate emphasis by the majority. These included composition (forty-two or 82%), choral arranging (thirty-six or 70%), orchestration/arranging (thirty five or 68%), and

counterpoint (thirty-two or 62%). Arranging for contemporary worship band was given a rating of no emphasis to little emphasis by the majority of respondents (forty-two or 82%). Approximately half of responding institutions gave no emphasis to this topic.

Table 25. Music Theory: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Music theory	0	0%	0	0%	6	12%	45	88%	
Aural skills	0	0%	0	0%	6	12%	45	88%	
Form and analysis	2	4%	8	16%	22	43%	19	37%	
Orchestration/arranging	7	14%	15	29%	20	39%	9	18%	
Counterpoint	10	20%	18	35%	14	27%	9	18%	
Choral arranging	6	12%	23	45%	13	25%	8	16%	1
Composition	2	4%	19	37%	23	45%	7	14%	
Arranging for contemporary worship band	25	49%	17	33%	8	16%	0	0%	1

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data relative to the importance of music theory course topics are presented in table 26. A rating of very important was applied by a majority of respondents to aural skills (forty-six or 90%) and music theory (forty-one or 80%). It is surprising to see that the remaining 20% of the respondents considered music theory to be moderately importance or important in the training of church music directors. Nevertheless, the majority do feel that music theory is a very important component in the undergraduate church music curriculum. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to form and analysis (forty-two or 82%) and choral arranging (thirty-seven or 73%), while a rating of moderately important to

important was applied to three topics. These included composition (forty-three or 84%), orchestration/arranging (forty-one or 80%), and arranging for contemporary worship band (thirty-eight or 74%). Counterpoint was split with twenty-six respondents (51%) rating this topic as not important to moderately important and twenty-five respondents (49%) rating it as important to very important.

Table 26. Music Theory: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Aural skills	0	0%	0	0%	5	10%	46	90%	
Music theory	0	0%	1	2%	9	18%	41	80%	
Form and analysis	0	0%	9	18%	25	49%	17	33%	
Choral arranging	0	0%	13	25%	26	51%	11	22%	1
Counterpoint	5	10%	21	41%	15	29%	10	20%	
Orchestration/arranging	1	2%	12	23%	29	57%	9	18%	
Composition	0	0%	17	33%	26	51%	8	16%	
Arranging for contemporary worship band	10	20%	17	33%	21	41%	2	4%	1

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

To form a more accurate picture of the respondents' evaluation of the music theory course topics, a second analysis of the data was made by comparing the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each topic. As seen in table 27, the mean of the importance of all music theory course topics were greater than the mean of the emphasis for each corresponding topic. The differences in mean ranged from .02 to .64, illustrating a wide range of variability.

With the exception of music theory, form and analysis, aural skills, composition, and counterpoint, all differences in mean were statistically significant. The topic with the largest difference, arranging for contemporary worship band (.64), suggests that most faculty recognize the need for training church music leaders in popular styles. The emphasis that institutions place on this topic may be lower than the indicated level of importance because music faculty may not have the necessary skills to adequately teach popular music. Even fewer faculty would have the skills or interest in the area of contemporary worship band. The four topics with the lowest difference in means, music theory, form and analysis, aural skills, composition, and counterpoint, indicate that the emphasis of these topics is consistent with the level of importance that church music faculty place on them.

Table 27. Music Theory: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Arranging for contemporary worship band	1.66	2.30	.64
Choral arranging	2.54	2.96	.42
Orchestration/arranging	2.61	2.90	.29
Counterpoint	2.43	2.59	.16
Composition	2.69	2.83	.14
Aural skills	3.88	3.90	.02
Form and analysis	3.14	3.16	.02
Music theory	3.88	3.90	.02

Table 28 shows a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on music history course topics. This table indicates that the majority of respondents placed moderate to

much emphasis on all five historic periods. The classical and romantic eras received the highest ratings (fifty-one or 100%). These were followed by the baroque period (fifty or 98%), twentieth-century music (forty-nine or 96%), and medieval/renaissance (forty-six or 90%). One topic, ethnomusicology, was rated by a majority of the respondents with little to moderate emphasis (forty-three or 84%), while popular music was given no emphasis to little emphasis by the majority (thirty-seven or 72%). Although a majority of respondents placed no emphasis or little emphasis on the history of popular music, as many as thirteen schools (25%) did place moderate to much emphasis on this topic.

Table 28. Music History: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Classical	0	0%	0	0%	23	45%	28	55%	
Romantic	0	0%	0	0%	23	45%	28	55%	
Baroque	0	0%	1	2%	23	45%	27	53%	
20 th century music	0	0%	2	4%	23	45%	26	51%	
Medieval/Renaissance	0	0%	5	10%	22	43%	24	47%	
Ethnomusicology	4	8%	26	51%	17	33%	4	8%	
Popular music	21	41%	16	31%	12	23%	1	2%	1

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data relative to the importance of music history course topics are presented in table 29. Clearly, the majority of respondents placed a significant importance on the five stylistic periods of western music. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to both twentieth-century music and the romantic era (fifty or 98%). This was followed by the baroque era (forty-nine or 96%), the

classical era (forty-eight or 94%), and medieval/renaissance with forty-three respondents (84%). Ethnomusicology was considered to be important or very important to 55% of the respondents; however, twenty-three sacred music professors (44%) felt that this topic was not important or moderately important. More than half of the respondents (thirty-five or 68%) rated the history of popular music to be moderately important to important.

Table 29. Music History: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
20 th century music	0	0%	1	2%	24	47%	26	51%	
Romantic	0	0%	1	2%	25	49%	25	49%	
Baroque	0	0%	2	4%	25	49%	24	47%	
Classical	0	0%	3	6%	25	49%	23	45%	
Medieval/Renaissance	0	0%	8	16%	21	41%	22	43%	
Ethnomusicology	1	2%	22	43%	17	33%	11	22%	
Popular music	12	23%	20	39%	15	29%	3	6%	1

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each music history topic resulted in a range of -.16 to .32 (see table 30). The topic with the greatest difference in mean is the history of popular music (.32), indicating that the level of importance placed on this item is greater than the current level of emphasis reported by sacred music faculty. This suggests that respondents would like to see more time devoted to this topic in the undergraduate

sacred music curriculum. Although the medieval/renaissance, baroque, romantic and classical eras show a negative difference, the numbers are not statistically significant.

Table 30. Music History: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Popular music	1.86	2.18	.32
20 th century music	3.47	3.49	.02
Ethnomusicology	2.41	2.41	.00
Medieval/Renaissance	3.37	3.27	-.01
Baroque	3.51	3.43	-.08
Romantic	3.55	3.47	-.08
Classical	3.55	3.39	-.16

Table 31 presents a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on applied music topics. This table shows that the majority of respondents placed much emphasis on five applied music areas. Applied voice for voice majors was ranked first with forty-seven respondents (92%), this was followed by applied piano for piano majors (forty-six or 90%), piano proficiency requirement (forty-four or 86%), applied organ for organ majors (forty-two or 82%), and applied instrument for instrumental majors (forty-one or 80%). A majority of the respondents placed moderate to much emphasis on three topics. These included applied piano for non-piano majors (forty-one or 80%), vocal diction (thirty-six or 70%), and voice proficiency requirement (thirty-two or 62%). One topic, applied voice for non-voice majors, received a rating of little to moderate emphasis by the majority of respondents, and two topics received a majority rating of no emphasis to little emphasis. These two topics were applied organ for non-organ

majors (thirty-seven or 72%) and applied instrument for non-instrumental majors (thirty-three or 64%).

Table 31. Applied Music: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Applied voice (voice majors)	0	0%	0	0%	3	6%	47	92%	1
Applied piano (piano majors)	0	0%	0	0%	3	6%	46	90%	2
Piano proficiency requirement	0	0%	1	2%	5	10%	44	86%	1
Applied organ (organ majors)	3	6%	1	2%	3	6%	42	82%	2
Applied instrument (instrumental majors)	1	2%	1	2%	4	8%	41	80%	4
Voice proficiency requirement	7	14%	10	20%	12	23%	20	39%	2
Vocal diction	3	6%	11	22%	21	41%	15	29%	1
Applied piano (non-piano majors)	0	0%	10	20%	27	53%	14	27%	
Applied voice (non-voice majors)	0	0%	22	43%	23	45%	6	12%	
Applied organ (non-organ majors)	13	25%	24	47%	10	20%	3	6%	1
Applied instrument (non-instrumental majors)	14	27%	19	37%	12	23%	2	4%	4

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data concerning the importance of applied music course topics are presented in table 32. A rating of very important was applied by a majority of respondents to five of the applied music course topics. The piano proficiency requirement was ranked first with forty-five respondents (88%), this was followed by applied voice for voice majors (forty-three or 84%), applied piano for piano majors (forty-one or 80%), applied organ for organ majors (thirty-nine or 76%), and applied instrument for instrumental majors (thirty-seven or 72%). These results were predictable given the fundamental nature of applied music to any undergraduate music program. A rating of important to very

important was applied by a majority of respondents to applied piano for non-piano majors (forty-five or 88%), vocal diction (forty-two or 82%), applied voice for non-voice majors (thirty-nine or 76%), and voice proficiency requirement (thirty-nine or 76%). The following two topics were moderately important to important for a majority of the respondents: applied organ for non-organ majors (thirty-nine or 76%) and applied instrument for non-instrumental majors (thirty-four or 66%). While 20% of respondents indicated that applied instrument for non-instrumental majors was not important, a small percentage (three or 6%) did rate this item as very important. This finding is consistent with the data from the content analysis of the academic catalogues.

Table 32. Applied Music: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Piano proficiency requirement	0	0%	0	0%	5	10%	45	88%	1
Applied voice (voice majors)	0	0%	0	0%	7	14%	43	84%	1
Applied piano (piano majors)	0	0%	0	0%	8	16%	41	80%	2
Applied organ (organ majors)	2	4%	2	4%	6	12%	39	76%	2
Applied instrument (instrumental majors)	0	0%	2	4%	8	16%	37	72%	4
Voice proficiency requirement	1	2%	9	18%	17	33%	22	43%	2
Vocal diction	0	0%	8	16%	21	41%	21	41%	1
Applied piano (non-piano majors)	0	0%	6	12%	28	55%	17	33%	
Applied voice (non-voice majors)	0	0%	12	23%	25	49%	14	27%	
Applied organ (non-organ majors)	6	12%	26	51%	13	25%	6	12%	
Applied instrument (non-instrumental majors)	10	20%	19	37%	15	29%	3	6%	4

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each applied music area resulted in a range of -.08 to .35 (see table 33). The most significant differences take place in applied voice for non-voice majors (.35) and applied organ for non-organ majors (.31). This data suggests that not enough emphasis is being devoted to the development of these secondary applied areas. Additionally, the findings suggest sacred music faculty feel that applied voice and applied organ are important enough in church work that instruction in these instruments should be required by all church music students, regardless of their primary applied emphasis. The prominence of the organ and voice in church music clearly explains the level of importance that sacred music faculty place on these items.

Table 33. Applied Music: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Applied voice (non-voice majors)	2.69	3.04	.35
Applied organ (non-organ majors)	2.06	2.37	.31
Applied instrument (non-instrumental majors)	2.04	2.23	.19
Applied piano (non-piano majors)	3.08	3.22	.14
Piano proficiency requirement	3.86	3.90	.04
Voice proficiency requirement	2.92	3.22	.03
Vocal diction	2.96	3.26	.03
Applied piano (piano majors)	3.94	3.84	-.01
Applied organ (organ majors)	3.71	3.67	-.04
Applied instrument (instrumental majors)	3.81	3.74	-.07
Applied voice (voice majors)	3.94	3.86	-.08

Table 34 contains a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on conducting topics. This table indicates that the majority of respondents placed moderate to much

emphasis on all three items. Choral conducting had the highest rating with forty-eight respondents (94%). This was followed by instrumental conducting (forty-three or 84%) and rehearsal planning (forty or 78%). A small percentage of schools (6%) placed little emphasis on choral conducting and only 4% of institutions placed no emphasis on instrumental conducting.

Table 34. Conducting: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Choral conducting	0	0%	3	6%	10	20%	38	74%	
Instrumental conducting	2	4%	6	12%	20	39%	23	45%	
Rehearsal planning	0	0%	11	22%	22	43%	18	35%	

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data relative to the importance of conducting course topics are presented in table 35. A rating of very important was applied by a majority of respondents to choral conducting (forty-four or 86%) and a rating of important to very important was applied by a majority to rehearsal planning (fifty or 98%) and instrumental conducting (forty-seven or 92%). Although instrumental conducting is considered to be important or very important by the majority, it is clear that respondents placed a greater level of importance on choral conducting in the training of church musicians.

Table 35. Conducting: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Choral conducting	0	0%	0	0%	7	14%	44	86%	
Rehearsal planning	0	0%	1	2%	16	31%	34	67%	
Instrumental conducting	0	0%	4	8%	22	43%	25	49%	

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each conducting item created a range of .04 to .51 (see table 36). According to the data, rehearsal planning emerged with the greatest difference (.51). This finding may suggest that church music faculty prefer to devote more time to this topic in the sacred music curriculum.

Table 36. Conducting: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Rehearsal planning	3.14	3.65	.51
Choral conducting	3.69	3.86	.17
Instrumental conducting	3.37	3.41	.04

Table 37 shows a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on ensemble course topics. As anticipated, this table shows that the majority of respondents placed much emphasis on choral ensemble for voice/keyboards majors (forty-six or 90%). The

majority also placed moderate to much emphasis on orchestral ensemble for instrumental majors (thirty-six or 71%), concert band ensemble (thirty or 59%), and choral ensemble for instrumental majors (twenty-seven or 52%). The three topics that were given a rating of no emphasis to little emphasis by a majority of the respondents included praise and worship band for credit (forty-eight or 94%), orchestral ensemble for voice/keyboard majors (thirty-nine or 76%), and praise and worship band volunteer in chapel (thirty-five or 69%).

Table 37. Ensemble: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Choral ensemble (voice/keyboard majors)	0	0%	0	0%	5	10%	46	90%	
Orchestral ensemble (instrumental majors)	4	8%	6	12%	7	14%	29	57%	5
Concert band ensemble	5	10%	13	25%	8	16%	22	43%	3
Choral ensemble (instrumentalmajors)	7	14%	17	33%	14	27%	13	25%	
Orchestral ensemble (voice/keyboard majors)	20	39%	19	37%	7	14%	3	6%	2
Praise & Worship band volunteer in chapel	24	47%	11	22%	12	23%	3	6%	1
Praise & Worship band for credit	40	78%	8	16%	2	4%	0	0%	1

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data concerning the importance of ensemble course topics are presented in table 38. As expected, a rating of very important was applied by a majority of respondents to choral ensemble for voice/keyboard majors (forty-four or 86%). A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to choral ensemble for instrumental majors (thirty-seven or 72%), orchestral ensemble for

instrumental majors (thirty-six or 71%), and concert band ensemble (twenty-nine or 56%). A rating of moderately important to important was applied by the majority to orchestral ensemble for voice/keyboard majors (thirty-six or 70%), and two topics were rated by the majority of respondents as not important to moderately important. These were praise and worship band volunteer in chapel (thirty-five or 68%) and praise and worship band for credit (thirty-eight or 75%). Although most respondents rated praise and worship band for credit as not important or moderately important, twenty-two individuals (43%) felt this topic was moderately important to important in the training of church musicians. Twelve schools (23%) indicated that participation in this ensemble was important for church music students.

Table 38. Ensemble: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Choral ensemble (voice/keyboard majors)	0	0%	0	0%	7	14%	44	86%	
Orchestral ensemble (instrumental majors)	2	4%	8	16%	7	14%	29	57%	5
Choral ensemble (instrumentalmajors)	1	2%	11	22%	15	29%	22	43%	2
Concert band ensemble	3	6%	15	29%	13	25%	16	31%	4
Praise & Worship band volunteer in chapel	18	35%	17	33%	11	22%	4	8%	1
Orchestral ensemble (voice/keyboard majors)	10	20%	22	43%	14	27%	3	6%	2
Praise & Worship band for credit	28	55%	10	20%	12	23%	0	0%	1

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each ensemble item resulted in a wide range of variability

(-.09 to .53). As illustrated in table 39, the topics with the most significant differences are choral ensemble for instrumental majors (.53), praise and worship band for credit (.44), and orchestral ensemble for voice/keyboard majors (.34). The significant difference in mean for choral ensemble (instrumental majors) is consistent with the ensemble requirements found in the academic catalogues of the NASM institutions and reported in chapter three. Because choral work is such an integral part of church music, it follows that all students, even those with an instrumental focus, would be required to participate in a choral ensemble. The data also suggests that sacred music professors would support more emphasis on praise and worship band for credit and on orchestral ensemble for voice/keyboard majors.

Table 39. Ensemble: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Choral ensemble (instrumentalmajors)	2.65	3.18	.53
Praise & Worship band for credit	1.24	1.68	.44
Orchestral ensemble (voice/keyboard majors)	1.86	2.20	.34
Praise & Worship band volunteer in chapel	1.88	2.02	.14
Orchestral ensemble (instrumental majors)	3.33	3.37	.04
Choral ensemble (voice/keyboard majors)	3.90	3.86	-.04
Concert band ensemble	2.98	2.89	-.09

Table 40 presents a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on literature topics. This table indicates that the majority of respondents placed moderate to much emphasis on four of the items. Vocal solo literature for voice majors and sacred choral

literature (liturgical) both ranked first with forty-four respondents each (86%); this was followed by organ literature for organ majors (forty-two or 82%) and sacred choral literature (non-liturgical) with forty respondents (78%). The following two topics were given a rating of no emphasis to little emphasis by a majority of the respondents: organ literature for non-organ majors (forty-five or 88%) and vocal solo literature for non-voice majors (thirty-nine or 76%).

Table 40. Literature: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Vocal solo literature (voice majors)	1	2%	5	10%	13	25%	31	61%	1
Organ literature (organ majors)	2	4%	6	12%	13	25%	29	57%	1
Sacred choral literature (non-liturgical)	1	2%	10	20%	17	33%	23	45%	
Sacred choral literature (liturgical)	0	0%	7	14%	26	51%	18	35%	
Organ literature (non-organ majors)	30	59%	15	29%	4	8%	1	2%	1
Vocal solo literature (non-voice majors)	17	33%	22	43%	9	18%	1	2%	2

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data relative to the importance of literature course topics are presented in table 41. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to organ literature for organ majors (forty-eight or 94%), vocal solo literature for voice majors (forty-six or 90%), liturgical sacred choral literature (forty-five or 88%), and non-liturgical sacred choral literature (forty-three or 84%). A rating of not important to moderately important was applied by a majority of respondents to

organ literature for non-organ majors (thirty-nine or 76%), and vocal solo literature for non-voice majors (thirty-four or 66%).

Table 41. Literature: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Organ literature (organ majors)	1	2%	1	2%	14	27%	34	67%	1
Vocal solo literature (voice majors)	0	0%	4	8%	15	29%	31	61%	1
Sacred choral literature (liturgical)	1	2%	5	10%	18	35%	27	53%	
Sacred choral literature (non-liturgical)	1	2%	7	14%	16	31%	27	53%	
Organ literature (non-organ majors)	24	47%	15	29%	7	14%	4	8%	1
Vocal solo literature (non-voice majors)	12	23%	22	43%	11	22%	4	8%	2

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each literature topic resulted in a wide range of variability (-.26 to .45). As shown in table 42, the topics with the greatest differences in mean are vocal solo literature for non-voice majors (.45) and organ literature for organ majors (-.26). The findings suggest that vocal solo literature, regardless of the applied primary area, is an important competency for church music leaders and should be given a little more emphasis in the curriculum. It is interesting to note that the level of importance for organ literature (organ majors) was lower than the corresponding emphasis rating. This suggests that sacred music faculty are inclined to place a little less emphasis on this topic within the sacred music program. Although important for organ performance majors, organ literature may not be as relevant for church musicians who will use the

organ primarily for accompanying vocal solo and choral literature. Nevertheless, it is clear that sacred music faculty still place great importance on organ literature for organ majors in the church music program.

Table 42. Literature: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Vocal solo literature (non-voice majors)	1.69	2.14	.45
Organ literature (non-organ majors)	1.52	1.82	.30
Sacred choral literature (liturgical)	3.22	3.39	.17
Sacred choral literature (non-liturgical)	3.22	3.35	.13
Vocal solo literature (voice majors)	3.48	3.54	.06
Organ literature (organ majors)	3.88	3.62	-.26

Table 43 contains a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on methods and materials topics. This table shows that a majority of respondents placed moderate to much emphasis on adult choral methods and materials (forty-four or 86%) and on children's choral methods and materials (thirty-two or 62%). One topic, youth choral methods and materials, was given a rating of little to moderate emphasis by a majority of the respondents (thirty-four or 66%) and two topics were rated with no emphasis to little emphasis. These included worship band methods and materials (forty-four or 86%) and handbell methods (thirty-three or 64%).

Table 43. Methods and Materials: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Adult choral methods and materials	1	2%	6	12%	16	31%	28	55%	
Children's choral methods and materials	4	8%	15	29%	13	25%	19	37%	
Youth choral methods and materials	5	10%	15	29%	19	37%	12	23%	
Handbell methods	16	31%	17	33%	13	25%	5	10%	
Worship band methods and materials	25	49%	19	37%	5	10%	1	2%	1

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data relative to the importance of methods and materials topics are presented in table 44. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to adult choral methods and materials (fifty or 97%), children's choral methods and materials (forty-seven or 92%), and youth choral methods and materials (forty-five or 88%). Handbell methods received a rating of moderately important to important by a majority of respondents (thirty-seven or (72%). On the other hand, the results were split for worship band methods and materials. As seen in table 44, more than half of the respondents (thirty-four or 67%) rated this topic as not important to moderately important; however, equally as many rated it as moderately important to important.

Table 44. Methods and Materials: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Adult choral methods and materials	0	0%	1	2%	12	23%	38	74%	
Children's choral methods and materials	0	0%	4	8%	12	23%	35	69%	
Youth choral methods and materials	0	0%	6	12%	24	47%	21	41%	
Handbell methods	5	10%	18	35%	19	37%	9	18%	
Worship band methods and materials	11	22%	23	45%	11	22%	5	10%	1

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each methods and materials topic created a range of .34 to .68 (see table 45). The topics with the greatest differences are children's choral methods and materials (.68), worship band methods and materials (.56), and youth choral methods and materials (.54). The large differences in mean for each of these topics underscores the importance that sacred music faculty place on these items. It is clear that these three topics are not emphasized as much as faculty feel they are important. The same is true for handbell methods and adult choral methods and materials.

Table 45. Methods and Materials: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Children's choral methods and materials	2.92	3.60	.68
Worship band methods and materials	1.64	2.20	.56
Youth choral methods and materials	2.75	3.29	.54
Handbell methods	2.14	2.63	.49
Adult choral methods and materials	3.39	3.73	.34

Table 46 shows a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on functional skills course topics. This table shows that the majority of respondents placed moderate to much emphasis on sight-reading (forty-two or 82%), accompanying (thirty-four or 66%) and service playing (thirty or 58%). As illustrated in table 46, thirty-six respondents (70%) placed little to moderate emphasis on harmonization; however, equally as many placed moderate to much emphasis on this topic as well. The following four functional keyboard skills were given a rating of little to moderate emphasis by a majority of the respondents: improvisation and score reading, both with forty-three respondents each (84%); modulation (thirty-nine or 76%); and transposition (thirty-seven or 72%). One functional skill, playing by ear, was given a rating of no emphasis to little emphasis by a majority of the respondents (thirty-eight or 74%).

Table 46. Functional Keyboard Skills: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Service playing	9	18%	12	23%	12	23%	18	35%	
Accompanying	1	2%	16	31%	17	33%	17	33%	
Sight-reading	0	0%	9	18%	26	51%	16	31%	
Harmonization	0	0%	15	29%	21	41%	15	29%	
Transposition	3	6%	16	31%	21	41%	11	22%	
Modulation	4	8%	21	41%	18	35%	8	16%	
Score reading	1	2%	15	29%	28	55%	7	14%	
Improvisation	1	2%	21	41%	22	43%	6	12%	
Playing by ear	17	33%	21	41%	11	22%	2	4%	

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data concerning the importance of functional skills course topics are presented in table 47. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to sight-reading (forty-nine or 96%), accompanying (forty-six or 90%), harmonization (forty-four or 86%), score reading (forty-three or 84%), service playing and improvisation (forty or 78% each), transposition (thirty-eight or 74%), and modulation (thirty-four or 66%). Playing by ear was the only functional skill rated moderately important to important by the majority of respondents (thirty-three or 64%). The data provides clear evidence of the importance sacred music faculty place on functional keyboard skills in the training of church musicians.

Table 47. Functional Keyboard Skills: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Service playing	3	6%	8	16%	12	23%	28	55%	
Accompanying	0	0%	5	10%	20	39%	26	51%	
Sight-reading	0	0%	2	4%	24	47%	25	49%	
Harmonization	0	0%	7	14%	23	45%	21	41%	
Transposition	0	0%	13	25%	19	37%	19	37%	
Score reading	0	0%	8	16%	27	53%	16	31%	
Improvisation	1	2%	10	20%	26	51%	14	27%	
Modulation	4	8%	13	25%	20	39%	14	27%	
Playing by ear	8	16%	15	29%	18	35%	10	20%	

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each functional skills topic resulted in a wide range (.27 to .63). Although all topics are statistically significant in table 48, the skills with the greatest differences are playing by ear (.63), service playing (.51), accompanying (.43) and improvisation (.43). The large differences in mean for each of these topics underscores the importance that sacred music faculty place on these items. While all functional skills topics are deemed to be important by sacred music faculty, playing by ear, service playing, accompanying, and improvisation are skills that should be given more attention in the undergraduate sacred music curriculum.

Table 48. Functional Keyboard Skills: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Playing by ear	1.96	2.59	.63
Service playing	2.76	3.27	.51
Accompanying	2.98	3.41	.43
Improvisation	2.61	3.04	.43
Score reading	2.80	3.16	.36
Transposition	2.78	3.12	.34
Sight-reading	3.14	3.45	.31
Harmonization	3.00	3.27	.27
Modulation	2.59	2.86	.27

A summary of the emphasis respondents placed on pedagogy course topics is found in table 49. This table indicates that a majority of the respondents placed moderate to much emphasis on vocal pedagogy (forty or 82%), piano pedagogy (thirty-seven or 72%), and instrumental pedagogy (twenty-nine or 56%). One topic, organ pedagogy, was given a rating of little to moderate emphasis by a majority of the respondents (twenty-nine or 56%).

Table 49. Pedagogy: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Vocal pedagogy (voice majors)	1	2%	9	18%	18	35%	22	43%	1
Piano pedagogy (piano majors)	3	6%	9	18%	21	41%	16	31%	2
Instrumental pedagogy (instrumental majors)	3	6%	14	27%	14	27%	15	29%	5
Organ pedagogy (organ majors)	11	22%	13	25%	16	31%	10	20%	1

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data relative to the importance of pedagogy course topics are presented in table 50. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to all of the topics. Vocal pedagogy was ranked first with forty-nine respondents (96%). This was followed by piano pedagogy (forty-two or 82%), organ pedagogy (thirty-eight or 74%), and instrumental pedagogy (forty-three or 84%). It is interesting to note that piano pedagogy was slightly favored over organ pedagogy relative to importance in the undergraduate sacred music curriculum.

Table 50. Pedagogy: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Vocal pedagogy (voice majors)	0	0%	1	2%	20	39%	29	57%	1
Piano pedagogy (piano majors)	0	0%	7	14%	19	37%	23	45%	2
Instrumental pedagogy (instrumental majors)	1	2%	8	16%	20	39%	17	33%	5
Organ pedagogy (organ majors)	3	6%	9	18%	21	41%	17	33%	1

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each pedagogy topic created a range of .31 to .56 (see table 51). Although all topics are statistically significant, the items with the greatest differences in mean are instrumental pedagogy (.56) and organ pedagogy (.54). The large differences in mean for these topics suggest that sacred music faculty would like to see more emphasis devoted to these skills. The items with the lowest differences in

mean, vocal pedagogy and piano pedagogy, underscores the high level of importance sacred music faculty place on these topics.

Table 51. Pedagogy: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Instrumental pedagogy (instrumental majors)	2.59	3.15	.56
Organ pedagogy (organ majors)	2.50	3.04	.54
Vocal pedagogy (voice majors)	3.22	3.56	.34
Piano pedagogy (piano majors)	3.02	3.33	.31

Table 52 presents a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on popular music course topics. This table shows that a majority of the respondents placed no emphasis to little emphasis on praise and worship choruses (forty-four or 86%), playing from lead sheets (forty or 78%), and the use of popular, blues, jazz and gospel (thirty-eight or 74%).

Table 52. Popular Music: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Praise and Worship choruses	23	45%	21	41%	4	8%	3	6%	
Use of popular, blues, jazz, gospel	14	27%	24	47%	13	25%	1	2%	
Playing from lead sheets	22	43%	18	35%	10	20%	1	2%	

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data concerning the importance of popular music course topics are presented in table 53. A rating of moderately important to important was applied by a majority of respondents to all of the topics. The use of popular, blues, jazz, and gospel was ranked first with forty-one respondents (80%). This was followed by praise and worship choruses (thirty-eight or 74%), and playing from lead sheets (thirty-six or 70%). The data represents an increase in the ratings for each topic when compared to the current emphasis. These findings may indicate that sacred music faculty are more accepting of popular music forms than in the past.

Table 53. Popular Music: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Playing from lead sheets	7	14%	18	35%	18	35%	7	14%	1
Use of popular, blues, jazz, gospel	5	10%	17	33%	24	47%	3	6%	1
Praise and Worship choruses	10	20%	21	41%	17	33%	2	4%	1

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each popular music topic resulted in a narrow range (.34 to .47). However, as illustrated in table 54, all differences in mean are statistically significant. The skills with the greatest differences in mean are praise and worship choruses (.47), and the use of popular, blues, jazz and gospel (.40). The topic of playing from lead sheets followed with a difference of .34. It is clear that sacred music faculty

place some value on popular music forms and are inclined to increase the presence of these forms in the sacred music curriculum.

Table 54. Popular Music: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Praise and Worship choruses	1.75	2.22	.47
Use of popular, blues, jazz, gospel	2.06	2.46	.40
Playing from lead sheets	1.80	2.14	.34

Table 55 contains a summary of the emphasis respondents placed on technology course topics. This table indicates that the majority of responding institutions placed little to moderate emphasis on introduction to music technology and MIDI (thirty-two or 62%). However, it should be noted that as many as 29% of respondents placed much emphasis on introduction to music technology and as many as 20% placed much emphasis on MIDI. The two topics that were given a rating of no emphasis to little emphasis by a majority of the respondents were presentation graphics (forty-two or 82%) and recording techniques (forty-one or 80%). Almost half of the institutions (47%) gave no emphasis to presentation graphics training and more than one-third (37%) placed no emphasis on recording techniques.

Table 55. Technology: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic
by Responding Institutions
(N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Intro to music technology	4	8%	17	33%	15	29%	15	29%	
MIDI	8	16%	16	31%	16	31%	10	20%	1
Presentation graphics training	24	47%	18	35%	3	6%	6	12%	
Recording techniques	19	37%	22	43%	7	14%	3	6%	

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data concerning the importance of technology course topics are presented in table 56. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to introduction to music technology (forty-five or 88%) and MIDI (thirty-six or 70%). A rating of moderately important to important was applied by approximately two-thirds of the respondents to presentation graphics training (thirty-three or 64%) and recording techniques (thirty-six or 70%). As many as 20% and 14%, respectively, did not feel that presentation graphics and recording techniques were important in the training of church music directors.

Table 56. Technology: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic
by Responding Institutions
(N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Intro to music technology	1	2%	5	10%	24	47%	21	41%	
MIDI	3	6%	10	20%	23	45%	13	25%	2
Presentation graphics training	10	20%	21	41%	12	23%	7	14%	1
Recording techniques	7	14%	19	37%	17	33%	7	14%	1

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each technology topic resulted in a range of .38 to .60 (see table 57). The topics with the greatest differences are recording techniques (.60) and presentation graphics (.50). The differences for introduction to music technology (.47) and MIDI (.38) were also significant. The data suggests that sacred music faculty are inclined to place more importance on technology topics than the reported current emphasis. It is interesting to note that the majority of schools who emphasize popular music more in depth are the same schools that incorporate technology topics to a greater extent.

Table 57. Technology: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Recording techniques	1.88	2.48	.60
Presentation graphics training	1.82	2.32	.50
Intro to music technology	2.80	3.27	.47
MIDI	2.56	2.94	.38

Table 58 shows a summary of the emphasis placed on other (non-musical) courses and topics. This table shows that a majority of respondents placed moderate to much emphasis on theology (forty or 78%) and approximately half of the respondents placed moderate to much emphasis on the study of foreign language (twenty-seven or 52%). More than half (thirty-one or 60%) placed little to moderate emphasis on interpersonal/people skills; however, an equal percentage of respondents also placed moderate to much emphasis on this topic. A majority of respondents placed little to moderate emphasis on church history (thirty-four or 66%), while forty-five respondents (88%) placed no emphasis to little emphasis on church drama/musicals.

Table 58. Other Courses and Topics: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Theology	3	6%	7	14%	19	37%	21	41%	1
Church history	3	6%	16	31%	18	35%	13	25%	1
Interpersonal/people skills	6	12%	13	25%	18	35%	13	25%	1
Foreign language	14	27%	8	16%	14	27%	13	25%	1
Church drama/Musicals	29	57%	16	31%	5	10%	0	0%	1

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data relative to the importance of other (non-musical) courses and topics are presented in table 59. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to both interpersonal/people skills and theology (fifty or 98%). Church history was also rated important to very important by the majority (forty-three or 84%), while foreign language was rated as moderately important to important by more than half of the respondents (twenty-nine or 56%). On the other hand, the results were split for church drama/musicals. As seen in table 59, more than two-thirds of the respondents (thirty-five or 69%) rated this topic as not important to moderately important; however, equally as many indicated it was moderately important to important.

Table 59. Other Courses and Topics: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Interpersonal/people skills	0	0%	0	0%	16	31%	34	67%	1
Theology	0	0%	0	0%	19	37%	31	61%	1
Church history	0	0%	6	12%	23	45%	20	39%	2
Foreign language	9	18%	15	29%	14	27%	12	23%	1
Church drama/Musicals	11	22%	24	47%	11	22%	3	6%	2

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for other courses and topics resulted in a wide range of variability (.10 to .92). All topics shown in table 60, with the exception of foreign language, were statistically significant. The topics with the greatest differences in mean included interpersonal/people skills (.92), church drama/musicals (.60), church history (.47), and theology (.46). The findings under this main grouping suggest that the level of importance for these items are greater than the current level of emphasis reported by the sacred music faculty. Based on the findings, interpersonal/people skills, church drama/musicals, church history, and theology deserve much more attention in the undergraduate sacred music program.

Table 60. Other Courses and Topics: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Interpersonal/people skills	2.76	3.68	.92
Church drama/Musicals	1.52	2.12	.60
Church history	2.82	3.29	.47
Theology	3.16	3.62	.46
Foreign language	2.48	2.58	.10

Table 61 presents a summary of the emphasis placed on final projects. This table indicates that the majority of responding institutions placed much emphasis on the senior recital (forty-three or 84%) and moderate to much emphasis on the internship/practicum (thirty-eight or 75%). More than half of the respondents placed no emphasis to little emphasis on an internship that includes contemporary worship (thirty-two or 62%) or on the junior recital (twenty-eight or 55%).

Table 61. Final Projects: Amount of Emphasis Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		N R
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Senior recital	2	4%	2	4%	4	8%	43	84%	
Internship/practicum	3	6%	10	20%	9	18%	29	57%	
Junior recital	22	43%	6	12%	8	16%	15	29%	
Internship that includes contemporary worship	19	37%	13	25%	9	18%	9	18%	1

1 - No emphasis 2 - Little Emphasis 3 - Moderate Emphasis 4 - Much Emphasis

The data concerning the importance of final projects are presented in table 62. A rating of important to very important was applied by a majority of respondents to both the senior recital and the internship/practicum (forty-five or 88%). The junior recital was rated as not important to moderately important by approximately half of the respondents (twenty-seven or 53%), while the internship that includes contemporary worship was rated as moderately important to important by two-thirds of the responding institutions (thirty-four or 66%).

Table 62. Final Projects: Amount of Importance Placed on Course Topic by Responding Institutions (N=51)

Topic	1		2		3		4		NR
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Senior recital	0	0%	5	10%	6	12%	39	76%	1
Internship/practicum	1	2%	4	8%	12	23%	33	65%	1
Junior recital	18	35%	9	18%	9	18%	14	27%	1
Internship that includes contemporary worship	6	12%	18	35%	16	31%	11	22%	

1 – Not Important 2 – Moderately Important 3 - Important 4 - Very Important

A comparison of the differences between the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for final projects resulted in a wide range of variability (-.05 to .47). As illustrated in table 63, the internship that includes contemporary worship (.47) and internship/practicum (.29) were the topics with the most significant differences in mean. This may suggest that faculty are not only placing more importance on the internship experience, but also on the popular music component of the experience.

Table 63. Final Projects: Difference Between Mean of Emphasis and Mean of Importance

Topic	Mean of Emphasis	Mean of Importance	Difference
Internship that includes contemporary worship	2.16	2.63	.47
Internship/practicum	3.25	3.54	.29
Junior recital	2.31	2.38	.07
Senior recital	3.73	3.68	-.05

The Open-Ended Questions

The final section of the survey was designed to elicit responses to four open-ended questions. These questions dealt with the preference for a master’s degree in sacred music, the preference for an undergraduate music-education degree, and strengthening the sacred music program in North America. The fourth question allowed respondents to add additional comments related to the survey.

First, sacred music professors were given an opportunity to comment on the importance of a graduate degree in the training of church musicians. All fifty-one professors responded to the following question: “Do you feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of a graduate program rather than an undergraduate program”? The majority of respondents (twenty-six or 51%) answered “no” and nineteen (37%) answered “yes,” while three respondents checked both “yes” and “no.” Although a few faculty did not select “yes” or “no,” they did respond to the question by writing comments only.

The respondents who answered “no” to this question supported their answers with various reasons. Several respondents felt that undergraduate training in sacred

music was essential and sufficient for church work and that graduate studies should be optional. The following quotations represent this view (remaining comments are listed in appendix G):

While the training of church musicians can be expanded and deepened at the graduate level, undergraduate training can be meaningful and effective.

I feel like our undergraduate program offers everything I received in my graduate program.

Basic training in church music can be accomplished in an undergraduate program. Advanced study is encouraged and very helpful. Conferences can supplement classroom training.

We attempt to prepare students for basic church music positions and for graduate study, not to take the place of seminary or graduate training.

Additionally, respondents who answered “no” indicated that since not all students will go on to graduate school, it becomes imperative for training in church music to commence at the undergraduate level. Because of the great need for church musicians, many students obtain church jobs immediately after their undergraduate training (responses listed in appendix G).

On the other hand, many faculty (37%) answered “yes” to this question indicating that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of a graduate program rather than an undergraduate program. Some suggested that the curriculum is already overburdened.

The undergraduate curriculum is crowded as is, you can't effectively add sufficient church music courses and get real depth.

Precious little time in our undergraduate program to get our core curriculum accomplished given the background (or lack thereof) they enter with.

This particular curriculum is overwhelming! Lots of hours. I feel that its scope is of graduate proportions. On the other hand, many students do not continue to grad school. They'll need something!

Others who answered “yes” felt church music positions require well-developed skills that can only be realized within the context of a graduate degree.

The task of church music requires strong skills. Graduate study begins with prerequisite skills and can then expand upon them.

Leadership skills, musical development, and life experience. Undergraduates are just learning their craft. The complexities of professional life in the church world require graduate training.

Students would be at a higher level of skill at the graduate level.

I do feel that the undergraduate program serves as an introduction to the church musician, but graduate work is a must!

Some faculty felt that undergraduate students did not have the maturity to understand the value of specialized training.

Specialized training for a more mature student is more effective.

I find fewer students who even discuss the music ministry option as 18-20-year-olds. Most gravitate toward that vocation at the end of their undergraduate studies or a while later.

It is interesting to note that those who favored a graduate degree in church music, also underscored the importance of the undergraduate degree (remaining comments are listed in appendix G).

Yes, but that shouldn't rule out excellent undergraduate training and exposure in the field.

Our undergraduates spend so much time in general music education that we have little time to have specific courses. However, it is essential to keep the program in the undergraduate. Ideally a student should have both undergraduate and graduate.

I think undergraduate school is the best place for developing general skills for all musicians and graduate school should focus on the development of specific skills.

The undergraduate degree can train its student more soundly in basic musicianship, but the undergrad is rarely ready to move beyond likes and dislikes into a people-centered ministry.

The second open-ended question gave sacred music professors an opportunity to comment on the value of an undergraduate music-education degree in the training of church musicians. Forty-nine professors responded to the following question: “Do you feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of an undergraduate music-education degree rather than an undergraduate church music degree”? The majority of respondents (thirty-three or 65%) answered “no,” and ten respondents (20%) answered “yes,” while four respondents checked both “yes” and “no.” Although two faculty did not select “yes” or “no,” they did respond to the question by writing comments only.

The respondents who answered “no” to this question offered three primary reasons for their answers. First, faculty did not prefer a music-education degree over a church music degree because they felt the music-education program was already a busy curriculum. The following quotations are representative of this view (remaining comments are listed in appendix G):

Not enough opportunity in many music ed programs for courses specific to church music.

The undergraduate degrees in music education are already so full that there would be little to no time for the church music aspects.

This can be a good preparation for church music, because it provides the teaching skills and experience with children so necessary for a church musician. But there simply isn't enough room in the schedule to do a full education degree and still learn all things a church musician needs to know, and finish in four years.

A second reason why faculty did not prefer the music-education degree over the sacred music degree was because church music requires specific courses and training unique to the field. The following quotations are representative of this view (remaining comments are listed in appendix G):

While much of the coursework is the same, there are certain areas unique to church music- worship, hymnology, administration, etc.

If the curriculum is well planned, an undergraduate church music degree will provide a better focus in preparation for ministry in this area.

While much valuable experience falls in the structure of a music education degree, there are more important things for future church musicians to study than some of the typical course work of a music education degree which would preclude, for reasons of time, such studies.

One reason our church music major numbers are so low is that the former music administrator steered students into music education and reasoned ‘they can always lead music in a church.’ At least a dozen of our recent music education graduates are ‘serving’ churches full-time right now, and they are simply not equipped in worship principles or hymnology or church music administration, or church politics. Many are having difficulty.

Thirdly, the church music degree is preferred because most faculty do not see a correlation between the church music and music-education programs.

Music education and church music are two entirely different foci for the student. The church music major must be trained in hymnology (including what makes a hymn worthy), service playing, organ literature, etc. The BME student is now required to learn not only techniques for teaching music but for reading, special education, etc. as well.

Music ed programs are bloated with irrelevant course materials.

Student teaching and certification requirements are not applicable, exactly, to church music.

Our music education program includes many teacher education courses that have little relationship to church music and prevent students from taking other studies and courses related to church music.

If students do not intend to do school music and they are not passionate about teaching they should be allowed to follow their call and passion.

One respondent, like many others, felt that the music-education degree was not effective in training church musicians. However, he did state that there was overlap between the programs and that some of his music-education students do make the transition into church music work after graduation.

On the other side of the coin, ten respondents did feel that the music education degree was more effective in the training of a church musician. These faculty felt that the overall skills developed in a music-education degree would benefit the church music student. Additionally, some of the respondents indicated that completing a music-education degree would broaden the opportunities for employment. The following are representative statements:

Good principles of music education transfer to sacred music and give 'job Security' for graduates.

We are doing this since our sacred music program includes quite a bit of our music education core. It means summer school or an extra year but I believe that people trained in education make effective leaders in our churches and the education degree provides more job security. That is if they have had basic church music courses-hymnology, liturgy, etc., service playing.

Access to methods courses.

Two respondents answered "yes" and "no" to this issue, contingent upon the student's future plans:

Yes and no – we encourage students to consider music education with a church music minor. For those unwilling to go an extra year the church music degree does them well.

Yes, if a master's degree at a seminary could be mandated at the conclusion of the undergraduate degree. No, if the student was not going to seminary.

The third question asked respondents to comment on the changes needed to strengthen the church music curriculum. Forty-one professors responded to the following question: “What changes are needed to strengthen the church music curriculum in North America to keep the degree vital”? In the previous questions, responses could easily be grouped into a few categories based on the similarity of the answers. However, the responses to this question were quite diverse. Although there was a significant lack of uniformity to the comments, many faculty did agree on some areas that needed to change. Subsequently, these issues are brought to the forefront and are presented in this chapter. The diverse comments are listed in appendix G and illustrate that sacred music faculty are not in agreement with regard to the fundamental changes that are needed to strengthen the church music curriculum. Nevertheless, all individual comments are certainly valuable and should be considered if the undergraduate sacred music degree is to be strengthened (see appendix G).

Seventeen of the forty-one respondents indicated that in order for the sacred music program to remain vital, more emphasis needs to be placed on various musical styles, including contemporary congregational music. However, these respondents also stated that the inclusion of other musical styles in the curriculum should be a supplement, not a substitute, for the traditional curriculum. The following quotations represent this perspective (remaining comments are listed in appendix G):

More interaction with current church music. However, students (currently) must know most of what they’ve known in the past and must know much more.

Further integration of the skills needed for contemporary church music into the curriculum while continuing a broad-based preparation.

Greater attention to “contemporary worship”: philosophy, theology, methodology, skills required, etc. (but without sacrificing development of basic musicianship).

The music component of “worship” degrees needs to remain strong. Emphasis on current trends in church music should not take the place of musical skills training, but should play a major role in the preparation of future church musicians.

Studies need to include “liturgical”, “traditional”, “blended” and “contemporary” paradigms.

The curriculum must continue to stress philosophy, history, strong foundations, biblical examples and exhortations, spending much less time on teaching “trendiness.” The “praise and worship” band approach must be incorporated into the whole of church music, not take over the entire focus!

My own church music undergrad program, while well taught, was too philosophical and book-oriented, and too pigeon-holed in one approach and denomination. I think a balance is necessary with lots of hands-on instruction as well as work with world music. Regardless of how we feel about it, we also cannot stick our heads in the sand about contemporary Christian music. We need to at least discuss it and the issues related to it.

We need to be more relevant to the worship practices of the 21st century, while maintaining the early Christian worship practices.

On the other hand, a few respondents were adamantly against the inclusion of popular music in the curriculum. From their perspective, the elimination of contemporary styles would strengthen the church music program and keep the degree vital. One respondent felt that musicians should be able to work in churches “without the pressure to include substandard styles.” Another faculty commented, “I view church music as a wasteland. I'm sorry to be so pessimistic- but whatever happened to giving of one's best to the Master”? An additional respondent said there needs to be a “willingness to expand on classical music training as the sole style a church musician needs.” Considering these comments, it is apparent that the debate of the use of popular music continues to be an issue in the church and in the sacred music curriculum.

Some of the church music faculty also agreed that there should be more emphasis on current trends and music technology. Additionally, others felt that “a reliable job market with wages and working conditions needs to be there” along with “a salary to make a living for a family.” Certainly these are reasonable expectations.

A final question, “Is there anything else related to this questionnaire you would like to add,?” provided the opportunity for respondents to comment on related issues. The responses to this question were also diverse and did not add new or significant data to the study. The following quotations represent these diverse comments (remaining responses may be viewed in appendix G):

I am new at this institution and hope to make a few changes. I feel that a working knowledge of major denominations and general Christian history is presently lacking. I learned most of sacred music trade on the job and in grad school. I’m pondering how to get practical experience paired with all the classroom work, without turning a state university into a seminary!

Good survey. I have answered the questions as they pertain to our current program. We are proposing extensive revisions, and I have attached a description of them in case you are interested.

I found this emphasis/importance set-up difficult. I would rather have just shared what’s in the curriculum. For example: if church musicians are required to take one 2-credit counterpoint class, it doesn’t mean that counterpoint is “not emphasized” – we think it’s important but don’t need 12 credits! I didn’t know what constituted “emphasizing” something.

Our tradition is the minister of music-conductor, singer and church music educator rather than an organist/choirmaster.

Summary

The Institutions

The majority of responding institutions that offered an undergraduate sacred music degree were private (92%) and were likely to divide the academic year into

semesters (90%). The largest number of schools (76%) had an enrollment between one and 160 music majors, while 49% of the institutions enrolled between one and eighty music majors on the undergraduate level. Enrollment in the undergraduate sacred music program was typically under twenty students (87%) with 64% of schools reporting fewer than ten enrollees. The enrollment trend at 80% of NASM institutions either increased or remained relatively constant over the past five years. This is significant in view of the 40% decline in church music enrollment between 1990 and 2000 (Brady 2002).

Institutions were likely to graduate between one and eight students in the church music program during the 2003-2004 academic year (89%). However, more than half of the schools (65%) reported between five and eight church music graduates. Of those who graduated, approximately 33% were placed in a church music position while another 33% did not find jobs in the field. However, these figures are lower than they appear because they do not account for students who either went on to graduate school or were not seeking a full-time position.

The Sacred Music Curriculum

Thirty-eight of the fifty-one responding institutions (74%) required an internship experience for the undergraduate sacred music program. The hours typically expected for the internship varied widely among institutions with 63% of schools requiring between sixty-six and 185 hours. The total number of church music majors likely to complete an internship experience was between one and four (51%). A variety of responsibilities were required as part of the experience, with the following activities being most common: observing church music directors (72%), rehearsal planning

(70%), directing choral ensemble rehearsals (64%), worship planning (62%), and conducting ensembles during church services (56%). Other duties ranged from music library assignments to journaling to hospital visitation and other pastoral skills.

Using a four-point Likert scale, respondents were asked to rate the amount of emphasis and importance they place on specific course topics normally found in an undergraduate sacred music program. The topics that received the highest emphasis among NASM schools were applied voice, choral ensemble, organ literature, music theory and aural skills, and senior recital (see table 64).

Table 64. Topics Receiving the Highest Emphasis

Topic	Mean
Applied Voice	3.94
Choral ensemble	3.90
Organ literature (organ majors)	3.88
Music theory and aural skills	3.88
Senior recital	3.73

The course topics that received the least amount of emphasis included praise and worship band for credit, organ literature for non-organ majors, church drama/musicals, pipe organ construction/repair, and worship band methods (see table 65).

Table 65. Topics Receiving the Lowest Emphasis

Topic	Mean
Praise and worship band for credit	1.24
Organ literature (non-organ majors)	1.52
Church drama/musicals	1.52
Pipe organ construction/repair	1.60
Worship band methods	1.64

Topics that were rated with the highest importance included music theory, aural skills, applied voice, choral conducting, choral ensemble, and hymnology/congregational song (see table 66).

Table 66. Topics Considered Most Important in Sacred Music Curriculum

Topic	Mean
Music theory and aural skills	3.90
Applied voice	3.86
Choral Conducting	3.86
Choral ensemble	3.86
Hymnology/congregational song	3.76

Sacred music faculty considered the following topics to be the least important in the church music program: praise and worship band for credit, organ literature (non-organ majors), pipe organ construction and repair, church drama/musicals, and playing from lead sheets (see table 67).

Table 67. Topics Considered Least Important in Sacred Music Curriculum

Topic	Mean
Praise and worship band for credit	1.68
Organ literature (non-organ majors)	1.82
Pipe organ construction/repair	1.84
Church drama/musicals	2.12
Playing from lead sheets	2.14

To facilitate a better understanding of the relationship of the ratings between the emphasis and importance of course topics, a second analysis of the data was made by comparing the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each topic. The differences between the means were used to assess the relationship between what is currently emphasized and what faculty feel is important (or unimportant). In this analysis, a positive difference indicated that the mean of the importance was greater than the mean of the emphasis for that topic. A large positive difference also suggested that faculty felt the topic should receive more prominence in the sacred music program. Conversely, a large negative difference indicated that the mean of the importance was less than the mean of the emphasis for that topic, and that faculty felt the item should receive less attention in the curriculum.

Across all fourteen major groupings, the following topics had the greatest (positive) differences in mean: interpersonal/people skills, children's choral methods and materials, arranging for contemporary worship band, playing by ear, recording techniques, instrumental pedagogy (instrumental majors), interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms, choral ensemble (instrumental majors), rehearsal planning, internship that includes contemporary worship, praise and worship choruses, vocal solo

literature (non-voice majors), applied voice (non-voice majors), and history of popular music. Table 68 lists these topics by rank in descending order.

Table 68. Topics with the Greatest Positive Difference in Mean from Each Major Grouping

Topic	Difference of Means
Interpersonal/people skills	.92
Children's choral methods and materials	.68
Arranging for contemporary band	.64
Playing by ear	.63
Recording techniques	.60
Instrumental pedagogy (instrumental majors)	.56
Interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms	.54
Choral ensemble (instrumental majors)	.53
Rehearsal planning	.51
Internship that includes contemporary worship	.47
Praise and worship choruses	.47
Vocal solo literature (non-voice majors)	.45
Applied voice (non-voice majors)	.35
History of popular music	.32

The only topic that had the most significant negative difference in mean was organ literature for organ majors (-.26), perhaps suggesting that sacred music faculty would prefer a little less emphasis on this item. This may indicate that while organ literature is important, it may not be as relevant for church musicians who use the organ primarily to accompany vocal solo and choral literature.

The Open-Ended Questions

In response to the first open-ended question, the majority of sacred music faculty did not feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of a graduate degree (51%). The following reasons were stated:

1. Undergraduate training is sufficient for church music work
2. Not all students pursue graduate school
3. In view of the great need for church musicians, most students begin church work immediately after their undergraduate studies.

On the other hand, 37% of respondents felt that a graduate program in church music would be more effective in training church musicians. Reasons included the following:

1. The undergraduate curriculum is too overburdened
2. Church music positions require well-developed skills that can only be realized within the context of a graduate degree.
3. Undergraduate students do not have the maturity to understand the value of specialized training.

All respondents who favored a graduate degree in sacred music also supported an undergraduate church music degree as well.

In response to the second open-ended question, the majority of faculty did not feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of an undergraduate music-education degree (65%). The following reasons were cited:

1. The music-education curriculum is already too demanding.
2. Church music training requires specific coursework.
3. There is no correlation between the church music and music-education program.

While most did not prefer a music-education degree, 20% of the population did support this concept.

1. The overall skills acquired from a music-education degree would benefit a church music student.
2. There would be greater employment opportunities (job security).

In response to the third question, seventeen respondents linked the strengthening of the sacred music curriculum to the use of popular music. These professors felt that the integration of popular music into the curriculum, without compromising traditional training, would offer relevancy and keep the degree vital. On the other hand, three respondents felt that removing popular music from the curriculum would be beneficial. A few others strongly believed that a reliable job market and competitive salaries would strengthen the undergraduate sacred music program.

In response to the final question, “Is there anything else related to this questionnaire you would like to add?” nine respondents offered miscellaneous comments, mostly personal reflections, that did not add new or significant data to the study. These comments are listed in appendix G.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINAL COMMENTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to analyze undergraduate sacred music curriculum content in colleges and universities accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. This research provides a comprehensive report on the undergraduate church music program and will serve as a reference point for those in higher education who plan to revise their undergraduate sacred music curriculum. The study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What course topics are offered in the undergraduate sacred music curriculum among NASM schools?
2. To what extent are the course topics offered?
3. What value do church music faculty place on each course topic in the curriculum?
4. What do church music professors at these schools indicate is necessary to keep the church music degree in North America vital?
5. How do the findings of this study compare with findings of previous studies?

The research was conducted by means of a content analysis of academic catalogs and a survey questionnaire mailed to undergraduate sacred music faculty at seventy NASM schools in the United States. The institutions offering an undergraduate degree in church music were identified using the 2004 National Association of Schools of Music *Directory* and the *Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, US and Canada, 2004-2005*, published by the College Music Society.

For the content-analysis portion of the study, required course titles from each institution were categorized into major groupings and subgroupings. The subgroupings within each major grouping are listed in tabular form and show the number of schools that offered courses, the range of credit hours per course, and the mean of the range of credits. Appendix B provides a comprehensive list of specific course titles within each group and subgrouping.

Following a preliminary study of a small sample drawn from NASM institutions, the survey materials (questionnaire, cover letter, and stamped, self-addressed envelope) were mailed to the sacred music professors at seventy NASM institutions. The survey requested information relative to the institution and to the sacred music curriculum. Opinions surrounding preferences for a master's degree in sacred music, an undergraduate music-education degree, and thoughts for strengthening the sacred music program in North America were obtained through open-ended questions. The data in this study are compiled from fifty-one responses, representing 73% of the population.

Summary and Comparison of Findings with Related Literature

Findings of the Content Analysis

Sacred Music Degrees

The undergraduate sacred music programs of the seventy NASM institutions offer at least one of three types of music degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music, and Bachelor of Science. The most common degree was the Bachelor of Music with a Major in Church Music (75.7%). This was followed by the Bachelor of Arts in Music with a Concentration in Church Music (21.4%) and the Bachelor of Science with a

Major in Church Music (2.9%). These degree titles are similar to those reported by Smith (1949), Morrison (1957), Farrier (1963), Stephens (1964), Leach (1983), and Melton (1987).

Curricular Components of the Sacred Music Degrees

The curricular components of the degrees included the church music core (ranging from 6-48 credits), the music core (ranging from 27-94 credits), and the general-education core (ranging from 30-95 credits). The range of credit hours in each category varied based on whether the requirements were for a concentration in church music or a major in church music. The total number of semester hours for an undergraduate degree in church music ranged from 120 to 161 credits with a mean of 130.9.

The first Bachelor of Music degree proposed in 1953 by NASM's Church Music Committee outlined a program totaling 120 credits. This original program required twelve credits in the church music core, fifty-two credits in the music core, and thirty credits in the general-education core. The remaining twenty-six credit hours were electives, however the kinds of courses permitted to fulfill these electives are unknown. In 1963, Farrier found that church music classes ranged from zero to thirty credits, with nine credits being the median. According to Breland (1974), the average number of hours for the church music core was seventeen credits. A comparison of the data shows that from 1953 to the present, the mean of core church music courses has increased from nine to nineteen credits.

Music Courses Offered

Of the 193 church music courses offered in the 2004-2005 academic year, the most common titles were Hymnology, Church Music Administration, and Service Playing. This contrasts with the fifty-five church music courses offered in the 1967-1968 school year as reported by Dunbar (1970). At that time, the most common titles of church music courses were Church Music, Music and Worship, and History of Church Music. Pfleuger (1964) also noted that Hymnology and Church Music Literature were common titles in the programs he reviewed. In 1987, Melton found the most common titles to be Philosophy of Church Music and Church Music Administration.

Similarities among programs existed in several church music studies. All schools in this study required courses in church music, conducting, applied music, piano proficiency, music theory, aural skills, music history, and ensemble. Pfleuger (1964) reported the following courses to be common among the schools in his research: English; religion; physical education; music theory; history and literature of music; courses in liturgies, chant, and hymnology; and church music literature. Stephens (1964) noted the following common church music classes among his population: hymnology, church music literature, graded choir methods and materials, conducting, and church music administration. In 1970 Dunbar found that course titles and course content were consistent among schools in areas such as church music administration, internship, liturgies, and service playing. Finally, in 1983 Leach found similarities among programs relative to hymnology, church music administration, and conducting.

Findings of the Survey

The Institutions

The first part of the questionnaire sought information regarding the type of institution (public or private), length of terms (semesters, quarters, or other), total undergraduate music major enrollment, total church music enrollment, five-year enrollment trends, number of graduates in church music, and the percentage of graduates placed in a full-time church position. Of the responding schools, the majority were private institutions (92%) that organized the academic year into semesters (90%). An enrollment of between one and 160 music majors was reported by 76% of schools; 49% of the institutions enrolled between one and eighty music majors on the undergraduate level. Although total enrollment in the church music programs ranged from fewer than ten to more than forty-one students, the majority of institutions (88%) reported an enrollment of zero to twenty students. More than half of the respondents (64%) reported fewer than ten enrollees in church music and two schools reported no students in the program.

The findings of this study revealed that seven schools eliminated the church music degree from their curriculum within the past year due to low enrollment. Initially, this may seem like a significant number. However, the study also revealed that enrollment at 80% of NASM institutions either increased or remained relatively constant over the past five years. This trend is surprising in view of the enrollment figures reported by Ball (1994) and Brady (2002) which indicated a 65% decline in enrollment among church music programs at NASM schools between 1982 and 2000. Although the reasons for the current upward enrollment trend are not clear, this new

pattern may be an indication that the sacred music program in the United States is gaining new vitality. Institutions in the current study were likely to graduate between one and eight students in the church music program during the 2003-2004 academic year (86%).

Job placement for church music graduates in the current study was split with approximately half of the respondents indicating a placement of between 0% and 33%, and the other half reporting a placement of between 50% and 100%. However, these placement figures are higher than they appear since several graduates either went on to graduate school or did not seek a full-time church position. In studies completed by Smith (1949), F.E. Williams (1969), Crocker (1985), Emch (1986), and Dunbar (1970) placement in church music positions ranged from 0.2% to 98%.

The Sacred Music Curriculum

The second part of the questionnaire sought information regarding the internship and the emphasis and importance of church music course topics. Four questions were formulated to collect information on whether an internship was required, the number of church music majors who completed an internship, internship hours, and activities or responsibilities required for the experience. Of the fifty-one respondents, thirty-eight (74%) indicated that an internship was required as part of the sacred music program. Although the number of total clock hours to complete an internship varied greatly among institutions, the majority (63%) required between sixty-six and 185 hours. The number of church music majors likely to complete an internship at each NASM school was between one and four students (51%). A wide range of activities was required for the field experience including observing church music directors (72%), rehearsal

planning (70%), directing choral ensemble rehearsals (64%), worship planning (62%), and conducting ensembles during church services (56%). Brady (2002) also found that the majority of CCCU schools required an internship for the church music degree as well. However, the field experience was not always a requirement among schools offering a sacred music program. For example, in 1964 Stephens indicated that only two out of fourteen Southern Baptist schools required an internship. Breland (1974) also reported that only five out of thirty-five schools in his population required a supervised internship and approximately ten years later in 1983, Leach found that less than one-third of institutions in her study offered an internship experience. An increase in the number of required internships found in the current study and in Brady's study (2002) reflects the 1993 NASM recommendation that institutions provide church music majors with an internship experience.

To determine the amount of emphasis and importance sacred music faculty placed on church music course topics, a table was created with a list of eighty-eight topics normally found in the undergraduate sacred music program. Respondents were instructed in column A to indicate the amount of emphasis they placed on each topic by circling the appropriate response (4-point Likert scale). In column B respondents rated the topics based on the value (importance) they placed on each item in preparing students for church music leadership (4-point Likert scale).

The topics that received the greatest emphasis (highest means) were applied voice, choral ensemble, organ literature, music theory and aural skills, and senior recital. The topics considered to be the most important (highest means) included music theory and aural skills, applied voice, choral conducting, choral ensemble, and

hymnology/congregational song. In studies completed by Smith (1949), Klassen (1990), and Brady (2002), it is clear that sacred music faculty and church musicians alike placed great importance on these topics as well. Smith (1949) indicated that church music directors placed significant importance on choral and instrumental conducting, choral ensembles, vocal training, sight-reading, and hymnology. In 1990, Klassen found conducting, choral ensemble, applied instruction, music education, hymnology, and church music administration to be the most important courses in the undergraduate sacred music curriculum. Brady (2002) reported that sacred music faculty at CCCU schools considered conducting and vocal training to be the most important classes, along with church administrative structures and planning for the order of worship. Clearly, the value of these courses and competencies has remained consistent over the years.

To provide a better understanding of the relationship of the ratings between the emphasis and importance of course topics, a second analysis of the data was made by comparing the mean of the emphasis and the mean of the importance for each topic. The differences between the means were used to evaluate the relationship between what is currently emphasized and what faculty feel is important. Through the use of a t-test, it was determined that a significant positive difference in means was .20 or greater. A significant positive difference suggested that faculty felt the topic should receive more attention in the sacred music curriculum. Likewise, a significant negative difference (-.20 or greater) suggested that faculty felt the item should receive less attention in the curriculum. The topics with the largest positive differences in mean included interpersonal/people skills, children's choral methods and materials, arranging for

contemporary worship band, playing by ear, recording techniques, instrumental pedagogy (instrumental majors), interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms, choral ensemble (instrumental majors), rehearsal planning, internship that includes contemporary worship, praise and worship choruses, vocal solo literature (non-voice majors), applied voice (non-voice majors), and history of popular music. Only one topic, organ literature for organ majors, had a large negative difference in mean (-.26).

Valued now for over half a century, interpersonal/people skills was an item highly regarded in studies published by Smith (1949), Stephens (1964), Bearden (1980), Emch (1986), and Melton (1987). Although professors have placed great importance on this topic, evidence shows that few institutions have incorporated interpersonal/people skills into the sacred music curriculum.

In the current study, the majority of respondents placed little to moderate emphasis on the interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms and the relationship between sacred music and the music of the general culture. However, the differences in means suggested that sacred music faculty desire more emphasis on these items in the curriculum. In a similar finding, Brady (2002) concluded that the same two competencies were included in the curricula of CCCU schools to some extent, but faculty felt they should be included to a moderate extent.

Theological training was ranked as a very important non-musical topic in the current study. This finding is consistent with the findings of other researchers and church music scholars who advocate preparation in this area as part of the undergraduate sacred music program. These included writings by Routley (1959, 1977) and studies by Emch (1986) and Melton (1987).

The Open-Ended Questions

The final part of the questionnaire included four open-ended questions to obtain information on the preference for a master's degree in sacred music, the preference for an undergraduate music-education degree, and strengthening the sacred music program in the United States. The last question requested additional related comments.

Of the fifty-one professors who responded to the first open-ended question, the majority (51%) did not feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of a graduate program. Three primary reasons were given.

1. Undergraduate training is sufficient for church music work
2. Not all students pursue graduate school.
3. In view of the great need for church musicians, most students begin church work immediately after their undergraduate studies.

The following quotations represent these views:

While the training of church musicians can be expanded and deepened at the graduate level, undergraduate training can be meaningful and effective.

In the current climate, very few of our students will go to seminary (this is a real change from 15 years ago). So, the undergraduate degree is the only academic study in church music that they will get.

Many of our church music graduates begin serving churches as full-time music ministers directly out of college. Some go on to seminary or other graduate study, but a fair number continue to serve full-time without further study.

On the other hand, 37% of respondents felt that a graduate program in church music would be more effective than an undergraduate degree in church music. Three primary reasons were given.

1. The undergraduate curriculum is too overburdened
2. Church music positions require well-developed skills that can only be realized within the context of a graduate degree.
3. Undergraduate students do not have the maturity to understand the value of specialized training.

The following quotations represent these views:

The undergraduate curriculum is crowded as is, you can't effectively add sufficient church music courses and get real depth.

The task of church music requires strong skills. Graduate study begins with prerequisite skills and can then expand upon them.

Specialized training for a more mature student is more effective.

All respondents who favored a graduate degree in sacred music also supported an undergraduate church music degree as well.

Our undergraduates spend so much time in general music education that we have little time to have specific courses. However, it is essential to keep the program in the undergraduate. Ideally a student should have both undergraduate and graduate.

From 1964 to 2002, data revealed that the majority of church music faculty did prefer a master's degree in sacred music over an undergraduate degree in sacred music. This preference existed among NASM institutions as well as non-NASM institutions and was reported by Pfleuger (1964), Dunbar (1970), Breland (1974), Melton (1987), and Brady (2002). The preference for an undergraduate church music degree in the current study is clearly a shift in philosophy.

Of the forty-nine faculty who responded to the second open-ended question, the majority (65%) preferred an undergraduate sacred music degree over an undergraduate music-education degree in preparing church musicians. Three primary reasons were given.

1. The music-education curriculum is already too demanding.
2. Church music training requires specific coursework.
3. There is no correlation between the church music and music-education program.

The following quotations represent these views:

This can be a good preparation for church music, because it provides the teaching skills and experience with children so necessary for a church musician. But there simply isn't enough room in the schedule to do a full education degree and still learn all things a church musician needs to know, and finish in four years.

While much valuable experience falls in the structure of a music education degree, there are more important things for future church musicians to study than some of the typical course work of a music education degree which would preclude, for reasons of time, such studies.

Our music education program includes many teacher education courses that have little relationship to church music and prevent students from taking other studies and courses related to church music.

While most faculty did not prefer a music-education degree, 20% of the population did support this idea. Two reasons were cited for this preference.

1. The overall skills acquired from a music-education degree would benefit a church music student.
2. There would be greater employment opportunities (job security).

The following quotations characterize this view:

We are doing this since our sacred music program includes quite a bit of our music education core. It means summer school or an extra year but I believe that people trained in education make effective leaders in our churches and the education degree provides more job security. That is if they have had basic church music courses-hymnology, liturgy, etc., service playing.

Good principles of music education transfer to sacred music and give 'job Security' for graduates.

The preference for an undergraduate sacred music degree over a music-education degree outlined by respondents in this study is consistent with the findings of Pfleuger (1964), Dunbar (1970), and Breland (1974). However, among non-NASM institutions, Melton (1987) and Brady (2002) reported that the majority of sacred music faculty preferred a music-education degree over a church music degree.

Of the forty-one professors who responded to the third open-ended question, approximately half offered diverse answers. The following quotations are examples of these unrelated responses (all comments may be viewed in appendix G):

A textbook!, more open minds for faculty. Ongoing practical experience beyond internship.

Need for forward thinking/vision of integrating music as a ministry tool. Creativity of bridging past heritage with future.

Graduate students with excellent skills on a philosophy of church music which has solid theological roots. Have them read everything Marva Dawn and Erik Routley ever wrote.

The remaining half of respondents felt that the inclusion of popular music styles, without compromising traditional training, would strengthen the sacred music program. The following quotations encapsulate this position:

Greater attention to “contemporary worship”: philosophy, theology, methodology, skills required, etc. (but without sacrificing development of basic musicianship).

The music component of “worship” degrees needs to remain strong. Emphasis on current trends in church music should not take the place of musical skills training, but should play a major role in the preparation of future church musicians.

We need to be more relevant to the worship practices of the 21st century, while maintaining the early Christian worship practices.

Only a few respondents felt that popular music should be completely eliminated from the curriculum. One respondent felt that musicians should be able to work in churches “without the pressure to include substandard styles.” Another faculty commented, “I view church music as a wasteland. I'm sorry to be so pessimistic- but whatever happened to giving of one's best to the Master”?

In the current study the data revealed that while no emphasis or little emphasis was placed on all popular music topics, the majority of faculty felt that popular music should be given more attention in the undergraduate curriculum. This sentiment was also articulated by Baskerville (1971), Sharp (1977), Klassen (1990), Pierce (1994), Carson (1995), Dawn (1995), Wicker (1999), Brady (2002), King (2002), and Cobb (2003).

The fourth open-ended question invited respondents to add comments related to any part of the questionnaire. Nine individuals (18%) offered statements on a variety of topics, including what they felt was lacking in the curriculum, positive and negative remarks about the layout of the survey, and musical trends. The following quotations represent these topics (remaining comments are listed in appendix G):

I am new at this institution and hope to make a few changes. I feel that a working knowledge of major denominations and general Christian history is presently lacking. I learned most of sacred music trade on the job and in grad school. I'm pondering how to get practical experience paired with all the classroom work, without turning a state university into a seminary!

Good survey. I have answered the questions as they pertain to our current program. We are proposing extensive revisions, and I have attached a description of them in case you are interested.

Life is cyclic. Worship trends are too! As Eric Routley said, we gravitate from romantic to classical to experimental (contemporary) tendencies and back again. The best of each cycle, and that which remains closest to the biblical truth, are the texts, forms and musical entities that endure, and all of these should be used in an eclectic non-age specific offering to God.

Final Comments

Based on the present findings, one may reasonably conclude that the task of training church musicians is a challenging endeavor. Sacred music faculty continue to wrestle with issues such as the use of popular music in the curriculum, the preference for a master's degree versus an undergraduate degree in church music, the preference for a music-education degree over a sacred music degree, and the development of non-musical competencies such as theology, church history and interpersonal/people skills. Consequently, church music professors have varying opinions relative to the changes that should be made to the undergraduate sacred music degree.

There are, however, positive developments taking place within the church music programs. The first of these is the ongoing dialogue regarding the use of popular music in the curriculum. Although the majority of sacred music faculty at NASM schools support the use of popular styles, some oppose it for aesthetic, theological, and philosophical reasons. This exchange of ideas is essential, however, if the church music degree is to maintain its vitality.

Another substantial development, the strong five-year enrollment trend, revealed that enrollment at 80% of NASM schools either increased or remained relatively constant from 1999-2004. These are encouraging statistics for a program that experienced a 65% decline in enrollment between 1982 and 2000.

From the responses of the first two open-ended questions, it is reassuring to see that most professors acknowledge the value of an undergraduate sacred music degree. This course of study is preferred over a graduate program in church music and an undergraduate program in music education. With this level of support, sacred music

faculty are more likely to be committed to the long-term process of evaluating and improving the curriculum.

An increase in the number of church music courses offered over the past fifty-two years is yet another positive development. This study indicated that the overall number of church music classes offered at NASM institutions in the United States increased from fifty-five courses in 1967 to 193 courses in 2004. Additionally, from 1953 to the present, the mean of core church music courses increased from nine to nineteen credits.

The inclusion of an internship experience, another improvement, takes the sacred music degree to a new level. In the 1993-1994 NASM *Handbook*, additional guidelines were published recommending that institutions incorporate the field experience into the curriculum. Consequently, as of the current study, 74% of respondents indicated that an internship was required for their church music students.

Finally, a noteworthy development within the church music degree is the inclusion of some popular music topics. According to this study, a little to moderate emphasis is currently placed on praise and worship choruses; the use of popular music, blues, jazz, and gospel; and playing from lead sheets. Although educators feel there should be more emphasis on these items, some students are nevertheless being introduced to the language of popular music, a language they will likely be expected to use in their positions as ministers of music.

It is evident that great strides have been made in the development of the church music program since its inception. However, the success and vitality of this degree is contingent upon the ongoing dialogue between college professors, church leadership,

theologians, church music practitioners, and graduates of church music programs. This communication is necessary in order to define areas of strength and areas that need improvement.

As we move further into the twenty-first century, church music positions may require the use of more than one style of music. The curricula should continue to be evaluated and revised so students can function as musicians in a traditional, contemporary, or blended style. Church musicians must maintain musical integrity while being sensitive to emerging cultures and ethnically diverse congregations. Weadon states that “the narcissism of offering only the music of today is as dangerous as the antiquarianism of the use of only historical music in worship” (Weadon 1993, 439). This balance can be achieved only by church music directors who are competent in a variety of musical styles. As one respondent said, “we need a rigorous musical training, intended to prepare each student to be the best they can be so that each becomes a knowledgeable, flexible musician who can adapt his/her skills to the various repertoires encountered in the sacred music vocations.” If professors embrace this approach, colleges and universities will graduate competent, well-rounded church musicians who are prepared for the challenges of the future. If church musicians are well-prepared for these challenges, the undergraduate sacred music curriculum will certainly remain vital into the twenty-first century.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of the present study suggest the need for further investigation in the following areas:

1. A content analysis of graduate and post-graduate sacred music programs at NASM institutions needs to be completed and compared with the findings of this study as well as the findings of previous research on graduate church music curricula. This research could also include sacred music programs found in seminaries.
2. A study should be completed among sacred music graduates of NASM schools to assess the skills and competencies that ministers of music feel are most important in church music leadership. Music ministers could indicate opinions on curricular content, internships, and other aspects of the undergraduate sacred music degree. Data could then be compared to the competencies that church music faculty feel are most important in the current study.
3. A longitudinal study similar to this one could be implemented over a period of ten to fifteen years, with data being collected from the same institutions. A comparison could then be made analyzing trends and curricular changes. The best possibility for maintaining the vitality and growth of the undergraduate sacred music curricula will be the careful application of current research.

REFERENCE LIST

- Alreck, Patricia L. and Robert B. Settle. 1995. *The survey research handbook: Guidelines and strategies for conducting a survey*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baskerville, D. 1971. Black music, pop, and rock vs. our obsolete curricula. In *the proceedings of the 46th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 59, 53-60.
- Bearden, D. R. 1980. Competencies for a minister of music in a Southern Baptist church: Implications for curriculum development. Ph.D. diss., The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- Best, H.M. 1982. Church music curriculum. In *the proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 50, 137-139.
- Brady, M.M. 2002. An investigation of the use of contemporary congregational music in undergraduate sacred music programs. Ed.D. diss., Northern Illinois University.
- Breland, W. L. 1974. A survey of church music curricula in accredited non-church-controlled colleges and universities. Ph.D. diss., Indiana University.
- Brookhart, Edward. 1988. *Music in American higher education: An annotated bibliography*. Warren, Michigan: Harmonie Park Press.
- Bynum, A.C. 1975. Music programs and practices of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. D.M.A. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Carson, L. 1995. Changing times, enduring quality. In *the proceedings of the 70th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 83, 110-112.
- Chase, Gilbert. 1987. *America's music: From the pilgrims to the present*, rev. 3rd ed. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Cobb, G.W. 2003. One persons plea for a return to focus in worship. In *the proceedings of the 70th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 91, 261-267.
- Crawford, Richard. 2001. *America's musical life: A history*. New York: Norton.

- Crocker, D. J. (1985). Retention of music leadership in the church of the Nazarene. D.M.A. diss., University of Missouri-Kansas City.
- Davison, Archibald. 1933. *Protestant church music in America*. Boston: E.C. Shirmer.
- Davison, Archibald. 1952. *Church music: Illusion and reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dawn, M.J. 1995. *Reaching out without dumbing down: A theology of worship for the turn of the century*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Dean, Talmage W. 1988. *A survey of twentieth century protestant church music in America*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.
- Dickenson, W. 2002. University of Iowa: Institute for sacred music 2002. *The Diapason* (US) 93, (August): 20-21.
- Dillman, D.A. 2000. *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*, 2nd ed. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Dunbar D. G. 1970. A study of the church music curricula of selected religiously oriented liberal arts colleges. D.M.A. diss., University of Southern California.
- Ellinwood, Leonard. 1970. *The history of American church music*, rev. ed. New York: Da Capo Press.
- Emch, Duane. 1986. A music curriculum for Canadian Bible College. Ed.D. diss., Arizona State University.
- Farrier, W. H. 1963. Academic training in the field of church music in the United States. Master's thesis, University of Southern California.
- Fowler, F.J. Jr. 1995. *Improving survey questions: Design and evaluation*, vol. 38 of Applied Social Research Methods Series. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Graham, J.H. 1993. Conducting from the console: Potential employment and professional preparation of the organist/director. Ph.D. diss., University of Florida.
- Hamm, Charles. 1983. *Music in the new world*. New York: Norton.
- Hooper, W. 1965. The master's degree in church music in protestant theological seminaries of the United States. Ph.D. diss., George Peabody College for Teachers.

- Hsieh, Fang-Lan. 2003. *An annotated bibliography of church music*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Howard, J. and G. Bellows. 1957. *A short history of music in America*. New York: Crowell
- Keller, M. 1988. The most neglected part of a church musician's education: Learning how to deal with people. *Journal of Church Music* (April): 8-11.
- Kemp, John. 1981. Training leaders for church music. *Journal of Church Music* 6 (March): 2-6.
- King, B.R. 2003. Recent researches in music for worship as they might relate to music curricula. In the *proceedings of the 79th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 91, 247-255.
- Klassen, R. 1990. The influences of Mennonite college choral curricula upon music practices in American Mennonite churches. D.M.A. diss., Arizona State University.
- Lamb, M. 1990. Report on the panel discussion: "The impact of popular culture on church music." In the *proceedings of the 65th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 78, 91-92.
- Leach, L.M. 1983. A survey of music programs in schools of the American association of Bible colleges in Ohio and contiguous states. Ph.D. diss., The Ohio State University.
- Licon, P.A. 1989. Twentieth-century liturgical reform in the Catholic church and a sample of current choral literature. D.M.A. diss., Arizona State University.
- Marshall, J. 1997. Church music: Where music, language, and theology meet. In the *proceedings of the 72nd annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 85, 160-163.
- McKinney, J.C. Developing musical leadership for the church. *Music Educator's Journal* 49 (1) (September-October 1962): 65-66.
- Melton, J. L. 1987. Choral music curricula in Bible colleges: Recommendations for program improvement. D.M.A. diss., Arizona State University.
- Miller, D.L. 1990. Video selection of a Nazarene minister of music: Implications for college curriculum advisement. D.M.A. diss., University of Missouri-Kansas City.

- Morrison, D. 1957. The sacred music degrees (protestant) in the colleges, universities, and seminaries of the united states (1956-1957). Master's Thesis, Union Theological Seminary.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1943. *Bulletin of the national association of schools of music, No. 17*. Reston, VA.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1944. *Bulletin of the national association of schools of music, No. 19*. Reston, VA.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1945. *Bulletin of the national association of schools of music, No. 21*. Reston, VA.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1953. *Bulletin of the national association of schools of music, No. 37*. Reston, VA.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1957. *Bulletin of the national association of schools of music, No. 42*. Reston, VA.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1960. *Bulletin of the national association of schools of music, No. 48*. Reston, VA.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1962. *Bulletin of the national association of schools of music, No. 50*. Reston, VA.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1972. *1972 directory of the national association of schools of music*. Reston, VA.
- National Association of Schools of Music. 1993. *1993-1994 handbook*. Reston, VA.
- Pierce, E.A. 1994. The future of the church music curriculum: An evangelical viewpoint. In the *proceedings of the 69th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 82, 132-134.
- Pflueger, M.R. 1964. A study of selected undergraduate programs in protestant church music and implications for improved curricula. Ed.D. diss., Columbia University.
- Robinson, R. 1982. The sacred music degree—is it all that it could be? *proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 70, 140-143.
- Routley, E. 1950. *The church and music*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co.

- Routley, E. 1959. *Church music and theology*. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press.
- Routley, E. 1968. *Twentieth century church music*. London: H. Jenkins.
- Routley, E. 1970. *Words, Music and the Church*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Routley, E. 1977. Theology for church musicians. *Theology Today* 34 (April 1977): 20-28.
- Rox, D.W. 1995. Church music, culture wars, and speaking the truth in love—where have we been? In the *proceedings of the 70th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 83, 116-119.
- Sharp, S.P. 1977. Church Musician. *Music Educator's Journal*, 63, (March): 88.
- Stephens, G. 1964. Preparation of ministers of music by Southern Baptist colleges. Ed.D. diss., George Peabody College for Teachers.
- Smith, C. H. 1949. Academic training in the field of sacred music in American educational institutions: Present status and influence in school and the Protestant church. Master's thesis, University of Southern California.
- Thompson, Randall., E. Wilkins, and D. Moore. 1935. *College music: An investigation for the association of American colleges*. New York: Macmillan.
- Weadon, David. 1993. Clarence Dickenson (1873-1969) and the school of sacred music at union theological seminary in the city of New York (1928-1973). Ph.D. diss., Drew University.
- Wicker, V. 1999. Open forums—institutions offering church/sacred music programs: Report on the open forum (influence of mega-church movement on music ministry). In the *proceedings of the 74th annual meeting of the national association of schools of music*, 87, 69-72.
- Williams, F.M. 1969. A survey-appraisal of the music curricula of liberal arts colleges related to the Lutheran church in America. D.M.A. diss., Florida State University.

Appendix A

List of the Seventy NASM Institutions in Population

Anderson University	Newbery College
Appalachian State University	Northwest Nazarene University
Asbury College	Nyack College
Baptist College of Florida	Oklahoma Baptist University
Baylor University	Olivet Nazarene University
Belhaven College	Oral Roberts University
Belmont University	Ouachita Baptist University
Birmingham-Southern College	Palm Beach Atlantic University
Bluffton College	Philadelphia Biblical University
Brewerton-Parker College	St. Olaf College
Calvin College	Samford University
Campbellsville University	Seton Hill University
Capital University	Shenandoah University
Carson-Newman College	Shorter College
Carthage College	Southwest Baptist University
Centenary College	Southwestern University
Concordia University (Illinois)	Susquehanna University
Concordia University (Nebraska)	Texas Christian University
Dallas Baptist University	Toccoa Falls College
Drake University	Trevecca Nazarene College
East Carolina University (North Carolina)	Union University
East Texas Baptist University	University of Colorado (Boulder)
Evangel University	University of Evansville
Furman University	University of Mobile
Gardiner-Webb University	University of Tennessee (Knoxville)
Hardin-Simmons University	University of Tennessee (Chattanooga)
Howard Payne University	Valparaiso University
Lebanon Valley College	Wartburg College
Lee University	Wayland Baptist University
Luther College (Iowa)	Westminster Choir College (New Jersey)
Marywood University	Westminster College (Pennsylvania)
Mercer University	William Carey College
Messiah College	Wittenburg University
Mississippi College	
Missouri Baptist University	
Moody Bible Institute	
Moravian College	

Appendix B

Music Course Titles Offered in Academic Catalogs of Seventy NASM Sacred Music Programs

Church Music

Administrative Structures and Procedures

Church Music Administration (16)
Church Music Methods and Administration (3)
Church Music Organization and Administration (2)
Administration of Church Music (1)
Church Music Administration and Internship (1)
Church Music Administration and Materials (1)
Church Music Administration and Philosophy (1)
Liturgies and Service Structure (1)
Music Ministry Administration (1)
Organization and Administration of the Church Music Program (1)
Organization and Philosophy of Church Music (1)
Service Planning (1)

Church Music

Music in Worship (6)
Music and Worship (5)
Christian Worship (3)
Music in Christian Worship (3)
Church Music (2)
Church Music Ministry (2)
Worship in the Church (2)
Arranging for the Church (1)
Church Music I (Includes music and worship) (1)
Church Music II (Includes role of music in the church) (1)
Church Music III (Includes music and worship) (1)
Church Music V (Includes music and worship) (1)
Church Music and Liturgies (1)
Church Music and Liturgy (1)
Church Music and Worship (1)

Church Music (continued)

Church Music (continued)

Church Music Arranging (1)
Church Music Composition (1)
Church Music Ministries (1)
Church Music Ministry I (1)
Church Music Ministry II (1)
Liturgies (1)
Ministry of Music (1)
Musical Leadership in Worship (1)
Music and Worship in the Charismatic/Evangelical Church (1)
Music for the Contemporary Church (1)
Music in the Church Service (1)
Music in Worship and Evangelism (1)
Music Ministry (1)
Practical Church Music I (1)
Practical Church Music II (1)
Practice of Church Music (1)
Practice of Church Music Ministry I (1)
Practice of Church Music Ministry II (1)
Practicing Church Musician I (1)
Practicing Church Musician II (1)
The Church Musician (1)
The Church Music Minister (1)
The Church Music Program (1)
Worship (1)
Worship and Liturgies (1)
Worship and Music (1)
Worship and Music in the Life of the Church (1)
Worship Leadership II (1)
Worship Leadership Seminar (1)
Worship Practices (1)

History and Philosophy of Church Music

Church Music Philosophy (2)
Philosophy of Church Music (2)
Church Music V (1)
Church Music History/Practices (1)
Historical Perspectives in Music Ministry (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Church Music (continued)

History and Philosophy of Church Music (continued)

History and Philosophy of Music in Worship (1)
History of Church Music (1)
History and Philosophy of Church Music (1)
History of Christian Worship (1)
History of Church Music in America (1)
History of Hymnody (1)
History of Music and Worship (1)
History of Sacred Music (1)
History of Sacred Music and Worship (1)
Musical Heritage of the Church (1)
Philosophy and Practice of Sacred Music I (1)
Philosophy and Practice of Sacred Music II (1)
Theology and Music (1)
Theory and Practice of Church Music (1)
The Theological Foundations of Worship and Church Music (1)
Worship in Christian Tradition (1)

Hymnology

Hymnology (30)
Christian Hymnody (2)
Congregational Song (2)
Worship and Hymnology (2)
Chant/Liturgics (1)
Church Music V (1)
Church Music VI (1)
Congregational Song in Christian Worship (1)
Hymnody and Psalmody (1)
Hymnology and Congregational Song (1)
Liturgies and Hymnody (1)
Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs (1)
Sacred Music I: Liturgical Music and Hymnology (1)
Survey of Congregational Song (1)
Survey of Hymnology I (1)
Survey of Hymnology II (1)
Worship and Song in the Church (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Church Music (continued)

Internship

Church Music Internship (5)
Practicum in Church Music (5)
Internship (4)
Sacred Music Internship (3)
Church Music Practicum (2)
Field Study (2)
Field Work (2)
Internship in Church Music (2)
Music Ministry Internship (2)
Music practicum (2)
Practicum (2)
Seminar in Church Music (2)
Career Internship in Church Music (1)
Christian Ministry Internship (1)
Church Field Education (1)
Church Ministry Internship (1)
Church Music Field Work (1)
Church Music Field Work I (1)
Church Music Field Work II (1)
Church Music Practicum I (1)
Church Music Practicum II (1)
Church Music Seminar and Field Work (1)
Field Experience (1)
Field Work I (1)
Field Work II (1)
Individual Studies (field work) (1)
Music Internship (1)
Music Ministry/Chapel Choir Practicum (1)
Parish Music Fieldwork (1)
Practicum in Church Music Ministry (1)
Practicum in Music Ministry (1)
Sacred Music II: Church Music Management and Internship (1)
Sacred Music Practicum (1)
Sacred Music Professional Experience (1)
Seminar in Church Music Programs (1)
Supervised Field Experience in Church Music (1)
Supervised Field Work in Church Music (1)
Supervised Music Ministry (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Church Music (continued)

Internship (continued)

The Interning Minister of Music (1)

Introduction to Church Music

Introduction to Church Music (5)

Foundations of Church Music (2)

Introduction to Music Ministry (2)

Baylor Association of Church Musicians (1)

British Cathedrals and the Arts (1)

Church Music Observation (1)

Foundations of Christian Theology (1)

Foundations for Christian Ministry (1)

Foundations in Church Music (1)

Introduction to Baptist Denomination (1)

Introduction to Baptist Ministry (1)

Introduction to Church Music Ministry (1)

Introduction to Church Music: Philosophy and Administration (1)

Introduction to the Ministry of Music (1)

Lutheran Service (1)

Sacred Music Orientation (1)

Southern Baptist Church Music Conference (1)

Work of the Minister (1)

Relationships Between Sacred Music and the Music of General Culture

Contemporary Practices in Church Music (1)

Contemporary Trends (1)

Contemporary Worship Practices (1)

Issues in Church Music (1)

Issues in Music Ministry (1)

Music and Community (1)

Music, Worship and Culture (1)

Philosophy of the Arts and Culture (1)

Service Playing

Service Playing (12)

Service Playing I (5)

Church Music (continued)

Service Playing (continued)

Service Playing II (5)
Piano Service Playing (3)
Service Playing and Improvisation I (3)
Service Playing and Improvisation II (3)
Accompanying (2)
Improvisation (2)
Accompanying Techniques I (1)
Accompanying Techniques II (1)
Advanced Service Playing I (1)
Advanced Service Playing II (1)
Anthem Teaching/Accompanying (1)
Church Music III (1)
Church Music IV (1)
Church Music Accompaniment (1)
Church Service Playing I (1)
Church Service Playing II (1)
Church Service Playing III (1)
Hymn Playing/Improvisation (1)
Introduction to Service Playing (1)
Organ Accompanying (1)
Organ Construction and Design (1)
Organ Improvisation (1)
Organ Service Playing (1)
Piano Accompanying in Worship (1)
Service Music (1)
Service Playing and Improvisation (1)
Service Playing and Liturgical Leadership (1)
Service Playing and Repertory (1)
Service Playing: Organ (1)
Service Playing: Piano (1)
Service Playing Techniques (1)

Music Theory and Composition

Composition and Arranging

Choral Arranging (7)
Composition (5)
Beginning Composition with the Computer (1)
Arranging (1)
Arranging and Composing Methods (1)
Choral Arranging and Composition (1)
Choral Composition and Arranging (1)
Composition I (1)
Composition and Choral Arranging (1)
Composition and Improvisation (1)
Composition: Beginning (1)
Composition: Intermediate (1)
Composition: Advanced (1)
Introduction to Composition (1)
Songwriting and Arranging (1)

Counterpoint

Counterpoint (19)
Eighteenth Century Counterpoint (4)
Sixteenth-Century Counterpoint (4)
Modal Counterpoint (3)
Studies in Counterpoint (2)
Tonal Counterpoint (2)
Counterpoint I (1)
Counterpoint: Eighteenth Century (1)
Music Theory: Counterpoint (1)
Principles of Counterpoint (1)

Form and Analysis

Form and Analysis (30)
Form and Analysis I (5)
Analysis of Musical Structure (2)
Form (2)
Form and Analysis II (2)
Analysis of Musical Form (1)
Analysis of Tonal Music (1)

Music Theory and Composition

Form and Analysis (continued)

Analysis of Twentieth Century Music (1)
Music Theory: Form and Analysis (1)
Seminar in Form and Analysis (1)
Twentieth Century Analytical Techniques (1)

Introduction to Music

Introduction to Music Theory (4)
Fundamentals of Music (2)
Introduction to Music (2)
Introduction to Musical Styles and Ideas (1)

Music Theory

Music Theory II (19)
Theory I (19)
Theory II (19)
Music Theory I (18)
Theory III (18)
Theory IV (18)
Music Theory III (16)
Music Theory IV (15)
Musicianship I (7)
Musicianship II (7)
Musicianship III (6)
Musicianship IV (6)
Harmony I (6)
Harmony II (6)
Harmony III (5)
Advanced Theory I (5)
Advanced Theory II (5)
Elementary Theory I (5)
Elementary Theory II (5)
Harmony IV (4)
Music Theory V (3)
Chromatic Harmony (2)
Diatonic Harmony (2)
Theory V (2)

Music Theory and Composition

Music Theory (continued)

Written Theory I (2)
Written Theory II (2)
Advanced Harmony (1)
Advanced Harmony I (1)
Advanced Harmony IV (1)
Advanced Harmony and Analysis (1)
Advanced Musicianship I (1)
Advanced Musicianship II (1)
Advanced Music Theory (1)
Advanced Music Theory Laboratory (1)
Advanced Music Theory I (1)
Advanced Music Theory II (1)
American Popular Music/Jazz Theory I (1)
American Popular Music/Jazz Applied Lab I (1)
American Popular Music/Jazz Theory II (1)
American Popular Music/Jazz Applied Lab II (1)
Basic Musicianship I (1)
Basic Musicianship II (1)
Basic Musicianship III (1)
Basic Musicianship IV (1)
Basic Musicianship: Written Theory I (1)
Basic Musicianship: Written Theory II (1)
Basic Music Theory and Skills (1)
Chromatic Harmony and Compound Forms (1)
Development of Western Music (1)
Diatonic Harmony and Simple Forms (1)
Elementary Harmony I (1)
Elementary Harmony II (1)
Elementary Music Theory (1)
Elementary Music Theory Laboratory (1)
First Year Theory I (1)
First Year Theory II (1)
Freshman Theory I (1)
Freshman Theory II (1)
Freshman Theory III (1)
Intermediate Harmony (1)
Intermediate Music Theory I (1)
Intermediate Music Theory II (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Music Theory and Composition

Music Theory (continued)

Materials of Music I (1)
Materials of Music III (1)
Materials of Music V (1)
Materials of Music VII (1)
Music Theory A (1)
Music Theory B (1)
Music Theory C (1)
Music Theory D (1)
Music Theory and Ear Training I (1)
Music Theory and Ear Training II (1)
Music Theory and Ear Training III (1)
Music Theory VI (1)
Post-Tonal Music Theory (1)
Second Year Theory (1)
Sophomore Theory I (1)
Sophomore Theory II (1)
Techniques of Chromatic Music I (1)
Techniques of Chromatic Music II (1)
Techniques of Diatonic Music I (1)
Techniques of Diatonic Music II (1)
Theory, Form and Counterpoint I (1)
Theory, Form and Counterpoint II (1)
Theory, Form and Counterpoint III (1)
Theory, Form and Counterpoint IV (1)
Theory of Music I (1)
Theory of Music II (1)
Theory of Music III (1)
Tonal Harmony I (1)
Tonal Harmony II (1)
Twentieth Century Harmonic Practice (1)
Twentieth Century Theory (1)
Written Theory III (1)

Orchestration

Orchestration (29)
Instrumentation (2)
Instrumentation and Orchestration (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Music Theory and Composition

Orchestration (continued)

Orchestration and Arranging (1)

Sight-Singing and Ear-Training

Sight Singing/Ear Training I (9)

Sight Singing/Ear Training II (9)

Sight Singing/Ear Training III (8)

Aural Skills I (8)

Aural Skills II (8)

Ear Training I (8)

Ear Training II (8)

Ear Training III (7)

Sight Singing/Ear Training IV (7)

Aural Skills III (6)

Aural Skills IV (6)

Ear Training IV (6)

Theory I Lab (5)

Theory II Lab (5)

Aural Theory I (4)

Aural Theory II (4)

Aural Theory III (4)

Musicianship I (4)

Musicianship II (4)

Theory III Lab (4)

Theory IV Lab (4)

Advanced Ear Training I (3)

Advanced Ear Training II (3)

Elementary Ear Training I (3)

Elementary Ear Training II (3)

Musicianship IV (3)

Aural Theory IV (2)

Ear Training and Sight Singing I (2)

Ear Training and Sight Singing II (2)

Ear Training and Sight Singing III (2)

Ear Training and Sight Singing IV (2)

Musicianship III (2)

Musicianship Skills I (2)

Musicianship Skills II (2)

Music Theory and Composition

Sight-Singing and Ear-Training (continued)

Music Theory I (1)
Music Theory III (1)
Advanced Ear Training and Sight Singing I (1)
Advanced Ear Training and Sight Singing II (1)
Advanced Musicianship Skills (1)
Audiation I (1)
Audiation II (1)
Audiation III (1)
Audiation IV (1)
Aural Comprehension I (1)
Aural Comprehension II (1)
Aural Comprehension III (1)
Aural Comprehension IV (1)
Aural Perception (1)
Aural Skills Advanced (1)
Aural Skills and Improvisation (1)
Aural Skills Intermediate (1)
Basic Musicianship Laboratory I (1)
Basic Musicianship Laboratory II (1)
Basic Musicianship Laboratory III (1)
Basic Musicianship Laboratory IV (1)
Basic Musicianship: Sight Singing/Aural Training I (1)
Basic Musicianship: Sight Singing/Aural Training II (1)
Ear Training (1)
Ear Training and Keyboard III (1)
Ear Training, Sight Singing and Keyboard I (1)
Ear Training, Sight Singing and Keyboard II (1)
Elementary Ear Training and Sight Singing I (1)
Elementary Ear Training and Sight Singing II (1)
First Year Ear-Training and Keyboard I (1)
First Year Ear-Training and Keyboard II (1)
Fundamental Aural Skills (1)
Harmony, Sight Singing, and Ear Training III (1)
Harmony, Sight Singing, and Ear Training IV (1)
Intermediate Music Skills I (1)
Intermediate Music Skills II (1)
Lab (1)
Materials of Music II (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Music Theory and Composition

Sight-Singing and Ear-Training (continued)

Materials of Music IV (1)
Materials of Music VI (1)
Materials of Music VIII (1)
Musicianship Skills III (1)
Musicianship Skills IV (1)
Music Theory I (1)
Music Theory III (1)
Second Year Ear-Training and Keyboard I (1)
Second Year Ear-Training and Keyboard II (1)
Sightsinging I (1)
Sightsinging II (1)
Sightsinging III (1)
Sightsinging IV (1)
Sight Singing Advanced (1)
Sight Singing Intermediate (1)

Music History and Literature

Introduction to Music History

Introduction to Music Literature (3)
Introduction to Music History (1)
Introduction to Music History and Literature I (1)
Introduction to Music History and Literature II (1)
Introduction to Music Research I (1)

Literature

Music Literature I (6)
Music Literature II (6)
Survey of Music Literature (3)
Music Literature (2)
Music Literature III (1)
Music Literature IV (1)
Symphonic Literature (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Music History and Literature (continued)

Literature (continued)

Twentieth Century Literature and Performance Practices (1)

Twentieth Century Literature and Techniques (1)

Music History

Music History II (19)

Music History I (18)

History of Music I (12)

History of Music II (12)

History and Literature of Music I (5)

History and Literature of Music II (5)

Music History III (5)

Music History and Literature II (5)

Music History and Literature I (4)

History of Western Music to 1750 (3)

Music History IV (3)

Music History and Literature III (3)

Twentieth Century Music (3)

History of Music III (2)

History of Music from Antiquity to 1750 (2)

History of Western Music I (2)

History of Western Music II (2)

History of Western Music: 1750-1900 (2)

Advanced Study in Music History (1)

A History of Musical Style (1)

Art of Music (1)

A Survey of Music Literature (1)

Chamber Music (1)

Classical and Romantic Music (1)

Classic, Romantic and 20th Century (1)

Contemporary Music Since 1945 (1)

Classical and Romantic Music (1)

Early Music Seminar (1)

Exploring Music (1)

History I (1)

History II (1)

History III (1)

History and Literature I (1)

Music History and Literature (continued)

Music History (continued)

History and Literature II (1)
History and Literature III (1)
History of Music IV (1)
History of Music and Art I (1)
History of Music and Art II (1)
History of Music: Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance (1)
History of Music: Baroque and Classic (1)
History of Music from 1750 to Present (1)
History of Music: Contemporary (1)
History of Music: Romantic and Twentieth Century (1)
History of Music: The Classical Period (1)
History of Music: The Romantic Era (1)
History of Western Art Music I (1)
History of Western Art Music II (1)
History of Western Music since 1900 (1)
Literature and Language of Music (1)
Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque (1)
Music from Antiquity to 1750 (1)
Music from 1750 to the Present (1)
Music Historiography I (1)
Music Historiography II (1)
Music History and Analysis I (1)
Music History and Analysis II (1)
Music History and Analysis III (1)
Music History: Antiquity through Baroque (1)
Music History: Classic, Romantic, and Modern (1)
Music History: Classical through 20th Century (1)
Music History: Medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque (1)
Music History since 1900 (1)
Music of the Baroque, Classical and Early Romantic Eras (1)
Music of the Baroque Era (1)
Music of the Classical and Romantic Eras (1)
Music of the Late Romantic and Modern Eras (1)
Music of the Renaissance Era (1)
Music of the 20th Century (1)
Music of the Eighteenth Century (1)
Music of the Nineteenth Century (1)
Music of the Twentieth Century (1)

Music History and Literature (continued)

Music History (continued)

Order, Meaning and Function (1)
Piano in Chamber Performance (1)
Post-Romantic Period and 20th Century Music (1)
Special Topics in Music History (1)
Studies in Early Music (1)
Studies in Baroque and Classical Music (1)
Studies in Nineteenth Century Music (1)
Studies in Music: History, Philosophy, and Practice (1)
Studies in Music Since 1900 (1)
Survey of Music II (1)
Survey of Musical Style (1)
Survey of Music History I (1)
Survey of Music History II (1)
The History of Music Before 1600 (1)
The History of Music From 1600 to 1800 (1)
The History of Music From 1800 to World War I (1)
The History of Music From World War I to the Present (1)
The Music of the Classic and Romantic Eras (1)
The Music of the Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque Eras (1)
The Symphony from 1720-1880 (1)
Twentieth-Century Music History and Theory (1)
Twentieth Century Music to 1945 (1)
Twentieth Century Techniques (1)
Western Music to 1700 (1)
Western Music to 1750 (1)
Western Vocal Music from 1500 to 1750 (1)

Music in the United States

American Music (1)
American Musical Heritage from 1500 to the Present (1)
U.S. Music (1)

Music of the General Culture

Contemporary Cultures (1)
Music in World Cultures (1)
Music of Diverse Cultures (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Music History and Literature (continued)

Music of the General Culture (continued)

Music of World Cultures (1)

Popular Music From the 1930's to the Present: A Cultural Mirror (1)

World Music

World Music (8)

Introduction to World Music (3)

Musics of the World (3)

Asian Music (1)

Music of the World's Peoples (1)

Seminar in World Music (1)

Studies in Ethnic Music (1)

Survey of World Music (1) 1 cr. 37

World Music Cultures and Missions (1)

World Music Laboratory (1)

Applied Music

Applied Composition

Applied Composition (1)

Applied Conducting

Applied Conducting (1)

Applied Guitar

Guitar (42)

Class Guitar (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Applied Music (continued)

Applied Harpsichord

Harpsichord (1)

Applied Organ

Organ (68)

Improvisation I (1)

Improvisation II (1)

Introduction to Organ (1)

Applied Piano

Piano (60)

Keyboard Harmony (4)

Class Piano IV (3)

Keyboard Harmony I (3)

Keyboard Harmony II (3)

Class Piano (2)

Class Piano I (2)

Class Piano II (2)

Class Piano III (2)

Keyboard I (2)

Keyboard II (2)

Advanced Functional Piano I (1)

Advanced Functional Piano II (1)

Advanced Keyboard Skills and Improvisation (1)

Advanced Piano Class I (Secondary applied) (1)

Advanced Piano Class II (Secondary applied) (1)

Advanced Piano Skills (1)

Basic Keyboard Skills I (1)

Basic Keyboard Skills II (1)

Beginning Functional Piano (1)

Beginning Group Piano I (1)

Beginning Group Piano II (1)

Class Jazz/Contemporary Keyboard I (1)

Class Piano Instruction (1)

Elementary Functional Piano (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Applied Music (continued)

Applied Piano (continued)

Functional Keyboard Skills (1)
Intermediate Functional Piano (1)
Intermediate Group Piano I (1)
Intermediate Group Piano II (1)
Keyboard III (1)
Keyboard IV (1)
Keyboard Accompaniment (1)
Keyboard Class I (1)
Keyboard Class II (1)
Keyboard Harmony III (1)
Keyboard Harmony IV (1)
Keyboard Skills (1)
Piano Class (1)
Piano Class I (Secondary applied) (1)
Piano Class II (Secondary applied) (1)
Piano Class III (1)
Piano Laboratory I (1)
Piano Laboratory II (1)
Piano Laboratory III (1)
Piano Laboratory IV (1)
Piano Seminar (1)

Applied Voice

Voice (66)
Class Voice (4)
Voice Class (instrumental concentration) (2)
Advanced Voice Class I (1)
Advanced Voice Class II (1)
Beginning Voice Group I (1)
Beginning Voice Group II (1)
Classical Vocal Seminar (1)
Class Voice for Instrumentalists (1)
Class Voice Instruction (1)
Fundamentals of Singing (1)
Fundamentals of Vocal Techniques (1)
Musical Theatre I (1)
Techniques I (voice class) (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Applied Music (continued)

Applied Voice (continued)

Techniques II (voice class) (1)

Understanding the Voice (1)

Voice Class I (1)

Voice Class II (1)

Applied Orchestral Instruments

Brass

Brass (40)

Percussion

Percussion (40)

Strings

Strings (41)

Woodwinds

Woodwinds (39)

Diction

Diction for Singers (5)

Diction (3)

Diction I (3)

Diction II (3)

French Diction (3)

German Diction (3)

Vocal Diction (voice concentration) (3)

Diction for Singers I (2)

Diction for Singers II (2)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Applied Music (continued)

Diction (continued)

English and Italian Diction (2)
Latin and Italian Diction (2)
Diction and Song Literature I (1)
Diction and Song Literature II (1)
Diction for Vocal Majors I (1)
Diction for Vocal Majors II (1)
English Diction (1)
French and German Diction (1)
French Diction for Singers (1)
Functional Diction for Singers (1)
German Diction for Singers (1)
Italian Lyric Diction for Singers (1)
Singer's Diction (1)
Singer's Diction I (1)
Vocal Diction I (1)
Vocal Diction II (1)
Voice Diction (1)
Voice: Diction Lab (Voice Majors) (1)
Voice Lab (1)

Junior/Senior Recital

Senior Recital (50)
Junior Recital (14)
Half Recital (2)
Capstone Recital (1)
Full Recital (1)

Recital Attendance

Recital Attendance (34)
Recital (4)
Recital Hour (4)
Recital Lab (3)
Music Colloquium (2)
Music Seminar (2)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Applied Music (continued)

Recital Attendance (continued)

Performance Seminar (2)
Recital Class (2)
Recitals (2)
Concert Attendance (1)
Concert Music (1)
Concerto (1)
Concert Practice (1)
Music Convocation (1)
Music Department Recital (1)
Music Major Seminar (1)
Performance (1)
Performance Arts Class (1)
Performance Attendance (1)
Performance Lab (1)
Recital and Concert Attendance (1)
Recital Performance (1)
Recital/Workshop Attendance (1)
Repertory Seminar (1)
Seminar/Performance Lab (1)
Student Recital (1)
Student Recital Hour (1)

Senior Project

Senior Seminar (4)
Senior Project (3)
Church Music Project (1)
Independent Study in Music (1)
Senior Capstone (1)
Senior Composition Project (1)
Senior Project in Music (1)
Senior Research Project (1)
Senior Thesis (1)

Studio Class

Master Class (1)
Piano Seminar (piano Majors only) (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Applied Music (continued)

Studio Class (continued)

Repertory and Studio Class (1)
Solo Class (1)
Studio Class (1)

Conducting

Basic Conducting

Basic Conducting (15)
Conducting (13)
Conducting I (11)
Introduction to Conducting (7)
Elementary Conducting (4)
Beginning Conducting (3)
Fundamentals of Conducting (3)
Conducting Lab (2)
Church Music I (1)
Conducting Fundamentals (1)
Foundations of Choral Conducting (1)
Methods and Techniques of Conducting (1)
Principles of Conducting (1)
Techniques of Conducting (1)

Choral Conducting

Choral Conducting (32)
Choral Conducting I (2)
Choral Conducting Lab (2)
Choral Conducting and Literature I (1)
Choral Conducting and Techniques (1)

Instrumental Conducting

Instrumental Conducting (16)
Instrumental Conducting and Literature (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Conducting (continued)

Instrumental Conducting (continued)

Instrumental Conducting and Literature II (1)
Instrumental Conducting Lab (1)
Orchestral Conducting (1)

Intermediate/Advanced Conducting

Advanced Conducting (8)
Conducting II (8)
Advanced Choral Conducting (4)
Choral Conducting II (2)
Advanced Choral Conducting and Literature (1)
Advanced Choral Techniques (1)
Advanced Conducting I (1)
Advanced Conducting II (1)
Advanced Instrumental Conducting (1)
Choral and Instrumental Conducting (1)
Church Music II (1)
Church Music III (1)
Church Music IV (1)
Church Music VI (1)
Conducting II-Choral (1)
Conducting III (1)
Conducting IV (1)
Conducting from the Console (1)
Conducting Project (1)
Intermediate Conducting (1)
Seminar in Advanced Conducting (1)

Performance Organizations

Choral Groups

Primary Choral Ensembles

Concert Choir (19)
Chapel Choir (11)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Performance Organizations (continued)

Choral Groups (continued)

Primary Choral Ensembles (continued)

Chorale (9)
Women's Chorus (7)
University Chorale (6)
Choral Union (5)
Men's Chorus (5)
Oratorio Chorus (4)
University Choir (4)
Women's Chorale (4)
A Cappella Choir (3)
Campus Choir (3)
College Choir (3)
Collegiate Chorale (3)
Women's Choir (3)
Collegium Musicum (2)
Concert Chorale (2)
Kantorei (2)
Men's Chorale (2)
Women's Ensemble (2)
Anderson Symphonic Choir (1)
Appalachian Chorale (1)
ASU Glee Club (1)
Bach Collegium Musicum (1)
Baylor Men's Choir (1)
Belhaven Chorale (1)
Belmont Chorale (1)
Bison Glee Club (men) (1)
Bisonette Glee Club
Cantare (1)
Cantorei (1)
Carthage Choir (1)
Carthage Community Chorus (1)
Carthage Women's Ensemble (1)
Cathedral Choir (1)
Centenary Choir (1)
Choral Arts Society (1)
Choral Society (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Performance Organizations (continued)

Choral Groups (continued)

Primary Choral Ensembles (continued)

Chorus (1)
College Singers (1)
Community Chorus (1)
Concert Chorus (1)
Concert Singers (1)
Conservatory Choir (1)
Consort Singers (1)
Covenant Choir (1)
Crusader Choir (1)
Drake Choir (1)
Drake Chorale (1)
Drake University Community Chorus (1)
Early Music Singers (1)
ECU Choral Scholars (1)
Furman Chorale (1)
Furman Singers (1)
HSU Chorale (1)
International Choir (1)
Kapelle (1)
Manitou Singers (1)
MBU Choral Society (1)
Meistersingers (1)
Men's Choir (1)
Men's Glee Club (1)
Mercer University Choir (1)
Moody Chorale (1)
Moody Men's Collegiate Choir (1)
Nordic Choir (1)
Norsemen (1)
Orpheus Choir (1)
Pike Kor (1)
Ritterchor (1)
SBU Chorale (1)
Schola Cantorum (1)
Shenandoah Chorus (1)
Shorter Chorale (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Performance Organizations (continued)

Choral Groups (continued)

Primary Choral Ensembles (continued)

Southern Chorale (1)
Southwestern University Chorale (1)
Southwestern University Singers (1)
St. Elizabeth Chorale (1)
St. Olaf Cantorei (1)
St. Olaf Choir (1)
Symphonic Choir (1)
Treble Choir (1)
Treble Tones (1)
Union University Singers (1)
University A Cappella Choir (1)
University Chorus (1)
University Concert Chorale (1)
University Singers (1)
University Women's Choir (1)
Valparaiso University Chorale (1)
Viking Chorus (1)
Wartburg Choir (1)
Wittenberg Choir (1)
Women's Concert Choir and Bell Ensemble (1)
Women Singers (1)

Secondary Choral Ensembles

Chamber Singers (14)
Opera Workshop (9)
University Singers (6)
Chamber Choir (5)
Opera Theatre (5)
Madrigal Singers (2)
Opera/Musical Theatre Production (2)
Opera Studio (2)
Accent! (1)
Ambassadors (1)
Baylor Showtime (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Performance Organizations (continued)

Choral Groups (continued)

Secondary Choral Ensembles (continued)

Bel Canto (1)
Belmont Chamber Singers (1)
Black Gospel Choir (1)
Camerata (1)
Camerata Singers (1)
Cantus Singers (1)
Capella (1)
Chattanooga Singers (1)
Evangelistic Singers (1)
Gospel Choir (1)
Heritage Singers (1)
Jazz Singers (1)
Laboratory Choir (1)
Ladies of Lee (1)
Lee Singers (1)
Lincoln Chamber Singers (1)
Lyric Singers (1)
Lyric Theatre (1)
Madrigalians (1)
Madrigals (1)
Mercer Chamber Singers (1)
Mercer Singers (1)
Musical Theatre Ensemble (1)
Musical Theatre Workshop (1)
Newberry College Singers (1)
Northwesterners (1)
Opera (1)
Opera Chorus (1)
Opera Production (1)
Operaworks (1)
Ouchita Singers (1)
PBA Singers (1)
Shenandoan Singers (1)
Singers (1)
Singing Mocs (1)
Theatre Production (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Performance Organizations (continued)

Choral Groups (continued)

Secondary Choral Ensembles (continued)

Theatre Workshop I (1)
University Chamber Singers (1)
Vocal Chamber Ensemble (1)
Vocal Ensemble (1)
Vocal Ensemble-Allusion (1)
Vocal Jazz Choir (1)
Vocal Jazz Ensemble (1)
Voices of Lee (1)
Voices of Mobile (1)
Wayland Singers (1)
Wittenberg Singers (1)

Instrumental Groups

Primary Instrumental Ensembles

Handbell Choir (13)
Concert Band (11)
Orchestra (10)
Symphonic Band (10)
Wind Ensemble (10)
Guitar Ensemble (8)
Accompanying (7)
String Ensemble (7)
Marching Band (6)
Handbells (3)
Symphonic Winds (3)
Symphony Orchestra (3)
University Orchestra (3)
University Band (2)
University Ringers (2)
Appalachian Symphony Orchestra (1)
Band (1)
Belmont Band (1)
Belmont Orchestra (1)
College Band (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Performance Organizations (continued)

Instrumental Groups (continued)

Primary Instrumental Ensembles (continued)

College-Community Orchestra (1)
College Ringers (1)
College Orchestra (1)
College Wind Ensemble (1)
Collegiate Orchestra (1)
Concert Orchestra (1)
Concert Handbell Choir (1)
Concert Ringers (1)
Handbell Ensemble (1)
Lima Symphony Orchestra (1)
MBU Ringers (1)
Mercer/Macon Symphony Youth Orchestra (1)
Mercer Wind Ensemble (1)
Moody Symphonic Band (1)
Ouchita Handbell Ringers (1)
PBA Symphony (1)
Symphonic Wind Ensemble (1)
Trevecca Symphony (1)
Union University Handbell Choir (1)
University Concert Band (1)
University Handbell Choir (1)
Wayland Handbell Ensemble (1)
Westmoreland Symphonic Winds (1)
Westmoreland Symphony Orchestra (1)
Wind Symphony (1)

Secondary Instrumental Ensembles

Jazz Ensemble (10)
Percussion Ensemble (10)
Brass Ensemble (6)
Jazz Band (6)
Woodwind Ensemble (6)
Chamber Orchestra (4)
Piano Ensemble (4)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Performance Organizations (continued)

Instrumental Groups (continued)

Secondary Instrumental Ensembles (continued)

Chamber Ensemble (3)
Brass Choir (2)
Chamber Music (2)
Flute Choir (2)
Instrumental Ensemble (2)
Brass Ensemble/Hallelujah Brass (1)
Chamber Winds (1)
Double Reed Ensemble (1)
Ensemble Playing and Accompanying (1)
Flute Ensemble (1)
Instrumental Chamber Ensemble (1)
Lee Symphonic Band (1)
MBU Jazz Band (1)
Mercer Jazz Ensemble (1)
Pop-Rock Lab Ensemble (1)
Recorder Consort (1)
Special Ensembles (1)
Stage Band (1)
String Chamber Ensemble (1)
Studio and Ensemble Accompanying (1)
Winds of Triumph (1)

Literature

Choral/Vocal Literature

Choral Literature (10)
Survey of Music Literature (3)
Choral Literature I (2)
Choral Literature II (2)
Choral Literature and Materials (1)
Choral Literature and Methods (1)
Choral Literature and Pedagogy (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Literature (continued)

Choral/Vocal Literature (continued)

Choral Masterworks (1)
Choral Repertoire (1)
Opera and Oratorio Literature and Vocal Pedagogy (1)
Song Literature I (1)
Song Literature II (1)
Studies in Music Literature (1)
Survey of Choral Literature (1)
Survey of Music Literature I (1)
Survey of Music Literature II (1)
Survey of Oratorio and Cantata Literature (1)
Vocal Literature (1)
Vocal Performance Literature (1)

Church Music Literature

Church Music Literature (6)
Sacred Vocal Literature (4)
Church Choral and Solo Literature (2)
Church Music Literature and Materials (2)
Sacred Choral Literature (2)
Sacred Music Literature (2)
Choral Literature for the Church (1)
Choral Music of the Church (1)
Introduction to Music Literature (1)
Introduction to Music Literature and Fine Arts (1)
Music Literature (1)
Music Literature for the Church (1)
Sacred Music Literature and Materials (1)
Sacred Solo Literature (1)

Guitar Literature

Classical Guitar Literature I (1)
Classical Guitar Literature II (1)

Instrumental Literature

Instrumental Literature (2)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Literature (continued)

Instrumental Literature (continued)

Instrumental Music in the Church (1)
Instrumental Performance Literature (1)
Symphonic/Chamber Literature (1)

Organ Literature

Organ Literature (9)
Church Music III (1)
Church Music IV (1)
Keyboard Literature for the Church (1)
Literature of the Organ (1)
Organ Literature I (1)
Organ Literature II (1)
Organ Literature and Design (1)
Organ Literature and History (1)
The Organ and Its Literature I (1)
The Organ and Its Literature II (1)

Piano Literature

Piano Literature I (5)
Piano Literature II (2)
Piano Literature (1)
Piano Literature through Beethoven (1)

Unspecified

Technique and Literature of the Major Instrument I (1)
Technique and Literature of the Major Instrument II (1)

Methods and Materials

Choral Methods

Choral Techniques (2)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Methods and Materials (continued)

Choral Methods (continued)

Choral Conducting Methods (1)
Choral Literature and Advanced Choral Techniques (1)
Choral Materials (1)
Choral Procedures (1)
Choral Techniques and Materials (1)
Graded Choir (1)
Graded Choir Techniques (1)
Teaching Choral Music (1)

Church Music Methods

Church Music Education (6)
Church Music Education I (3)
Church Music Education II (3)
Children’s Music Ministry (2)
Church Music Methods (2)
Youth and Adult Music Ministry (2)
Choir Training for Young Singers (1)
Church Choir Development (1)
Church Music I (1)
Church Music II (1)
Church Music for Youth (1)
Church Music for Children and Youth (1)
Church Music Materials and Methods I (1)
Church Music Materials and Methods II (1)
Material and Methods for Church Musicians (1)
Music and Drama Workshop (1)
Music Ministry Methods (1)
Music Ministry: Preschool-Children (1)
Music Ministry with Children (1)
Music Ministry with Youth and Adults (1)
Music Ministry: Youth-Adult (1)

Elementary/Secondary Methods

Beginning Band (1)
Beginning Orchestra (1)
Elementary Methods (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Methods and Materials (continued)

Elementary/Secondary Methods (continued)

Elementary Music Education (1)
Elementary Music Methods and Materials (1)
Elementary School Music Methods, K-6 (1)
Elementary School Music Methods, Materials, and Observation (1)
Elements of Music I (1)
Elements of Music II (1)
General-Music Methods (1)
Instructional Strategies and Practices in Secondary Choral Music (1)
Instructional Strategies and Practices in Secondary Instrumental Music (1)
Music Education Methods (1)
Music Education Methods: Introduction to Teaching and Elementary Music (1)
Music for Children (1)
Music for Adolescents (1)
Music in Elementary Schools (1)
Music in the Elementary School (1)
Music, Learning and Children (1)
Older Children and Music (1)
Secondary Choral Methods (1)
Secondary Methods (1)
Secondary Music Education (1)
Teaching Music to Children (1)
The Child and Adolescent Voice (1)
Vocal Music Ed IV: Choral Music P-12 (1)

Instrumental Methods

Brass

Brass Methods (3)
Brass I (1)
Brass Instruments Class (1)
Brass Methods Class (1)

Combined

Brass and Percussion Class (1)
Brass and Percussion Instruments (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Methods and Materials (continued)

Instrumental Methods (continued)

Combined (continued)

String and Percussion Methods (1)
Strings and Woodwinds Class (1)

General

Instrumental Methods (2)
Instrumental Fundamentals (1)
Instrumental Methods I (1)
Instrumental Methods II (1)
Instrumental Methods and Literature (1)
Instrumental Methods and Materials (1)
Instrumental Methods for Vocal Music Education Majors (1)
Instrumental Perspectives (1)
Marching Band Techniques (1)
Methods and Materials (1)
Recreational Music (1)
Survey of Instrumental Techniques (1)

Handbell

Handbell Class (1)
Handbell Leadership (1)
Handbells (1)
Handbell Methods (1)
Handbell Techniques (1)
Handbell Techniques I (1)
Handbell Techniques II (1)
Introduction to Handbells (1)

Percussion

Percussion Methods (2)
Percussion (1)
Percussion Instruments Class (1)
Percussion Methods Class (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Methods and Materials (continued)

Instrumental Methods (continued)

String

String Instruments Class (2)
String Fundamentals (1)
String Methods (1)
String Methods Class (1)
Strings (1)

Woodwind

Woodwind Methods (3)
Woodwind Instruments Class (2)
Woodwind Methods Class (1)
Woodwinds I (1)

Instrumental Pedagogy

Instrumental Pedagogy (4)
Advanced Instrumental Pedagogy (1)
Brass Pedagogy (1)
Classical Guitar Pedagogy (1)
Methods for Teaching General-Music (1)
Music Pedagogy (1)
Percussion Pedagogy (1)
String Pedagogy (1)
Woodwind Pedagogy (1)

Organ/Piano Pedagogy

Piano Pedagogy (13)
Organ Pedagogy (10)
Piano Pedagogy and Literature (2)
Introduction to the Organ (1)
Piano Pedagogy I (1)
Piano Pedagogy and Accompaniment I (1)
Piano Pedagogy and Accompaniment II (1)
Piano Pedagogy and Accompaniment III (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Methods and Materials (continued)

Unspecified

Applied Principle Pedagogy (1)
Directed Study in Area Pedagogy and Literature (1)
Pedagogy (1)

Voice Pedagogy

Vocal Pedagogy (18)
Voice Pedagogy (5)
Directed Teaching of Voice (1)
Pedagogy I (1)
Pedagogy II (1)
Pedagogy of Music I (voice) (1)
Pedagogy of Music II (voice) (1)
Vocal-Choral Pedagogy (1)
Vocal Pedagogy I (1)
Vocal Pedagogy II (1)
Vocal Pedagogy and Choral Techniques (1)
Vocal Pedagogy and Literature (1)

Technology

Advanced Technology Courses

Advanced Music Technology (1)

General Technology Courses

Music Technology (3)
Audio Technology (1)
Computer Applications in Music (1)
Computers in Music (1)
Music and Technology (1)
Music Computer Lab I (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Technology (continued)

General Technology Courses (continued)

Music Computer Lab II (1)
Music Computer Lab III (1)
Music Computer Lab IV (1)
Principles of Music Technology (1)
Synthesizers and Sequencing (1)
Technology for Music Ministry (1)

Introductory Courses in Technology

Introduction to Music Technology (7)
Basics of Sequencing and Computer Notation (1)
Beginning Composition with the Computer (1)

Software Courses

Computer Music Editing (1)
Finale (1)
Introduction to Music Software (1)

Proficiency

Conducting

Conducting Proficiency (1)

Computer

Computer Proficiency (2)
Music Technology Proficiency (1)

General

Capstone Course in Musical Thinking (1)
Comprehensive Exam in Music (1)
Freshman Platform (1)

Appendix B – *Continued*

Proficiency (continued)

General (continued)

Music Vocabulary Proficiency (1)
Secondary Examination (1)
Sophomore Hearing (1)
Sophomore Platform (1)
Sophomore Technical (1)
Upper Division Admission Exam (1)

Guitar

Guitar Proficiency (1)

Piano

Piano Proficiency (70)

Sight-Singing/Ear-Training

Sight Singing Proficiency (2)
Ear-Training Proficiency (1)

Voice

Voice Proficiency (8)

Miscellaneous

Music Orientation (1)
Introduction to Music Study (1)

Appendix C

Questionnaire

**AN ANALYSIS OF UNDERGRADUATE SACRED MUSIC CURRICULUM
CONTENT IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NORTH AMERICA
ACCREDITED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF
MUSIC**

This study is a survey of undergraduate sacred music programs in colleges and universities accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. Results of this research will assist the writer in the completion of his doctorate at the University of Oklahoma. All schools that offer an emphasis, concentration, or specialization in church music, are asked to respond.

Please return questionnaire on or before February 18, 2005 to:

William DeSanto, Chair
Music Department
Valley Forge Christian College
1401 Charlestown Road
Phoenixville, PA 19460

The phrase "church music program" will be used in parts of this questionnaire to encompass both the bachelor's degree in church music and an emphasis in church music. If your institution offers an emphasis or concentration in church music rather than a bachelor's degree in church music, your response to all questions in this survey is still needed.

1. Type of institution:
 - Public
 - Private
2. Length of terms:
 - Semesters
 - Quarters
 - Other
3. Total number of undergraduate music majors (all degrees):
 - 1-80
 - 81-160
 - 161-240
 - 241-320
 - 321-400
 - 401 or more
4. Total undergraduate enrollment in the church music program:
 - 1-10
 - 11-20
 - 21-30
 - 31-40
 - 41 or more
5. Over the past 5 years enrollment in your undergraduate church music program has:
 - Increased
 - Decreased
 - Remained relatively constant
6. Is an internship required for the church music program?
 - Y (Continue to #7)
 - N (Skip to #10)
7. How many total clock hours are required to complete the undergraduate church music internship? _____
8. How many church music majors completed an undergraduate internship during the 2003-2004 academic year?
 - None
 - 1-4
 - 5-8
 - 9-12
 - 13 or more
9. What activities or responsibilities are required as part of the undergraduate internship? (check all that apply)
 - Rehearsal planning
 - Directing choral ensemble rehearsal
 - Directing instrumental ensemble rehearsal
 - Conducting ensemble during church service
 - Service playing
 - Worship planning
 - Worship leading
 - Observing church music directors
 - Teaching private lessons (voice, piano, etc.)
 - Contemporary worship band participation
 - Assisting with drama or musical
 - Assisting with technology in the church
 - Other (please specify):

10. How many undergraduate students graduated with a degree in church music (or emphasis) in the 2003-2004 academic year?
 _____ None
 _____ 1-4
 _____ 5-8
 _____ 9-12
 _____ 13 or more
11. What percentage of your graduates from the 2003-2004 academic year were placed in a full-time church position? _____
12. Listed below are topics typically offered in a church music program, either as a single course or as a topic within a course.

Column A - Circle the amount of emphasis this topic is given for students in the church music program.

1- No Emphasis 2-Little Emphasis 3-Moderate Emphasis 4-Much Emphasis

Column B - Rate the importance of each topic based on the value you place on each item in preparing students for church music leadership.

1- Not Important 2-Moderately Important 3-Important 4-Very Important

(Rate the importance of each course topic in column B even if you indicate that an item is not part of your curriculum in column A).

Topics	Column A				Column B			
	Emphasis				Importance			
CHURCH MUSIC	No			Much	Not			Very
Philosophy of church music	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Hymnology/congregational song	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Pipe organ construction/repair	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Introduction to church music	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Current trends in church music	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Orders of worship/worship planning	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Liturgies	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Administrative structures and procedures	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Relationship between sacred music and the music of the general culture	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Interrelationship of sacred music with other art forms	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Ecumenical training	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Worship music from non-western cultures	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

Topics	Column A				Column B			
MUSIC THEORY	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Music theory	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Aural skills	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Counterpoint	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Form and analysis	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Composition	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Choral arranging	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Orchestration/arranging	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Arranging for contemporary worship band	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

MUSIC HISTORY	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Medieval/Renaissance	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Baroque	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Classical	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Romantic	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
20 th century music	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Ethnomusicology	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Popular music	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

APPLIED MUSIC	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Applied voice (voice majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Applied voice (non-voice majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Applied piano (piano majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Applied piano (non-piano majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Applied organ (organ majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Applied organ (non-organ majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Applied instrument (instrumental majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Applied instrument (non-instrumental majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Vocal diction	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Piano proficiency requirement	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Voice proficiency requirement	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

CONDUCTING	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Choral conducting	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Instrumental conducting	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Rehearsal planning	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

Topics	Column A				Column B			
ENSEMBLE	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Choral ensemble (voice/keyboard majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Choral ensemble (instrumentalmajors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Orchestral ensemble (voice/keyboard majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Orchestral ensemble (instrumental majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Concert band ensemble	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Praise & Worship band for credit	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Praise & Worship band volunteer in chapel	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

LITERATURE	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Organ literature (organ majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Organ literature (non-organ majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Vocal solo literature (voice majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Vocal solo literature (non-voice majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Sacred choral literature (liturgical)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Sacred choral literature (non-liturgical)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

METHODS AND MATERIALS	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Children's choral methods and materials	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Handbell methods	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Youth choral methods and materials	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Adult choral methods and materials	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Worship band methods and materials	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

FUNCTIONAL KEYBOARD SKILLS (all students)	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Improvisation	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Harmonization	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Transposition	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Modulation	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Sight-reading	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Score reading	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Accompanying	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Playing by ear	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Service playing	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

Topics	Column A				Column B			
--------	----------	--	--	--	----------	--	--	--

PEDAGOGY	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Vocal pedagogy (voice majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Piano pedagogy (piano majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Organ pedagogy (organ majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Instrumental pedagogy (instrumental majors)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

POPULAR MUSIC	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Use of popular, blues, jazz, gospel	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Playing from lead sheets	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Praise and Worship choruses	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

TECHNOLOGY	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Intro to music technology	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
MIDI	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Presentation graphics training	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Recording techniques	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

OTHER COURSES AND TOPICS	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Theology	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Church history	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Church drama/Musicals	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Foreign language	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Interpersonal/people skills	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

FINAL PROJECTS	Emphasis				Importance			
	No			Much	Not			Very
Junior recital	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Senior recital	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Internship/practicum	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Internship that includes contemporary worship	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

13. Do you feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of a graduate program rather than an undergraduate program?

Yes No Please explain:

14. Do you feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of an undergraduate music education degree rather than an undergraduate church music degree? Yes No Please explain:

15. What changes are needed to strengthen the church music curriculum in North America to keep the degree vital?

16. Is there anything else related to this questionnaire you would like to add?

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey. To ensure confidentiality, no identifying information will be reported in the study.

Check here if you would like a final report of the results of this study sent to you.

Appendix D

Cover Letter to Pilot Study Participants

Dear Colleague:

I would like to express my appreciation for being willing to assist in the development of my research instrument. As you know, I am doing an analysis of undergraduate sacred music curriculum content in colleges and universities accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. This research is being conducted as part of my doctoral studies in Piano Performance and Pedagogy at the University of Oklahoma.

As a sacred music professor, your input is invaluable to this study. Please answer the questions in the survey, noting the length of time required for completion. Provide specific comments about the questionnaire and the cover letter, as you consider formatting issues, overall impression, clarity of wording and instructions, and if some questions were difficult to answer.

Feel free to write comments and suggestions for revisions directly on the survey or on a separate sheet of paper and please return the documents in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope by December 20, 2004.

Once again, thank you for your time and participation in this pilot test.

Sincerely,

Bill DeSanto
Department Chair
Valley Forge Christian College

Appendix E

E-mail to Department Chairs

Dear Colleague:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Jane Magrath in the School of Music at the University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus. As part of my doctoral studies in Piano Performance and Pedagogy I am involved in a research study being conducted under the auspices of the University of Oklahoma. The title of my study is “An Analysis of Undergraduate Sacred Music Curriculum Content in Colleges and Universities Accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music”

A component of my research involves the distribution of a questionnaire to music faculty members at NASM schools who are most familiar with the undergraduate sacred music program. Consequently, input from a faculty member at your institution would be invaluable to my research. Would you please reply to this e-mail by recommending the name of a faculty member in your department who would be most knowledgeable to answer questions related to the sacred music curriculum?

Since a study focusing solely on the church music curriculum of NASM schools has not been completed in 30 years, the results of this research should be helpful and informative to department chairs and sacred music faculty.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (610) 917-1438 or e-mail at wfdesanto@vfcc.edu. Questions about your rights as a research participant or concerns about the project should be directed to the Institutional Review Board at the University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

Your assistance and guidance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bill DeSanto
Department Chair
Valley Forge Christian College

Appendix F

Cover Letter to Sacred Music Professors

Dear Colleague:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Jane Magrath in the School of Music at the University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus. I invite you to participate in a research study being conducted under the auspices of the University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus, entitled *An Analysis of Undergraduate Sacred Music Curriculum Content in Colleges and Universities Accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music*. This research is being conducted as part of my doctoral studies in Piano Performance and Pedagogy at the University of Oklahoma.

A component of my research involves the distribution of a questionnaire to music faculty members at NASM schools who are most familiar with the undergraduate church music program. Your department chair, Dr. _____, recommended your name and indicated that you would be the most appropriate person to answer the questions in the survey. As an authority in the field of sacred music, your assistance in this project would be invaluable. There will be no cost to you other than the time it takes to complete the survey.

The enclosed survey, which will take 20 minutes to complete, is intended to gather information on your institution and the sacred music curriculum. Would you please answer the questions and return the survey in the stamped, enclosed envelope by February 25, 2005? Please feel free to write any additional comments on the questionnaire and to consult with other music faculty members in your department. The published results will be presented in summary form only and will be designed to protect the anonymity of all individuals and schools.

Since a study focusing solely on the church music curriculum of NASM schools has not been completed in 30 years, I hope to contribute a useful tool for each NASM institution as they continue to evaluate and develop the sacred music curriculum. If you are interested in receiving a report on the results of this study for your department, please check the appropriate response at the end of the questionnaire.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (610) 917-1438 or e-mail at wfdesanto@vfcc.edu. Questions about your rights as a research participant or concerns about the project should be directed to the Institutional Review Board at the University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

By returning this questionnaire in the envelope provided, you will be agreeing to participate in the above described project.

Your support and time are greatly appreciated. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Bill DeSanto
Department Chair
Valley Forge Christian College

Appendix G

Complete Responses from Open-Ended Questions of Survey

Question 13: “Do you feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of a graduate program rather than an undergraduate program?”

NO. Undergraduate training is essential and sufficient:

While the training of church musicians can be expanded and deepened at the graduate level, undergraduate training can be meaningful and effective.

I feel like our undergraduate program offers everything I received in my graduate program.

Basic training in church music can be accomplished in an undergraduate program. Advanced study is encouraged and very helpful. Conferences can supplement classroom training.

We attempt to prepare students for basic church music positions and for graduate study, not to take the place of seminary or graduate training.

I feel like our undergraduate program offers everything I received in my graduate program.

All aspects of church music training—skills, history, interpersonal skills—should be taught from the undergraduate level.

The key to training a church musician is vocational formation and the 4 year undergraduate experience can be better structured and is at a more formative time for the student.

Churches need trained musicians now, not in two more years when one is finished with a graduate program. Those with specialized interests and talent should be encouraged to go on.

Not necessarily. A good undergraduate program can be valuable in that many church positions are volunteer or part-time.

It is then (typically) in a music school/conservatory setting. Students are not as easily able to interact with other departments, campus worship, etc.

NO, sacred music training should commence at the undergraduate level:

In the current climate, very few of our students will go to seminary (this is a real change from 15 years ago). So, the undergraduate degree is the only academic study in church music that they will get.

Graduate program would be too late; many students don't pursue graduate work.

In our tradition-leadership is expected sooner. Undergraduate training should be required-graduate training should be a choice.

Many of our church music graduates begin serving churches as full-time music ministers directly out of college. Some go on to seminary or other graduate study, but a fair number continue to serve full-time without further study.

It depends on the situation. Our school is an undergraduate institution. Some of our graduates go on to graduate school. Many graduates go on to serve local churches with small music programs. Therefore, undergraduate sacred music education is vital.

Our music majors come with significant prior musical training and are looking for present church music experience. They are ready to consider issues and practice of church music.

Many of our students go directly to church music positions from college. Fewer churches are requiring graduate study.

No. Both undergraduate and graduate-level training are important:

There is so much musical training that must be accomplished in the undergraduate work, it is difficult to cover all the areas needed in the church field.

It needs to begin at the undergraduate level and continue at the graduate level.

It depends on a student's background. Students with an undergraduate degree in music education, for instance, would be well served by a graduate church music program if they enter with good keyboard and choral skills. Others need the additional time an undergraduate program provides to develop those skills.

I think the four years of the undergraduate gives time to explore a wide range of topics, and develop skills in multiple musical styles. The graduate program can hone and focus the broader palette.

On some levels I think students might be better able to develop specific skills (musical) and learn a broad overview of theory and history driving the undergraduate degree, while the more general topics (musical and philosophical, administrative) can be learned at the graduate level once the basic musical foundation has been "set". However, both approaches have merit and I have seen students at all levels thrive and succeed. Many who wait until their graduate degree to specialize in sacred music have to spend considerable time making up for deficiencies in their undergraduate studies and often express how much they wish they had found their direction earlier.

Both are valuable. However, the undergraduate major should be foundational rather than extensive (with primary emphasis upon developing basic musicianship).

Our undergraduates spend so much time in general music education that we have little time to have specific courses. However, it is essential to keep the program in the undergraduate. Ideally a student should have both undergraduate and graduate.

I think undergraduate school is the best place for developing general skills for all musicians and graduate school should focus on the development of specific skills.

The undergraduate degree can train its student more soundly in basic musicianship, but the undergrad is rarely ready to move beyond likes and dislikes into a people-centered ministry.

Yes. The undergraduate curriculum is already overburdened:

The undergraduate curriculum is crowded as is, you can't effectively add sufficient church music courses and get real depth.

Precious little time in our undergraduate program to get our core curriculum accomplished given the background (or lack thereof) they enter with.

This particular curriculum is overwhelming! Lots of hours. I feel that its scope is of graduate proportions. On the other hand, many students do not continue to grad school. They'll need something!

Yes, but that shouldn't rule out excellent undergraduate training and exposure in the field.

Yes. Skills can only be realized within the context of a graduate degree:

The task of church music requires strong skills. Graduate study begins with prerequisite skills and can then expand upon them.

Leadership skills, musical development, and life experience. Undergraduates are just learning their craft. The complexities of professional life in the church world require graduate training.

Students would be at a higher level of skill at the graduate level.

I do feel that the undergraduate program serves as an introduction to the church musician, but graduate work is a must!

Yes. Undergraduate students lack understanding of specialized training.

Specialized training for a more mature student is more effective.

I find fewer students who even discuss the music ministry option as 18-20-year-olds. Most gravitate toward that vocation at the end of their undergraduate studies or a while later.

Question 14: “Do you feel that the training of a church musician would be more effective in the context of an undergraduate music education degree rather than an undergraduate church music degree”?

No. Music education is a busy curriculum:

Not enough opportunity in many music ed programs for courses specific to church music.

The undergraduate degrees in music education are already so full that there would be little to no time for the church music aspects.

This can be a good preparation for church music, because it provides the teaching skills and experience with children so necessary for a church musician. But there simply isn't enough room in the schedule to do a full education degree and still learn all things a church musician needs to know, and finish in four years.

There are too many requirements in our music education program-almost requires five years.

I did a double major in church music and music education and personally found many of the music education courses very helpful. We make our church music majors take some of the music education courses. But to do the whole

music education degree would be too much- and they also need some religion training.

The music education degree is already too time-consuming.

Too many education requirements mandated by state as it is. Would take them five years to complete!

The music education degree at our school is already overloaded with course work. While the aspect of education in church work is fundamental, I don't see combining the two as working at our school.

Too many other education courses to fulfill; not enough religion /theology.

No. Church music requires specific courses and training:

While much of the coursework is the same, there are certain areas unique to church music- worship, hymnology, administration, etc.

If the curriculum is well planned, an undergraduate church music degree will provide a better focus in preparation for ministry in this area.

While much valuable experience falls in the structure of a music education degree, there are more important things for future church musicians to study than some of the typical course work of a music education degree which would preclude, for reasons of time, such studies.

One reason our church music major numbers are so low is that the former music administrator steered students into music education and reasoned 'they can always lead music in a church.' At least a dozen of our recent music education graduates are 'serving' churches full-time right now, and they are simply not equipped in worship principles or hymnology or church music administration, or church politics. Many are having difficulty.

Most students are entering church music fields straight out of college. They need at least some training in the field, even if it is just introductory.

There are some common components. However, a music education degree would leave the student missing some valuable and necessary learning experiences.

Not necessarily. Music education can contribute to church music, but not replace it.

General music education has different objectives from a church music education program. Although they share many skills and “book topics”, by the junior year there should be a marked departure in specialization.

No. There is no correlation between the two degrees:

Music education and church music are two entirely different foci for the student. The church music major must be trained in hymnology (including what makes a hymn worthy), service playing, organ literature, etc. The BME student is now required to learn not only techniques for teaching music but for reading, special education, etc. as well.

Music ed programs are bloated with irrelevant course materials.

Student teaching and certification requirements are not applicable, exactly, to church music.

Our music education program includes many teacher education courses that have little relationship to church music and prevent students from taking other studies and courses related to church music.

If students do not intend to do school music and they are not passionate about teaching they should be allowed to follow their call and passion.

Yes. Skills from a music education degree is valuable and provides job security:

Good principles of music education transfer to sacred music and give ‘job Security’ for graduates.

We are doing this since our sacred music program includes quite a bit of our music education core. It means summer school or an extra year but I believe that people trained in education make effective leaders in our churches and the education degree provides more job security. That is if they have had basic church music courses-hymnology, liturgy, etc., service playing.

Access to methods courses.

Yes and No. It is contingent upon the student’s future plans:

Yes and no – we encourage students to consider music education with a church music minor. For those unwilling to go an extra year the church music degree does them well.

Yes, if a master’s degree at a seminary could be mandated at the conclusion of the undergraduate degree. No, if the student was not going to seminary.

Question 15: “What changes are needed to strengthen the church music curriculum in North America to keep the degree vital”?

More emphasis needs to be placed on various musical styles:

Emphasis on diversity. Quality maintained in a variety of stylistic approaches. Balance of approaches.

Throughout the curriculum, current trends (being careful of fads) must be addressed (particularly technology) without sacrificing the history and traditions of church music. With today's churches being wide ranging, today's students must have a wide range.

Current trends and styles have to be addressed while keeping our traditional/historical base.

The programs should not be watered down with too much emphasis on contemporary worship. Students need to have exposure but majority of time needs to be spent with the highest quality of music available.

A willingness to address contemporary issues and practices without rejecting tradition.

Preparation in a variety of styles; Encourage, prepare and equip students to seek excellence, regardless of style.

More interaction with current church music. However, students (currently) must know most of what they've known in the past and must know much more.

Further integration of the skills needed for contemporary church music into the curriculum while continuing a broad-based preparation.

Greater attention to “contemporary worship”: philosophy, theology, methodology, skills required, etc. (but without sacrificing development of basic musicianship).

The music component of “worship” degrees needs to remain strong. Emphasis on current trends in church music should not take the place of musical skills training, but should play a major role in the preparation of future church musicians.

Studies need to include “liturgical”, “traditional”, “blended” and “contemporary” paradigms.

The curriculum must continue to stress philosophy, history, strong foundations, biblical examples and exhortations, spending much less time on teaching “trendiness.” The “praise and worship” band approach must be incorporated into the whole of church music, not take over the entire focus!

My own church music undergrad program, while well taught, was too philosophical and book-oriented, and too pigeon-holed in one approach and denomination. I think a balance is necessary with lots of hands-on instruction as well as work with world music. Regardless of how we feel about it, we also cannot stick our heads in the sand about contemporary Christian music. We need to at least discuss it and the issues related to it.

We need to be more relevant to the worship practices of the 21st century, while maintaining the early Christian worship practices.

Less emphasis needs to be placed on popular music:

I don't think curriculum is the problem. A reliable job market with wages and working conditions needs to be there, and the opportunity for musicians who love classical music (including sacred music) to work in churches without pressure to include substandard styles needs to be there.

I am at a loss! I felt called into music ministry and was seminary educated (Master's) to that end. Now, however, I view church music as a wasteland. I'm sorry to be so pessimistic-whatever happened to "giving of one's best to the Master??"

Other Changes needed to strengthen the church music curriculum:

More detailed study of the history and roots of American church music (including the study of our European heritage). More time studying hymnology. More emphasis on ethnomusicology and pastoral training.

A textbook!, more open minds for faculty. Ongoing practical experience beyond internship.

1) Stronger biblical foundation 2) More versatile musicians 3) better contextualization skills 4) better interpersonal skills 5) More comprehensive understanding of culture/worldview.

Music programs and offerings in seminaries need to be enlarged and improved! That's the change we need.

More focus on worship; more attention given to content and theology than style; “cross-training” in both choral and instrumental areas.

I can only say that we try to strive toward 1. A firm foundation in the rich historical traditions as expressed in Western classical art music and the rich tapestry of hymnody from pre-Christian roots to the present; a thorough grounding in Bible history, the history and theology of worship and a familiarity with representative current liturgical practices as well as the philosophical foundations of the vocation. 2. A rigorous musical training, intended to prepare each student to be the best can be so that each becomes a knowledgeable, flexible musician who can adapt his/her skills to the various repertoires encountered in the sacred music vocations. 3. To help each students recognize his/her gifts and apply these to his/her vocational calling.

Need for forward thinking/vision of integrating music as a ministry tool.
Creativity of bridging past heritage with future.

Strengthen ties between colleges and ministry leaders.

Addition of: technology: audio, video, lights and multi-media; Spiritual foundations; Leadership training; Worship: History, forms, philosophy; Pastoral skills: grief, conflict management, basic counseling.

We have broaden(ed) our program from “church music” to worship arts.

More focus on vocational foundation – the why of church music as well as the craft.

Convince administration to recognize the importance of the organ – our dean doesn’t!

We need to reach out to high school students and encourage them to start their training as organists then. College students are already too old to begin the necessary coordination of hands and feet (although I teach beginner college organ students every semester). We need special scholarship to encourage good piano students to study organ.

Make sure there is good theological training.

Graduate students with excellent skills on a philosophy of church music which has solid theological roots. Have them read everything Marva Dawn and Erik Routley ever wrote.

Broader skill training (not just organ), greater emphasis on theological understanding.

Question 16: “Is there anything else related to this questionnaire you would like to add”?

I am new at this institution and hope to make a few changes. I feel that a working knowledge of major denominations and general Christian history is presently lacking. I learned most of sacred music trade on the job and in grad school. I’m pondering how to get practical experience paired with all the classroom work, without turning a state university into a seminary!

Our church music degree is new. We have no graduates yet for this reason.

Good survey. I have answered the questions as they pertain to our current program. We are proposing extensive revisions, and I have attached a description of them in case you are interested.

I found it frustrating to try to evaluate courses in our curriculum which I do not teach.

I found this emphasis/importance set-up difficult. I would rather have just shared what’s in the curriculum. For example: if church musicians are required to take one 2-credit counterpoint class, it doesn’t mean that counterpoint is “not emphasized” – we think it’s important but don’t need 12 credits! I didn’t know what constituted “emphasizing” something.

Our tradition is the minister of music-conductor, singer and church music educator rather than an organist/choirmaster.

Life is cyclic. Worship trends are too! As Eric Routley said, we gravitate from romantic to classical to experimental (contemporary) tendencies and back again. The best of each cycle, and that which remains closest to the biblical truth, are the texts, forms and musical entities that endure, and all of these should be used in an eclectic non-age specific offering to God.

The emphasis in many churches even in this questionnaire on so-called “praise” music is most distressing. We must show students why these songs are musically and theologically unfit to be used in a “worship” service of God (as opposed to worship of self-feeling good, entertainment). “Praise” is a glorious word that has been degraded by “praise” bands and “praise” songs. However, there is hope. High school students I know are turning against the shallow triviality of this type of church music. My college students are more vehement than I in condemning it. This is a tsunami that will recede.

Best wishes!