


1958

Teaching Music Theory in High School Music classes: A Comparative Study of Current Practices in High Schools of the State of Washington

William L. Wicker
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Methods Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wicker, William L., "Teaching Music Theory in High School Music classes: A Comparative Study of Current Practices in High Schools of the State of Washington" (1958). *Electronic Theses*. Paper 195.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship and Creative Works at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU.

TEACHING MUSIC THEORY IN HIGH SCHOOL MUSIC CLASSES:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN
HIGH SCHOOLS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington College of Education

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
William L. Wicker
July, 1958

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Wayne S. Hertz, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Maurice L. Pettit

Joseph S. Haruda

LD
5771.3
W636t

SPECIAL
COLLECTION

92940

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.	1
Music theory as part of the total picture.	4
The problem.	5
Statement of the problem	5
Importance of the study.	6
Limitations of the study	7
Organization of the study.	7
Definition of terms used	8
Music theory	8
Course of study.	9
Vocal and instrumental classes	9
Music theory courses	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
The role of music in secondary education	10
The place of theory in the music	
curriculum	13
Definitions of music theory.	15
The basic approach to music theory	16
Music theory in high school performing	
groups	18
Current practices and suggestions.	18
Bases for organizing the special music	
curriculum	23

	iii
CHAPTER	PAGE
Music theory courses	25
Summary.	27
III. THE QUESTIONNAIRE: PROCEDURE AND GENERAL	
INFORMATION.	29
General information.	30
Range and per cent of enrollments.	30
Number of music teachers employed at the	
high school level.	32
Degree to which a course of study is	
planned for use in presenting music	
theory	34
Vocal classes.	35
Instrumental classes	36
Music theory courses	38
Summary.	39
IV. THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON THEORY IN	
HIGH SCHOOL MUSIC CLASSES.	41
Analysis of emphasis placed on music	
theory in vocal classes.	42
Select choir	42
General chorus	44
Boys' glee club.	45
Girls' glee club	46
Vocal ensembles.	46

CHAPTER

PAGE

Beginning chorus	47
Voice class.	47
Analysis of emphasis placed on music	
theory in instrumental music classes . .	50
Advanced band.	50
Intermediate band.	52
Advanced orchestra	53
Intermediate orchestra	53
Instrumental ensembles	54
Dance band	55
Private lessons.	55
Analysis of emphasis placed on music	
theory in music theory courses	58
General Music.	58
Music Theory	60
Harmony.	60
Harmony and General Music.	61
Harmony and Arranging.	61
Harmony and Composition.	61
Music History.	62
Music Appreciation	62
Composition.	63
Music Survey	63
Summary.	65

CHAPTER

PAGE

V. OBSTACLES IN THE WAY OF INCLUDING MUSIC

THEORY COURSES IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

CURRICULUM 69

Reasons given for not including music

theory courses in the curriculum 69

Class A schools. 70

Class B schools. 71

Class C schools. 71

Class D schools. 72

Reasons given for discontinuing music

theory courses 75

Class A schools. 75

Class B schools. 76

Class C schools. 76

Information submitted by schools planning

to offer music theory courses in the

future 78

Course titles. 78

Course content 79

Class A schools. 79

Class B schools. 81

Class C schools. 81

Class D schools. 81

Summary. 84

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. AN ANALYSIS OF TWENTY MUSIC THEORY COURSES OFFERED IN WASHINGTON STATE HIGH SCHOOLS.	86
Class A schools	87
General Music	87
Harmony	90
Composition	90
Harmony and General Music	90
Music Theory.	90
Music History	90
Music Survey.	91
Class B schools	91
General Music	91
Harmony and Arranging	93
Harmony and Composition	93
Music Appreciation.	93
Music Theory.	93
Class C schools	93
Summary	95
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	96
The questionnaire	97
Trends indicated by the questionnaire .	97
Difficulties encountered in establishing theory courses	98
Suggested theory course contents.	99

CHAPTER	PAGE
	vii
	99
Bases for established theory courses.	99
Conclusions	100
Recommendations for future study.	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	104
APPENDIX A. The questionnaire and letter to	
music educators	108
APPENDIX B. Degree of planning for music	
theory presentation	114

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Evaluation of music subjects for study in high school by prospective school music majors.	20
II. Summary of general information submitted by music teachers responding to the questionnaire	31
III. Degree to which a course of study is planned for use in presenting music theory. .	37
IV. Emphasis placed on music theory in high school vocal classes.	43
V. Summary of the emphasis placed on music theory in high school vocal classes . . .	49
VI. Emphasis placed on music theory in high school instrumental classes	51
VII. Summary of the emphasis placed on music theory in high school instrumental classes	57
VIII. Emphasis placed on music theory in music theory courses.	59
IX. Summary of the emphasis placed on music theory in music theory courses.	64
X. Summary of the emphasis placed on music theory in all music classes and courses .	67

TABLE

PAGE

XI.	Comparative grouping of music theory according to the emphasis received in high school music classes and courses	68
XII.	Reasons for not including music theory courses in the curriculum	73
XIII.	Reasons for discontinuing music theory courses	77
XIV.	Proposed titles for music theory courses.	80
XV.	Suggested course contents of music theory courses	83
XVI.	Percentage and distribution of music theory courses offered in high schools	88
XVII.	An analysis of ten music theory courses offered in class A high schools	89
XVIII.	An analysis of eight music theory courses offered in class B high schools	92
XIX.	An analysis of two music theory courses offered in class C high schools	94

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

From time immemorial, music has held an important and undisputed place in the history of man. Primitive man developed mystic rituals employing music which dealt with every phase of his life; religion, love, the planting and harvesting of crops, hunting, war, and the complete range of human emotions and experiences. Through the centuries music has held its place in man's life in varying degrees and capacities, and at present music, in all its varying forms, connotations and uses, contributes a large and indispensable part of our cultural heritage. Who among us can imagine a world in which there was no music, whether it be the trilling of a bird or the great swelling of a symphony orchestra?

As music became more complex during the passing of centuries, it necessarily demanded a more exhaustive study in order to gain comprehension of the art. With each passing generation this study has taken on more and more aspects as the art has developed and matured. Style, musical form, media for performing, listening to and studying music are constantly changing, and educational institutions which include music in the curriculum must keep pace with the changes and developments, if they are to do a satisfactory

job of instruction.

"By general concensus, the school is now regarded as a section of life itself, not merely a place of preparation for life."¹ Music, as one of the fine arts, has now gained an important and respected place in the curriculum offerings of the American educational system. This acceptance of music in our school systems is well justified by Chambers, when he states:

If. . .there is to be any provision for what has been known as culture, that place should be taken by the arts which are prominent in the life of our time. And first among the arts comes music (1) because of its age-old and deep reaching appeal to our most powerful emotions, and (2) because it is now the most universal of all the arts, affecting us both in our hours of work and our hours of leisure.²

Many objectives, aim, and purposes have been voiced countless ways as justification for the presentation of music in our schools. For example, Article I of the Child's Bill of Rights in Music states that:

Every child has the right to full and free opportunity to explore and develop his capacities in the field of music in such ways as may bring him happiness and a sense of well-being; stimulate his imagination and stir his creative activities; and to make him so responsive that he

¹W. Otto Meissner, "Music As Integrated Experience," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1937), p. 123.

²Will Grant Chambers, "What Company Should Music Keep?" Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook, (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1929), p.40.

will cherish and seek to renew the fine feeling induced by music.³

Kwalwasser, in discussing public school music, writes:

The schools should afford the child as rich a musical experience as possible, so that. . .subtle cultural values may be realized. Not that music is unique in this respect, but because it reveals the "heart" of a people. The language, the aspirations, the hopes, the fears, are all eloquently expressed in the music of different people.⁴

Regardless of the manner in which these purposes and objectives are expressed, authorities on the subject generally agree that the primary aim of music education in the public schools should be acquainting students with the cultural and recreational value of music, the role in history which music has played, and the basic fundamentals of our present music system as it is employed in the creation of the art. They further generally agree that all children should have ample opportunity to develop their capacities in, and appreciation for, worthwhile music which meets their interests and needs, deepens their appreciation of music through greater understanding, and gives them the means for a permanent, satisfying emotional outlet throughout their lives. Thus, if the public schools of America

³North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, The Child's Bill of Rights in Music (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1951), p. 3.

⁴Jacob Kwalwasser, Problems in Public School Music (New York: M. Witmark and Sons, 1932), p. 155.

can produce young people whose music instruction has led them to a genuine enthusiasm for music which carries over into adult life, they will have fulfilled their obligation to society by passing on the cultural heritage of music.

Music Theory as Part of the Total Picture.

If, as most leading educators of today agree, each child in our educational system should be considered in the light of total growth, according to his interests, needs and capacities, then music, as a part of that total growth, should occupy a place in the educational structure. In turn, music, as a unified whole, should be studied in terms of its component parts in order to more fully understand the entire subject.

On the basis of this reasoning, the statement may be predicated that music theory, as an integral and indispensable component of the art of music, should be included in today's school music curriculum. The true aim of "theoretic" instruction, as stated by Murphy, is "to promote an understanding of music through a growing awareness of musical structure in terms of musical needs."⁵ The problem which confronts public school music educators today is not whether music theory shall be included in the curric-

⁵Howard A. Murphy, Teaching Musicianship (New York: Coleman-Ross Company, Incorporated, 1950), p. 18.

ulum, but rather where, in the often overcrowded and over-pressured curriculum, shall it be placed? How much theory is it advisable and necessary to include? Which of the many phases of music theory should be stressed as being more important in the educational scheme of things? How can such instruction be utilized in fulfilling the total aims of our educational policies?

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to investigate the current educational practices in providing for the teaching of music theory in the high schools of the State of Washington.

How do school districts of various sizes meet this problem? Do they have a definite policy concerning the inclusion of music theory in the curriculum? What degree of emphasis is placed on the various types of theory? Do music directors feel that they are able to teach an adequate amount of theory under present conditions and, if not, what planning is being done to improve conditions? These are some of the questions which this comparative study endeavored to answer.

It is hoped that, as a result of this study, further investigation will be made into the problem and that a suggested course of study for music theory will evolve which will more adequately meet the needs and requirements of our high school music students.

Importance of the study. School administrators, music specialists and music supervisors are constantly striving to improve the curriculum content of their music departments. Yet too often, in the course of a busy school year, they have little time or opportunity available for evaluating their music curriculums in the light of other music departments. True, the directors and students perform for one another at music concerts, festivals and contests, but only the finished product is evaluated. The course content and manner of presentation which is responsible for the development of these programs too often remains a mystery. For this reason, it was felt that a comparative survey of current practices of teaching music theory in the high school music classes of the State would be of value, not only to music specialists and supervisors, but also to public school administrators who are interested in improving and enriching their music curriculums.

If this study has indicated what educational practices are being followed in presenting to students the music

theory with which they should be acquainted, not only as an aid to performance, but also as a prerequisite to true understanding and appreciation of music, it will have been useful. If, in addition, it can provide a measure for comparison by which schools may evaluate, organize and re-organize their music theory curriculum in the light of current educational practices in other music departments, then it will have served the purpose for which it was intended.

Limitations of the study. This study was based on questionnaire responses from one hundred and twenty-four high school music teachers of Washington State.

II. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I offers justification for the inclusion of music theory as a necessary part of every music curriculum. It also states the purpose and importance of the study, limitations of the study, and defines terms which are used throughout the study. Chapter II presents a review of literature which is pertinent to the study. Chapter III presents an analysis of general information obtained from the questionnaire, as well as an analysis of

the degree to which a course of study is planned and followed by music directors in presenting music theory. Chapter IV states the degree of emphasis, as indicated by questionnaire returns, placed on various types of music theory in (1) vocal classes, (2) instrumental classes, and (3) music theory courses. Chapter V presents (1) an analysis, based on questionnaire returns, of obstacles in the way of including music theory courses in the high school curriculum, (2) reasons given for discontinuing theory courses, and (3) general information submitted by respondents planning to offer music theory courses in the future. Chapter VI presents a general analysis of twenty music theory courses offered in high schools of Washington State. In the light of foregoing chapters, Chapter VII presents a summary and draws certain conclusions based on trends indicated by the questionnaire.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Music theory. The term "music theory," for purposes of this study, shall be defined as a body of facts and principles about the construction and notation of music, as distinguished from performance.

Course of study. The term "course of study," throughout this study, refers to that entire series of explanations, studies, drills, and practices which is planned in advance by the music director for the purpose of systematizing music theory instruction.

Vocal and instrumental classes. Performing groups such as band, orchestra, and chorus, which are offered as a regular part of the high school curriculum, are referred to throughout this study as vocal and instrumental classes.

Music theory courses. Music courses offered as a part of the regular school curriculum which have, as their primary objective, the rational organization of musical experiences with regard to writing, reading, listening to, analyzing, and creating music, are referred to as music theory courses throughout this study. These theory courses are to be distinguished from vocal and instrumental classes.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Even a cursory glance through the available literature reveals a wealth of illuminating material, with regard to both "theoretic" instruction and music education in general. Since, for present purposes, any discussion of "theory" must use "music education" as a constant point of reference, this chapter assumed the following twofold purpose: (1) a review and re-defining of the general purposes of secondary education, and (2) a clarification and development of the role which "theoretic instruction plays, or should play, with regard to the total educational picture in secondary music classes.

I. THE ROLE OF MUSIC IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Music Educators Source Book states, in part, that:

. . .The primary aim of the senior high school music program should be to offer many musical experiences to every student so as to build for continuing growth and expansion of participation and appreciation. The musical experiences offered every child should, of course, include either participation in or frequent listening to the fine high school bands, orchestras, and choirs which for so long have been a matter of great school pride.¹

¹"Senior High School Music," Music Education Source Book (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1947), p. 13.

Lest the place which music education occupies in the total educational picture be forgotten, Miessner wrote:

. . .it is a fact that music, like each of the other arts and sciences is, in turn, an integral part of a larger whole which we may term life, experience, or state of culture; it is intimately related with life situations; indeed, it could not exist independently of them. . . It is, then, the responsibility of the music teacher to preserve this relationship of music with the rest of life, and so to induct the child into meaningful experiences with music that it may become an integral, essential part of his life.²

Music educators generally agree that secondary music should be a development and enrichment of what has come before, as well as preparation for life to come. Music instruction, according to Chambers, should have (1) intrinsic value, (2) practical or utilitarian value, (3) cultural value, and (4) preparatory value.³ Thus, secondary music courses should be complete in themselves for those not planning to continue music in higher education, and they should have preparatory value for students interested in more advanced study. As Weaver stated, "The purpose of music instruction in the schools

²W. Otto Meissner, "Music As Integrated Experience," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1937), p. 117.

³Will Grant Chambers, "What Company Should Music Keep?", Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1929), p. 42.

is dual: to develop appreciation as a cultural asset, and to develop technical proficiency for vocational or avocational purposes."⁴

This twofold purpose of secondary music education suggests the problem of individual differences. Helen Boswell, in discussing types of students found in music classes, segregates them into the following three groups:

(1) The largest group will be those who will never make music a vocation, but who are vital to the survival of music as an art. . . For them, there are, in the high schools, the music course offering small credit, such as general chorus.

(2) The next group is smaller but equally important. It includes those gifted young people who may become fine amateurs and the most discriminating consumers. Music will be their chief avocational interest.

(3) The third group of students to consider. . . is that small group whom we think are justified in entering the music field with the idea that it offers a living.⁵

The Rochester, Minnesota, public schools, recognizing the problem of individual differences with regard to musical talent and abilities, have established definite

⁴Paul J. Weaver, "High School Music Credits," Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1929), p. 138.

⁵Helen Boswell, "High School Music Credits," Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1937), p. 99.

objectives, which include: (1) the finding and special encouragement of the musically-gifted child, (2) the presentation of a variable course of study to meet wide differences in talent, and (3) the recommendation of specialized instruction for which the gifted child seems particularly equipped. To fit students into this program the Rochester schools have devised a "talent profile" which, when combined with the teacher's estimate of musical and general ability, mental rating, and industry, are used to guide the student in selecting music courses.⁶

Based upon the preceding paragraphs, a brief summary would indicate that music in secondary education should: (1) reach every student, either through participation or listening; (2) maintain the relationship of music as an integral part of life itself; (3) have intrinsic, practical, and preparatory values, and (4) adequately meet the needs of all students.

II. THE PLACE OF THEORY IN THE MUSIC CURRICULUM

In the preceding paragraphs the role of music in secondary education has been briefly discussed, and its

⁶Ruth Crewdon Larson, "A Brief Report of a Prediction and Guidance Program in School Music," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1934), p. 223.

purposes and objectives outlined. For all students except those talented few, it may be said that music, primarily, has for them a general or cultural interest.

What, then, are the advantages of the study of music theory for these students? The Music Education Curriculum Committee lists them as follows:

(1) The study of theory assists in making it possible to hear more completely all details of the tonal complex that characterizes our music. The listener trained in theory is more aware of the details of rhythm, melodic line, harmonic content and musical structure than the nontrained listener, hence his reaction to music can be fuller and more complete.

(2) The study of theory brings about a realization of how music is created. The student comes to see that music does not spring into full-fledged existence by the operation of some mystical inspiration. Rather, a great composition is the result of the patient toil of a great craftsman. From this realization springs a new respect for the composer. . . Theory study thus enlarges the students' concept of music and extends the range of his reactions. His enjoyment of music is thus greater than that of the untrained listener.⁷

For the music student with a professional-interest viewpoint, the Committee considered the general cultural values above to be of equal or even greater importance. In addition, they listed these values:

(1) The study of theory assists in score reading . . . The study of theory sharpens the ear of the prospective conductor.

⁷Hazel B. Nohavec (ed.), "Music History, Composing and Arranging," Music Education Curriculum Committee Reports (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1945), p.45.

(2) A knowledge of the functions of tones, resulting from a study of theory, influences the performer's rendition and leads to more effective performance.⁸

Definitions of music theory. Music educators often use the term "music theory" in referring to that body of basic facts and principles about music, such as the staff, clef signs, time and key signatures, etc., which might be more accurately defined as "music fundamentals." As Murphy points out, this "corpus" of fundamental facts is known as "theory," pure and simple--although actually it is neither.⁹ Dykema and Gehrkens define music theory as "a body of facts and principles about the construction and notation of music."¹⁰ Haydon, however, emphasizes the broader aspect of music theory, and defines it as:

. . . a branch of applied music in that the study of music theory, as we commonly use that expression, is a matter of getting certain basic factual material and of acquiring and developing certain particular skills. . . We distinguish then between two meanings of the phrase "music theory"--(1) as the acquirement of certain skills and basic knowledge in music; and (2) as research in the fundamental principles of musical structure in a broad sense.¹¹

⁸Hazel B Nohavec, Loc. Cit.

⁹Howard A. Murphy, Teaching Musicianship (New York: Coleman-Ross Company, Inc., 1950), p. 20.

¹⁰Peter Dykema and Karl Gehrkens, The Teaching and Administration of High School Music (Boston: C.C. Birchard and Company, 1941), p. 261.

¹¹Glen Haydon, "Music Research and Modal Counterpoint," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1934), p.217.

Music theory, in its fullest sense, thus includes a general understanding of the principles of musical structure in addition to music fundamentals.

The basic approach to music theory. "Music theory," declares Stowlinski, "has this twofold purpose: (1) to supply the novice musician with a sound core of musicianship and knowledge; (2) to equip the potential recipients of degrees with a working knowledge of the professional art in which they will teach, perform, or create."¹² Murphy, speaking of the basic approach to theoretic instruction, states that the most effective approach to the understanding of music is through the organized study of music itself. He cautions against the prevalent undue emphasis upon written skills without due recognition of the vital role of ear training, keyboard harmony, and creative work, and against the isolation of these individual aspects of theory. Furthermore, he reminds educators that theoretic instruction, whenever introduced, must be in terms of the musical background and maturity of the student in order to achieve maximum effectiveness.¹³

¹²Gail de Stowlinski, "The Function of Music as a Service Course to Music Education," Music In American Education (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1955), p. 214.

¹³Murphy, op. cit., p. 12.

Mursell voices the concensus of opinion of music educators when he states that "the crux of the theoretical music in high school is the pedagogical viewpoint from which it is handled."¹⁴ He warns that it will have little value if taught along the traditional lines of the old-fashioned conservatory work for harmony, but, he continues, "if it is regarded as a formalizing and regularizing of actual directed musical experiences. . .it could be a tremendous boon."¹⁵

Murphy proposes that theory be taught by means of "a realistic and rational organization of musical experience relevant to practical needs."¹⁶ These experiences, according to Murphy, lie in six major areas of learning; writing, reading, listening, playing, analyzing, and creating. For maximum effectiveness, he urges that the insight and skills derived from all six areas be integrated as parts of a unified whole. Finally, all learning should be based upon practice as found in music literature, using the rule "practice always preceeds principles." Only by constant reference to living music, he concludes,

¹⁴James L. Mursell, Principles of Music Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 200.

¹⁵Mursell, loc. cit.

¹⁶Murphy, op. cit., p. 13.

can instruction be validated and freed from artificiality.¹⁷

III. MUSIC THEORY IN HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMING GROUPS

Although experience and enjoyment of music should precede the technical approach, Rafferty points out that it is hardly possible to experience music without the technical being present, with or without the knowledge of the individual. Functional music theory, she maintains, should be presented whenever it may be applied in musical experience; thus, music theory is cumulative, and goes hand in hand with participation.¹⁸

Current Practices and Suggestions

A survey by Curry revealed a few definite trends regarding present practices of theory instruction in Arizona high schools. Based on returns of twenty-nine per cent of all high schools in the state, the following datum were thought to be significant:

(1) There seemed to be no particular correlation between the size of the school and the amount of composition and theory taught, nor did any general area of the state report a dominating amount.

¹⁷Murphy, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

¹⁸Sadie M. Rafferty, "Music Literature, Theory, Harmony, and Composition," Music In American Education (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1955), p. 210.

(2) It is the opinion of many of the music educators in the Arizona high schools that most of the theory should be taught through performing groups.

(3) The extent to which theory and composition is being taught depended upon the background of the teacher and not particularly upon the size, facilities, and time available in the particular high school.

(4) In reference to the opinion of the teachers as to what should be taught, the following are listed in the order of preference: knowledge of fundamentals (lines, spaces, key and time signatures, clefs); background of major scales; basic harmony; minor scales; sight singing; classical through romantic periods; pre-classical; background of melodic dictation; modern through contemporary music; knowledge of modulation; form and analysis; harmonic dictation.¹⁹

An earlier study by McEachern, which evaluated high school music subjects for study by prospective music majors, revealed somewhat different results. Music educators in the one hundred and fifty universities and colleges included in the McEachern study generally agreed that most of the time should be spent in the study of piano, sight reading, and rudiments of music.²⁰ Table I, on page twenty, indicated that piano rated somewhat more important than band or orchestral instruments, music appreciation more desirable than history of music, and

¹⁹Pat B. Curry, "Arizona Theory and Composition Survey," Music In American Education (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1955), p. 213.

²⁰Edna McEachern, "A Survey and Evaluation of the Education of School Music Teachers in the United States," Contributions to Education, No. 701 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937), p. 46.

TABLE I

EVALUATION OF MUSIC SUBJECTS FOR STUDY IN HIGH SCHOOL BY PROSPECTIVE SCHOOL MUSIC MAJORS

Music Subject	No. of Music Educators Rating Subject	Rating							
		Very Desirable		Fairly Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Not at all Desirable	
		No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Piano	145	131	90.3	11	7.6	3	2.	0	0
Sight reading	144	125	86.8	16	11.1	3	2.	0	0
Rudiments of music	141	112	79.4	20	14.1	9	6.4	0	0
Band and orchestral instruments	144	87	60.4	44	30.5	13	9.	0	0
Music appreciation	139	75	53.9	41	29.5	19	13.6	4	2.8
Voice, girls	142	42	29.5	62	43.6	30	21.1	8	5.6
Voice, boys	140	39	27.8	56	40.	35	25.	10	7.1
History of music	138	30	21.7	44	31.8	50	36.2	14	10.1
Harmony	139	27	19.4	62	44.6	31	22.3	19	13.6

harmony in question. Voice, particularly for girls, was considered somewhat more important than harmony or music history.²¹ Although McEachern's study indicated wide disagreement concerning the elements to be included in high school music study, it showed agreement among college musicologists that the most difficult obstacle to overcome in the education of school music teachers was insufficient pre-college musical training. In fact, this problem was considered more serious than a lack of native talent.²²

A comparison of the results of the Curry and McEachern studies seemed to indicate a wide discrepancy between actual practices in the high school and the recommendations of colleges and universities. Why does such a discrepancy exist? First, because there exists the philosophy of school music, as stated by Mursell, that "the proper purpose of a program of music. . . is to provide musical experiences as significant and varied as possible, and to provide them for everybody."²³ Second, as stated by Park, because most teachers and directors who are responsible for presenting groups before the

²¹McEachern, loc. cit.

²²McEachern, op. cit., p. 41.

²³James L. Mursell, The High School Music Curriculum (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947), p. 546.

public are so vitally concerned about the finished product that they hammer and drill hard on a few numbers, doing them in a routine and humdrum way, so that very little real knowledge of music, as such, is taught.²⁴ As Park said, many music teachers would be amazed if they realized how little the average choir and band member knew about the fundamentals, including the structure, of music, and of the life and purpose of the great composers.²⁵

Certainly no music teacher would argue seriously with the philosophy that music education should be planned to meet the needs of every child. Neither would most teachers deny that, under the constant pressure of public performance, sufficient time is usually not available for a complete program of theoretic and appreciative instruction. What, then, are the possible solutions?

First, the theoretical and technical aspects of music need not be taught as isolated elements which have no connection with the music under preparation. In fact, Phelps stated that the study of musical theory has little value to the student unless that student can see the theory

²⁴S. Norman Park, "To Entertain or to Educate," Music Educators Journal, 23:55, February-March, 1947, p.36.

²⁵Park, op. cit., p.35.

in actual use.²⁶ "The salvation lies not in the study of music alone, but in the daily use of theoretical fact in chorus practice, band practice, class piano instruction, and creative music writing classes."²⁷ Second, music theory courses should, whenever possible, be offered to both the general student body and the prospective music major. Subject matter offered in such courses would be determined by the individual teacher and the interests and needs of students, and would be offered, as outlined by Smith: (1) as a preparation for continued music study; (2) as a safeguard to the student and to the teacher; (3) as a cultural subject; (4) as an adjunct to the high school bands, orchestras, and choruses.²⁸

IV. BASES FOR ORGANIZING THE SPECIAL MUSIC CURRICULUM

A well-balanced music curriculum, designed to meet the needs of both general and pre-professional students, will meet most needs of the pre-professional students

²⁶Norman Phelps, "Music Theory As a Part of the High School Music Program," Education, 67:404, March, 1949, p. 406.

²⁷Phelps, loc. cit.

²⁸Melville Smith, "The Importance of Solfege as a Secondary School Subject," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1934), p.255.

with an opportunity to elect courses in Music Appreciation, History, and Theory.²⁹ As noted by the Music Educators Research Committee, such courses are of three kinds:

(1) A course in theory, usually combined with ear training and sight singing, which is planned for the pupil who is seriously interested in music and has already done considerable work on some instrument--usually the piano.

(2) A course in music appreciation with some sort of a historical basis, intended primarily for those who are not very far advanced in performance and who must therefore make their approach to better appreciation of music through listening rather than performance.

(3) An integrated course which combines theory, history, listening, and performance. This course is based in general on the same principles that are followed in planning the General Music class in the junior high school, but the course is planned for pupils who are several years older. It should be a restricted course, open only to those who have considerable ability in music and who want to work hard to develop their musicianship.³⁰

If only one course is possible in theory, Dykema and Gehrkens suggested that it might well be called "Elementary Music Theory," this to include such items as the following: (1) scales and key signatures--major and minor; (2) tempo and dynamics and other common musical terms, including spelling and pronunciation; (3) sight

²⁹Dykema and Gehrkens, op. cit., p. 262.

³⁰Music Education Research Council, Music Theory and Music History in the Secondary School (Music Educators National Conference Bulletin No. 104, Chicago: Music Educators National Conference), p.1.

singing--unison and in parts; (4) easy dictation--tone groups, melodies, harmonic formulae; (5) intervals--their names and their sounds; (6) chord construction and combination, emphasizing creative work; (7) original melody writing; (8) transposition; (9) the elements of form and design.³¹

Music Theory Courses

In general, the advanced phases of music theory, such as composition, harmony, and keyboard harmony, must be relegated to special "theory" classes, for more intense study. This is not to say that any one segment, or segments, of music are isolated from music as an art, but rather that they are studied intensively in relation to the art, in order to better understand the whole. As stated by Dykema and Gehrkens, "although there is no place for 'compartmental teaching' in music education, it is sometimes desirable to isolate some special phase of a subject in order to give it additional temporary emphasis. The theory course is simply a 'controlled environment' in which the pupil learns more quickly."³²

As Murphy emphasizes, the only reason for so-called "theoretic" instruction is to explain the structure of

³¹Dykema and Gehrkens, op. cit., pp. 261-262.

³²Dykema and Gehrkens, op. cit., p. 269.

music for appreciative, expressive, and creative purposes. Its central purpose, he continues, is the development of musicianship, which may be defined as the ability to deal effectively with musical problems through insight into musical texture. It is the conscious understanding of the organization of music.³³ To teach such conscious understanding, he urges that the basic approach to all class instruction be based on a specific musical example which is first played and then analyzed. This, he remarks, is in direct contrast to the usual "theoretic" approach, in which facts are stated first and music is sometimes used to illustrate them.³⁴

The Music Educators Curriculum Committee expressed the opinion that the aural aspects of theory training contributed most to the objectives sought. Their recommendations for planning theory courses included: (1) decide, in each school or situation, what listening, singing, and playing experiences are desirable; (2) construct a body of theory based on this representative list of compositions; (3) see that students admitted into the theory courses have this body of aesthetic experience in these compositions.³⁵ They urge theory teachers to be sure

³³Murphy, op. cit., p.22.

³⁴Murphy, op. cit., p.41.

³⁵Nohavec, op. cit., pp.45-46.

that activities carried on are actually contributing to musical goals, and that the value of any procedure be determined by the extent to which it results in a definite aural experience within the student, and contributes to the development of skill in "inner hearing." Activities considered most valuable by the committee were reading by means of the voice, reproduction of music heard with the voice, on the keyboard or by writing, oral analysis of harmonic structure, and improvisation at the keyboard or on some other instrument.³⁶

V. SUMMARY

Noted music educators have voiced the opinion that music in secondary education should: (1) reach every student, either through participation or listening; (2) maintain the relationship of music as an integral part of life itself; (3) have intrinsic, practical, and preparatory values; and (4) adequately meet the needs of all students. Furthermore, they have urged that training in music theory, to be practical, be approached through the study of actual musical examples, following the rule "practice always precedes principles."

A comparison of Curry's study of current practices in Arizona high schools with McEachern's survey of college

³⁶Nohavec, op. cit., p. 46.

musicologists revealed an apparent discrepancy concerning the type and amount of music theory taught in high school. This discrepancy seemed to exist because: (1) the basic philosophy of public school music demands a program of "music for everyone," and (2) most directors of performing groups are too busy drilling on a few numbers to teach very much real knowledge of music, as such. Two solutions to the discrepancy were: (1) the practical application of music theory in daily rehearsals, and (2) the inclusion of music theory courses in the curriculum.

Music theory courses are controlled environments in which special phases of music are isolated and given additional temporary emphasis. The value of any theoretic activity in these courses may be judged, according to the Music Educators Curriculum Committee, by the extent to which it results in a definite aural experience within the student, and contributes to the development of "inner hearing."³⁷ Activities considered most valuable by the committee were reading by means of the voice, reproduction of music heard with the voice, on the keyboard or by writing, oral analysis of harmonic structure, and improvisation at the keyboard or some other instrument.³⁸

³⁷Nohavec, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

³⁸Nohavec, loc. cit.

CHAPTER III

THE QUESTIONNAIRE: PROCEDURE AND GENERAL INFORMATION

In an effort to discover how the problem of teaching music theory in high school music classes was being met by teachers in Washington State, three hundred questionnaires were sent to high school music directors in all sizes of schools from enrollments of twenty to eighteen hundred. Representative samplings were taken from every section of the state and, in cases of schools with enrollments of over three hundred, questionnaires were sent to both the vocal and instrumental music directors.

Of the three hundred questionnaires, one hundred and fifty-one, or 50.3 per cent, were returned. Of these, twenty-seven, or 9 per cent, were discarded as being incomplete or incorrectly filled out; thus, the total number of questionnaires used in the study was one hundred and twenty-four, or 41.3 per cent of the questionnaires sent.

The data obtained from this survey was organized into tables, which are included in this and following chapters, with responses summarized and interpreted in the

order that they were asked.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

In order to more fully interpret the data gathered in the questionnaires, the responses were divided into four groups, according to high school enrollment, as follows:

<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Designation</u>
Over 600	Class A
251 to 600	Class B
100 to 250	Class C
Below 100.	Class D

Range and per cent of enrollments. As shown in Table II, the greatest number of returns--forty-eight, or 38.7 per cent of the questionnaires used--were from class C schools. Class B schools submitted thirty-three returns, class A schools twenty-seven returns, and class D schools sixteen returns. Enrollment in the various high schools ranged from twenty to eighteen hundred, with a mid-point of approximately two hundred and fifty pupils.

A definite trend in favor of four-year high schools was indicated by class B, C, and D schools, whose returns showed that 89.1 per cent of these schools offered four-year programs. Of the class A schools responding, however, only 33.3 per cent offered four-year programs; 66.6 per cent were three-year institutions.

TABLE II
SUMMARY OF GENERAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED
BY MUSIC TEACHERS RESPONDING
TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Size of School									
	Class A		Class B		Class C		Class D		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Total responses	30	100.	40	100.	59	100.	22	100.	151	100.
Discarded questionnaires.	3	10.	7	17.5	11	18.7	6	27.2	27	17.8
Total questionnaires used	27	90.	33	82.5	48	81.3	16	72.8	124	82.2
Range of enrollment	650- 1800		251- 500		103- 250		20- 90			
Three-year high schools	18	66.6	13	39.4	10	20.8	1	6.2	42	33.9
Four-year high schools	9	33.3	20	60.5	38	79.2	15	93.8	82	66.1
Number of teachers employed at the high school level:										
(1) One, part-time	1	3.7	8	24.2	22	45.8	11	68.6	42	33.9
(2) One, full-time	1	3.7	10	30.3	22	45.8	5	31.2	38	30.6
(3) Two, part-time	1	3.7	8	24.2	3	6.3			12	9.7
(4) Two, full-time	15	55.6	7	21.2	1	2.1			23	18.5
(5) Three, part-time	3	11.1							3	2.4
(6) Three, full-time	3	11.1							3	2.4
(7) Four, part-time	1	3.7							1	.7
(8) Four, full-time	2	7.4							2	1.7

Number of music teachers employed at the high school level. The data with regards to the number of music teachers employed at the high school level is presented in Table II. There is a definite tendency for the columns to become shorter as one reads from left to right, which indicates less spread in the number of teachers employed as the size of the school diminishes. The mode for class A high schools was two full-time teachers, with 55.5 per cent of the schools reporting this arrangement. Variations from this mode were, for the most part, in direct relation to size of enrollment; they ranged from 7.4 per cent of schools employing four full-time music teachers to 3.7 per cent employing one part-time teacher.

For class B schools there was no clear-cut policy concerning the number of music teachers employed, although some relation was noted between the number of teachers and size of enrollment. Schools with enrollments of over four hundred and fifty usually, though not always, employed two teachers on a full or part-time basis. As indicated by Table II, 21.2 per cent of class B schools reported two teachers employed on a full-time basis, 30.3 per cent reported one full-time teacher, 24.2 per cent reported one part-time teacher, and 24.2 per cent reported two part-time teachers.

Of forty-eight class C schools reporting, 2.1 per cent employed two full-time music teachers, and 6.3 per cent employed two part-time teachers. The remaining schools were evenly divided between one part-time and one full-time teacher (45.8 per cent each).

Class D schools most often employed one part-time teacher for high school music instruction. Of the eleven class D schools included in the study, 31.2 per cent indicated full-time music teachers employed for high school music instruction, as compared to 68.6 per cent which employed a part-time high school music instructor.

To summarize briefly, the greatest spread, as regards the number of music teachers employed at the high school level, was noted in class A schools. This spread ranged from one part-time teacher to four full-time teachers, and this spread was governed, for the most part, by size of enrollment. As shown by Table II, most class A schools employed two full-time teachers. Class B schools showed considerable variation in the number of music teachers employed, with a slight preference indicated for one full-time teacher. Class C schools, with few exceptions, employed one music teacher at the high school level on a full-time or part-time basis, while most class D schools employed one teacher on a part-time basis.

II. DEGREE TO WHICH A COURSE OF STUDY IS PLANNED
FOR USE IN PRESENTING MUSIC THEORY

The purpose of part two of the questionnaire was to discover the degree to which music teachers planned the theory content of their music classes. Did teachers plan the theory content of advanced choir, for example, more thoroughly than they did for their vocal ensembles? Were advanced band members given more careful treatment in this regard than were girls' glee clubs? What was the relation, if any, between size of school and amount of emphasis placed on music theory in the various high school music classes?

In order to find possible answers to these questions, the questionnaire was arranged in the following manner: all music classes which one might ordinarily expect to find offered in high schools were listed under vocal, instrumental, or special theory class headings, with provision made for entering classes not listed. Teachers were asked to indicate, by check system for each class taught by them, the method of incorporating music theory into the teaching of their regular music classes. The possible methods from which to choose were: (1) no planned course of theory study in this class, (2) partially planned course of theory study in this class, and (3) fully planned course of theory study

in this class. Teachers were asked to place a zero after classes not taught by them. This section of the questionnaire also served to indicate the total number of each type of class offered.

Vocal classes. Results of the questionnaire showed that the percentage distribution between fully planned, partially planned, and no planned courses of theory study remained fairly constant for all sizes of schools. The mean distribution for all schools was as follows: fully planned course of study, 10.1 per cent; partially planned course of study, 50.5 per cent; no planned course of study, 39.4 per cent. Largest variation from the mean was noted in the percentage of class C and D choral directors reporting fully planned courses of theory study (2.6 and 5.2 per cent, respectively), as compared to the percentage of class A and B choral directors (14.8 and 16.4 per cent) reporting this procedure.

The percentage of teachers reporting partially planned courses of study ranged from 50 per cent in class A schools to 63 per cent in class D schools. Class B and C directors' reports coincided closely with those of class A schools, with 49.1 per cent of class B, and 48.8 per cent of class C choral directors following partially planned courses of theory study.

The percentage of vocal classes taught with no planned course of theory study was tabulated as follows: class A, 35.2 per cent; class B, 34.5 per cent; class C, 48.6 per cent; and class D, 31.6 per cent. Thus, approximately one-third of all class A, B, and D schools, and almost one-half of class C schools, reported no planned course of theory study in vocal classes.

Table III, on page thirty-seven, shows the distribution and percentage of fully planned, partially planned, and no planned courses of study. This table is supplemented by Tables III A, III B, III C, and III D, in Appendix B, which present a complete analysis of numbers and percentages for each type of class included in the study.

Instrumental classes. For instrumental classes, the mean distribution of fully planned, partially planned, and no planned courses of theory study was as follows: fully planned, 11.2 per cent; partially planned, 65.3 per cent; no planned course of theory study, 23.5 per cent. The largest variation from the mean was noted in the percentage of class C instrumental directors reporting fully planned courses of theory study; only 4.8 per cent of class C directors reported this degree of planning, as compared to 13.7 per cent for both class A and C schools, and 17.1 per cent for class B schools.

TABLE III

DEGREE TO WHICH A COURSE OF STUDY IS PLANNED
FOR USE IN PRESENTING MUSIC THEORY

Type of class	Size of school	Fully planned		Partially planned		Not planned		Totals	
	Class	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
<u>Vocal</u>	A	8	14.8	27	50.5	19	35.2	54	100.
	B	10	16.4	30	49.1	21	34.5	61	100.
	C	3	2.6	41	48.8	40	48.6	84	100.
	D	1	5.2	12	63.2	6	31.6	19	100.
	Totals, and mean distribution . . .		22	10.1	110	50.5	86	39.4	218
<u>Instrumental</u>	A	6	13.7	22	50.	16	36.3	44	100.
	B	8	17.1	22	60.	7	22.9	37	100.
	C	3	4.8	57	74.4	16	21.8	76	100.
	D	3	13.7	16	72.6	3	13.7	22	100.
	Totals, and mean distribution . . .		20	11.2	117	65.3	42	23.5	179
<u>Theory</u>	A	9	90.	1	10.			10	100.
	B	7	87.5	1	12.5			8	100.
	C			2	100.			2	100.
	Totals, and mean distribution . . .		16	80.	4	20.			20

The percentage of returns indicating partially planned courses of theory study tended to increase as the size of the school decreased. Distribution of partially planned courses of study was as follows: class A, 50 per cent; class B, 60 per cent; class C, 74.4 per cent; and class D, 72.6 per cent. Conversely, the percentage of returns indicating no planned course of theory study decreased as the size of the school decreased. Distribution for no planned course of theory study was as follows: class A, 36.3 per cent; class B, 22.9 per cent; class C, 21.8 per cent; and class D, 13.7 per cent.

A comparison of vocal and instrumental classes in Table III showed agreement on the percentage of fully planned courses of theory study (10.1 and 11.2 per cent, respectively). Instrumental teachers, however, reported a larger percentage of partially planned courses of study than did vocal teachers, and vocal teachers reported a larger percentage of no planned courses of study than did instrumental teachers.

Music theory courses. Eighty per cent of the music theory courses included in the study were taught on the basis of fully planned courses of theory study. Eight of the nine class A courses, and six of the seven class B courses reported this degree of planning, with both theory

courses from class C schools reporting partially planned courses of theory study. For all schools, the percentage distribution was as follows: fully planned, 80 per cent; partially planned, 20 per cent. No music theory course included in the study was taught without at least a partially planned course of study, as is shown on Table III.

III. SUMMARY

The one hundred and twenty-four used responses to the questionnaire were distributed by size of school as follows: class A, 21.8 per cent; class B, 26.6 per cent; class C, 38.7 per cent; class D, 12.9 per cent. Of these, 89.1 per cent were from four-year high schools.

Mean distributions for all schools, with regard to the degree to which teachers planned the theory content of their classes, were as follows:

Type of class	Per cent fully planned	Per cent partially planned	Per cent not planned
Vocal	10.1	50.5	39.4
Instrumental	11.2	65.3	23.5
Theory	80.	20.	

For vocal classes, the percentage distribution remained fairly constant for all sizes of schools, with the exception of fully planned courses of study; 14.8 per cent

of class A, and 16.4 per cent of class B respondents indicated this degree of planning, as compared to 2.5 per cent of class C, and 5.2 per cent of class D respondents.

For instrumental classes, the percentage of schools reporting partially planned courses of theory study tended to increase as the size of the school decreased; the percentage of schools reporting no planned course of theory study tended to increase as the size of the school increased. The largest variation from the mean was noted in the percentage of class C schools reporting fully planned courses of theory study; only 4.8 per cent of class C respondents reported this degree of planning, as compared to 13.7 per cent for class A and D schools, and 17.1 per cent for class B schools.

Of the twenty music directors reporting on music theory courses, 80 per cent followed fully planned courses of study and 20 per cent followed partially planned courses of study. A slight tendency was noted for directors from the larger schools to plan their courses of study more carefully.

In general, results of the questionnaire seemed to indicate that respondents from smaller schools planned the theory content of their instrumental classes more carefully than did respondents from the larger schools. This situation was reversed for vocal classes and theory courses.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON THEORY IN HIGH SCHOOL MUSIC CLASSES

Each respondent's estimate of the degree of emphasis he placed on fourteen selected types of music theory was obtained from page two of the questionnaire. Choices given were: (1) much emphasis, (2) some, or average, emphasis, (3) little or no emphasis. Raw scores obtained from page two were converted, for easier interpretation, into a ten-point rating scale, according to the following procedure: (1) responses indicating "much emphasis" were multiplied by ten, responses indicating "some, or average, emphasis" were multiplied by five, and responses indicating "little or no emphasis" were multiplied by one; (2) the sum of these products was divided by the total number of responses to obtain the average, or mean emphasis placed on each type of music theory being rated. The following formula was used:

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{(n \times 10) + (n \times 5) + (n \times 1)}{N \text{ (total responses)}}$$

With five as the midpoint, all scores can thus be easily interpreted as follows: ratings below 2. indicate very little emphasis, rating from 5. to 5.5 indicate average emphasis, and ratings of 8. and above indicate much emphasis.

I. ANALYSIS OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC THEORY IN VOCAL CLASSES

A total of two hundred and eighteen vocal classes were included in the study, distributed as follows: thirty-five select choirs, sixty-eight general choruses, twenty boys' glee clubs, forty girls' glee clubs, fifty-two vocal ensembles, two beginning choruses, and one voice class. Of these, 24.7 per cent were from class A schools, 27.9 per cent from class B schools, 38.5 per cent from class C schools, and 8.9 per cent from class D schools.

Select choir. Of the thirty-five select choirs reported, 40 per cent were from class A schools, 34.2 per cent from class B schools, 22.9 per cent from class C schools, and 2.9 per cent from class D schools. As indicated by Table IV, on page forty-three, all schools except the class D choir were in close agreement as to the amount of emphasis placed on the various types of music theory. For class A, B, and C schools, most emphasis was placed on music terminology, interval study, rhythmic analysis, scale structure, key signatures, and chord construction, in that order. Harmony was rated somewhat below average. While rhythmic dictation was given a rating of 5.4 by class B schools, class A and C schools rated it 2.9 and 2.,

TABLE IV
EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC THEORY IN
HIGH SCHOOL VOCAL CLASSES *

			Type of Theory															
			Terminology	Scale Structure	Key Signatures	Intervals	Chord Construction	Harmony	Harmonic Dictation	Rhythmic Analysis	Rhythmic Dictation	Form and Analysis	Transposition	Keyboard Harmony	Arranging	Composition		
Class	Size	Responses		Degree of Emphasis														
		No.	Per cent															
Select Choir	A	14	40.	4.5	6.5	6.5	7.6	5.9	4.0	2.2	5.3	2.9	2.2	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.0	
	B	12	34.2	7.5	4.6	5.3	7.5	7.8	4.4	2.5	6.7	5.4	2.3	1.3	1.3	1.	1.3	
	C	8	22.9	7.6	5.6	4.	5.9	3.6	4.1	2.1	4.8	2.	2.5	2.1	1.	1.	1.	
	D	1	2.9	1.	5.	10.	1.	5.	1.	1.	10.	10.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	
	Total Average		35	100.0	5.9	5.4	6.5	5.5	4.5	3.4	1.9	6.7	5.1	2.	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.1
General Chorus	A	13	19.1	8.5	8.2	7.8	8.2	6.2	4.9	4.2	5.4	3.4	3.	1.7	1.6	1.	1.	
	B	18	26.5	7.8	4.8	5.6	5.6	3.5	4.1	1.	4.3	1.9	2.6	1.4	1.9	1.2	1.	
	C	29	42.7	7.3	5.9	5.	4.5	4.	1.8	5.3	2.1	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.	1.	1.	
	D	8	11.7	7.3	5.9	5.	5.	4.5	4.	1.8	5.3	2.1	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.	1.	
	Total Average		68	100.0	7.3	5.8	5.9	5.9	4.3	3.9	2.1	4.5	2.2	2.1	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.
Boys' Glee	A	3	15.	6.7	6.7	6.7	5.	5.	5.	2.5	5.3	4.	2.5	1.	2.5	1.	1.	
	B	6	30.	6.2	3.8	3.1	5.3	3.1	2.3	2.3	4.5	3.1	1.7	1.7	1.	1.	1.	
	C	8	40.	4.8	6.3	3.0	4.6	3.1	2.6	1.5	5.3	1.0	1.5	2.1	1.	1.	1.	
	D	3	15.	5.	2.3	5.3	5.3	2.3	3.7	1.	2.3	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	
	Total Average		20	100.0	5.8	4.8	4.5	5.1	3.4	3.4	1.8	4.3	2.3	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.	1.

TABLE IV (continued)

				Type of Theory													
				Terminology	Scale Structure	Key Signatures	Intervals	Chord Construction	Harmony	Harmonic Dictation	Rhythmic Analysis	Rhythmic Dictation	Form and Analysis	Transposition	Keyboard Harmony	Arranging	Composition
Class	Size	Responses		Degree of Emphasis													
		No.	Per cent														
Girls' Glee	A	10	25.	8.5	6.7	8.1	8.1	5.2	5.3	2.7	4.9	2.3	2.2	1.	1.8	1.	1.
	B	7	17.5	7.3	4.1	4.	6.6	5.4	4.6	1.6	6.7	5.4	2.1	1.6	2.7	1.	2.5
	C	17	42.5	7.7	7.1	4.2	6.1	4.7	4.5	2.1	6.6	2.5	2.4	1.5	2.	1.2	1.
	D	6	15.	6.5	5.	4.	5.3	5.3	3.	4.5	2.5	7.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
Total Average		40	100.0	7.1	5.7	5.1	6.5	5.2	4.4	2.7	5.2	4.3	1.9	1.3	1.8	1.1	1.4
Vocal Ensembles	A	12	23.1	6.	3.6	3.8	4.1	4.6	4.3	2.	4.7	2.1	2.5	1.8	1.7	1.	1.
	B	17	32.7	6.8	4.4	5.4	6.1	4.2	3.2	1.5	5.9	3.8	2.9	1.2	2.2	1.	1.5
	C	22	42.3	6.8	6.4	3.7	4.7	4.7	6.4	1.7	4.8	2.2	2.3	1.7	7.7	1.7	1.
	D.	1	1.9	5.	5.	5.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
Total Average		52	100.0	6.2	4.9	4.5	3.9	3.	3.7	1.6	4.1	2.3	2.2	1.4	1.7	1.2	1.1
Beginning Chorus	A	1	50.	10.	5.	10.	5.	5.	5.	10.	10.	10.	10.	1.	1.	1.	5.
	B	1	50.	10.	5.	10.	5.	5.	5.	1.	10.	10.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
	Total Average	2	100.	10.	5.	10.	5.	5.	5.	5.5	10.	10.	5.5	1.	1.	1.	3.
Voice Class	A	1	100.	5.	10.	5.	10.	10.	10.	5.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	1.	1.

* 10. indicates great emphasis, 5. indicates average emphasis, 1. indicates little or no emphasis

respectively. Form and analysis was lightly stressed, while harmonic dictation, transposition, keyboard harmony, arranging, and composition were given little or no attention.

Since only one class D school reported a select choir, results shown cannot be considered representative for all class D schools. It was interesting to note, however, that the teacher reporting on this class indicated most emphasis placed on key signatures, rhythmic analysis and rhythmic dictation, with some emphasis placed on scale structure and chord construction. All other types of theory were given little or no emphasis.

General chorus. The sixty-eight general choruses included in the study were distributed as follows: class A, 19.1 per cent; class B, 26.5 per cent; class C, 42.7 per cent; and class D, 11.7 per cent. Table IV shows a slight tendency for the amount of stress placed on theory to diminish in proportion to the size of the school; in every instance, class A schools indicated considerably more stress on all music theory than did class D schools. All respondents agreed that little or no emphasis was placed on transposition, keyboard harmony, arranging, and composition.

For all schools, the fourteen types of music theory

were listed in order of importance as follows: music terminology, 7.3; key signatures, 5.9; interval study, 5.9; scale structure, 5.8; rhythmic analysis, 4.5; chord construction, 4.3; harmony, 3.9; rhythmic dictation, 2.2; harmonic dictation, 2.1; form and analysis, 2.1; keyboard harmony, 1.5; transposition, 1.4; arranging, 1.1; and composition, 1.

Boys' glee club. Respondents generally agreed that less emphasis was placed on music theory in boys' glee clubs than in select choirs, general choruses, or girls' glee clubs. As in general chorus, it may be noted that the degree of emphasis for all music theory tended to decrease as school enrollment decreased.

The percentage distribution for the twenty boys' glee clubs included in the study was as follows: class A, 15 per cent; class B, 30 per cent; class C, 40 per cent; class D, 15 per cent. Types of music theory were listed in order of importance as follows: music terminology, 5.8; interval study, 5.1; scale structure, 4.8; key signatures, 4.5; rhythmic analysis, 4.3; chord construction, 3.4; harmony, 3.4; rhythmic dictation, 2.3; harmonic dictation, 1.8; form and analysis, 1.7; transposition, 1.5; keyboard harmony, 1.4; arranging, 1.; and composition, 1.

Girls' glee club. Respondents generally agreed that members of girls' glee clubs received more intensive training in music theory than did members of boys' glee clubs. Furthermore, on the basis of this study, girls' glee clubs were more commonly offered than boys' glee clubs in the ratio of two to one. Distribution of returns for girls' glee clubs was: class A, 25 per cent; class B, 17.5 per cent; class C, 42.5 per cent; and class D, 15 per cent. The various types of music theory were ranked in order of importance as follows: music terminology, 7.1; interval study, 6.5; scale structure, 5.7; chord construction, 5.2; rhythmic analysis, 5.2; key signatures, 5.1; harmony, 4.4; rhythmic dictation, 4.3; harmonic dictation, 2.7; form and analysis, 1.9; keyboard harmony, 1.8; composition, 1.4; transposition, 1.3; arranging, 1.1.

Vocal ensembles. Of the fifty-two vocal ensembles included in the study, 23.1 per cent were from class A schools, 32.7 per cent from class B schools, 42.3 per cent from class C schools, and 1.9 per cent from class D schools. Theoretic instruction in vocal ensembles, as in boys' glee clubs, was not as intense as in select choirs, general choruses, or girls' glee clubs. The types of theory were ranked in order of importance as follows: music terminology, 6.2; scale structure, 4.9; key signa-

tures, 4.5; rhythmic analysis, 4.1; interval study, 3.9; harmony, 3.7; chord construction, 3.6; rhythmic dictation, 2.3; form and analysis, 2.2; keyboard harmony, 1.7; transposition, 1.4; arranging, 1.2; composition, 1.1.

Beginning chorus. One class A and one class B school reported the inclusion of a beginning, or cadet, chorus in their high school curriculums. The four areas of music theory receiving most attention in these classes were music terminology, key signatures, rhythmic analysis, and rhythmic dictation, all with a rating of 10. Both teachers placed average emphasis on scale structures, interval study, chord construction, and harmony, with little or no emphasis placed on transposition, keyboard harmony, and arranging. Points of extreme difference between the classes were noted on harmonic dictation and form and analysis, which were given much emphasis in the class A group and no emphasis in the class B group. The class A group also placed average emphasis on composition, while the class B group received little or no instruction in composition.

Voice class. One class A school reported a voice class, with much emphasis placed on the following types of theory: scale structure, interval study, chord construction, rhythmic analysis, rhythmic dictation, form and analysis,

and transposition. Average stress was placed on music terminology, key signatures, harmonic dictation, and keyboard harmony. No emphasis was placed on arranging and composition.

As shown by Table V, on page forty-nine, the ranking of all vocal classes according to the emphasis placed on music theory was as follows: Voice Class, 7.; Beginning Chorus, 6.2; Girls' Glee, 3.8; Select Choir, 3.7; General Chorus, 3.5; and Boys' Glee, 3. The average of the combined vocal classes ranked the fourteen types of music theory as follows: music terminology, 6.6; rhythmic analysis, 6.4; scale structure, 5.9; key signatures, 5.9; interval study, 5.9; rhythmic dictation, 5.2; chord construction, 5.1; harmony, 4.9; form and analysis, 3.6; harmonic dictation, 2.9; transposition, 2.7; keyboard harmony, 1.9; composition, 1.4; and arranging, 1.1.

The preceding figures were heavily weighted by the Voice Class and the two Beginning Choruses, which were in the nature of special classes, and which stressed music theory to a much greater degree than did other voice classes. By eliminating these classes from final tabulation, the amended emphasis placed on music theory by vocal classes read as follows: music terminology, 6.5; interval study, 5.4; scale structure, 5.3; key signatures, 5.3; rhythmic analysis, 4.9; chord construction, 3.8;

TABLE V

SUMMARY OF THE EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC
THEORY IN HIGH SCHOOL VOCAL CLASSES*

	Type of Class								
	Select choir	Chorus	Boys' glee	Girls' glee	Vocal ensembles	Beginning chorus	Voice class	Average, all classes	Average, without last two classes
Total classes	35	68	20	40	52	2	1	218	215
	Degree of Emphasis								
Terminology	5.9	7.3	5.8	7.1	6.2	10.	5.	6.6	6.5
Scale structure	5.4	5.8	4.8	5.7	4.9	5.	10.	5.9	5.3
Key signatures	6.5	5.9	4.5	5.1	4.5	10.	5.	5.9	5.3
Interval study	5.5	5.9	5.1	6.5	3.9	5.	10.	5.9	5.4
Chord construction	4.5	4.3	3.4	5.2	3.6	5.	10.	5.1	3.8
Harmony	3.4	3.9	3.4	4.4	3.7	5.	10.	4.9	3.4
Harmonic dictation	1.9	2.1	1.8	2.7	1.6	5.5	1.	2.9	2.
Rhythmic analysis	6.7	4.5	4.3	5.2	4.1	10.	10.	6.5	4.9
Form and analysis	2.	2.1	1.7	1.9	2.2	5.5	10.	3.6	1.9
Transposition	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.	10.	2.7	1.4
Keyboard harmony	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.8	1.7	1.	5.	1.9	1.5
Arranging	1.2	1.1	1.	1.1	1.2	1.	1.	1.1	1.1
Composition	1.1	1.	1.	1.4	1.1	3.	1.	1.4	1.1
Average emphasis on all theory	3.7	3.5	3.	3.8	3.	6.2	7.	4.3	3.4

- * 10. indicates great emphasis
5. indicates average emphasis
1. indicates little or no emphasis

harmony, 3.4; rhythmic dictation, 3.2; harmonic dictation, 2.; form and analysis, 1.9; keyboard harmony, 1.5; transposition, 1.4; arranging, 1.1; and composition, 1.1. This listing was considered more representative of the emphasis placed on music theory in average vocal classes, and was used in subsequent tabulations.

II. ANALYSIS OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC THEORY IN INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC CLASSES

A total of one hundred and seventy-nine high school instrumental classes were included in the study, distributed as follows: eighty-five advanced bands, forty-three intermediate bands, twelve advanced orchestras, five intermediate orchestras, twenty-nine instrumental ensembles, two dance bands, and three groups of private students. A comparative listing of these classes is shown in Table VI, on page fifty-one.

Advanced band. Of the eighty-five advanced bands included in the study, 16.5 per cent were from class A schools, 22.3 per cent from class B schools, 47.1 per cent from class C schools, and 12.1 per cent from class D schools. For all schools, the fourteen types of theory under consideration were listed in order of importance as follows: key signatures, 8.9; music terminology, 7.9;

TABLE VI

EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC THEORY IN HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL CLASSES *

			Type of Theory														
Class	Size	Responses		Terminology	Scale Structure	Key Signatures	Intervals	Chord Construction	Harmony	Harmonic Dictation	Rhythmic Analysis	Rhythmic Dictation	Form and Analysis	Transposition	Keyboard Harmony	Arranging	Composition
		No.	Per cent														
			Degree of Emphasis														
Advanced Band	A	14	16.5	9.3	7.5	8.6	4.7	5.6	4.3	1.6	6.8	2.6	3.4	4.	1.4	1.6	1.4
	B	19	22.3	8.9	6.5	8.2	3.9	4.8	4.3	1.	6.8	2.1	3.2	4.2	1.6	1.6	1.
	C	42	47.1	7.9	7.3	8.9	3.9	5.4	4.7	1.4	6.8	2.3	2.5	3.8	1.1	2.2	1.4
	D	10	12.1	5.7	7.5	10.	3.7	3.2	2.3	2.	6.4	2.4	1.5	3.6	1.	1.5	1.
	Total Average		85	100.0	7.9	7.2	8.9	4.1	4.8	3.9	1.5	6.7	2.4	2.7	3.9	1.3	1.7
Intermediate Band	A	7	16.3	9.1	8.6	8.6	4.7	5.8	3.3	1.	7.3	2.3	2.1	2.1	1.	1.	1.
	B	9	20.9	9.3	7.3	9.3	4.3	4.8	3.2	1.4	9.3	2.4	2.3	3.3	2.3	1.	1.4
	C	21	48.4	7.1	8.6	8.8	4.2	4.6	3.9	1.	6.1	2.4	2.4	2.6	1.2	1.8	1.2
	D	6	14.4	6.9	5.7	6.9	3.8	2.3	3.8	2.3	8.3	2.5	3.	1.	1.	1.7	1.
	Total Average		43	100.0	8.	7.6	8.4	4.3	4.4	3.6	1.4	7.8	2.4	2.5	2.	1.4	1.4
Advanced Orchestra	A	10	83.3	9.	8.	8.5	6.6	7.	5.6	1.8	7.1	2.8	5.3	4.5	1.	2.7	1.9
	B	2	16.7	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	5.	5.	3.	3.	1.	3.	5.	1.	3.	1.
	Total Average		12	100.0	8.3	7.8	8.	7.1	6.	5.3	2.4	3.7	2.9	4.2	4.8	1.	2.9

* 10. indicates great emphasis, 5. indicates average emphasis, 1. indicates little or no emphasis.

TABLE VI (continued)

			Type of Theory															
			Terminology	Scale Structure	Key Signatures	Intervals	Chord Construction	Harmony	Harmonic Dictation	Rhythmic Analysis	Rhythmic Dictation	Form and Analysis	Transposition	Keyboard Harmony	Arranging	Composition		
Class	Size	Responses		Degree of Emphasis														
		No.	Per cent															
Intermediate Orch. Total Average	A	4	80.	6.5	7.3	7.3	6.5	5.2	3.	2.	6.5	1.	2.	3.2	1.	1.	1.	
	B	1	20.	10.	10.	5.	1.	1.	1.	10.	1.	5.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	
		5	100.															
					8.3	8.4	6.2	3.8	3.1	2.	6.	3.3	3.	1.5	2.1	1.	1.	1.
Ensembles Total Average	A	7	24.1	7.3	5.9	6.6	4.	4.6	2.7	1.6	4.	1.	2.7	2.9	1.6	1.6	1.6	
	B	6	20.7	8.5	5.3	10.	5.3	7.6	6.8	1.	6.8	2.3	6.	3.	2.3	1.7	1.	
	C	14	44.8	7.1	5.5	6.7	4.6	5.3	5.2	1.3	4.9	1.3	2.9	5.2	1.7	2.3	1.7	
	D	3	10.4	10.	8.3	8.3	4.	5.	7.	1.	10.	2.3	6.8	2.3	1.	2.3	1.	
		29	100.0															
				8.2	6.3	9.	4.5	5.6	5.4	1.2	6.4	1.7	4.6	3.4	1.7	1.9	1.3	
Dance Band	A	2	100.	10.	5.	7.5	5.5	5.	3.	3.	7.5	1.	1.	5.5	1.	5.5	1.	
Private Lessons	D	3	100.	6.7	6.7	6.7	5.	2.3	2.3	3.7	6.7	1.	4.	1.	1.	2.3	1.	

scale structure, 7.2; rhythmic analysis, 6.7; chord construction, 4.8; interval study, 4.1; harmony, 3.9; transposition, 3.9; form and analysis, 2.7; rhythmic dictation, 2.4; arranging, 1.7; harmonic dictation, 1.5; keyboard harmony, 1.3; and composition, 1.2. A comparison of Table VI with Table V showed more emphasis placed on key signatures, arranging, transposition, and composition in this and other instrumental classes than was the case in vocal classes.

Intermediate band. The percentage distribution of the forty-three intermediate bands included in the study was as follows: class A, 16.3 per cent; class B, 22.3 per cent; class C, 47.1 per cent; and class D, 12.1 per cent. A slight tendency was noted for less emphasis to be placed on theory in class D schools than in larger schools. Theory content of both intermediate and advanced band curriculums were very similar. For intermediate bands, the fourteen types of music theory were listed in order of importance as follows: key signatures, 8.4; music terminology, 8.; rhythmic analysis, 7.8; scale structure, 7.6; chord construction, 4.4; interval study, 4.3; harmony, 3.6; form and analysis, 2.5; rhythmic dictation, 1.4; keyboard harmony, 1.4; arranging, 1.4; and composition, 1.2.

Advanced orchestra. Orchestral conductors indicated greater emphasis than band directors on the following types of theory: interval study, chord construction, harmony, harmonic dictation, form and analysis, transposition, and arranging. They placed less stress on rhythmic analysis, however, than did band directors.

Of the twelve advanced orchestras included in the study, 83.3 per cent were from class A schools, and 16.7 per cent from class B schools. The fourteen types of theory were listed in order of importance as follows: music terminology, 8.3; key signatures, 8.; scale structure, 7.8; interval study, 7.1; chord construction, 6.; harmony, 5.3; transposition, 4.8; form and analysis, 4.2; rhythmic analysis, 2.9; arranging, 2.9; harmonic dictation, 2.4; composition, 1.5; and keyboard harmony, 1.

Intermediate orchestra. A comparison of advanced and intermediate orchestras in Table VI seemed to indicate that key signatures, intervals, chord construction, harmony, form and analysis, transposition, arranging, and composition were given more attention in advanced groups, while harmonic dictation received more emphasis in the intermediate orchestras. Of the five intermediate orchestras included in the study, four were from class A schools and one was from a class B school.

For intermediate orchestras, the fourteen types of theory were listed in order of importance as follows: scale structure, 8.4; music terminology, 8.3; key signatures, 6.2; harmonic dictation, 6.; interval study, 3.8; rhythmic analysis, 3.3; chord construction, 3.1; rhythmic dictation, 3.; transposition, 2.1; harmony, 2.; keyboard harmony, 1.; arranging, 1.; and composition, 1.

Instrumental ensembles. The twenty-nine schools reporting instrumental ensembles were distributed as follows: class A, 24.1 per cent; class B, 20.7 per cent; class C, 44.8 per cent; and class D, 10.4 per cent. It was interesting to note that class B and D schools generally seemed to emphasize music theory more in the teaching of instrumental ensembles than did class A and C schools. Class B schools reported more emphasis than did other schools on key signatures, chord construction, harmony, and keyboard harmony, while class D schools placed more emphasis than other schools on music terminology, scale structures, rhythmic analysis, and form and analysis. While class A and C schools rather closely paralleled each other with regard to theoretic instruction in ensemble classes, class A schools reported considerably less emphasis than other schools on harmony, and slightly less emphasis on rhythmic analysis and chord construction. Class C

schools reported more emphasis than other schools on transposition.

Listing of the various types of music theory for all schools in order importance was as follows: key signatures, 9.; music terminology, 8.2; rhythmic analysis, 6.4; chord construction, 5.6; harmony, 5.4; form and analysis, 4.6; interval study, 4.5; transposition, 3.4; arranging, 1.9; rhythmic dictation, 1.7; keyboard harmony, 1.7; composition, 1.3; and harmonic dictation, 1.2.

Dance band. The two class A schools which reported the inclusion of a dance band in their high school curriculums listed the fourteen types of music theory, in order of importance, as follows: music terminology, 10.; key signatures, 7.5; rhythmic analysis, 7.5; interval study, 5.5, transposition, 5.5; arranging, 5.5; scale structure, 5.; chord construction, 5.; harmony, 3.; harmonic dictation, 3.; rhythmic dictation, 1.; form and analysis, 1.; and composition, 1. Two types of theory which received significantly higher emphasis for dance bands than for other types of instrumental classes were arranging and transposition.

Private lessons. The three class D teachers who reported on theoretic instruction in their private instrumental lessons rated the fourteen types of music theory,

in order of importance, as follows: music terminology, 6.7; scale structure, 6.7; key signatures, 6.7; rhythmic analysis, 6.7; interval study, 5.; form and analysis, 4.; harmonic dictation, 3.7; chord construction, 2.3; arranging, 2.3; rhythmic dictation, 1.; transposition, 1.; keyboard harmony, 1.; and composition, 1.

Table VII, on page fifty-seven, shows the average degree of emphasis placed on music theory in each type of instrumental class included in the study. Ranking of these classes according to total stress placed on theoretic instruction was as follows: advanced orchestra, 4.7; instrumental ensembles, 4.4; dance band, 4.4; advanced band, 4.2; intermediate band, 4.; intermediate orchestra, 3.7; and private lessons, 3.6.

As shown by Table VII, the average of all instrumental classes ranked the fourteen types of theory as follows: music terminology, 8.2; key signatures, 7.8; scale structure, 7.; rhythmic analysis, 6.; interval study, 4.8; chord construction, 4.2; harmony, 3.6; transposition, 3.2; form and analysis, 2.9; harmonic dictation, 2.7; arranging, 2.4; rhythmic dictation, 2.1; keyboard harmony, 1.2; and composition, 1.2.

TABLE VII
 SUMMARY OF THE EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC THEORY
 IN HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUMENTAL CLASSES*

	Type of Class							Average emphasis
	Advanced band	Intermediate band	Advanced orchestra	Intermediate orchestra	Ensembles	Dance band	Private lessons	
Total classes	85	43	12	5	29	2	3	179
Type of music theory								
Terminology	7.9	8.	8.3	8.3	8.2	10.	6.7	8.2
Scale structure	7.2	7.6	7.8	8.4	6.3	5.	6.7	7.
Key signatures	8.9	8.4	8.	6.2	9.	7.5	6.7	7.8
Interval study	4.1	4.3	7.1	3.8	4.5	5.	5.	4.8
Chord construction	4.8	4.4	6.	3.1	5.6	5.	2.3	4.2
Harmony	3.9	3.6	5.3	2.	5.4	3.	2.3	3.6
Harmonic dictation	1.5	1.4	2.4	6.	1.2	3.	3.7	2.7
Rhythmic analysis	6.7	7.8	3.7	3.8	6.4	7.5	6.7	6.
Rhythmic dictation	2.4	2.4	2.9	3.	1.7	1.	1.	2.1
Form and analysis	2.7	2.5	4.2	1.5	4.6	1.	4.	2.9
Transposition	3.9	2.	4.8	2.1	3.4	5.5	1.	3.2
Keyboard harmony	1.3	1.4	1.	1.	1.7	1.	1.	1.2
Arranging	1.7	1.4	2.9	1.	1.9	5.5	2.3	2.4
Composition	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.	1.3	1.	1.	1.2
Average emphasis on all theory	4.2	4.	4.7	3.7	4.4	4.4	3.6	4.1

- * 10. indicates great emphasis
 5. indicates average emphasis
 1. indicates little or no emphasis

III. ANALYSIS OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC THEORY IN MUSIC THEORY COURSES

Of the twenty music theory courses included in the study, 50 per cent were from class A schools, 40 per cent from class B schools, and 10 per cent from class C schools. No class D school reported the inclusion of a music theory course in the curriculum. The most common course titles proved to be General Music, Music Theory, and Harmony, with six, four, and three listings, respectively. The remaining titles were listed only once. Table VIII, on page fifty-nine, presents an analysis of the emphasis placed on music theory in each of the music theory courses included in the study.

General Music. The six General Music courses were distributed by school size as follows: class A, 16.6 per cent; class B, 66.6 per cent; and class C, 16.6 per cent. Average emphasis placed on most types of theory in General Music courses was less than in other theory courses, with the exception of the Music Appreciation course. Listing of types of theory under consideration, in order of importance, was as follows: music terminology, 10.; key signatures, 9.1; scale structure, 7.9; interval study, 7.9; chord construction, 7.4; harmony, 7.4; form and analysis, 6.1; harmonic dictation, 5.4; rhythmic analysis, 4.4;

TABLE VIII

EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC THEORY
IN MUSIC THEORY COURSES*

			Type of Theory														
Class	Size	Responses		Terminology	Scale Structure	Key Signatures	Intervals	Chord Construction	Harmony	Harmonic Dictation	Rhythmic Analysis	Rhythmic Dictation	Form and Analysis	Transposition	Keyboard Harmony	Arranging	Composition
		No.	Per cent														
General Music	A	1	16.6	10.	5.	10.	5.	5.	5.	1.	1.	1.	10.	1.	1.	1.	1.
	B	4	66.7	10.	8.8	7.3	8.8	7.3	7.3	5.2	7.3	5.2	7.3	6.5	4.5	5.2	4.
	C	1	16.6	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	5.	1.	5.	5.	1.	5.
Total.		6															
Average.				10.	7.9	9.1	7.9	7.4	7.4	5.4	4.4	3.7	6.1	4.2	3.5	2.4	3.
Music Theory	A	2	50.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	3.	5.	3.	3.
	B	1	25.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.
	C	1	25.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	5.	5.	5.	5.	5.	1.	5.
Total.		4															
Average.				10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	9.2	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	6.7	6.7	4.7	6.
Harmony	A	3	100.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	8.3	8.3	8.3	3.7	5.3	6.7	2.3	8.3
Harmony and Arranging	B	1	100.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	5.	5.	10.	5.	5.	10.	5.
Harmony and General Music	A	1	100.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	1.	5.	10.	5.

TABLE VIII (continued)

			Type of Theory														
Class	Size	Response		Terminology	Scale Structure	Key Signatures	Intervals	Chord Construction	Harmony	Harmonic Dictation	Rhythmic Analysis	Rhythmic Dictation	Form and Analysis	Transposition	Keyboard Harmony	Arranging	Composition
		No.	Per cent														
Harmony and Composition	B	1	100.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	10.	10.	5.	5.	10.
Music History	A	1	100.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	1.	5.	5.	5.	1.
Music Appreciation	B	1	100.	10.	10.	5.	5.	5.	5.	1.	5.	1.	10.	5.	1.	1.	1.
Composition	A	1	100.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	10.	5.	10.	10.	5.	5.	10.
Music Survey	A	1	100.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	1.	5.	1.	5.

* 10. indicates great emphasis
 5. indicates average emphasis
 1. indicates little or no emphasis

transposition, 4.2; rhythmic dictation, 3.7; keyboard harmony, 3.5; composition, 3.; and arranging, 2.4.

Music Theory. The four Music Theory courses were distributed as follows: class A, two; class B, one; and class C, one. Types of theory receiving greatest emphasis (10.) were: music terminology, scale structure, key signatures, interval study, and chord construction. The remaining types of theory were listed, in order of importance, as follows: harmony, 9.2; harmonic dictation, 7.5; rhythmic analysis, 7.5; rhythmic dictation, 7.5; form and analysis, 7.5; transposition, 6.7; keyboard harmony, 6.7; composition, 6.; and arranging, 4.7

Harmony. The three harmony courses included in the study were from class A schools. Types of music theory receiving greatest emphasis in these courses were: music terminology, scale structure, key signatures, interval study, chord construction, and harmony. Harmonic dictation, rhythmic analysis, rhythmic dictation, and composition were also heavily stressed (8.3). The remaining types of theory were rated as follows: keyboard harmony, 6.7; transposition, 5.3; form and analysis, 3.7; and arranging, 2.3. A comparison of Harmony courses with General Music and Music Theory courses showed more stress placed on harmonic and rhythmic elements and composition in the Harmony classes,

and less emphasis on form and analysis and arranging.

Harmony and General Music. The Harmony and General Music course, reported by a class A school, placed greatest emphasis on the following ten types of music theory: music terminology, scale structure, key signatures, interval study, chord construction, harmony, harmonic dictation, rhythmic analysis, rhythmic dictation, and arranging. Form and analysis, keyboard harmony, and composition received average stress, and transposition received little or no attention.

Harmony and Arranging. This course, reported by a class B school, placed greatest emphasis on the following eight types of theory: music terminology, scale structure, key signatures, interval study, chord construction, harmony, form and analysis, and arranging. Average emphasis was given to harmonic dictation, rhythmic analysis, rhythmic dictation, transposition, keyboard harmony, and composition.

Harmony and Composition. The Harmony and Composition course, reported by a class B school, placed greatest emphasis on the following eleven types of theory: music terminology, scale structure, key signatures, interval study, chord construction, harmony, harmonic dictation, rhythmic analysis, form and analysis, transposition, and

composition. The remaining types of theory--rhythmic dictation, keyboard harmony, and arranging--received average emphasis.

Music History. This course, reported by a class A school, placed greatest emphasis on the following nine types of theory: music terminology, scale structure, key signatures, interval study, chord construction, harmony, harmonic dictation, rhythmic analysis, and rhythmic dictation. Transposition, keyboard harmony, and arranging received average emphasis in this course, and form and analysis and composition received little or no attention. This was the only music theory course which placed no emphasis on form and analysis.

Music Appreciation. The Music Appreciation course, reported by a class B school, generally placed less emphasis on music theory than any of the other music theory courses included in the study. Only music terminology, scale structure, and form and analysis received great emphasis. Key signatures, interval study, chord construction, harmony, rhythmic analysis and transposition received average emphasis, and harmonic dictation, rhythmic dictation, keyboard harmony, arranging, and composition received little or no attention.

Composition. The Composition course, reported by a class A school, placed greatest emphasis on the following ten types of music theory: music terminology, scale structure, key signatures, interval study, chord construction, harmony, rhythmic analysis, form and analysis, transposition, and composition. Harmonic dictation, rhythmic dictation, keyboard harmony, and arranging received average emphasis.

Music Survey. The Music Survey course, reported by a class A school, placed greatest emphasis on the following nine types of music theory: music terminology, scale structure, key signatures, interval study, chord construction, harmony, harmonic dictation, rhythmic analysis, and rhythmic dictation. Form and analysis, keyboard harmony, and composition received average emphasis, and transposition and arranging received little or no attention.

Table IX, on page sixty-four, shows the average degree of emphasis placed on music theory in each music theory course included in the study. As shown by Table IX, the average of all music theory courses ranked the fourteen types of music theory as follows: music terminology, 10.; scale structure, 9.2; harmony, 9.2; rhythmic analysis, 8.; harmonic dictation, 7.2; form and analysis, 6.8; rhythmic dictation, 6.6; composition, 5.4; transposition, 5.3;

TABLE IX

SUMMARY OF THE EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC
THEORY IN HIGH SCHOOL THEORY COURSES*

	Type of Class										Average emphasis
	General Music	Harmory	Music Theory	Harmory and Arranging	Harmory and General Music	Harmory and Composition	Music History	Music Appreciation	Composition	Music Survey	
Total classes . . .	6	3	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	20
Type of music theory	Degree of Emphasis										
Terminology . . .	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.
Scale structure .	7.9	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	9.8
Key signatures . .	9.1	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	10.	10.	9.4
Interval study . .	7.9	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	10.	10.	9.3
Chord construction	7.4	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	10.	10.	9.2
Harmory	7.4	10.	9.2	10.	10.	10.	10.	5.	10.	10.	9.2
Harmonic dictation	5.4	8.3	7.5	5.	10.	10.	10.	1.	5.	10.	7.2
Rhythmic analysis .	4.4	8.3	7.5	5.	10.	10.	10.	5.	10.	10.	8.
Rhythmic dictation	3.7	8.3	7.5	5.	10.	5.	10.	1.	5.	10.	6.6
Form and analysis	6.1	3.7	7.5	10.	5.	10.	1.	10.	10.	5.	6.8
Transposition . .	4.2	5.3	6.7	5.	1.	10.	5.	5.	10.	1.	5.3
Keyboard harmony .	3.5	6.7	6.7	5.	5.	5.	1.	5.	5.	5.	4.8
Arranging	2.4	2.3	4.7	10.	10.	5.	5.	1.	5.	1.	4.6
Composition . . .	3.	8.3	6.	5.	5.	10.	1.	1.	10.	5.	5.4
Average emphasis on all theory .	5.9	7.9	7.4	7.8	8.2	8.9	7.7	4.5	8.6	7.7	7.5

- * 10. indicates great emphasis
5. indicates average emphasis
1. indicates little or no emphasis

keyboard harmony, 4.8; and arranging, 4.6.

IV. SUMMARY

A study of page two of the questionnaire to high school music teachers revealed that, in vocal music classes, the amount of emphasis placed on music theory tended to diminish in proportion to the size of the school; this tendency was not noted for instrumental classes. Vocal classes in general received little or no emphasis on transposition, keyboard harmony, arranging, and composition. For all vocal classes, groups which received the most intensive training in music theory were the voice class and two beginning choruses; groups which received the least intensive training in music theory were boys' glee clubs and vocal ensembles.

High school instrumental groups generally received more intensive instruction in music theory than did vocal groups, particularly in music terminology, key signatures, scale structure, rhythmic analysis, transposition, and arranging. Key signatures and transposition received more emphasis in advanced instrumental groups than in intermediate groups. Arranging was emphasized most in dance bands, and form and analysis received most attention in advanced orchestra and instrumental ensembles.

A comparison of the degree of emphasis placed on types of music theory in vocal and instrumental classes, and in music theory courses, is shown in Table X, on page sixty-seven. As indicated by the table, music theory courses placed considerably more emphasis on all types of theory than did either vocal or instrumental classes. Analysis of Table X showed groupings of types of music theory, according to the degree of emphasis placed on them, in vocal and instrumental classes, and in music theory courses. These groupings were thought to be significant by the present writer, and are shown in Table XI, on page sixty-eight.

TABLE X
SUMMARY OF THE EMPHASIS PLACED ON MUSIC THEORY
IN ALL MUSIC CLASSES AND COURSES*

	Type of Class		
	Vocal	Instru- mental	Theory
Total classes	218	179	20
Type of theory	Degree of Emphasis		
Terminology	6.5	8.2	10.
Key signatures.	5.3	7.8	9.4
Scale structure	5.3	7.	9.8
Rhythmic analysis	4.9	6.	8.
Interval study.	5.4	4.8	9.3
Chord construction.	3.8	4.2	9.2
Harmony	3.4	3.6	9.2
Form and analysis	1.9	2.9	6.8
Rhythmic dictation.	3.2	2.1	6.6
Transposition	1.4	3.2	5.3
Harmonic dictation.	2.	2.7	7.2
Arranging	1.1	2.4	4.6
Keyboard harmony.	1.5	1.2	4.8
Composition	1.1	1.2	5.4
Average emphasis on all theory	3.4	4.1	7.5

* 10. indicates great emphasis
5. indicates average emphasis
1. indicates little or no emphasis

TABLE XI
 COMPARATIVE GROUPING OF MUSIC THEORY ACCORDING TO THE
 EMPHASIS RECEIVED IN HIGH SCHOOL
 MUSIC CLASSES AND COURSES

Type of Class	Degree of Emphasis Placed on Music Theory			
	Most emphasis	Moderate emphasis	Light emphasis	Little or no emphasis
Vocal	Musical terms Key signatures Scale structure Intervals	Chord construction Harmony Rhythmic dictation Rhythmic analysis	Harmonic dictation Form and analysis	Transposition Keyboard harmony Arranging Composition
Instrumental	Musical terms Key signatures Scale structure Rhythmic analysis	Chord construction Harmony Intervals Transposition	Harmonic dictation Form and analysis Arranging Rhythmic dictation	Keyboard harmony Composition
Theory	Musical terms Key signatures Scale structure Intervals Chord construction Harmony	Rhythmic analysis Rhythmic dictation Harmonic dictation Form and analysis	Composition Transposition Arranging Keyboard harmony	

CHAPTER V

OBSTACLES IN THE WAY OF INCLUDING MUSIC THEORY COURSES IN THE HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Page three of the questionnaire to high school music teachers was directed towards schools which did not, at time of writing, include a music theory course in their high school curriculum. Data obtained from this section of the questionnaire was divided into three categories, in order to reveal: (1) reasons for not including music theory courses in the curriculum, (2) reasons for discontinuing music theory courses which were once offered, and (3) plans being made for future inclusion of music theory courses in the curriculum. A total of one hundred and eight teachers responded to part one of this section; of these, fifteen teachers responded to part two, and forty-one teachers responded to part three.

I. REASONS GIVEN FOR NOT INCLUDING MUSIC THEORY COURSES IN THE CURRICULUM

Music directors who completed this section of the questionnaire were given a list of possible reasons for not including music theory courses in the curriculum, and space was provided for listing additional contributing reasons. Choices offered in the questionnaire were:

(1) the administration feels that a music theory course is unnecessary; (2) our music staff feels that sufficient music theory can be taught in regular music classes such as band and chorus; (3) our music staff does not have time to teach a music theory course; (4) high school scheduling difficulties have prevented the addition of a music theory course; (5) student interest in a music theory course is too low to justify its' addition; (6) a music theory course has not been included because of the cost of books and materials; and (7) any other contributing reasons.

The one hundred and eight teachers responding were distributed by size of school as follows: class A, 16.7 per cent; class B, 28.7 per cent; class C, 39.8 per cent; and class D, 14.8 per cent.

Class A schools. The eighteen teachers from class A schools listed a total of thirty-five reasons, under six categories, for not including a music theory course in the high school curriculum. Listed in order of frequency, they were: (1) scheduling difficulties, 42.9 per cent; (2) insufficient time on the part of the music staff, 31.4 per cent; (3) student interest too low, 8.6 per cent; (4) help in music theory is given to advanced students outside of regular class hours, 8.6 per cent; (5) our music staff feels sufficient music theory can be taught

in regular music classes, 5.7 per cent; (6) the administration feels such a course is unnecessary, 2.8 per cent.

Class B schools. Thirty-one teachers from class B schools listed a total of sixty-seven reasons, under seven categories, for not including music theory courses in the curriculum. Listed in order of importance, they were: (1) scheduling difficulties, 41.8 per cent; (2) insufficient time on the part of the music staff, 32.8 per cent; (3) the administration feels such a course is unnecessary, 10.4 per cent; (4) student interest is too low, 8.9 per cent; (5) help in music theory is given to advanced students outside of regular class hours, 3.1 per cent; (6) our music staff feels sufficient music theory can be taught in regular music classes, 1.5 per cent; (7) the cost of books and materials is prohibitive, 1.5 per cent.

Class C schools. Forty-three teachers from class C schools listed a total of one hundred and seventeen reasons, under eight categories, for not including music theory courses in the curriculum. Listed in order of importance, they were: (1) insufficient time on the part of the music staff, 33.3 per cent; (2) scheduling difficulties, 29.8 per cent; (3) the administration feels such a course is unnecessary, 12.9 per cent; (4) student interest is too low, 10.2 per cent; (5) our music staff feels suf-

ficient music theory can be taught in regular music classes, 8.5 per cent; (6) our school is too small, 2.5 per cent; (7) the cost of books and materials is prohibitive, 1.7 per cent; (8) help in music theory is given to advanced students outside of regular class hours, 1.1 per cent.

Class D schools. Sixteen teachers from class D schools listed a total of sixty reasons, under eight categories, for not including music theory courses in the curriculum. Listed in order of importance, they were: (1) scheduling difficulties, 30 per cent; (2) student interest is too low, 18.3 per cent; (3) insufficient time on the part of the music staff, 16.7 per cent; (4) our music staff feels sufficient music theory can be taught in regular music classes, 13.3 per cent; (5) the administration feels such a course is unnecessary, 10.3 per cent; (6) our school is too small, 8.3 per cent; (7) help in music theory is given to advanced students outside of regular class hours, 1.7 per cent; (8) the cost of books and materials is prohibitive, 1.7 per cent.

Table XII, on page seventy-three, shows the number and percentage of reasons given for not including music theory courses in the high school curriculum. As shown by the table, two hundred and seventy-nine reasons were listed by the one hundred and eight music directors, dis-

TABLE XII

REASONS FOR NOT INCLUDING MUSIC THEORY COURSES IN THE CURRICULUM

Reason	Size of School									
	Class A		Class B		Class C		Class D		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Lack of administrative support . .	1	2.8	7	10.4	15	12.9	6	10.	29	10.3
Sufficient theory can be taught in performing groups	2	5.7	1	1.5	10	8.5	8	13.3	21	7.5
Insufficient teacher time.	11	31.4	22	32.8	39	33.3	10	16.7	82	29.8
Scheduling difficulties.	15	42.9	28	41.8	35	29.8	18	30.	96	34.4
Low student interest	3	8.6	6	8.9	12	10.2	11	18.3	30	11.4
Cost of books and materials. . . .			1	1.5	2	1.7	1	1.7	4	1.3
School is too small.					3	2.5	5	8.3	8	2.8
Help is given to advanced students	3	8.6	2	3.1	1	1.1	1	1.7	7	2.5
Totals	35	100.	67	100.	117	100.	60	100.	279	100.
Directors rating subjects.	18		31		43		16		108	

tributed in order of importance as follows: (1) scheduling difficulties, 34.4 per cent; (2) insufficient teaching time, 29.8 per cent; (3) student interest too low, 11.4 per cent; (4) the administration feels such a course is unnecessary, 10.3 per cent; (5) the music staff feels sufficient music theory can be taught in regular music classes, 7.5 per cent; (6) the school is too small, 2.8 per cent; (7) help in music theory is given to advanced students outside of regular class hours, 2.5 per cent; (8) the cost of books and materials is prohibitive, 1.3 per cent.

The following observations were made on the basis of the data collected: (1) class A and B schools considered scheduling to be a more serious problem than did class C and D schools. (2) Class A music directors were more certain of administrative support of music theory programs than were directors from smaller schools. (3) Only 16.7 per cent of class D respondents considered insufficient teacher time to be a deciding factor in not presenting a music theory course, while directors from A, B, and C schools felt that this, together with scheduling difficulties, was a major obstacle. (4) The percentage of respondents indicating low student interest as a factor increased as the size of the school decreased. (5) The percentage of respondents indicating that help was given to advanced students outside of regular class hours showed a tendency

to increase in proportion to the size of the school. (6) Only one class B teacher and two class A teachers felt that sufficient music theory could be taught in regular music classes, while ten class C teachers and eight class D teachers felt they could teach sufficient theory in regular music classes. (7) Size of school as a factor influencing the establishment of music theory courses was listed by class C and D schools only, and the percentage was too small to be considered significant. (8) The cost of books and materials as a prohibitive factor was considered by most respondents to be insignificant.

II. REASONS GIVEN FOR DISCONTINUING MUSIC THEORY COURSES

Eleven teachers stated that their high school curriculums had once included a music theory course. Of these, 18.2 per cent were from class A schools, 27.3 per cent from class B schools, and 54.4 per cent from class C schools. No class D respondent completed this section of the questionnaire. Music teachers responding to this section were given a check list of possible reasons for discontinuing the music theory courses, and space was provided for listing additional reasons.

Class A schools. Two music directors from class A schools listed a total of three reasons, under two cate-

gories, for cancelling music theory courses in their high school curriculums. Both respondents checked low student interest as a reason, and one teacher also checked scheduling difficulties as a contributing factor.

Class B schools. Three music directors from class B schools listed three different reasons for discontinuing their music theory courses. Reasons listed were: (1) scheduling difficulties, (2) prohibitive cost of books and materials, and (3) the addition of a junior high General Music class to replace the high school theory course.

Class C schools. Six music directors from class C schools listed a total of nine reasons, under four categories, for discontinuing high school music theory courses. Reasons listed were: (1) scheduling difficulties, 45.5 per cent; (2) lack of student interest, 18.2 per cent; (3) prohibitive cost of books and materials, 9.1 per cent; and (4) the addition of a junior high theory course to replace the high school theory course, 9.1 per cent.

As shown in Table XIII, on page seventy-seven, a total of fifteen reasons for discontinuing high school theory courses were listed by eleven music directors from class A, B, and C schools. Listed in order of importance, they were: (1) scheduling difficulties, 46.7 per cent; (2) lack of student interest, 28.7 per cent; (3) prohibi-

TABLE XIII

REASONS FOR DISCONTINUING MUSIC THEORY COURSES

Reasons	Size of School							
	Class A		Class B		Class C		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Scheduling difficulties . . .	1	33.3	1	33.3	5	45.5	7	46.7
Low student interest.	2	66.6			2	18.2	4	28.7
Cost of books and materials .			1	33.3	1	9.1	2	14.3
Theory class has been transferred to junior high . . .			1	33.3	1	9.1	2	14.3
Totals.	3	99.9	3	99.9	9	99.9	15	100.
Directors rating subjects . .	2		3		6		11	

tive cost of books and materials, 14.3 per cent; (4) the addition of a junior high theory course to replace the high school theory course, 14.3 per cent. It was interesting to note that five of the seven responses listing scheduling difficulties as the major factor leading to cancellation of music theory courses were from class C schools.

III. INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY SCHOOLS PLANNING TO OFFER MUSIC THEORY COURSES IN THE FUTURE

Forty-one respondents indicated that some degree of planning had been done by them towards future inclusion of a music theory course in the high school curriculum. Of these, eight were from class A schools, twelve from class B schools, seventeen from class C schools, and four from class D schools. However, only seven of these respondents stated that their theory courses would begin during the next school year, 1956-57. The remaining thirty-four teachers indicated that the date for beginning their theory courses was indefinite.

Course titles. Seven titles for proposed music theory courses were submitted by the forty-one music directors. In order of frequency, they were: (1) General Music, 31.8 per cent; (2) Music Theory, 29.3 per cent; (3) Music Fundamentals, 17.1 per cent; (4) Music History and Appreci-

ation, 12.2 per cent; (5) Music I and II, 4.4 per cent; (6) College Preparatory Music, 2.6 per cent; and (7) Cause and Effect of Music on Human Behavior, 2.6 per cent.

Table XIV, on page eighty, shows the comparison of proposed course titles by frequency and size of school.

Course content

Respondents planning theory courses were asked to list the probable course content of these courses and, while all of them did not do so, the listings obtained were considered of sufficient size for representative tabulation. Information submitted in the following paragraphs, and in Table XIV, was obtained from seven class A schools, six class B schools, thirteen class C schools, and three class D schools.

Class A schools. Harmony was included in the proposed curriculums of five class A directors, and comprised 21.8 per cent of the total responses. Sight singing, sight reading, music history and appreciation, keyboard harmony, composition, arranging, and form and analysis were each listed three times, and together comprised 65 per cent of the proposed theory curriculums. Melodic and harmonic dictation, listed by two teachers, and conducting, listed by one teacher, comprised the remaining 13.2 per cent of the proposed curriculums.

TABLE XIV

PROPOSED TITLES FOR MUSIC THEORY COURSES

Title	Size of school									
	Class A		Class B		Class C		Class D		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
General Music	1	12.5	3	25.	7	41.2	2	50.	13	31.7
Music Theory	4	50.	4	33.3	4	23.5			12	29.4
Music Fundamentals	2	25.	1	8.3	2	11.8	2	50.	7	17.1
College Preparatory Music			1	8.3					1	2.4
Music History and Appreciation			2	16.7	3	17.6			5	12.2
Cause and Effect of Music on Human Behavior			1	8.3					1	2.4
Music I and II	1	12.5			1	5.9			2	4.8
Total responses	8	100.	12	100.	17	100.	4	100.	41	100.

Class B schools. Distribution of the proposed theory course contents by the six class B respondents was as follows: music fundamentals, 25 per cent; sight singing and reading, 16.7 per cent; keyboard harmony, 16.7 per cent; music history and appreciation, 8.3 per cent; composition and arranging, 8.3 per cent; and melodic and harmonic dictation, 8.3 per cent.

Class C schools. Distribution of the proposed theory course contents by the thirteen class C respondents was as follows: harmony, 24.3 per cent; sight singing and reading, 18.9 per cent; music history and appreciation, 13.6 per cent; keyboard harmony, 10.8 per cent; music fundamentals, 8.1 per cent; form and analysis, 5.4 per cent; conducting, 5.4 per cent; and melodic and harmonic dictation, 2.7 per cent.

Class D schools. Distribution of the proposed theory course contents by the three class D respondents was as follows: harmony, 20 per cent; sight singing and reading, 20 per cent; music history and appreciation, 20 per cent; keyboard harmony, 10 per cent; composition and arranging, 10 per cent; music fundamentals, 10 per cent; and conducting, 10 per cent.

Table XV, on page eighty-three, presents an analysis of the theory course contents suggested by the twenty-nine

music directors who completed this section of the questionnaire. As shown by the table, types of suggested music theory were listed, in order of frequency, as follows: harmony, 21.5 per cent; sight singing and reading, 16.7 per cent; music history and appreciation, 15.3 per cent; keyboard harmony, 11.9 per cent; composition and arranging, 10.7 per cent; music fundamentals, 8.3 per cent; form and analysis, 6. per cent; conducting, 4.8 per cent; and melodic dictation, 4.8 per cent.

Class B schools, as shown by Table XV, placed less emphasis on music history and appreciation, composition, and arranging than did other schools, and placed no emphasis on form and analysis and conducting. Class B schools, however, placed more emphasis on music fundamentals and keyboard harmony than did other schools. While form and analysis comprised 13 per cent of the suggested course contents of class A schools, and 5.4 per cent of the course content of class C schools, it was not mentioned by class C and D music directors. Conducting was given little attention by most directors, and was omitted entirely by class B respondents. Melodic and harmonic dictation were also given slight attention, and were not mentioned by class D respondents.

TABLE XV

SUGGESTED COURSE CONTENTS OF MUSIC THEORY COURSES

	Size of School									
	Class A		Class B		Class C		Class D		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Suggestions										
Harmony	5	21.8	2	16.7	9	24.3	2	20.	18	21.5
Sight singing and reading	3	13.	2	16.7	7	18.9	2	20.	14	16.7
Music history and appreciation	3	13.	1	8.3	5	13.6	2	20.	11	15.3
Keyboard harmony	3	13.	2	16.7	4	10.8	1	10.	10	11.9
Composition and arranging	3	13.	1	8.3	4	10.8	1	10.	9	10.7
Music fundamentals			3	25.	3	8.1	1	10.	7	8.3
Form and analysis	3	13.			2	5.4			5	6.
Conducting	1	4.4			2	5.4	1	10.	4	4.8
Melodic and harmonic dictation	2	8.8	1	8.3	1	2.7			4	4.8
Totals	23	100.	12	100.	37	100.	10	100.	82	100.
Directors rating subjects	7		6		13		3		29	

IV. SUMMARY

The one hundred and eight music directors who listed reasons for not including music theory courses in the high school curriculum considered scheduling and insufficient teacher time to be the most serious problems; together, they comprised 64.2 per cent of the total listed reasons. Low student interest and lack of administrative support comprised 21.7 per cent of listed reasons, and 7.5 per cent of the respondents believed they could teach sufficient music theory in regular music classes such as band and chorus. The percentage of responses indicating school size, outside help given to advanced students, and the cost of books and materials as obstacles to the establishment of theory courses was insignificant.

Respondents from class A and B schools considered scheduling to be a more serious problem than did respondents from class C and D schools, and class A directors felt that insufficient teacher time was not a major obstacle. While music teachers in larger schools offered advanced students more outside help, teachers in smaller schools indicated a greater belief in their ability to teach sufficient music theory in regular music classes. Low student interest, however, seemed to be a more serious problem in the smaller schools.

Eleven respondents from class A, B, and C schools reported on music theory courses which had been dropped from their high school curriculums. Their reasons, listed in order of frequency, were: (1) scheduling difficulties, (2) lack of student interest, (3) prohibitive cost of books and materials, and (4) the addition of a junior high school theory course to replace the high school theory course.

Forty-one respondents were planning to incorporate a music theory course into the curriculum at a future date. Only seven, however, planned to initiate the course during the following school year (1956-57). The respondents generally agreed that harmony, sight singing, music history and appreciation, keyboard harmony, composition and arranging, and music fundamentals, in that order, should be included in the theory course contents. Opinion concerning the desirability of form and analysis, conducting, and melodic and harmonic dictation was somewhat divided. These latter types of theory were listed, for the most part, by respondents from class A and C schools.

CHAPTER VI

AN ANALYSIS OF TWENTY MUSIC THEORY COURSES OFFERED IN WASHINGTON STATE HIGH SCHOOLS

Page four of the questionnaire to high school music teachers was directed to schools that included music theory courses in the high school curriculum. Questions included in this section of the questionnaire were designed to obtain the following information: (1) length of course; (2) whether the courses were required or elective and, if required, for which students; (3) towards which goals credits for the course were applied. Information concerning course content had been obtained from page two of the questionnaire, and will be found in Chapter V, section III.

Twenty music directors from class A, B, and C schools reported on music theory courses being offered to high school students during the current school year, 1955-1956. Of these, 50 per cent were from class A schools, 40 per cent from class B schools, and 10 per cent from class C schools. Of the twenty classes reported, 30 per cent were entitled General Music, 20 per cent were entitled Music Theory, and 15 per cent were entitled Harmony. The remaining titles, each comprising 5 per cent of the total classes listed, were: Harmony and Arranging, Harmony and General Music, Harmony and Composition, Music History,

Music Appreciation, Composition, and Music Survey. The percentage and distribution of these classes is shown in Table XVI, on page eighty-eight.

I. CLASS A SCHOOLS

Eight class A schools reported a total of ten music theory courses being offered, distributed as follows: three Harmony courses, two Music Theory courses, and one each of General Music, Harmony and General Music, Composition, Music History, and Music Survey. Of these, six courses were offered for one semester, and the remaining four courses for two semesters. No courses listed were on a required only basis; six were elective, and four were required for some students and elective for others. Students required to take music theory courses were listed variously as music majors, band members, orchestra members and, in one instance, advanced choir members. Credit, in all but one instance, was applied towards graduation; the one class offered no credit. An analysis of class A theory courses is shown in Table XVII, on page eighty-nine.

General Music. The General Music course, an elective, was offered for two semesters, and credit was applied towards graduation.

TABLE XVI
 PERCENTAGE AND DISTRIBUTION OF MUSIC THEORY
 COURSES OFFERED IN HIGH SCHOOLS

Course titles	Size of School							
	Class A		Class B		Class C		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
General Music	1	10.	4	50.	1	50.	6	30.
Harmony	3	30.					3	15.
Music Theory.	2	20.	1	12.5	1	50.	4	20.
Harmony and Arranging . .			1	12.5			1	5.
Harmony and General Music	1	10.					1	5.
Harmony and Composition.			1	12.5			1	5.
Music History	1	10.					1	5.
Music Appreciation. . . .			1	12.5			1	5.
Composition	1	10.					1	5.
Music Survey.	1	10.					1	5.
Totals.	10	100.	8	100.	2	100.	20	100.

NOTE: This table is based on information submitted by eight class A schools, six class B schools, and two class C schools.

TABLE XVII

AN ANALYSIS OF TEN MUSIC THEORY COURSES OFFERED IN CLASS A HIGH SCHOOLS

Course Title	No. of semesters, each course		Required or Elective			For whom required				Credit applied towards:	
	1	2	Req.	Elec.	Both	Music major	Band	Orch.	Adv. choir	Graduation	None
General Music		X		X						X	
Harmony and General Music	X				X	X				X	
Harmony		X		X						X	
Harmony		X		X						X	
Harmony	X			X						X	
Composition		X		X						X	
Music Theory	X				X	X			X	X	
Music Theory	X				X	X	X	X		X	
Music History	X				X	X	X	X		X	
Music Survey	X			X							X
Totals	6	4		6	4	4	2	2	1	9	1

NOTE: This table is based on information submitted by eight class A schools.

Harmony. Two of the three Harmony courses were offered for two semesters; the remaining course was offered for one semester only. All three courses were elective, with credit earned applied towards graduation.

Composition. The Composition course, elective for music students, was offered for two semesters, with credit earned applied towards graduation.

Harmony and General Music. The Harmony and General Music course, required of music majors and elective for the general student body, was offered for one semester each year. Credit earned was applied towards graduation.

Music Theory. Both Music Theory courses were one semester in length, and were both elective and required. One course was required for music majors and advanced choir members; the other was required for music majors and band and orchestra members. In both courses, credit earned was applied towards graduation.

Music History. The Music History course, offered for one semester, was required for music majors and band and orchestra members. It was also elective for the general student body. Credit earned was applied towards graduation.

Music Survey. The Music Survey course, offered for one semester, was elective for music students and the general student body. No credit was given for the course.

II. CLASS B SCHOOLS

Six class B schools reported a total of eight music theory courses being offered, distributed as follows: four General Music courses, and one each of Harmony and Arranging, Harmony and Composition, Music Appreciation, and Music Theory. The Harmony and Arranging course was offered for one semester; all other courses were two semesters in length. One General Music course was required for music majors; the other three were elective. Credit towards graduation was given for all courses and, in addition, one General Music course and the Harmony and Composition course gave extra credit in other music classes. An analysis of these courses is shown in Table XVIII, on page ninety-two.

General Music. All four General Music courses were two semesters in length, with credit earned applied towards graduation. Students completing one of these courses were also given extra credit in other music classes. One course was required for music majors; the others were elective for the general student body.

TABLE XVIII

AN ANALYSIS OF EIGHT MUSIC THEORY COURSES OFFERED IN CLASS B HIGH SCHOOLS

Course title	No. of semesters, each course		Required or Elective			Credit applied towards:	
	1	2	Req.	Elec.	Both	Graduation	Credit in other music classes
General Music		X	X			X	
General Music		X		X	X	X	
General Music		X	X			X	
General Music		X	X			X	X
Harmory and Arranging .	X		X			X	
Harmory and Composition		X	X			X	X
Music Appreciation. . .		X	X			X	
Music Theory.		X	X			X	
Totals.	1	7	7	1	1	8	2

NOTE: This table is based on information submitted by six class B schools.

Harmony and Arranging. The Harmony and Arranging course, one semester in length, was elective for music students. Credit earned was applied towards graduation.

Harmony and Composition. The Harmony and Composition course, two semesters in length, was elective for music students. Credit earned was applied towards extra credit in other music classes, as well as towards graduation.

Music Appreciation. The Music Appreciation course, two semesters in length, was elective for the general student body. Credit earned was applied towards graduation.

Music Theory. The Music Theory course, two semesters in length, was elective for the general student body. Credit earned was applied towards graduation.

III. CLASS C SCHOOLS

A General Music and a Music Theory course were reported by two class C schools. Both were two semesters in length and both were required for music majors; in addition, the Music Theory course was elective for the general student body. The General Music course offered no credit, while the Music Theory course offered credit for music awards as well as towards graduation. An analysis of

TABLE XIX

AN ANALYSIS OF TWO MUSIC THEORY COURSES OFFERED IN CLASS C HIGH SCHOOLS

Course title	No. of semesters, each course		Required or Elective		Required for music majors	Credit applied towards:		
	1	2	Req.	Elec. Both		Graduation	Music awards	None
General Music		X	X		X			X
Music Theory.		X		X	X	X	X	
Totals.		2	1	1	2	1	1	1

these courses is shown in Table XIX, on page ninety-four.

IV. SUMMARY

A comparison of all music theory courses included in the study showed a slight preference for one-semester course offerings in class A schools, and a decided preference for two-semester course offerings in class B and C schools. Only 5 per cent of the twenty courses were offered on a required basis only, while 65 per cent were elective and 30 per cent were both required and elective. Of the twelve course which were required of some students, 58.3 per cent were required of music majors, 16.7 per cent of band members, 16.7 per cent of orchestra members, and 8.3 per cent of advanced choir members.

Eighteen of the twenty courses offered credit of some sort for completion of the course. Ninety per cent of the courses applied credit towards graduation, 5 per cent applied credit earned towards music awards, and 10 per cent applied credit earned towards extra credit in other music classes. The remaining two courses offered no credit for the course.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There has been a great deal of controversy among music educators concerning the methods, or lack of methods, by which music theory is taught in high schools. A review of literature written on the subject seemed to indicate that the biggest problems had to do with where, how, and in what quantity the material should be presented. For example, what should be the answers to the following questions: What music theory can be successfully included in the regular band and chorus curriculums? What music theory should lie particularly within the realm of the specialized music theory course? Should the music theory offered to members of performing groups be strictly utilitarian, or should it emphasize a broader understanding of music through more historical and appreciative instruction? These are questions which must be given constant and careful consideration by the music director who wishes to plan an effective and worthwhile program.

It seemed evident that, in light of the findings of the present study, the small school curriculum offers very little opportunity for the inclusion of a music theory course. That this was not the exclusive problem of the small school, however, was shown by questionnaire

returns, which indicated that the main obstacles in the way of including theory courses in the curriculum were difficulties in scheduling and lack of teacher time and personnel. These obstacles make it obvious that, if high school students are to learn music theory at all, the great majority of them must learn it in the regular band and chorus periods. Thus, the responsibility of the director of performing groups to plan the theory content of his course carefully is obvious.

I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In an effort to discover how the problem of teaching music theory in high school music classes was being met by teachers in Washington State, three hundred questionnaires were sent to a representative sampling of high schools in every section of the state. The total number of questionnaires used, after discarding those which were incomplete or incorrectly filled out, was one hundred and twenty-four, or 41.3 per cent of the questionnaires sent.

Trends Indicated by the Questionnaire

Results of the questionnaire indicated that directors in smaller schools planned the theory content of their instrumental classes more carefully than did direc-

tors in larger schools; this situation, however, was reversed for vocal and theory classes. In vocal classes, the amount of emphasis placed on music theory tended to diminish in proportion to the size of the school; this tendency was not noted for instrumental classes. Types of theory most generally emphasized in vocal classes, in order of frequency, were music terminology, key signatures, scale structures, and interval study. High school instrumental groups generally received more intensive training in music theory than did vocal groups, particularly in terminology, key signatures, scale structures, rhythmic analysis, transposition, and arranging. Theory courses placed considerably more emphasis on all types of music theory than did either vocal or instrumental classes.

Difficulties encountered in establishing theory courses. Next to scheduling and insufficient teacher time, low student interest and lack of administrative support were felt to be the most serious obstacles to the establishment of music theory courses. This opinion, however, was only partially supported by reports from eleven schools which had once included music theory courses in their curriculums. Listed in order of frequency, their reasons for dropping the courses included: (1) scheduling difficulties, (2) lack of student interest, (3) the prohibitive cost of books and materials, and (4) the addition of a junior high

school theory course to replace the high school course. These results would seem to indicate that the cost of books and materials for such a course is more than most music directors realize, and that the junior high theory course is, in some cases, the only satisfactory solution to the problem of scheduling.

Suggested content for theory courses. Twenty-nine music directors, who had devoted some thought to the future addition of a music theory course to the high school curriculum, submitted suggestions for the content of theory courses. In order of frequency, the listing included harmony, sight reading and singing, music history and appreciation, keyboard harmony, composition and arranging, form and analysis, conducting, and melodic and harmonic dictation. This listing agreed closely with the results of Curry's survey of current practices in the Arizona high schools. According to McEachern's survey of college and university musicologists, however, the listing placed undue emphasis on harmony.

Bases for established theory courses. A comparison of twenty music theory courses currently being offered in class A, B, and C schools showed some preference for one-semester courses in class A schools, and two-semester courses in class B and C schools. Ninety-five per cent of

listed courses were placed primarily on an elective basis, but some were also required for music majors or other specialized groups of students. Ninety per cent of these courses offered credit towards graduation.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The survey of Washington music educators indicated that the types of music theory receiving greatest emphasis were grouped into three categories: (1) music fundamentals, including terminology, key signatures and scale structures; (2) rudimentary harmony, including interval study by name and sound, chord construction, and basic chord progression; and (3) rhythmic analysis and drill. With few exceptions, this proved to be the case for music theory courses as well as performing groups, the difference being one of degree of emphasis rather than types of theory emphasized.

Instrumental and choral directors not presently teaching a theory course suggested that the basis of such a course be: (1) harmony, sight singing and reading, music history and appreciation; (2) keyboard harmony, composition and arranging, and music fundamentals. Opinion was divided as to the value of form and analysis, melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic dictation, and conducting. These suggestions agree closely with recommendations of the Music Educators

National Conference Curriculum Committee, college musicologists, and Arizona music educators.

Results of the study revealed an apparent discrepancy between recommendations of music educators, concerning the course content of music theory courses, and actual practices as they exist in established theory courses of the state. With few exceptions, the study of keyboard harmony, and creative work such as composition and harmony, were given little emphasis in these courses.

The questionnaire used in this study was not designed as an instrument to measure the emphasis placed upon music history and appreciation. It may be noted, however, that the course titles of fifty-five per cent of the theory courses included in the study implied some degree of study in these areas. These titles were: General Music, Harmony and General Music, Music History, Music Appreciation, and Music Survey.

Most music educators agreed that the busy rehearsal schedule of most performing groups left little time for instruction in the broader areas of music theory, and they recommended the addition of a music theory course as a solution to the problem. Many directors further recommended that such a course be offered to the general student body as well as to members of performing groups.

Recommendations for future study.

In view of the foregoing conclusions, the following studies which, to the writer's knowledge, have not been attempted, suggest themselves as worthwhile subjects for future investigation.

(1) A survey of musicologists in colleges and universities of Washington State to determine their recommendations for a program of music study in the high schools which would (a) provide an adequate musical education for students not planning advanced musical studies, and (b) provide the type of adequate pre-college training which is, in their opinion, most desirable.

(2) A survey of superintendents and principals in high school of Washington State to determine their attitudes and feelings about the establishment of music theory courses in the high schools, with the following points in mind: (a) their philosophy of education, concerning the inclusion of music theory courses in the high school curriculum; (b) their willingness to work with the music staff in the planning and establishment of such a course; (c) if such courses are already established, their degree of satisfaction with the results; (d) if such courses were once established in the curriculum but were removed, what were the reasons; (e) suggestions for the improvement of theoretic or other musical instruction.

(3) A comparative study of high school students in Washington State, to include (a) students not enrolled in music classes, (b) students enrolled in bands, orchestras, and choirs, and (c) students enrolled in music theory courses. The purpose of the study would be to determine the effect which the various types and degrees of musical training had upon the following: (a) a general knowledge of music fundamentals, such as clef signs, key and time signatures, and music terminology; (b) a knowledge of musical skills such as chord structure and progression, transposition, and arranging; (c) the aural aspects of music, such as sight singing, recognition and distinction of tones, melodies, and rhythms, and the ability to remember and/or reproduce them by playing, singing, or writing; (d) cultural and historical aspects of music, such as periods of music history, style, form and design, and familiarity with well-known composers' names, works, and lives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Books

Dykema, Peter, and Karl Gehrkens. The Teaching and Administration of High School Music. Boston: C.C. Birchard and Company, 1941.

Kwalwasser, Jacob. Problems in Public School Music. New York: M. Witmark and Sons, 1932.

McEachern, Edna. Education of School Music Teachers. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937.

Murphy, Howard A. Teaching Musicianship. New York: Coleman-Ross Company, Incorporated, 1950.

Mursell, James L. "Music in the Curriculum." H.R. Douglass, editor, The High School Curriculum. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1927. Chapter 27, pp.546-560.

_____. Principles of Music Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

2. Articles and Bulletins

Boswell, Helen. "High School Music Credits," Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1937. Pp. 98-101.

Chambers, Will Grant. "What Company Should Music Keep?" Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1929. Pp. 40-46.

Curry, Pat B. "Arizona Theory and Composition Survey," Music In American Education. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1955. Pp. 23-4.

De Stowinski, Gail. "The Function of Music as a Service Course to Music Education," Music In American Education. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1955. P.24.

Haydon, Glen. "Music Research and Modal Counterpoint," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1934. Pp. 217-22.

- Larson, Ruth Crewdon. "A Brief Report of a Prediction and Guidance Program in School Music," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1934. Pp. 223-26.
- Meissner, W. Otto. "Music As Integrated Experience," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1937. Pp. 117-23.
- Music Education Research Council. Music Theory and Music History in the Secondary School. Music Educators National Conference Bulletin No. 104. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference. (n.d.).
- Music Educators National Conference. "Senior High School Music," Music Education Source Book. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1947. Pp. 13-16.
- Nohavec, Hazel B.(ed.). "Music History, Composing, and Arranging," Music Education Curriculum Committee Reports. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1945. Pp. 45-7.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. "The Child's Bill of Rights in Music," Music Educators Journal, 37:24-9, April-May, 1951.
- Park, S. Norman. "To Entertain or to Educate," Music Educators Journal, 23:55, February-March, 1947.
- Phelps, Norman. "Music Theory As a Part of the High School Music Program," Education, 67:404, March, 1949.
- Rafferty, Sadie M. "Music Literature, Theory, Harmony, and Composition," Music In American Education. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1955. Pp. 210-14.
- Smith, Melville. "The Importance of Solfege as a Secondary School Subject," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1934. Pp. 255-58.
- Weaver, Paul J. "High School Music Credits," Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1929. Pp. 138-9.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books

Morgan, Hazel Nohavec (ed.). Music In American Education: Music Education Source Book Number Two. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1955.

Mursell, James L., and Mabelle Glenn. The Psychology of School Music Teaching. New York: Silver, Burdett and Company, 1931.

Pitts, Lila Belle. The Music Curriculum in a Changing World. New York: Silver Burdett and Company, 1941.

2. Articles

Bodley, J. Russell. "Presenting Harmony as a Unit Course," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1937. Pp. 105-09.

Cheyette, Irving. "Screening College Music Freshmen," Education, 67:162-68, November, 1946.

National Research of Music Education. "High School Credit Courses in Music," Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1929. Pp. 30-6.

Normann, Theodore F. "The Responsibility of Music to Education," Music Educators Journal, Vol. 42, No. 7, September-October, 1956. P. 23.

Peter, Darrell. "Are We Teaching Music or Theory?" Music Educators Journal, Vol. 41, No. 6, June-July, 1955. Pp. 46-9.

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND LETTER
TO MUSIC EDUCATORS

William L. Wicker
824 Barnhart
Raymond, Washington

Dear Sir:

As part of the work on a Master's thesis, and in cooperation with the Division of Music of Central Washington College of Education, I am conducting a survey to determine the current educational practices in providing for the teaching of music theory in the high schools of Washington State. Since the survey is based on a selected sampling, the report of each school is extremely important if the results are to be valid.

Will you please give me your cooperation in this matter by filling out the following inquiry? All answers will be held in strict confidence; you need not sign your name.

For purposes of this study, music theory is defined as "a body of facts and principles about the construction and notation of music, as distinguished from performance." The areas of music theory under present investigation are listed in the inquiry.

If you desire to have the results of this survey sent to you, please indicate below:

 Please send me a copy of the results of this survey.

If possible, we would like to have this inquiry returned by November, 1955.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

William L. Wicker

A SURVEY TO DETERMINE CURRENT EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES IN PROVIDING FOR THE TEACHING OF MUSIC THEORY IN HIGH SCHOOLS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What is the enrollment of your high school? _____
2. Is your school a three-year or a four-year high school? _____
3. How many full-time or part-time teachers are employed at the high school level? _____

II. METHOD OF PLANNING FOR THEORY STUDY IN MUSIC CLASSES

Directions: Please use the following check system to indicate your method of incorporating music theory into the teaching of your regular music classes:

- No planned course of theory study in this class XXX
- Partially planned course of theory study in this class. XX
- Fully planned course of theory study in this class. . . X
- I do not teach this class 0

VOCAL CLASSES

1. Advanced or select choir. . . _____
2. General mixed chorus. _____
3. Boys' Glee club _____
4. Girls' Glee club. _____
5. Small ensembles _____
6. Other vocal (list):
 - a. _____ . . _____
 - b. _____ . . _____

INSTRUMENTAL CLASSES

7. Advanced band _____
8. Intermediate band _____
9. Beginning band. _____
10. Advanced orchestra. _____
11. Intermediate orchestra. _____
12. Beginning orchestra _____
13. Small ensembles _____
14. Other instrumental (list):
 - a. _____ . . _____
 - b. _____ . . _____

MUSIC THEORY COURSES

15. General music and/or music appreciation. _____
16. Arranging and/or composition _____
17. Other (list):
 - a. _____ . . _____
 - b. _____ . . _____

PLEASE CHECK THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS EACH TYPE OF LISTED MUSIC THEORY RECEIVES IN EACH HIGH SCHOOL MUSIC CLASS YOU TEACH.

Directions:	VOCAL CLASSES					INSTRUMENTAL CLASSES					THEORY COURSES						
	1. Adv. or select choir	2. General mixed chorus	3. Boys' glee club	4. Girls' glee club	5. Vocal ensembles	6. Other (list):	7. Advanced band	8. Intermediate band	9. Beginning band	10. Advanced orchestra	11. Intermediate orchestra	12. Beginning orchestra	13. Instrumental ensembles	14. Other (list):	15. General music and/or music appreciation	16. Arranging and/or composition	17. Other (list):
<p>Take one class at a time, proceed from top to bottom, and use the following check system to indicate the degree of emphasis each type of music theory receives in every high school music class which you teach.</p> <p>Much emphasis: XX Average emphasis: X Little emphasis: 0</p>																	
TYPES OF MUSIC THEORY:																	
1. Music terminology																	
2. Scale structure																	
3. Key signatures																	
4. Interval study, by name and sound.																	
5. Chord construction																	
6. Chord progression (harmony).																	
7. Harmonic dictation																	
8. Rhythmic analysis.																	
9. Rhythmic dictation																	
10. Form and analysis.																	
11. Transposition.																	
12. Keyboard harmony																	
13. Arranging.																	
14. Composition.																	
15. Other (list):																	
(a) _____																	
(b) _____																	

TO BE FILLED OUT ONLY IF YOU DO OFFER A MUSIC THEORY COURSE IN YOUR HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Directions:

In the right hand columns are listed possible titles of music theory courses, with additional columns provided for listing other theory courses included in your high school curriculum. Use these columns as a check list, as indicated in the questionnaire below.

- 1. Please check all music theory courses which are offered in your high school curriculum.
2. List the number of semesters the class meets, for completion of each course offered.
3. Indicate by (R) or (E) whether the courses are required (R) or elective (E).
4. If any courses were listed as required (R) in question three, to what students does this apply? Check all appropriate squares:
A. General student body.
B. Music majors.
C. Band members.
D. Orchestra members.
E. General chorus members.
F. Advanced or select choir members.
G. Other:
5. Towards which goal (goals) are credits for these theory courses given? Check all appropriate squares:
A. Graduation.
B. Music letters, awards, etc.
C. Extra credit in other music classes.
D. None.
E. Other:

Table with 6 columns: Arranging, Harmony, Composition, General Music, (a), (b). Includes 'Course Titles' and 'other:' headers.

TO BE FILLED OUT ONLY IF YOU DO NOT OFFER A
MUSIC THEORY COURSE IN YOUR CURRICULUM

Please check each of the following items
which help to explain such exclusion.

1. The administration feels that a music theory course
is unnecessary _____
2. Our music staff feels that sufficient music theory can be
taught in regular music classes such as band and chorus. . . _____
3. Our music staff does not have time to teach a music
theory course. _____
4. High school scheduling difficulties have prevented the
addition of a music theory course. _____
5. Student interest in a music theory course is too low to
justify its' addition. _____
6. A music theory course has not been included in the
curriculum because of the cost of books and materials. . . _____
7. A music theory course was once taught in our high school
but was discontinued, due to:
 - (a) scheduling difficulties _____
 - (b) lack of student interest. _____
 - (c) prohibitive cost of books and materials _____
 - (d) other (list): _____

8. Any other contributing reasons? (List):
9. A. Are you planning the addition of a music theory course
in the future? Yes ___ No ___
- B. If yes, how soon? (a) this school year _____
(b) next school year _____
(c) undecided. _____
- C. What will be the probable name and subject content
of the course?

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS:

DEGREE OF PLANNING FOR MUSIC THEORY PRESENTATION

TABLE III A
DEGREE OF PLANNING FOR MUSIC THEORY
PRESENTATION IN CLASS A SCHOOLS

Type of class	Degree of Planning							
	Fully Planned		Partially Planned		Not Planned		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
<u>Vocal</u>								
Select choir.	2	14.3	8	57.1	4	14.3	14	100.
Mixed chorus.	3	23.1	8	61.7	2	15.2	13.	100.
Boys' glee.	1	33.3			2	66.7	3	100.
Girls' glee	2	20.	4	40.	4	40.	10	100.
Ensembles			5	41.7	7	58.3	12	100.
Beginning chorus. . . .			1	100.			1	100.
Voice class			1	100.			1	100.
Total, all voice classes	8	14.8	27	50.	19	35.2	54	100.
<u>Instrumental</u>								
High school band. . . .	2	14.3	7	50.	5	35.7	14	100.
Intermediate band . . .	1	14.3	4	57.	2	28.7	7	100.
High school orchestra .	2	20.	4	40.	4	40.	10	100.
Intermediate orchestra.	1	25.	3	75.			4	100.
Ensembles			3	43.	4	57.	7	100.
Dance band.			1	50.	1	50.	2	100.
Total, all instrumental classes. . . .	6	13.7	22	50.	16	36.3	44	100.
<u>Theory</u>								
General Music	1	100.					1	100.
Harmony	2	66.7	1	33.3			3	100.
Music Theory.	2	100.					1	100.
Harmony and General Music	1	100.					1	100.
Music History	1	100.					1	100.
Composition	1	100.					1	100.
Music Survey.	1	100.					1	100.
Total, all theory classes	9	90.	1	10.			10	100.

TABLE III B
DEGREE OF PLANNING FOR MUSIC THEORY
PRESENTATION IN CLASS B SCHOOLS

Type of class	Degree of Planning						Totals	
	Fully Planned		Partially Planned		Not Planned		No.	Per cent
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent		
<u>Vocal</u>								
Select choir.	2	16.7	6	50.	4	33.3	12	100.
Mixed chorus.	3	16.7	9	50.	6	33.3	18	100.
Boys' glee.	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.	6	100.
Girls' glee.	1	14.3	4	57.2	2	28.6	7	100.
Vocal ensembles.	3	21.2	8	47.	6	31.8	17	100.
Beginning chorus.			1	100.			1	100.
Total, all voice classes	10	16.4	30	49.2	21	34.4	61	100.
<u>Instrumental</u>								
High school band.	4	23.6	12	55.2	3	21.2	17	100.
Intermediate band.	4	44.4	5	55.6			9	100.
Intermediate orchestra.			1	100.			1	100.
Ensembles			3	50.	3	50.	6	100.
Total, all instrumental classes.	8	22.9	22	60.	7	17.1	37	100.
<u>Theory</u>								
General Music	3	75.	1	25.			4	100.
Music Theory.	1	100.					1	100.
Harmony and Arranging	1	100.					1	100.
Harmony and Composition	1	100.					1	100.
Music Appreciation.	1	100.					1	100.
Total, all theory classes	7	87.5	1	12.5			8	100.

TABLE III C
 DEGREE OF PLANNING FOR MUSIC THEORY
 PRESENTATION IN CLASS C SCHOOLS

Type of class	Fully Planned		Partially Planned		Not Planned		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
<u>Vocal</u>								
Select choir.			5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100.
Mixed chorus.	1	3.4	15	51.7	13	44.9	29	100.
Boys' glee.			4	50.	4	50.	8	100.
Girls' glee.	1	5.9	10	58.8	6	35.3	17	100.
Ensembles	1	4.6	7	31.8	14	63.6	22	100.
Total, all voice classes	3	3.6	41	48.8	40	47.6	84	100.
<u>Instrumental</u>								
High school band.	1	2.4	31	73.8	10	23.8	42	100.
Intermediate band	2	9.6	15	71.4	4	19.1	21	100.
Ensembles			11	84.6	2	15.4	13	100.
Total, all instrumental classes.	6	3.7	57	61.1	16	35.2	76	100.
<u>Theory</u>								
General Music			1	100.			1	100.
Music Theory.			1	100.			1	100.
Total, all theory classes			2	100.			2	100.

TABLE III D
DEGREE OF PLANNING FOR MUSIC THEORY
PRESENTATION IN CLASS D SCHOOLS

Type of class	Fully Planned		Partially Planned		Not Planned		Totals	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
<u>Vocal</u>								
Select choir.			1	100.			1	100.
Mixed chorus.			5	62.5	3	37.5	8	100.
Boys' glee.			2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.
Girls' glee	1	16.7	3	50.	2	33.3	6	100.
Ensembles			1	100.			1	100.
Total, all voice classes	1	5.2	12	63.2	6	31.6	19	100.
<u>Instrumental</u>								
High school band.			9	90.	1	10.	10	100.
Intermediate band	2	33.3	4	66.7			6	100.
Ensembles			2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.
Private lessons	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	99.9
Total, all instrumental classes.	3	13.9	16	72.8	3	13.9	22	100.