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Abstract

Universities and degree granting institutions of higher education face a new set of responsibilities in their duties of providing society with a stronger set of citizens. Trends within the workforce have created a new set of parameters and expectations from job applicants, and higher education owes it to students to prepare them to succeed within their chosen path. Students at public higher education institutions studying music at the undergraduate level believe that a successful career awaits them with sufficient training in their instrument, when there are myriad paths available that require a more diverse skillset. The research and findings presented in this document came about from a study surveying undergraduate music majors at three separate institutions of mixed characteristics, regarding their perceptions towards their degree, the skills obtained and their usefulness within their chosen career. Students largely found that a limited skillset would be desired from employers, when literature showed a more pluralist skillset would provide more diverse opportunities. As relatively new findings, this research served as an exploratory finding, but possible applications are possible in the field of curriculum design, workplace management and degree accreditation.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

“[Y]ou dropped a hundred and fifty grand on [an] education you could’ve got for a dollar fifty in late charges at the public library.” – Will Hunting

This research was born out of both intimate connections with the source material and an intense search for practical justification. Upon obtaining my undergraduate degree in piano performance, like many of my classmates, I found myself questioning the worth of my degree. I realized that I had a unique set of skills to offer society, but in terms of my training, the stereotypical starving artist seemed to be the most available career path. A degree in applied music strongly resembled that of the theological or philosophical degrees, meaning a great deal in terms of personal and spiritual fulfillment, but seeming to offer little clear benefit to society. In a desire to continue my education, I received a unique opportunity to study the inner workings of arts organizations at the highest level of academia and answers immediately materialized with regard to how the arts fulfill a necessary function of society. These answers, however, spurred more questions: How does art and music function as a public good? How can the two be quantified in terms of output for a high functioning society fulfilling the higher needs of Maslow’s Pyramid (Maslow, 1943) and other models leading to a high functioning individual (Wahba & Bridwell, 1976)? Can training in the arts possibly offer a financially sustaining lifestyle, in addition to its intrinsically rewarding aspects? I drew on my own personal experience
to connect with the material in a way I had never experienced in academia. My business minor, former life as an artist and educator, and personal drive to fully understand my and my classmates passion manifested itself in research for a thesis to systematically pose and address these questions.

Questions of how public goods operate. Questions I thought I would never be able to answer because of the high and mighty indefinable aspects of art. Questions that soon found themselves answered by literature outlining the inevitable approach of the information economy. A common thread concerned a generalizable aspect of the arts in a well-rounded education: that if musicians and artists in the classical sense won’t be as demanded because of their increasingly viable and unique benefits offered, than college graduates simply need more arts and literature to fully embrace the liberal education that will enable them to fully confront the problems of tomorrow. A well-grounded education in the arts becomes a key facet of degree holding graduates, as opposed to knowledge exclusively held by musicians with specialized training. College graduates, on an unprecedented scale, find their narrow skills becoming increasingly in need of ongoing updates in the form of on the job training, in favor of an education that favors an ability to synthesize solutions to problems that aren’t actively affecting managed organizations (Delbanco, 2012, pp. 25-28) (U.S. Department of Labor, 1999). Forward thinking, an ability to create solutions to problems, and an employee transition from assembly line worker to manager capable of affecting change formed the foundation of my studies. The studies cited analyze the needs of the American workforce as a whole, and as I dug deeper, the conclusions and follow up questions transitioned into how artists specifically
could shape their environment to their strengths, specifically using abilities obtained through a public university education.

My main question stemming from personal experience is as follows: how are graduates with music degrees equipped to allow society to reach the next level, that next level of increased production, or enhanced products, or more streamlined creation? These questions were always in the back of my head as a student and artist, but began to coalesce on a new level upon intensive academic study. This chapter examines the literature within the fields of both curricula construction and needs of the workforce, offers a synopsis of what this research hopes to accomplish, and analyzes potential uses of findings, with a brief discussion of potential limitations.

One of the characteristics of the Creative Economy is an ability to de-emphasize production resources, as manufacturing becomes efficient on a unprecedented scale (Florida, Where the Skills Are, 2011) (Wilson, 2010). The common analogy is that of a snowball rolling down a hill: companies now have the ability to create a product marketed on the individual level, with a range of customizable options. Variable costs, or those costs that are accrued as each individual product is made, are rapidly (although will never) approaching zero. This is reflected in downsizing of manufacturing and service sectors domestically and upswing in second or third world countries; this can be represented by a model of the U.S. playing the role of manager and developing countries as ground level employees (Saruliene & Rybakovas, 2011) (Atkinson, 2012). The consequences resulting from this global shift in economic priority are going to be hard hitting and felt immediately, forcing the U.S. to innovate at a rapid level. Money no
longer flows towards the company with the most resources for production, but rather the most ideas to be utilized in the creation process (Burge & Bagg, 2013). When scientifically pressed for input factors, the search leads back to higher education (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2003) (U.S. Department of Education, 2011) (Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004). Funding for public universities frequently represents a state’s largest monetary investment in its local workforce, given academia’s interest in developing a high functioning citizen capable of analyzing, creating and defending justified perspectives (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2012). These two (higher education and the shifting needs of the workforce) have a disconnect; academic curricula change moves at, for a lack of a better word, a glacial pace, while the economy has experienced a fundamental change in values to reflect a new set of needs and demands. This research aims to investigate how wide this chasm is, in terms of what students expect from their education, and what future employers will be expecting from them. Few studies currently exist showing what students expect from their degree (with a smattering of articles, commissioned by for-profit and nonprofit companies dismayed by the diminishing skills of college graduates, show how tasks are increasingly being done by outside hires or being solved by costly in-house training (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2003) (Ashton & Green). Carefully calculated investments yield the best rewards for patient investors, and with gradual change to better shape the graduating workforce, the American labor pool can adapt and posit itself as an economic and cultural leader. These hypotheses can be realized by universities giving their graduates the skills
they need to present the best work possible to employers instead of companies having to resort to new hires or *ad hoc* training.

Furthering this idea of contrasting employer expectations, the days of a specific worker doing a specific job are over. Employees are increasingly being asked to complete tasks outside their job description, such as solving ideas, coming up with creative new products of a company or even the rudimentary tasks that may not be their expertise as fiscal resources dry up (Kaiser, 2010, pp. 1-7). This mentality of the brave new workforce is magnified in nonprofit organizations and even more so with small to midsize organizations. To these organizations, where creativity is *the* driving characteristic behind new programming or outputs, a hire of a college graduate in music means a great deal (Slover Linett Strategies, 2012) The skills indirectly learned from the degree, such as the ability to see and think in terms of long term objectives, may serve the organization far more than an ability to create an artistic product. From this example, graduates are expected to do more than follow directions from a superior, but rather to lead the way into a new innovation that could increase efficiency, economy or execution (Delbanco, 2012, pp. 25-30). Following the history of college graduates, from being trained as managers and professionals in the early 1900s to a B.A. or B.S. starting to become the *de facto* means of employment from the 70s to 90s, this represents a new mindset and set of expectations from the degree-holding workforce. No longer are these employees expected to come up with novel solutions once, or become employed by a company to do routine work: employees are expected to exceed expectations and be creative as part of their daily tasks (Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, 2002). To fully do this, a strong
training emphasizing cross-disciplinary critical thinking and ability to amalgamate ideas needs to become the *modus operandi* for all degree fields. Conversely, education of artists needs to encompass a wide breadth of managerial and administrative skills, as will be identified in later sections of this thesis. This research is built on the hypothesis that students currently enrolled in music programs undervalue these skills that will form the crucible of future careers.

*Statement of Purpose:*

This research, through analysis of responses from students currently obtaining their music degree, attempts to identify how much students will use the skills learned both from their degree-relevant coursework and general education courses. Too frequently, general education, liberal arts and elective courses fly under the radar in terms of appreciation for creating a high functioning worker and citizen (Walsh, Lewis, & Rakestraw, 2013). By interacting personally with sample populations at music departments on a national level, data are gathered directly from the primary recipients of education, at once reflecting the tendencies of individual professors, groups of classes and the curriculum as a whole. What isn’t reflected in this research is which of the primary influences are providing the most sway, in terms of what students are anticipating, learning and using. Instead, this provides an overview of the general attitude of students, with statistical outliers possibly providing the spark for more studies within the field. In addition, by taking a look at multiple music departments across a variety of regions nationwide, the possibility of generalization for results increases, and practical applications of this study become more viable. Through the use of unique, individual
short answers garnered from the second half of the survey instrument, individual participants are able to identify what a degree means to them personally.

Research Questions:

This research, through the connections between the demands of employers demonstrated in the considerable body of literature, aims to illustrate three main points not currently addressed by studies available:

- What do students expect to be doing with their degree, in terms of skills learned and how said skills are used?
- How is the curriculum of music majors equipped to give students the tools necessary to succeed in their future career?
- Are students aware of the required abilities of the rapidly changing labor pool and economic environment?

Because the anticipated needs of the workforce form a problem too vast to be solved by one study, these three questions, working in tandem, hope to present at least an overview of the problem from a statistically significant group of students.

Significance to the Field:

This research holds significant practical use, if for no other reason than studies emphasizing the effect of a degree on music majors currently doesn’t exist for use by policymakers and designers of curricula. Studies currently exist (Ashton & Green) (Florida, Where the Skills Are, 2011) (Slover Linett Strategies, 2012) (U.S. Department of Labor, 1999) as a result of an organization desiring a proactive stance with its hires
that illustrate that more is needed from employees, but for the purposes of higher education, these studies serve a limited function. It is natural to suspect that managers are always going to want the best possible employees for their organization to create the best possible product, but the needs of employers are at an impasse with the current production of academia. Furthermore, the studies detailed vary by organization and are largely focused on the for-profit and traditional business model, a form of employment simply not as widely available to graduates with music degrees. At best, these studies should be taken as an analytical whole, with common threads tied between them showing mutual aims, goals and aspirations of the workforce. In addition, common sense tells us that the desired skillset from scientists, businessmen and engineers is going to be different than that of the music major. Granted, the leadership and creativity is becoming a common idea amongst all professions, but in terms of studies currently available, the workday of musicians contrasted with other professions could not be more different. In addition, these needs are prone to the drawbacks of generalization, where key information is minimized or lost in an attempt to apply it to an outside field. By crafting a study aimed at future participants within the nonprofit sector, an entirely different set of motivations and mindsets could be discovered and put to more practical use by both higher education administrators and professionals within the non-profit field.

Building from these ideas, there exists a similar gap in the literature pertaining to the aims of students. As previously detailed, the studies outlined previously are responsive rather than proactive; they were created in response to a problem in contrast to identifying a root cause. In other words, the problem has already manifested itself, with
the symptoms already affecting the surveyed populations. The surveys are largely based on people currently employed and/or out of higher education. Research involving students and their aims are mostly for pedagogical purposes (Pitts, 2004), highlighting what needs to be done from an education perspective to more effectively teach students concepts. This research aims a bit higher than the educator and lower than the policymaker, in that the aims of curricula are questioned, but not after students graduate. Digging into students currently learning and engaging in the curriculum which they believe will provide a large return on investment provides a deeper level of insight and potentially eliminates the disconnect between workforce and student. Restated another way, causality is more direct and external factors such as training, employment experience and the shift in values that comes with age are minimized. The results of this study are aimed at administrators of higher education rather than employers, and the outcomes will hopefully allow for more educated decisions to be made regarding long term curricula planning for increased enrichment of the undergraduate experience.

**Scope and Limitations of Study:**

This study offers some insight into a little explored field of training for the future labor pool. By providing these insights through the use of short answer questions corroborated by future aims, course of study and class rank, new conclusions can be synthesized offered for use in creation of future policy and curriculum. However, this research faces limitations that need to be considered for future application. Some inherent characteristics considered in the construction of this research prevent findings from
application in non-arts fields and these limitations should be understood within the
countext of the study.

The first, and perhaps most significant, is the nature of how the data will be
obtained. Students will be expected to not only have a life goal (not an insignificant
request of a college student), but be able to articulate in a few short sentences on a
formulaic survey that bears no distinction from others taken in their lives as students. The
short answers obtained in this section will no doubt provide useful conclusions from
those students who have clearly defined goals and outcomes from the program, but most
students simply don’t have an idea of what they will be doing in the process of getting
their degree, much less be able to explain it on four lines in ten or fifteen minutes. While
this type of data appears, on the surface, to be a less useful metric to determine the
aspirations of students, the importance of instant reactions to questions has intrinsic
value. It is possible students who think and respond almost instantaneously yield “truer”
pictures than if a more elaborate, constructed response was required. The first half of the
survey is much more neutral in this regard, but yields much less interesting data in the
context of research. In any event, to impose further time for student responses would
require unreasonable concessions from the already generous consenting department
administrators. These answers provide class rank and anticipated degree, but little else in
terms of reaching substantiated conclusions.

The second problem involves sample population. The departments chosen come
from colleges at schools from three different regions of the country. These regions were
carefully chosen to include a wide range of students not specific to any region of the
country and, as such, are roughly proportional in population. This kind of review for population characteristics is a necessary condition for any seriously considered scientific research, as it removes potential sources of bias from native populations and creates necessary conditions for internal and external validity (Rea & Parker, 1992). Taking this idea further, it is possible, albeit unlikely that the anticipated skills and desires of a workforce are at least partially local. Considering this point within the potential consequences of polarization, this tenet became a fundamental feature of instrument construction. This is one of the necessary drawbacks of using a case study as research and could potentially render the findings moot (Merriam, 2009). One potentially positive aspect of this is the ability to identify regional characteristics within findings, and these potential angles are reflected in the review of current literature.

The third issue regards the specific nature of the study. Music graduates obviously study completely different disciplines than theatre, graphic design, humanities or any of the fine arts and therefore require a completely different course of study from these fine and applied art majors. These other majors are anticipated to require a different balance of discipline specific courses and general educations, in addition to the considerable degree specializations within each major (as an example, costume design within a theatre degree, or studio art contrasted with art history). By studying music majors specifically, a narrow enough portion of the fine arts graduates, quantifiable results are anticipated, but form a small part of the overall output of artists from a public university. To fully address the problems highlighted in the literature review, curricula from all fine arts majors would have to be analyzed and developed according to each major – no small task.
indeed. This point is not to diminish the impact of the survey within the context of this research, but rather to suggest this study as a jump off point. Tangible conclusions reached from this study could lead to case analysis within the previously mentioned departments.

Summarizing Ideas

These limitations form the conclusion of the first section of this research study. This section analyzed my personal connections to the material, took a brief look at what is currently developing within the field, proposed questions for study and analysis, described what tools would answer such questions and also observed potential limitations on findings. The next section will investigate deeper into the needs of what the workforce needs, wants and currently lacks, subsequently contrasted with what public university curricula is currently doing in terms of student development. Common points from the two will then be analyzed for use in survey instrument construction. Potential to expand this research on a larger scale to better meet these conditions are discussed in a later chapter.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

“Consider the following.” – Bill Nye

A college degree has stood for many contrasting sets of skills stemming from four years of study, ranging from actual certifications (as in to teach in public schools with a Music Education degree), high level of performance (B.M. or B.F.A) and/or think critically with a set of more different skills (B.A.). Recent debates within academia have cast the college degree as a measure of achievement, employability, and a benchmark of education among other classifications. Debate continues within the Ivory tower about whether the halls of learning should be used for personal enlightenment and fulfillment or an environment where work ethic and leadership are developed. The ideas that form the tenets of college originated from the seminary, but today, prospective students evaluate the idea of a college education from an entirely different perspective: obtaining the necessary training or qualifications needed for employment. Coupled with this is a new shift in what employers expect their employees to do. The management style of employees being measured by how well they follow directions has been reconsidered, with bosses having access to new schools of thought unavailable even ten years ago. The creative economy has allowed for employees to offer their own input into how production of goods and services can be made more efficient and increasingly effective. Studies that indicate a happy employee is a creative employee, and follow-ups that have demonstrated the value of creativity within businesses, have led to consideration of new models of
workplace structure, in the name of producing environments conducive to the employee thought process. Combining these ideas, studies illustrate a measureable divide between what students entering college should expect from their degree and what employers will require from them, in terms of skills both creative (i.e., performance) and administrative (managerial tasks). As previously discussed, those students that use their music degree to enter a field that doesn’t directly apply art still must utilize their creative skills to enhance the work put out by employers. As relating to the modern artist, today, students of the arts exit college with a set of skills suited towards a different era of business. As a result, the role of college has shifted, where the future workforce is required to have a wide spectrum of skills at their disposal.

In old models of arts organizations, performer and administrator were different, specialized branches of different tasks needed by the organization, but new schools of thought within the industry gear towards employees simply needing more from their hires. Tying the ideas of the previous paragraph together, supervisors need feedback from the ground up on how to more efficiently conduct business, and this correlates with employees from all branches of the organizations (performance AND administration) to think critically about short and long term objectives, formulate and defend hypotheses about organizational effectiveness, and to function on a high level for a diverse set of tasks and responsibilities. This research builds on the hypothesis that students both entering and fulfilling their degree program are unaware of this increased pressure to do more than perform that will be put on them upon their entry to the workforce. Extensive research exists analyzing what employers and organizations need, and a new emphasis on
This chapter will review current literature and analyze the goals and obligations of public colleges across the twenty-first century with a particular emphasis on music degrees, followed by what employers request from their hires with college degrees and how this has changed in the modern age, and finally a synthesis of these two concepts detailing the needs of employers contrasted with the aims of students.

**Degrees and Workforce Application**

Today, a college degree is required for most entry level jobs outside of the service sector. An estimated 63 percent of all jobs will require a college degree by 2018 (Carnevale, Smith, & Strohl, 2010, p. 13) and the estimated value of a college degree is $650,000.00 over a lifetime (Pew Research Center, 2011, p. 31), a considerable payoff on a mean investment of $54,400.00 at 2011 rates (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). Less statistically quantifiable are the developmental aspects of a college education that serve to create a sturdy method of constant inquiry. Colorful justification, such as “[being] able to detect when a man is talking rot” (Delbanco, 2012, p. 28) to its status as a public good (Lagemann & Lewis, 2012, p. 8) and recognition of the personal journey that has provided the journey of fulfillment through self-reflection and critical analysis (Lagomarcino, 1990). This kind of development on a private level, coupled with statistically valid backing derived from career earnings over the course of a lifetime, represents the kind of double whammy that is lacking in the crafting of policy.

Justification for a particular bill or law frequently falls into the category of cold numbers
or emotional connection; a college education, based on findings from a considerable amount of studies, offers both forms and a public university represents the largest investment in a workforce a state can make. Table 1 features a matrix highlighting the public, private, personal and community benefits of a college education (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2005). As evident, a degree provides not just the difficult to quantify benefits of personal enlightenment, but tangible benefits in the form of taxes and increased revenue by a workforce simply capable of doing more.

Today, employees are expected to have a degree in the style that a high school graduate was fifty years ago (Rampell, 2013), but this trend was not always the case. As early as 100 years ago, college was proposed as “specialized expert training” (Weber, 1991) and was viewed as a way to train the workforce, in contrast to earlier mindsets of the 1800s that placed more emphasis on religious enlightenment and spiritual fulfillment (Delbanco, 2012, pp. 36-67). This change of role to workforce development coincided with a windfall for general funds from the rise of large athletic programs (Estler, 2002) to create the modern industrial complex of higher education today. Universities now face increased demand as degrees become increasingly crucial to obtaining employment, and frequently, presidents are courted for their fundraising abilities prioritized over educational attainment (Bachman, 2013). Today, operating revenue is split fairly evenly between auxiliary operations such as athletics, student health and dining, state appropriations and tuition, with federal funding and private donations making up roughly the remaining ten percent. Data trends towards increased funding from auxiliary activities in the future, but the main point is that, on average, state funding of public universities is
a considerable investment from the state and represents a large portion of the operating revenue that colleges and universities use to achieve their aims (Delta Cost Project; American Institutes for Research, 2009).

In 2010, approximately 90,000 Bachelor’s in visual and performing arts were conferred, out of a total of 1,650,014 degrees awarded (U.S Department of Education, 2011). Approximately 60,000 employees are employed full time as musicians functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>- Increased Tax Revenues</td>
<td>- Higher Salaries and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Greater Productivity</td>
<td>- Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Consumption</td>
<td>- Higher Savings Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Workforce Flexibility</td>
<td>- Improved Working Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Decreased Reliance on Government Financial Support</td>
<td>- Personal/Professional Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>- Reduce Crime Rates</td>
<td>- Improved Health and Life Expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Charitable Giving/Community Service</td>
<td>- Improved Quality of Life for Offspring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased Quality of Civic Life</td>
<td>- Better Consumer Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social Cohesion/Appreciation of Diversity</td>
<td>- Increased Personal Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved Ability to Adapt to and Use Technology</td>
<td>- More Hobbies, Leisure Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Benefits of Higher Education (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2005)
as the creative force in large orchestras (as with most figures analyzing musician employment, this can be deceptive, partially due to an extremely low turnover of orchestra seats), but figures illustrating rates of employment for performing artists in general are notoriously faulty for a variety of reasons. First, official measurements taken by the U.S. Census usually categorize full and part time musicians, diminishing the roles of self-employed and micro-organizations. Declaration of music as a career requires a conscious decision of the person filling out the form as defined by the Census and lends less reliability as a metric as a result.

Second, because musicians fill the role as teacher, performer and marketer as defining characteristics of their career, measurements of the role played by those not self-employed (or those that work for definitively measured organizations) are diminished. Part of the problem stems from the vast discrepancy in literature of classification of musicians; for example, select scholars categorize those who use creativity within their job as members of a creative core (Florida, Where the Skills Are, 2011), useful for determining the new role of a creative skillset, but less so for categorizing specific subsets of performing arts (with all manner of models using different ideas). For the purposes of this study, it can be safe to assume that all the graduates use music in some capacity, if not physically in performance or education, than the analytical skills interacting with music on a daily level (Wollner, Ginsborg, & Williamon, 2011). Just as important is the increasingly demand for creativity in all aspects of the workforce. As summarized by the featured article at a recent conference on the pedagogy of creativity: “The challenge for universities seeking to equip undergraduates to enter the creative
workforce is to promote and support a culture of teaching and learning that parallels an unpredictable and irregular social and commercial world in which supply and demand is neither linear nor stable, and labour is shaped by complex patterns of anticipations, time and space.” (McWilliam, 2007)

But what exactly constitutes a degree in music? Like most academic disciplines, music at the university level is divided into several specializations that are categorized by their intensity of study within the discipline. At the public level, a high level of performance is expected from all students, with proficiency in multiple instruments not unusual. Like other academic degree programs, students go through the program with a fairly consistent group of classmates throughout the four years and develop networks and friendship through personal activities. For the purposes of this study, music programs are divided into three main categories: performance, education and liberal arts, respective to terms of curricular emphasis. The reader should bear in mind that these classifications hold mostly true for public universities and their various degree programs. Following this point, the ensuing descriptors are generalizations that can’t possibly account for the countless variation within major degree programs, or even minors.

Performance includes the largest number of degrees, encompassing instrumental performance, musicology, music history and composition. These degrees are focused on a high level of academic study of music as a science and discipline, advancing both theoretical and practical aspects of the field specifically. As a result, this definition includes those more specialized fields in academia such as the aforementioned musicology and music history, even if they are not technically performance-focused.
Musicians who graduate with performance degrees are often the best equipped to earn a living as professional musicians or academics within the field of music or closely related fields. This degree is marked by increased performances solo and/or with ensembles, mastery of multiple instruments and an increased number of higher level courses within the Department of Music. While the uniqueness of the portfolio career (to be discussed in greater depth later) allows these musicians to utilize more than performances as a way to make a living, their education and training lends them a performance skillset to fill the ranks of music groups all over the world.

Education majors, in contrast, are formally certified to teach within public schools. These majors take an increased number of pedagogy classes and their degree is often obtained in conjunction with a College of Education, followed by a public school certification to teach in a specific state. These majors, on average, take more than four years to obtain because of their necessary applied coursework as educators. Unlike the other two categorizations, this degree usually comes with a formal license to teach (in contrast to talented enough musicians that comprise the faculty of a private studio or university) and, as a result, has more tangible benefits that can be measured. These students are usually in the midrange level of performances, joining more ensembles and performance groups than liberal arts majors, but less than performance majors. In addition, while their formal coursework is geared towards public education, their prospects for private studio employment are enhanced as well.

Liberal arts majors are the last, and perhaps most interesting of the three categories. These majors experience the fewest focused music classes in contrast to the
education or performance degrees. Liberal arts majors are not required to join as many ensembles, perform as many concerts, obtain teaching certificates or take higher level coursework in music, although the option exists in the form of fairly flexible electives within the degree plan. These majors take a core curriculum of music classes that all three majors must take which includes a combination of history, ear training, theory, composition and applied lessons. Liberal arts majors often are required to take the bare minimum amount of courses within the Department of Music, but usually take higher level courses outside of the music department. Their versatility within the field of academia lends a more well-rounded nature to their degree, with graduates using their degree for arts administration or graduate school in more loosely related fields (nonprofit management, academia).

Degree program accreditation for programs of music come from the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the pre-eminent accreditation organization for programs from Associate’s to postdoctoral work. Certifying over 600 schools and responsible for oversight over a wide variety of programs (National Association of Schools of Music, 2013), NASM is a major player in deciding the major components of what exactly constitutes a music degree. Reviewing relevant sections of accreditation requirements, undergraduate degree programs are categorized into two main classifications: liberal arts degrees, “[focusing] on music in the context of a broad program of general studies” and professional degrees, “[focusing] on intensive work in music supported by a program in general studies” (National Association of Schools of Music, 2013, p. 97). With a four year degree typically requiring around 120 credit hours
in most degrees across all disciplines, Liberal arts degrees require 30-45% (36 – 55 hours) of music content of a full course of study, and professional degrees require 50-65% (60 – 128), the variation stemming from specific and subtle degree classifications such as music history, jazz studies, sacred music, or any variation. The content of said degree is comprised of three main sections loosely outlined in the previous paragraph detailing the various requirements of degree programs: General Education, musicianship, and performance and music electives. As is expected, the degree programs classified as liberal arts degrees require more comprehensive general education requirements (general education in this context is distinct from those General Education courses, with the former a synonym for a “well-rounded individual” and the latter fulfilling the General Education requirements for the respective university) and language is much less precise in terms of musicianship: students must develop an “understanding of procedures for realizing a variety of musical styles” and “knowledge and/or skills in one or more areas of music beyond basic musicianship appropriate to the individual’s needs and interests…consistent with the purposes of the specific liberal arts degree program being followed” (National Association of Schools of Music, 2013, p. 106).

Contrastingly, professional degrees require much less from their graduates in terms of multidisciplinary skills outside of music, needing “the ability to think, speak, and write clearly and effectively” and “awareness that multiple disciplinary perspectives and techniques are available to consider all issues and responsibilities”. This purposefully ambiguous wording allows for these requirements to be satisfied and even exceeded by the General Education coursework requirements of a university, but the bulk of
coursework comes from the comparably rigorous requirements posed by the sections of musicianship requirements. Specific skills in keyboard, teaching, and improvisational skills are listed, as well as a variety of lesser achievements in the academic settings of music history, jazz studies and other skills not directly connected to the principal instrument of study. In regards to administration techniques and studies related to music business, neither liberal arts nor performance degrees list any required skillsets, the closest tangible connection being a requirement of “multidisciplinary issues that include music”, and a “capability to produce work and solve professional problems coherently” from professional degrees. Liberal arts music business criteria is more open to interpretation regarding the nature of a well-rounded, intellectual student, and various mentions of intra-industry dynamics come attached to degrees in music industry, business, or similarly titled fields. However, these management skills are left out of the requirements required for a degree program certifying a student as having “[achieved] professional, entry-level competence in the major area” (National Association of Schools of Music, 2013, p. 111).

With these clear distinctions, the skills of a labor pool of graduates holding a music degree are clarified and demands from arts organizations can be put into a new perspective. For example, when considering a new artistic director for the city orchestra, it seems obvious that, *ceteris paribus*, the board of directors would consider those candidates that possess strong artistic interpretation, instrumental skills and long range goals regarding work interpretation and presentation. Inevitably, the candidate who can put on the strongest creative performance would obtain employment and the orchestra
would maintain pace with competition seeking to create an equally strong product. However, this entire situation changes when the orchestra finds itself in dire financial straits and is in need of a director who can fundraise, market a strong product and understand the economic demand of a community in relation to the work performed. In this situation, a candidate with a strong mixed, diverse background becomes much more appealing. This conundrum of business vs. art can be found at all levels of the organization and often (but not always) stand in some contrast to each other. In addition, these examples are extreme and need to be balanced with respect to context and situation, but nevertheless, represent one of the more pressing needs of arts organizations today.

And while higher education has been offering non-traditional accreditations in the form of minors and dual-degree programs, graduates holding music degrees represent the main focus of a Departments curriculum. Graduates are still leaving college with degrees specializing in performance, certified in education or generalizing within academia. Furthermore, minors and/or dual degree programs do a noticeable job of curing the symptoms of the problem, but not the actual problem itself. Because musicians graduating with a degree in Music are so specialized, it becomes necessary to revise particular curriculum rather than add new ones that may or may not serve the same function. Dual degree programs (as in Arts Administration, Nonprofit Law, and Cultural Analysis) are in their relative infancy and should be constructed and reviewed as responses to new curricula. A main idea concerning reform holds that rather than a comprehensive shift of the music department starting from scratch, courses would be re-tailored, aims of curricula would be re-thought and the goals of the department would be
considered against the demands of the workforce. Specialized musicians may represent the highest level of musical performance offered by public universities, but as I will conclude in the coming section, intense specialization may not be the best approach in the case of community-defining micro-organizations, or those groups with an extremely small management structure and individual, self-starting artists. Organizations who possess (relatively) high amounts of resources and can afford to specialize performance and administration operate on a different set of rules than these organizations and when one person makes up a considerable portion of the administrative staff, a plural set of skills may be the most beneficial.

**Pluralism vs. Specialization**

But to present the case for pluralist skills is to present another entirely different set of problems. If literature presents a case for moving away from specialization, what kind of skills should be taught to? In other words, this type of education, where a wide variety of skills and larger scale synthesis of solutions is required, needs to be defined in relation to the particular emphases of the curriculum. A unique disconnect between university departments and the workforce has already been somewhat illustrated, but there exists another gap between what skills are in excess in organizations that are more traditional and profit-focused, and those that employ artists and members of the core creative (Florida, The Rise of the Creative Class, 2002, pp. 65-70). The difference between a performer and a musician is a subtle difference in words, yet crucial for understanding the increasingly diverse needs of arts organizations today both large and small. In addition, this chapter will take a look at the increasing importance of the liberal
arts in college’s new role as employee designer, and the crucial role budget management plays in arts organization management.

The days of traditional, top down management style of business structure, for organizations of all disciplines and sizes, are over. Today’s businesses more resemble that of an interconnected web, where the input of an employee on the ground level overseeing production level tasks is just as (and in certain cases, more) important than that of the manager responsible for long term management of objectives and goals. This ties in with the idea that generalized skills are needed for utilization of human capital; training a worker to follow a task to the letter, with little possibility for improvement, flies in the face of organizational progress towards more product for less cost, a concept called creative destruction. Creative destruction, first coined by economist Joseph Schumpeter (Schumpeter, 1947), involves the process of creating something improved out of a pre-existing process. Abstractly applied to outdated business models and practices, the process takes a short term cost of labor and capital and produces benefits of long term satisfaction and growth. Although the concept is derived from Marxian theory and used by Schumpeter to argue for the imminent destruction of capitalism, this process of out with the old and in with the new manifests itself in the form of better technology and an improved standard of living for society as a whole. On a macroeconomic scale, creative destruction is a measurable effect that forms the basis of modern economic theory spanning a variety of disciplines (Diamond Jr, 2010, p. 22) (Reihan, 2012) (Garrison, 2009), especially when considering the current rate of information exchange within the post-Information Age. Seguing into arts organizations, the kind of input
required for creative destruction comes from all levels of a hierarchy, not just those supervisors responsible for long term goals and objectives.

Practical applications on the intra-organizational level form a much more relatable aspect into day to day life. As a scientist needs field research to prove or disprove a hypothesis, a manager needs input from product level interactions to gain a full picture of management effectiveness. Just as crucial as creating long term organizational aims and achievements is the ability to take a variety of inputs from all levels of an organization to synthesize a solution (Cheng & Chang, Implementations of the Lean Six Sigma Framework in Non-Profit Organisations: A Case Study, 2012). And to tie in the objectives of this research, it is this kind of ability to recognize connections between problems and figuring out a cognizant solution that is lacking in employees today. The most pressing need from for-profit businesses across the U.S. and Europe are those problem solving skills that managers rely on, with economist Daniel Pink summarizing the situation as such: “It’s the combination of the left brain and the right brain. Left-brain thinking — rule-based, linear, SAT-style thinking — used to be enough. Now right-brain thinking — artistry, empathy, narrative, synthesis — is the big differentiator.” (Friedman, 2008) Furthermore, studies show that employers increasingly are requiring this wide breadth of skills when initially hiring employees (Hart Research Associates, 2010) and are facing difficulties in either new hires or training after the fact (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2003) (Korte, 2011) (Holzer, 2012). This rising school of thought advocating for a more well-rounded education demonstrate that a liberal arts degree or at least an increased emphasis on fine or performing arts give graduates an ability to create solutions
to problems in a variety of environments. Even at the lowest levels of organization, a strong ability to recognize and produce is becoming required – a stark display of the increasingly diminishing prestige of a four year degree. Contrary to the debate raging in academia today, the main issue is not that the value of a college degree has decreased, but rather the needs of organizations at all levels have increased to the point where a traditional baccalaureate hasn’t been able to keep pace (Gillen, Selingo, & Zatynski, 2013). In a survey of higher education, 57% of Americans say that the “higher education system in the United States fails to provide students with good value for the money they and their families spend” (Pew Research Center, 2011). This disconnect between the for-profit world and the domain of higher education creates graduates that offer diminished value to their employers.

To best utilize learned skills while fulfilling personal passion, most graduates with a liberal and fine arts background would gravitate towards those industries that enrich the arts community: those organizations, large or small, that attempt to enrich communities through art and creative output. These arts organizations, indirectly funded through nonprofit status, function as a philanthropic arm of federal, state and municipal government; by affording citizens considerable freedom to administer the arts according to the needs of society, freedom of expression and culture on all levels is cultivated and engaged in the community through a variety of programming and advocacy. This kind of public policy methodology is characterized as a hands off approach from the perspective of governmental oversight and leads to “an elaborate network of partnership arrangements…linking government and the nonprofit sector” (Salamon, 1987, pp. 1-2).
This emphasis on a micro and macro level of freedom, however, in no way diminishes the need for the trinity of efficiency, economy, and execution that is required of any organization aiming to achieve goals. Interestingly enough, while for-profit agencies are facing a shortage of employees well versed in the arts, those nonprofit agencies that are responsible for overseeing community arts engagement require employees that bring principles of nonprofit management to the table. Much of the current literature outlining the needs of the creative industries comes from those countries that have established a central Department, Ministry, or similar centralized organization responsible for federal level cultural and arts policy. Studies are limited in the U.S., due to the fact that America employs more indirect methods of patronizing the arts (Hillman-Chartrand & McCaughey, 1989), but the U.K. Department for Culture, Media and Sport has sponsored research analyzing the needs of the creative industries. It is in these studies that a situation born of the two factors previously outlined begins to take form: “changes in the global skills environment” coupled with “[d]omestic shortages of individuals with the right skill sets”, with a particular emphasis on “skills shortages [including] generic skills such as sales and marketing” (Nathan, 2011). Similar results were demonstrated in a survey of the needs of a variety of creative industries in Wales. In a survey of around 260 businesses spanning industries including photography, advertising/marketing, fashion, publishing, film, television, radio and video game design, 54% of all industries identified business, marketing and sales skills as presenting an issue to the success of an organization (TBR's Skills and Labour Market Team, 2012). As further evidence for the lack of formal business training within the creative industries, the British Council
presented a report on the creative industries, citing education as the main cause of the lack of skills within the field and concluding “that Governments and business schools around the world have a long way to go in learning how that support can best be offered” (Newbigin, 2010) (interestingly, this study limited its scope to business schools, but the results can certainly be applied to less specific academic institutions). While U.S. studies have considerably less statistically valid evidence to offer, evidence still exists that arts industries currently suffer from a chronic lack of management and related skills. A relatively recent survey by RAND found that a lack of management skills would result in organizations not being able to keep pace with the rapidly changing business environment (italics added for emphasis): “Likely reductions in demand, rising costs, and static or even declining funding streams will force many of these institutions either to become larger and more prestigious—which many will lack the resources to do—or to become smaller and more community-oriented, using local talent to keep costs down and adapting programming to local audiences. Still others will simply close their doors, unable to reconcile conflicts among their various stakeholders.” (McCarthy, Brooks, Lowell, & Zakaras, 2001) A survey of Chicago-based arts organizations found that “many (organizations) are in need of the tools and skills to more effectively manage their expenses” and directly related this finding to a lack of financial management skills (Lee, Sarah, et al., 2012, p. 8), with similar findings when expanded to include arts organizations within the state of Illinois (Slover Linett Strategies, 2012).

This body of evidence suggests that some problems facing businesses originate from a set of two different causes: for-profit organizations face a lack of creativity and
right brain thinking from their graduates that can be alleviated by an increased presence of arts within curricula and nonprofit organizations rely on fine arts graduates that are lacking in formal management (especially within nonprofits) training. While this research focuses on the abilities of alleviating the problems of the latter, there exists significant potential for domestic American research analyzing the effectiveness of an increased curricular focus on liberal arts. The most intensive debates and the workforce are defined by the usefulness of higher education, and recent literature has detailed the debate of what exactly a liberal arts education offers (Hart Research Associates, 2010) (Rampell, 2013). As a possibility for practical application to address these issues, the principles behind a dual degree program can be explored as creating a more complete graduate of a music program, due to its presence as offering business administration skills tempered within the context of the fine arts. But possibilities certainly exist on an opposite end of the spectrum; that is, offering a business management degree complemented with artistic skills to help build the creativity that will become crucial as the creative economy begins to establish itself on a global level. This, however, is the subject of an entirely different body of research, and the next section will begin to explore the possibilities of change within the music curricula, as well as getting to the foundations of this research: what music majors expect from their degree and how it relates to what the workforce actually needs.

**Synthesis, or How Universities Can Adapt**

Increasingly, students are feeling pressure to enroll in a university for a degree from higher education, not just within the arts, but within all disciplines requiring
increased study at the postsecondary level. As outlined earlier, degrees within the performing and/or fine arts are becoming increasingly valuable in an economy that requires increased creativity and gives more autonomy to create solutions to problems that may be offbeat. Moreover, there exists a transitive property demonstrated in those degrees employing a more liberal and holistic curriculum showing that a little bit of liberal arts education goes a long way in developing the synthesis and transformative skills that are becoming more and more important. As more and more college graduates enter the workforce and begin to use their skills honed in higher education to meaningfully contribute to society, all boats will rise and the benefits to public, private, individual, and communal parties will fully realize – but consequently, increased pressure will be put on those entering the workforce to possess the ability to create change. Following from this, more and more students will feel the pressure to enroll in higher education, creating a virtuous cycle. The question then turns to how well colleges are doing their job of preparing graduates to face issues with skills such as problem solving, leadership and higher end thinking, at a recoupable cost. The key question to ask is whether graduates would be better served by learning on the job without a college degree, given the rate of technological development and value of “real-world” experience. This question of what college actually means is a centuries old question with a considerable range of opinions and justifications, but whether students have an answer that translates to real results is the subject of this research. This section explores what colleges are doing to create a degree that prepares, why change at the curriculum level is notoriously slow,
and explores what students are seeking from a degree, with connections made to what this research attempts to discover.

Due to the increasing number of college degrees awarded (U.S Department of Education, 2011), employers are weighing internships and workplace experience much more against what is being studied in the classroom. In a survey conducted by the Chronicle of Higher Education, employers place more weight on internship experience than any other factor, including degree, employment during college and extracurricular activities (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2012). In addition, in a separate study of graduates, those who completed an internship had a 20% greater chance of getting hired vs. those who had not (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2012). When hiring, it is this combination of experience within the workplace and excellence in the classroom that often creates the deciding variable in a hire. This ties into the theory that the transition from student to professional relies on a triad of three different states of development: knowing, acting and being. This methodology, the driving force behind curricular change, involves the intensive development of classroom concepts (knowing), workforce application (acting) and learning the various aspects of becoming a professional (being) (Barnett & Coate, 2005, pp. 69-81). Different professions require a different balance; for example, professional subjects require an increased emphasis on being, given that development of utilized skills are more useful, and non-performing arts and humanities require a considerable breadth of knowledge, or a stronger emphasis on knowing. This kind of balance can be tangibly measured through internships, labs and theoretical classes needed. While it’s clear that development of technology has become
too rapid for universities to fully prepare their graduates (in other words, it is impossible to fully educate a graduate solely from the classroom and training will always be needed as a necessary supplement simply to keep pace with rapid technological development), the governors behind education can at least give their graduates the theoretical tools to success, coupled with workforce experience to create a prepared employee.

As degrees within the arts become increasingly valued (Lindemann & Tepper, 2010), colleges are placing more emphasis on “being” and “acting”, creating degrees with more nonprofit management skills (Virginia Commonwealth University, n.d.) (Lombardi, Craig, Capaldi, & Gater, 2002). This represents a direct response to what arts organizations need from all their employees, including the creative and performing divisions. Conservatories and private colleges with a strong reputation in music have been taking steps towards a more all-inclusive education for all classifications of music degrees, giving their graduates tools for success with business, economics and marketing classes geared towards their specific industries. These higher end music schools attempt not to graduate musicians, but instead “music entrepreneurs who have a dynamic presence in society” (Peabody Conservatory, n.d.), “prepares highly talented students for careers as passionate performers and composers, and as imaginative, effective leaders in the arts” (Manhattan School of Music, n.d.) and to understand “students need practical, professional skills for successful, sustainable music careers” (Berklee College of Music, n.d.). This understanding of a well-rounded education for future leaders is reflected in required courses of music business, economics, marketing and other key facets of musicianship outside of performance skills. If these students don’t realize that these skills
are required of a musician entering the program, they are required to learn. These statements are contrasted by the mission statements of public schools, where more academic emphasis encompassing “excellence in performance, teaching, and scholarship” (URI Music Department, n.d.) “making exceptional music, stimulating artistic growth, exploring educational methodology, and conducting groundbreaking research” (The Ohio State University School of Music) and “promoting the highest levels of musicianship, scholarship, and creativity” (University of New Orleans Department of Music, 2008, p. 2). Mission statements, if translated to the context of nonprofit organizations with 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status, represent overarching goals of the organization with every program created and stewarded to foster this aim. As such, these mission statements represent the application of resources towards an end goal, and form the motivation of all reforms undertaken by a department.

However, public higher education institutes are taking initiative across the country to, if not remodel their degree programs, than to supplement additional courses in the form of minors or similar supplements to a degree. Southern Methodist University recently created two minors geared towards arts entrepreneurship, giving “students the chance to back their artistic talent with the practical business skills needed to navigate the arts world” (Lemon, 2012). This status as a minor course of study allow students to “develop entrepreneurial and managerial skills necessary to succeed as creative individuals in the increasingly complex economic environment of contemporary art-making” (OSU Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy), complementing courses within the major. Masters degrees are offered, but arts
administration as a comprehensive course of study is still in its infancy (Association of Arts Administration Educators, 2008) and curriculum ranges from performance concurrent with music performance and study (Florida State University, 2009), collaboration with Theatre Departments (Martenson, 2013) and a dual degree option with public policy (OSU Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy, 2013). Higher education has a reputation of adapting somewhat slowly to change, with responsive changes taking years to unfold in response to changes in the environment (Paye, 1995), albeit with exceptions made for particularly mobile organizations in more recent years (Bridges, 2000); however, this attempt to at least create a program in response to the needs of arts organization represents a step towards adapting to the punctured equilibrium of workforce needs.

Curriculum, as a whole, represents the fusion between the interests of multiple parties: the higher education administrators (deans, trustees, provosts) who create the larger picture scale of objectives and goals and the professors who implement the learning standards on the ground level. There, of course, exists a third party that still stands to be discussed within the scope of this research: the students! It is obvious that more and more students are choosing college, as demonstrated by the increased amount of degrees awarded (U.S Department of Education, 2011) and the current presidential administration’s focus on leading the world in college graduates (Obama, 2009), but not why college is being chosen over vocational school or direct employment as options stemming from high school. Extensive work has been done, studying students after they have gone through the degree plan and obtained a complete education (Gillen, Selingo, &
Zatynski, 2013) (Gaff, 1991) (Karabell, 1998, pp. 16-45) and even limited studies tracking the course of students throughout the course of an education (Pitts, 2004). In particular, the Pitts study is a case study analyzing a small group within a music studio, analyzing the usefulness of particular classes for pedagogical purposes. The study concluded that networking and music-specific skills were the most useful, but this study had such a small sample size (n=12), with its results more geared towards increasing the educational effectiveness of the courses taught by Pitts. Surveys on a large scale, geared towards increasing the scope of subjects studied in an attempt to create a more complete student in response to the markedly shifted needs of the global economy, are limited at best and are mostly found in other majors, especially within the liberal arts (Krueger, 2013) (Fantz, Siller, & Demiranda, 2011). This is perhaps due to the new economy prizing creativity and liberal arts coupled with a lag in curricula development, but opens the field to considerable research.

Of special interest, and particularly relevant to this research, are the studies currently being undertaken by the Strategic National Arts Alumni (SNAAP) Project, spearheaded by Indiana University at Bloomington. The reports prepared by SNAAP, which itself is comprised of a board of professors, administrators, and industry professionals, aim to “investigate the educational experiences and career paths of arts graduates nationally” (Lindemann & Tepper, 2010). In a recent report, a sample of 13,581 graduates from the performing and visual arts disciplines were surveyed for which skills they obtained in their degree were proving to be the most valuable within their current career, in addition to various demographic identifiers as current career, degrees
held, and other indicators of achievement. In the study, both qualitative and quantitative information were provided through the survey instrument and responses highlighted an extremely mixed set of outcomes. Of note were “gap scores”, or “percent of alumni indicating that a skills has been important in professional or work life, but their degree granting institution helped them ‘not at all’ or ‘very little’ to develop said skill” (Lindemann & Tepper, 2010, p. 30). The skills with the highest gap scores were various management skills (“Managing financial and business aspects”, “Using Enterpreneurial Skills”, “Demonstrating Broad Knowledge and Education”) and such data is especially pertinent towards which skills students currently enrolled in degree programs find to be the most valuable. As the survey analyzes current workers and not students, it serves as a helpful comparison, and barometer for how current students identify which skills are the most valuable, as well as providing grounds for generalization across various arts disciplines. Although musicians are perhaps the most entrepreneurial and require more business and administration skills than the visual and even other performing arts (Watson A. , 2013), at the core of all degrees in the arts is a balance between musical technique, General Education requirements, and industry-specific needs. Further research would delve into the more nuanced differences between the disciplines and serve as interdisciplinary reform adapting to research findings for all artists to increasingly develop as professionals.

Preliminary Conclusions

Re-stating what has already been said throughout this section, three factors are at work to create a gap in the literature: there have been demonstrated shifts in the
workforce in terms of management style, needs from every employee, and the role of creativity. There has been little response from the creators of curricula in higher education (especially important from public universities, which represent the largest investment in state workforces), and students enrolling in fine/performing arts (specifically, music) degrees are unaware of these changes and obtaining degrees without knowing what their degree will equip them to do. Through a survey distributed to three geographically different music degree granting institutions of various quality that generally graduate three different types of musicians, quantitative and qualitative data will be obtained on students of all instruments, majors and degree progress. The next section will discuss the rationale for population selection and survey construction, to provide background for the data obtained, and will also provide context of analysis upon data collection.
Chapter 3: Methodology

“All models are wrong. Some are useful.” – George Box

Coming from a mixed educational background of business administration and music performance, I found myself attempting to elucidate my education. Exactly what would having a degree in music allow me to do? A college degree signified to employers that I was capable of completing work by a reasonable time, while possessing a specialized set of musical training. Further studies in research methodology at the postgraduate level led me to the tools necessary to properly quantify these factors and form the foundation of the research methodology for these surveys. Both quantitative and qualitative research techniques are utilized to create stronger findings, and, with proper survey construction, a portrait of students and their motivations emerge. Considering the limitations discussed in Chapter 1 and further points within this chapter, the tools used to measure students are just that: tools, fitting a specialized purpose, but with limitations that need to be deliberated on within a larger context. Considering that quantitative evidence can depict evidence in ways that qualitative evidence cannot (and vice versa), when time and resources available are minimized as factors, findings can complement each other for a more complete depiction of what is happening within the field. This presents itself as background evidence that should be considered by those constructing policy, as a complete body of findings. In constructing an instrument such as this survey tool that utilizes both types of data, careful steps must be taken to maximize the unique
opportunity costs afforded to me by the participating populations. Therefore, this chapter
discusses the steps taken behind the gathering of results: population selection, survey
construction, distribution and collection, and analysis of results from both the “hard” and
“soft” scientific fields.

In terms of what this data offers, there are three main parties that have a stake in
knowing what students desire from their degrees, the first of which is policymakers at the
state level. It’s true that other legislators at the municipal level are indirectly affected by
what graduates of the program in their future employment, but often, their level is too
small to make a noticeable difference in the state college system, especially with flagship
universities. Likewise, those at the federal level are at too high a level to change direct
funding for state universities, although indirect funding through Pell Grants and
guaranteed loans are commonplace (Education Policy, 2010). The unique stance of public
universities being funded by the state puts the main burden of legislative responsibility on
state officials, who work with the University President and Board of Trustees (or similar
titles) to create common goals and funding objectives (Lombardi, Craig, Capaldi, &
Gater, 2002), with a chief duty to public constituents.

Second are those who create curriculum. Curriculum represents defined objectives
behind an assortment of classes, course aims and materials that is indirectly (but
considerably) affected by campus life and a present learning culture. As demonstrated
earlier in mission statements from assorted universities, higher objectives do not have to
be limited to one type; the goals are often abstract (such as creating educators, performers
or simply a high quality citizens), leaving the specifics to be filled in by an appropriate
courseload. This creation of courses is marked by even more specific marks that are usually more specific in nature. Figure 2 illustrates how the quiz grades for identifying scales and modes in a single music theory class fits into the higher goals of the University of Rhode Island. The creators and parties responsible for each level are represented as well. While this research was constructed with educators primarily in mind, its usefulness as identifying needs and wants of funded constituents makes it worthy of consideration by those within public policy.

Figure 1: Implementation of the Mission Statement of the University of Rhode Island
The third party who has a stake in what is taught at universities include the students. It is self-evident as to how those in college find their education useful, but there is limited research showing exactly what students are expecting from their degree plan. It is these three parties that I had to account for when deciding how my data would be obtained. The findings had to account for the choices of approximately 500 music majors, with appropriate representation for outlying responses. It had to have some correlation to music as a major, while representing the interests of students. In short, it had to have qualitative and quantitative data represented. Face to face interviews were impractical because my data had to represent generalizable results over a large population. Likewise, focus groups and similar group study were eliminated because geographically different data needed representation and personal supervision of study groups was impractical. For these reasons, I chose to distribute a survey of music majors within departments/colleges. Because the data is a personal opinion of what it means to obtain high level training in a subject close to students, I understood it would be difficult to have an instrument consisting of Likert scales and bubble choices. Likewise, if the survey was mostly short answer questions, students would either create noisy, difficult to analyze responses or not fill out the survey at all. Leading from this, I decided on a survey that was roughly split evenly. Half would be nominal data identifying class rank and major, with Likert scales analyzing the usefulness of general education classes. A note on question construction: question 4 asks students to identify courses most useful to students within their degree. The last three words in this question are crucial for understanding what students think of their degree; because the department statements (or
equivalent) identify their mission as creating well rounded students to enter the workforce, it is implied that the degree program and curriculum is the department's main tool to create these students. Student understanding of this goal is crucial to the recommendations found later in this research; therefore, the question was framed in the context of the degree program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Connect(s) with</th>
<th>To Illustrate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A given major specializations most useful class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>How valuable general education courses appear to be to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>How much modern curriculum of General Education and degree courses intertwine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Generalization of general education courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>How much the department is perceived to help students realize aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>What students believe they will be doing with their degree musically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 AND 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>How much satisfaction students obtain with degree in relation to degree progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>What students think are the most useful skills in the real world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reinforcement for above question set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Survey Instrument Question Connections*
The other half of the survey consists of short answers. A two to three sentence answer was recommended, as to best gauge the initial responses of the students in question. Questions were constructed to correlate and generate connecting strings of thought, as illustrated in Figure 3. The main objective behind construction of questions was to determine how much value students place on their general education courses, future career aims utilizing their degree and how well the department is doing in helping students realize their aims to illustrate findings for the use of policy maker, board member and student. Common phrases, ideas and motivations were combed from the responses and used to demonstrate themes present in schools geographically, musically and demographically different. Through the use of category lists, key words and defined recurring motives, qualitative research can present itself as drawing nuanced, valid conclusions, even if the data is as varied in composition and structure as the responses from such a diverse, numerically large group of students making up the population of this study (Chapter 7: Reading and Annotating, 1993).

One of the tenets of strong research is a strong population sampling process. A lack of care in this facet of studies can result in data that is noisy, limited in terms of generalizability and less useful overall (Sampling, 2005). Of course, it is impractical for a variety of reasons to sample the entire American body of music students, so strategic sampling must be observed. Samples, at once, must be small enough to eliminate the noise of an entire population, while large enough to reveal insight and valid data from the group studied (Sampling, 2005). Based on the literature review, I decided that three different universities would be studied, differing in size (both University and School of
Music size), geographic location and type of musician graduated. The main differences are summarized in Figure 4, with more in-depth analysis following.

College rankings on the national level would be useful for a larger scale study dealing with many departments within a university or college, but those findings, such as Princeton Review and U.S. News rankings, usually rank the college or university at its entire level. This renders these findings moot for two reasons: their findings suffer from a lack of generalization from including departments spanning the entire range of funding, population and prestige, and even if they applied sound research methods, the music department represents such a small factor of the university population (around 1 percent of total enrollment each in the three samples) that the results would be impractical to translate. There is little data outside of these rankings to determine success of graduates, due to the difficult nature of reaching such a conclusion. Ranking based on success of graduates presents a variety of problems: financial, critical and personal achievement can all be considered success for a graduate, yet are difficult to present in a strong study. Likewise, variables measuring rate of admission and rejection measure the effectiveness of a screening process, rather than how the program changes those admitted. In addition, program reputation evaluation is not the goal of this particular study; instead, this research aims to measure the knowledge of students in regards to career aims. Even if a credible metric for evaluating program “success” could be developed, it would be of limited use in corroborating findings. What is crucial for the sake of this study is a diverse population to create findings that translate over a variety of students and these three samples differ on three main characteristics: geography, music emphasis and school
size. Please note that while Ohio State has a School of Music, and University of New Orleans and University of Rhode Island have Departments of Music, I use the terms interchangeably, as they are functionally the same.

The Ohio State University is one of the largest research institutions in the country. Located in Columbus, Ohio, OSU is found in the top five total enrollment in the country, with 56,000 undergraduate and postgraduate students on the main campus (The Ohio State University Office of Enrollment Services, 2013). This large student population is reflected in its large music department that serves 700 students. OSU has a strong national reputation for its marching band (Ohio Senate, 2012) and can be construed to graduate the strongest band/ensemble students within the context of its study.

The University of New Orleans, located in New Orleans, Louisiana, is a member of the University of Louisiana System and enrolls about 9,000 students annually. UNO serves as the smaller school in this research design, with a music department consisting of about 100 students (The University of New Orleans Office of Internal Research and Data Management, 2013). UNO contrasts itself from the other schools in the study with its strong jazz background, influenced directly by New Orleans’ international jazz-based reputation and reflected in its faculty (nearly seven times the size of OSU’s). UNO also functions as a school from the Southern region of the United States.

Lastly, the University of Rhode Island is a mid-size research institution located in Kingston, Rhode Island. With an enrollment of approximately 16,000 and a music department of roughly 170 students, URI provides considerations from the East Coast to
the study (The University of Rhode Island Office of Institutional Research, 2013). While jazz classifications are usually self-identified, classical emphasis is harder to measure, as it is implicitly assumed that faculty are from a classical background. Therefore, URI functions as a balance between the ensemble focused graduates of OSU and the jazz graduates of UNO. URI also provided a median population of students between the smaller UNO and the statistically outlying size of OSU.

As a study, future findings address some of the needs of students, but there are some considerations that should be cogitated upon interpretation of the data. First, this study surveys music students in a variety of departments, but doesn’t take into account other fine arts (visual, theatre, etc.). The skills lacking in the workforce demonstrated in the literature review might be better found in these other majors as opposed to music. As such, this study represents a narrow possibility within the field. Second, this survey is intended to find out what students think about how well their degree will equip them for the workforce, not whether the degree actually does. Expansion of this study might include interviews with administrators within the community and/or alumni of the program in employment, to sufficiently determine if the degree met their aims to become a well-rounded citizen. In addition, the framing of the importance of a categorization of class within the degree might lead students to overemphasize more music oriented classes in the context of their degree, but this presents material for analysis if the data trends towards a given category. For example, if students think that individual music lessons are the most important aspect of their degree, it can be reasoned that students value this category over others. Lastly is the nature of the data obtained. The survey asks students to
compress their career aims, objectives and similarly weighty matters into a short paragraph on a survey in the middle of class. While some students will be able to clearly convey their desires into such a short space, at the least, responses will be noisy and at the most, incoherent. This concern was one of the main reasons for incorporation of Likert scales into the survey, to obtain at least a rudimentary sense of how well the students think the degree program serves them in their future careers.

As a graduate holding a music degree, I had experience knowing when students would be apt to fill out essays. Music majors across the country are required to attend a class called “convocation”, “recital hour” or a similar name. The class is one of the few chances for the Department of Music to meet as a whole, and usually consists of performances from the student body. Other requirements, such as low stakes professional development, external concert attendance and/or other musical activities outside the traditional curriculum may be factored into the grade. Students are expected to take convocation (usually, but not always for one credit) for their entire course of study. As a pedagogical tool, convocation “provides students with the opportunity to perform, as well as exposes them to a wide range of music and musical repertoire.” (Virginia Commonwealth University, n.d.). URI and UNO professors were kind enough to take time out of their first convocation/recital hour to distribute and collect surveys, and mail them out for analysis. OSU’s convocation meets roughly four times a year and could not afford to spare time to distribute and collect surveys within a convocation, due to its considerable size. However, Associate Professor Timothy Leasure was kind enough to provide similar data collected in a previous semester, which correlated with questions
posed in surveys distributed to UNO and URI. While the data provided by Professor Leasure lacked the qualitative questions posed in other surveys, correlations between general education, non-music courses and music courses are still present due to survey content. These differences will be fully discussed more in-depth in following sections. Surveys at UNO and URI were completed at recital hour and convocation on August 30, 2013 and September 12, 2013, respectively.

The creation of the survey for the purposes of this study had to account for the intended audience of policy makers and education administrators, a diverse variety of populations and a balance of questions both qualitative and quantitative. At the University of New Orleans, data was obtained from 80 students out of approximately 100 total students in the department, an 80% response rate. OSU provided data on 72 students of 700 total, roughly an 11% rate. The next chapter will analyze the findings and identify some correlations common within the three populations and each individual school.
Chapter 4: Results

“There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies, and statistics.”– Mark Twain

The combined results come from two different sets of questionnaires, and three different schools. Response rate was around 11% (73/660) from The Ohio State University, and an average of 72% from the student bodies of University of New Orleans and University of Rhode Island (160/220). OSU will be analyzed on a different set of graphs than UNO and URI, because of the contrasting response rate and the equally differing nature of the questions. This separation, although necessary to draw unmuddled conclusions, nevertheless presents a unique opportunity for identified trends: patterns of student perception can be paralleled with findings across different sets of populations and questions. This isn’t to say that conclusions between the two are symbiotic and automatically bolster the other; like all findings gleaned from data, the limitations of all findings need to be considered to fully understand the found results. A small amount of Masters students were incorporated into the survey findings, because their population was incredibly small (less than 10 across universities. Key caveats with this contrast between questions and populations will be identified in Chapter 5.

Section 1: OSU Findings

OSU released their data on the condition that it be anonymized. As such, these findings stem from the data provided by Professor Leasure, but the raw data is not available for public use.
Figure 2: OSU Sample Class Rank

Figure 3: OSU Sample Anticipated Degree Program
Applied lesson (recitals, juries and studio performances) experiences provide sufficient technical skills for artistic self-expression in my area of concentration.

Figure 4: OSU Sample Expression from Applied Lessons

Chamber music (small ensemble) experiences provide sufficient technical skills for artistic self-expression in my area of concentration.

Figure 5: OSU Sample Expression from Small Ensembles
Large ensemble (band/orchestra/choir) experiences provide sufficient technical skills for artistic self-expression in my area of concentration.

Figure 6: OSU Sample Expression from Large Ensembles

I think the General Education (GE) requirements are appropriate for my program.

Figure 7: OSU Sample GEC Appropriateness
I would like to have greater flexibility in the GE requirements required for my program.

Figure 8: OSU Sample GEC Flexibility

I would like to have fewer GE requirements and more elective credits (non-music).

Figure 9: OSU Sample GEC Preference over Non-Music Electives
I would like to have fewer GE requirements and more Music elective credits.

Figure 10: OSU Sample GEC Preference over Music Electives
Section 2: Pooled UNO and URI Quantitative Results

Note: specific trends between schools can be found in Appendix I. While these schools form trends together, there are Department-specific differences discussed in Chapter 5, based from data found in the Appendix. Not all data add up to the same value, because students were free to answer as many or as few questions as they wished.

![Class Rank Chart]

*Figure 11: URI and UNO Sample Class Rank*
Figure 12: URI and UNO Sample Current Degree Program

Figure 13: URI and UNO Sample Anticipated Degree Program
Ensembles are among the most useful courses in my degree.

Eartraining/Theory Courses are expected to be among the most useful in my degree.

Figure 14: URI and UNO Sample Ensemble Usefulness

Figure 15: URI and UNO Sample Eartraining/Theory Courses
Lessons are among the most useful in my degree.

Figure 16: URI and UNO Sample Applied Lesson Usefulness

Music Electives are among the most useful courses in my degree.

Figure 17: URI and UNO Sample Music Elective Usefulness
Non music electives are among the most useful in my degree.

Figure 18: URI and UNO Sample Nonmusic Elective Usefulness

GEC Courses are among the most useful in my degree.

Figure 19: URI and UNO Sample GEC Usefulness
Section 3: Pooled UNO and URI Qualitative Results

Of those who responded (11 sets of qualitative questions from both Departments were left blank), students valued performance skills of all kinds (solo, ensemble, cross-genre, multiple instruments), while emphasizing a high level of mastery on their “native” instrument. Note: all spelling and grammar was transcribed “as-is” throughout this section.

- UNO, Student 17 (Freshman B.M.), question 6: “musicianship, decorum, and technical ability”.

Figure 20: URI and UNO Sample Professional Use of GEC Courses
• UNO, Student 51 (Graduate M.M.), question 6: “I feel that ensemble playing skills and confidence in playing are most important.”

• URI, Student 27 (Freshman B.M.), question 6: “I feel as though a solid foundation in ear training and theory is important with knowledge of piano and proper technique on my instrument.”

• URI, Student 56 (Junior B.M.), question 6: “Having good eartraining skills and musicianship on your instrument.”

Those majoring in music education had slight trends towards methods of teaching, while indirectly acknowledging the skills required in a portfolio career by also prioritizing said performance abilities.

• URI, Student 7 (Sophomore Music Ed.), question 6: “Applied lessons, piano, theory, methods courses, music teaching”.

• URI, Student 6 (Freshman Music Ed.), question 9: “Training me to play expected music, as well as training me to teach methods.”

• URI, Student 41 (Sophomore Music Ed.) Question 6: “Professionalism, practice skills, performing skills, teaching skills”. Question 7: “Private flute teacher/Professional Performer”.

• UNO, student 38 (Junior Music Ed.), question 7: “Gigging, private teaching, composing/arranging, studio sessions.”
Of special interest was one student who credited “business administration skills” as the most important skill learned while obtaining his/her B.A, coupled with a handful of UNO students that exclusively identified technical business skills (marketing, accounting.

Tying into this was a perceived need for the department to aid by offering opportunities to perform, network, and develop as musicians. The careers identified ranged from teacher to performer to music therapist, and spanned largely those careers that principally used music in the workforce (in contrast to those career paths identified by SNAAP as support structures for performing arts organizations). Students principally identified many careers as their post-college work life, as opposed to solely performing, teaching and/or other more personal aims that didn’t directly fit into their career. Interestingly, the skills identified by students fell largely into two categories: personal development of social skills, work ethic and developing/executing personal and professional goals and objectives, and those performance and music specific courses (eartraining and theory, for example), with a lack of emphasis on music business and technology.

- UNO, Student 60 (Freshman B.M.), question 6: “Theory and eartraining.” Question 7: “Performing in ensembles and other such groups. Question 8: “Skills gathered from playing in various ensembles.” Question 9: “By providing the classes helpful to my success as a musician.”

• URI, student 13 (Senior B.M.), question 6: “Technical and artistic skills at the instrument, discipline to set and manage work/goals, ability to work and interact with ensembles in a health and beneficial manner.” Question 7: “Unsure.” Question 8: “My practice skill to continue playing casually, if not for a living.” Question 9: “Unsure.”

• URI, student 14 (Freshman B.M.) question 7: “Music teacher who plays in pits for musicals and other performing groups.” Question 8: “Everything; practice techniques, how to teach music, listening, conducting, expressing how I want the music to sound because everything is important if I want the kids I teach to have a good experience to learn something.”

• URI, student 17 (Senior B.M.), question 6: “There are several skills developed in the department that I rank equally important. They are performance, teaching skills, and composition.” Question 7: “I hope to teach as a day job and play out at night”. Question 8: “Teaching and composing. Hopefully, I’ll be able to play out as well.” Question 9: “Hopefully my degree will open some doors as far as teaching positions are concerned. The rest is for me to figure out.” Question 10: “I hope the aim is to produce sufficient teachers, performers and composers.”

• URI, student 50 (Freshman Music Ed.), question 9: “Helping me to develop good time management skills and practice techniques, and teach me more about being a good musician.”

• URI, Student 59 (Sophomore Music Ed.), question 6: “Sight reading, piano, theory, eartraining, error detection.” Question 7: “Teaching and/or performing.”
Question 8: “Sight reading, piano, error detection, and music theory.” Question 9: “Hopefully a great assortment due to learning how to be a professional musician and gaining connections.”

- URI, student 71 (Junior B.M.), question 7: “I hope to teach private lessons and play in an orchestra.” Question 8: “There are many skills I believe I will use when I graduate. These include: productive practicing, playing as part of a group – listening and working together.”

There was an adherence to what the Department prescribed as becoming a complete musician; a common recurring set of responses was for a student to view all the classes as important for professional development, and pick out the Departments mission as creating successful musicians

- UNO, student 60 (Freshman B.M.), question 10: “help students reach their goals”.
- UNO, student 35 (Senior B.M.), question 10: “to prepare me for a professional career in music”.
- URI, student 14 (Freshman B.M.), question 10: “To have successful and prepared musicians/teachers/composers once they graduate from URI to accomplish great things.”
- URI, student 41 (Senior Music Ed.), question 10: “to create professional musicians out of amateurs”.
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• URI, student 61 (Junior Music Ed.), question 10: “I feel like the goal of the Department is to supply the students with the tools and skills needed to make it in the real world of being a musician and/or a music teacher.”

• URI, student 70 (Sophomore Music Ed.), question 10: “to ensure that everyone leaves the department with some kind of skillset to put them in a career.

In addition to high hopes and aspirations of performance, there was a sense of disenfranchisement from select students regarding their employability. These students represent the minority in this dataset, but future research would involve more informal methods of inquiry to explore more involved dissatisfaction with the degree.

• URI, Student 27 (Freshman B.M.), question 7: “As a music performance major, ideally I would like to play in a variety of ensembles and groups, but I’m probably going to end up with minimum wage from my parents’ basement.”

• URI, Student 25 (Senior B.M.), question 7: “Music teacher in a public school…aka unemployment : ( (there’s always retail…))”

• URI, Student 69 (Junior B.A.), question 7: “Performing musician of my original music. Or, being a waitress. Because a BA in music degree is NOT going to get me a “career”.

An interesting conclusion to be drawn from the survey results came from a combination of question 8 and question 10, where skills used in the workforce compare with the aims of the Department. A recurring phrase of Department aims and objectives was “well-rounded”, or similar expressions of students perceptions of performing and teaching.
Corroborating this, when asked what skills they would use most in the workforce, students cited technical performance as previously detailed in this chapter.

- UNO, student 12 (Senior B.A.), question 6: “Theory for sure; ensemble skills are quite helpful as well.” Question 7: “Vocal performer.” Question 8: “Vocal skills.” Question 9: “All of the classes will make me more well-rounded”
- UNO, student 37 (Sophomore B.M.), question 7: “Traveling musician/house pianist” Question 10: “To help be a well-rounded musician”
- URI, student 3 (Junior Music Ed.), question 6: “Eartraining and methods classes because they teach you how to listen, and the fundamentals of playing any instrument. Having the actual experience is the best way to learn.” Question 10: “The aim is to produce well rounded musicians/educators that inspire music appreciation and enjoyment in others. This is true even in performers who inspire people to keep coming out to concerts and show and keep music part of their lives.”
- URI, student 11 (Freshman B.M.), question 6: “I find skills developed as a result of playing with others (Accompaniment, ensembles, big band) are important, as well as those developed in a position of leadership, such as instructing.” Question 10: “URI puts strong emphasis on well-rounded total musicianship which covers all possible aspects of the field.”
- URI, student 31 (Junior Music Ed.), question 10: “To support well-rounded, highly trained musicians.”
• URI, student 49 (Freshman B.A.), question 6: “Music Theory and the ability to apply it in real performances” Question 10: “To make each musician better and give them the essential skills to make it in the professional/music world.”

• URI, student 58 (Sophomore B.M.), question 10: “The aims are to prepare us for our professional lives in every way (especially maturity, professionalism, experience of different music). We are well rounded.”

As illustrated through these patterns of findings, there exists a clear distinction between which skills are useful as a professional, which skills allow for the most creative expression within a degree program, and which skills will be most utilized within a professional setting (being, acting, and knowing, respectively). There exists a small outlier group of students that categorize their degree as worthless and in need of a second, unrelated job, but students were fairly consistent in understanding that their ideal profession required them to take second forms of employment teaching, performing, and researching new opportunities. In other words, their degree allowed them to self-identify as well-rounded within the fields of performance and pedagogy, with the Department having chief responsibility to instruct and guide students towards a future career. Those courses that directly steered students towards an increased ability to play in a variety of settings and groups were prized over everything else, with music electives eliciting a mid-range level of approval, and non-music electives and GEC courses only gaining a small sense of personal fulfillment as a professional musician with a portfolio career. Students mostly had a strong sense of purpose within their degree program (exceptions
included freshmen and students who circled different answers on anticipated and current degree plans), and were passionate about what they were doing. The professors were perceived as highly intelligent, motivated, and determined to help students succeed in their chosen career path. Students at OSU displayed similar findings, with performance, ensemble, and lesson classes yielding an extremely high rating in terms of creative and artistic achievement. GEC courses and nonmusic electives were held less favorably (adjusting for different scales of measurement) than colleagues at URI and UNO, but this was probably due to errors in survey instrument construction to be outlined in the following chapter. The relatively large response rate and how seriously the students took the essay made for strong connections to be discussed in Chapter Five, when possibilities for generalization, conditions with findings, and possibilities for research expansion are discussed.
“When human judgment and big data intersect, there are some funny things that happen.”
– Nate Silver

Ultimately, this research gathered data directly from three different schools using two measurement tools. The survey distributed by OSU administrators served to examine what students attending a large, public university ascertained from their degree, while the populations at URI and UNO scrutinized student perceptions of degree value in terms of self-fulfillment. The surveys had a high overall response rate and the results section performs well as an observational study. Of course, the findings are derived from utilizing the form of an observational study, with all the limitations that come from it. It’s important to note that, because there is no dependent variable being measured, it would be irresponsible to determine causation from these findings. Self-determination of degree value is by itself a notoriously difficult outcome to measure and studies explicitly attempting to find relevant conclusions often suffer from problems of internal validity. Besides this narrow scope of focus and subsequent research goals, the surveys used in this research are self-limiting by their very nature, with the OSU instrument suffering from some considerable flaws. Survey findings and data from field experiments are often a direct reflection of what is sought from the researcher, and a syntactically neutral tone becomes key in producing results that are unbiased and externally reproducible. It is in this facet that the OSU survey falls short and serves as a backing set of findings rather
than the foundational trends to be found within the UNO and URI populations. These sets of considerations to be taken with the data do not necessarily render the findings as fundamentally defective, but rather take the form of the proverbial grain of salt to be considered with any set of figures.

The strengths stem from purposeful wording, relatively strong sample size, and a qualitative answer section providing a strong sense of undergraduate motivations extremely difficult to measure using traditional survey methods. These three tenets come together to create a survey and findings that create a sense of what undergraduates want and are experiencing from their degree in terms of what their future career entails. As stated in Chapter 2, with degree programs moving away from personal fulfillment and self-enlightenment as a goal and moving towards training future employees for a career, findings that gauge the motivations and perceptions of students working towards a degree become increasingly crucial to diagnose disenfranchisement and similar senses of unfulfilled aims. This importance of program evaluation grows as state investment in higher education continues to grow and shareholders increasingly demand dependable returns. To better correlate these preliminary findings, a larger and more diverse sample size would be needed to ascertain the trends taking shape within this relatively small population on a more comprehensive level, as well as standardized survey instruments. There also exist possibilities of generalization to other performing arts and, to a lesser extent, visual arts, due to the nature of the portfolio career. Specifics with translating findings to other art forms form the focus of a much larger study than this one could encompass, but this study serves its restricted goals as a pilot study to examine initial
views of the classes teaching skills directly used in employment. This chapter forms the conclusion of these findings, and is divided into three sections: first, I will examine the advantages and disadvantages of the two survey instruments, then I will discuss some possible representation of findings based on the data presented in Chapter Four, and I will conclude with where this research can go in terms of utilization for practical use, including the previously mentioned possibilities for generalization and how the trends identified can be more concretely recognized for use in creation of policy at the levels of academic and state administration.

Some Positive and Negative Aspects

In regards to the survey distributed by OSU, there were several benefits and drawbacks to incorporating their findings into the conclusions. OSU’s music department is a regionally accredited program that graduates 350 musicians on average annually (OSU’s average graduation rate multiplied by department size) (The Ohio State University Office of Enrollment Services, 2013). These musicians have achieved recent fame with their nationally broadcasted halftime performances at football games and certainly possess the technical skill necessary to succeed in a workforce based on merit. But is that enough to succeed for employment in the current time? The surveys distributed by OSU asked whether musicians felt that their various performance classes provided them with enough opportunities to express themselves in terms of artistry. Interestingly, this wording, although important by itself to determine whether musicians have the opportunity to express themselves through their craft, does not carry over to GEC courses. This question is worded as to whether those courses are appropriate for the
respective program. Considering the degree program is a comprehensive set of courses constructed to create a capable musician, to properly generalize findings, the questions should read extremely similar to convey to students the aims of the survey. Interpreting these results, students have a sense that the GEC requirements aren’t appropriate for their program, but they are creatively expressing themselves in their various classes. Of course, students in music programs will not creatively express themselves in their GEC courses, but if the GEC courses serve to create professional musicians if not well rounded citizens, then the question should have read into more practical application of these general skills required of all students.

The second flaw lies in the second set of questions, where the survey determines whether students would like to have more elective and music credits respectively over GEC courses. The survey asks whether students would like to have greater flexibility in choosing their GE requirements, a positively biased word that leads to skewed agreeing responses. In other words, responders tend to answer affirmatively when asked a question swayed by a positively biased word without conditional stipulations. This bias sways the specific question, but also immediately following questions through the principles behind inter-question interaction (Merriam, 2009). As students consider greater flexibility in their selection of GEC courses, the following questions that inquire into fewer GEC courses in favor of demonstrated favorably received courses lead towards positively swayed responses. This interaction between questions damages the internal validity of the survey and creates conditions that must be considered while drawing conclusions.
In addition, the survey faced a considerably small sample size, stemming from its method of delivery to the student body. Students were asked to volunteer to take the survey through a department website at their leisure, in contrast to the URI and UNO surveys distributed at class time with an allocation of ten to fifteen minutes for completion. While OSU faces a much larger population of approximately 700 students, these considerations nevertheless form the characteristics of the study. The data found provides somewhat strong insights as to how students perceive the GEC courses in terms of value compared to their performance classes and also shows specifically which classes within the GEC spectrum provide the most use for their development as musicians (omitted from Chapter Four; found in Appendix I).

Finally, these results provide a strong sense that musicians studying at OSU feel creatively fulfilled from the current curriculum of coursework. If students have a sense of musical self-actualization from an accredited curriculum, potential for curriculum reform comes from incorporating management and administration skills into this division of the coursework. In this study, OSU formed an interesting part of the results in that those management skills were not directly addressed, but rather allowed for an emphasis on creative skills and fulfillment of a set of skills necessary in the older economy, where exemplary musical technique was enough to keep steady employment. But as demonstrated in Chapter Two, there exists a new landscape for artists in performers. Universities graduate more musicians than ever and technical skill is no longer enough to solely build a career on. Rather than establish a strong sense of musical skill, performing arts organizations require artists to perform a multitude of duties, to say
nothing of the self-employed demographics that have to administrate themselves at an unforeseen level. These new workers form the focus of this survey that attempts to gauge the most useful skills to a student preparing to enter the workforce. This serves a twofold purpose: whether or not the classes that instruct specifically on management skills (musician professional development) or indirectly through the principles of GEC courses have a negative stigma from contrasting with performance courses, and what courses students themselves think they apply most to a future career considering the full body of coursework that constitutes an undergraduate degree. This is what the URI and UNO surveys attempted to identify, through requesting students to place a value on the various categories of music degree courses, ascertaining whether GEC courses were useful in terms of how professionals use the learned concepts, and providing a short answer section to complement findings outside the occasionally hindering format of a traditional examination. The professors at URI and UNO were kind enough to allow class time for completion and distributed the survey to students during a large class period, facilitating an extremely high response rate.

Trends

The trends resulting from the UNO and URI surveys also portrayed an intriguing picture. At once, students understood that, although their coursework allowed them to pursue a personal passion, it would result in underemployment and a lack of fulmination of a portfolio career to earn wages capable of supporting a lifestyle. Students almost exclusively had a desire to teach, perform, or some combination of the two, with administration and business careers within music forming an almost negligible minority.
No trends were found separating class rank; although some freshmen highlighted their relative unfamiliarity with the department (the UNO survey was distributed after the official first week of classes, with the URI survey on a similar timeframe), sophomores, juniors, and seniors alike had a similar mix of exploratory completion of coursework, and a clear desire for classes permitting them to showcase musical talents. A combination of performance and pedagogy was desired to create a complete musician; students understood that the department had a responsibility to create musicians able to adapt to the workforce immediately, in contrast to working full time in the field and returning to school for advanced degrees. The Department is perceived as having responsibilities towards musicians to facilitate their technical prowess and ability to perform a multitude of styles (classical, jazz, modern, etc.) with an equally diverse set of ensembles (small and large groups as well as experience with other non-native instruments) with little emphasis on anything else outside of the academic and directly practical fields of music.

Future music teachers were somewhat narrowly focused on their career aims, with trends toward public school teacher (more limited with those aiming for careers in higher education, with its requirements of a terminal or similarly advanced degree), but presented the condition that they would have to perform to supplement income as well.

An interesting point was whether these students aiming for public education wanted to perform to earn more money, as a sort of professional development, or for personal pleasure. Even with those students studying in the fields less specifically focused on education (such as the B.A. or B.M.), there was a desire to teach privately in a studio or similar community organization. This well-rounded nature of performance and
pedagogy leads to questions of what is emphasized at higher level conservatories; are those schools that have a reputation for producing high quality musicians producing the highly specialized performers, with public universities graduating the community performers that form the foundation of a community’s musical expression? These examples of well-roundedness tie into a crucial finding from these surveys: that students perceive working as a versatile musician is defined as teaching, performing, and honing these skills directly related to production of music. Almost no mention was made of the management and administration skills that received the strong emphasis in the studies completed by SNAAP. This brings into question whether students fully understand the importance of these professional aspects, whether there is a negative association with these skills due to not directly improving musical skills, or whether another influence is responsible for this perception. Of course, given this research’s status as an observational study, these kinds of conclusions can’t be drawn in terms of cause and effect, but raising these questions and developing follow-up studies is indeed a critical part of similarly constructed research. While deliberately excluded from this set of findings, a possible source of comparisons would have included those students studying a more focused set of business administration skills, such as those students incorporating minors or even secondary majors from arts administration, music industry or related degree related to a more managerial side of the creative economy.

**Possibilities for Generalization**

These beginning conclusions present a sound ground for generalization of findings, as well as opportunities to conduct research confirming findings to represent
fields outside of music specifically. Previously discussed in Chapter Two, music possesses an intrinsic need to perform and teach in a myriad of environments simply not possible to the realms of dance, theatre and other similarly structured disciplines that require a more formal setting. There are simply more opportunities for musicians to perform in informal and formal settings, and for large and small crowds that truly presents the art form as the most versatile of the performing arts (Hallam, Creech, Varvarigou, & McQueen, 2012). Nevertheless, the arts are burdened by their status as a public good, and this results in performers being underpaid and often underemployed. Tying from this, artists in all disciplines face an unparalleled need to utilize their artistic skills in a variety of settings, but the term dancer or actor could be easily interchanged with artist to achieve the same point, in terms of cross-disciplinary application. In undergraduate training, artists develop their skills on an individual basis through personal instruction and practice from a professor in the field, develop a technical skillset at an extremely high level, and network with similar professionals. Similar pressures exist to perform, teach, and establish a community presence, with possibilities for collaboration between multiple fields.

While management deficiencies in other disciplines were indirectly identified through the work completed by SNAAP and it stands to reason that most college academic departments have difficulty adapting to economy shifts, the conclusions that arise from this research should be taken with a nuanced understanding of the pertinent fields, especially within the visual arts. This study was based on the idea that concerts involve an active audience and a related performance setting, a sharp contrast with those
who work in a visual medium. The aesthetic differences between the mediums undoubtedly form the basis for entire careers in academia, but as pertaining to the portfolio career, there still remains a need to professionalize a workforce based on the needs of arts organizations and the mission statements of university departments. Departments could shift emphasis on a different exhibition of the portfolio based on department goals, traditional goals, and how to best utilize faculty within a respective department.

Points of Consideration

However, within the overarching ideas governing this research, there are some important stipulation to be addressed. First, students have a strong preference towards taking classes that improve their performance ability, which forms their defining characteristics as a career professional. This stems from the ideas presented in the URI and UNO survey, indirectly confirmed by the OSU studies: across the board, students place a strong emphasis on avenues of creative and artistic expression. This statement holds true across B.A.’s and B.M.’s, with a similar emphasis to be found in the population of Music Ed in addition to a priority on pedagogical methods, conducting, or similar skills to be used in educational settings large, small, public, or private. A strong sense of competitiveness and achieving the highest level of technical proficiency was found, amongst those who specified, different musical genres (jazz, classical, etc.), native instruments and even across non-music majors. With the latter group, there was an extremely small minority of students who were taking Convocation or Recital Hours for a music minor; even these students taking the required courses with seemingly limited
intentions of a full time career within the music industry believed that the ability to play an instrument in an artistically and creatively fulfilling way was a core facet of studying music at a high level. This comes from a newly identified, but omnipresent phenomenon of competitiveness between musicians similar to that of an athletic competition, with an increase in this mentality elicited from the increased connectivity of social media (Suhr, 2011). When musical performances from the most directly link to the skill of a musician, and this skill is the basis for competition within the pseudo-familial bonds of a music degree program, it ties that students would have a preference and aptitude towards those classes that give a preferred edge.

This leads into the second, converse point to be taken away from these findings: with this emphasis on performance and classes that lead to direct improvement in instrument skills and technique, classes that don’t satisfy a certain level of technical capacity are perceived as less useful, both in terms of professional use and application (as found in the URI and UNO survey data) and, in a limited context, within the constraints of a undergraduate degree program. GEC courses are generally perceived to be less useful than degree specific by all students in a given college or university (Nussbaum, 2002) (Barnes, Cerrito, & Levi, 2004), but music students trend towards a negative view of both those classes and non-music electives where music performance and academic study is not the primary focus. This creates two points for consideration that lead to these classes and trained skills being overly devalued: the portfolio career consists of three foundational aspects, including administrative and image management aspects that fall into a classification of non-musical courses, and the market requires from its artists more
managerial skills, especially from those who are classified as self-employed or affiliated with a microenterprise. These two ideas form mutually offsetting ideas that ultimately results in the creation of majors that lack the training needed for a graduate holding a performing arts degree to be immediately ready to enter the workforce. Of course, this training can come in the form of professional development, but this comes at a price to a given company while the employee presents undeveloped work during the training process. Given the increasingly large investment that states will make in their public universities, tangible and increasingly large returns will need to be demonstrated to present a case for increased funding. Future artists and those within the visual and performing realm face an added burden associated with the nature of the arts, and subsequent difficulties in earning a living wage. Metrics proving a strong return from investment in the arts have been the white whale of econometricians and those looking to further prove the status of the arts as a public good, prone to different market forces than traditional outputs from human capital (Kramer, 2010) (McCarthy, Brooks, Lowell, & Zakaras, 2001) (Watson J., 2012). With the hindrances placed on performance evaluation and return on investment, responding to the market needs and student perceptions becomes paramount, coupled with university and music department aims of producing citizens capable of contributing to a community.

Possible Courses of Actions for Departments

Short of an overhaul of national curriculum from key department accreditation agencies to adapt to these changes, universities can adapt to better prepare students and graduates through strategic use of already present organizational resources. The first
involves a more direct curricular reform, involving the placement of key financial and management courses directly within a four year course of study. As defined by the accreditation agency, electives are incorporated into the curriculum to produce citizens capable of making well informed decisions and professionally assess a problem to discover a solution (indeed, various other accreditation agencies incorporate similar language of leadership and personal fulfillment into the required coursework). There exists a sharp divide between two categorizations of coursework: either students are developing as musicians, or they are becoming more capable members of society. This dichotomy allows for accredited curriculum to exist with no financial management classes, with the broad requirements of electives being the only wiggle room for these courses that form the previously detailed cornerstones of the comprehensive performing arts career. The first step for administrators within a music department is to require these courses, but the first question posed by the savvy music department head would inquire into the transactional costs – what is given up in exchange.

The first course of action, stemming from the needs of the market, the observed lack of performance, and the slow rate of reform in the Ivory Tower, recommends that courses in image management, financial literacy, and business administration courses framed within the context of the arts be required at the cost of some electives. If a sufficient amount of courses are offered as electives to take for credit, and these courses fit the requirements to help music students achieve a level of administrative proficiency, then two aims are fulfilled: students enjoy a breadth of options to choose from in elective choice, the courses help achieve the broader aims of creating high functioning members
of society, and no performing arts courses, those classes that students acknowledge as far and away the most important, are lost in an exchange. URI and UNO both offer ample options in the way of choosing electives, but these courses are larger high level academic courses that are advanced studies of specialized musical topics. By including these courses in the elective section of a four year plan of study, most of the benefits of these courses are realized without significant tradeoff, but there still exists a price to be paid. Reform of courses of study such as this face considerable bureaucratic hoops from the department in realizing accreditation, as well as the respective supervising college (usually a College of Arts and Sciences). This red tape doesn’t allow for quick reform; although the end product usually faces a gauntlet of review processes from a variety of interested parties and consequently results in a product that all interested parties have some degree of input, reorganization requires a long term vision and leaders capable of carrying out long term goals and objectives. This emphasis on less directly related musical classes could also lead to a negative perception of the department, or one that focuses less on the needs of students. There already exists a strong negative perception of these courses and if a department reconsiders its department to realize an increased presence of management and business administration, students may interpret this change as a decreased focus on those skills that form the crux of their professional lives. These courses would have to be presented as key features of an inclusive degree of study, and presented in an immediately applicable method to illustrate their necessary nature. To reiterate, these courses included in an elective section with a wide variety of options would allow for interested parties to leave with some satisfaction: accreditation agencies
with acknowledgement of achievement, students with the necessary management techniques, professors and department administrators with a hopefully limited increase in required work to achieve these aims.

The second proposition for reform comes from a utilization of university resources and unofficial networking with both informal and formal resources to create a grassroots level of career development for interested performing and visual artists. A flagship mobilization of these resources is currently being undertook at The Ohio State University, in the form of the Barnett Center for Performing and Professional arts, where both fine and performing arts students from the university, and local artists enroll in courses not taken for credit to further bolster their professional skills. This sort of center for artists to network, train and obtain an increased sense of professionalization represents a lack of interference in the formal music curriculum and allows students to take courses that most improve them personally (The Ohio State University College of Arts and Sciences, 2012). By pairing practicing artists within the community with a center that utilizes their respective skillset to professionalize the future generation of artists, students have a choice in what to take, and the curriculum would not need to be modified to reflect the changing needs, with students taking these courses at their discretion. If they were to be required, potentials for collaboration provide opportunities for development within the framework of department professors and community arts leaders. In addition, various psychological studies highlight how students do better in classes where a degree of liberty is afforded in its choice – even more so than the freedom of electives, this Center offers students a middle ground between class and
improvement as a future employee. Students would have the ability to pick and choose which specific skills to develop, in addition to the immediate improvement of the community surrounding the university. This path, however faces a significant series of hurdles, the first of which is perhaps most prominent. The Center exists based on the donations from a wealthy alum, a luxury not afforded to most universities across the country (The Ohio State University College of Arts and Sciences, 2012). Without a significant donation from graduates, proposing and constructing a similar Center requires a substantial long term plan and investment from an increasingly small pool of resources. Similar Centers are impractical without a set of circumstances allowing a university to allocate resources and long term planning towards a long term project. In addition, Centers face the previously detailed quandary of providing qualitative results from a discipline that faces difficulties providing returns on investment, but this difficulty is reduced with capable leadership and a strong sense of achievement of objectives. Considering these set of factors, a Center provides a more immediate and stable positive achievement of goals, but at a significant cost. The Department looking to address the issues presented within this research would be best served with minor adjustments in course requirements, with the most efficient placement coming from placement in nonmusic elective requirements, at the discretion of the department head or respective administrator.

**Common Threads**

These conclusions, however, are presented within the limitations of this research and its various constraints: the conclusions are slightly, albeit not completely hindered by
a small sample size, unstandardized tools of inquiry, and somewhat limited time of response allowed to completely fill the survey. Complete synopses of future aims, ambitions, and respective skills can be difficult to write in a short answer section fifteen minutes before the conclusion of the class. While the conclusions in Chapter 4 were reached from demonstrated patterns from both short answer and bubbled answers, changes in the methodology would help the research fully develop trends and provide more concrete evidence for policymakers and department administrators to utilize in pertinent action. Thus, several possible options exist to expand this study into a larger and more fully realized body of work. The first option, geared towards proving what’s been established in the results, is oriented towards expanding the sample size, both in number and classification of school. With the first option, an increased number of surveyed music departments from a variety of demographics allows of findings across unique populations and, if trends continue, would provide evidence for regional or even national trends. Do students nationwide perceive GEC courses as being useful? Are there individual states that have completely different outlooks towards a variety of courses? How does different curricular structure affect the perceptions of various types of classes?

These trends, although useful on a large scale, would be difficult to statistically defend if identified within three schools. Information such as this, where patterns are identified per region, would shape the formulation of national and regional accreditation, where the strengths and weaknesses of each region could be utilized and harnessed.

Possibilities of Further Research
Although this survey takes account three different national regions, more areas within the nation as well as an increased number of schools could only cement the conclusions found. Coming from this, on a more local level, local arts administrators could be interviewed, surveyed via focus group or inspected through a similarly qualitatively intensive tool of investigation to determine local needs and whether graduates from public universities are fulfilling their administrative and managerial needs, if any. While this finding (what administrators need from the graduates of public music degree programs) is corroborated by the literature, developments on a state or individual township basis connected with the presence of a public university that holds a strong influence on the community form the basis of local needs. As some graduates from performing and visual art programs stay in their immediate community, these connections can be made to shape the more local needs, as well as those addressing the problems on a national level. Again, these problems can only be realized with a considerable sample size across the populations determined to provide internally valid results: schools of different sizes, emphases, faculty, etc. The most interesting caveat would include studies of private schools, or those that receive limited state funding. As this research largely focuses on determining a return on the considerable investment made by states in higher education and the potential benefits to be reaped by a more knowledgeable workforce, private schools operate by a slightly different set of standards in rules. Private schools enjoy a larger degree of autonomy and an incalculable amount of prestige associated with the widely known conservatories, as well as freedom to pursue less explored methods of pedagogy that public schools are unable to dig into because of the associated
standardization that comes with receiving state funding. Such research delving into the skills of students graduating with degrees from private universities would encompass the two major categorizations of schools within the United States, but would need to be carefully controlled for presentation to policymakers due to the vastly different educational structure. In distribution of a similar survey, questions could be posed inquiring to how students view a potential standardization of curriculum or a tradeoff between increased liberty of instruction pays off according to student needs as a professional.

A second path to be taken is to investigate those students who are at the forefront of music industry degrees and how they function within the creative economy. Schools detailed in Chapter Two are taking advantage of more administrative focused degrees or minors to better prepare graduates; potential surveys would interact with these people in the workforce to gauge how their education prepared them. To some extent, SNAAP is conducting this research, but its findings are too general; their conclusions do not differentiate between the more managerially focused schools and more traditional models. Whether these programs that are incorporating financial management and techniques into the curriculum in the form of a minor, required courses or a more liberal selection of electives graduate more successful students would raise questions of accountability and how much an investment in education paid off. Experimental curricula could be developed as an extensive application of field research and published literature, but finding sample populations to test this experimental course of study would require a unique set of circumstances, where a department and student body would consent to
having their education be tampered with, under an unproven curriculum. This path is possible, but requires a combination of luck and a particularly empathetic department head. First steps towards achieving this aim would encompass a pilot course, covering the major foci of deficits highlighted, with success according to a predetermined set of criteria leading to more intensive studies and application. Of course, this development, in conjunction with the aforementioned increased scope of studies in various schools, is not out of the reach of a particularly ambitious project.

To summarize, the market simply requires more administrative and management skills from its graduates. A prime example of these skills are those to be found within a typical minor in business administration, and the more recent curriculum emphasizing studies in arts entrepreneurship within the music industries. The limitations of this study prevent broad generalizations, but from the populations surveyed, music students determine these skills to be less valuable than those that hone respective musical technique. Opportunities to address this discrepancy between the findings and the literature, as well as both reform possibilities offered represent a considerable investment in the future of music graduates to better enhance their financial literacy and equip them with the skills needed to succeed within an increasingly competitive field.
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Appendix A: URI and UNO Survey Data

Coding

For data in column A, 1 = Freshman, 2 = Sophomore, 3 = Junior, and 4 = Senior/Graduate Student

For data in columns B & C, 1 = B.A., 2 = B.M., and 3 = Music Education.

For data in columns D, E, F, G, H, I, and J, 1 = Respondent filled in the bubble. 0 = Respondent did not fill in the bubble.

For data in column K, 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree, and 0 = Respondent did not fill out.

URI students are rows 1-78, and UNO students are rows 79-158.
## Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ClassRank</th>
<th>ProgramAnticipated</th>
<th>ProgramCurrent</th>
<th>UseEnsembles</th>
<th>UseExaminingTheory</th>
<th>UseLessons</th>
<th>UseMusicElectives</th>
<th>UseNonMusicElectives</th>
<th>UseEIC</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>GenEdPaUse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClassRank</td>
<td>ProgramAnticipated</td>
<td>ProgramCurrent</td>
<td>UseEnsembles</td>
<td>UseEatingTheory</td>
<td>UseLessons</td>
<td>UseMusicElectives</td>
<td>UseNonMusicElectives</td>
<td>UseGEC</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>GenEdPolUse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ClassRank</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Anicoped</td>
<td>ProgramCurrent</td>
<td>UseEnsembles</td>
<td>UseCurricularTheory</td>
<td>UseLessons</td>
<td>UseMusicElectives</td>
<td>UseNonMusicElectives</td>
<td>UseGEC</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ClassRank</td>
<td>ProgramAnticipated</td>
<td>ProgramCurrent</td>
<td>UseEnsembles</td>
<td>UseEartrainingTheory</td>
<td>UseLessons</td>
<td>UseMusicElectives</td>
<td>UseNonMusicElectives</td>
<td>UseGED</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>GenEdPrereq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Survey Instrument
This is a survey intended to find out how well general education courses serve college students completing a degree in music. The survey consists of one section of circled and bubbled answers, and a second short answer section. You are being asked to participate because, as a music student at a university, your input is critical to research findings. This survey involves research, and your participation is voluntary. You may answer as many or as few of the questions as you wish, and you may stop taking it at any point without any penalties. This survey is estimated to take 10-15 minutes for completion.

For questions or concerns regarding this survey, please contact William Johnson at johnson.5157@osu.edu, or at (401) 741-5054. For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, please contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in The Ohio State University Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251. Thank you for your participation!

Please circle the response that best fits you.

1) What is your class rank?
- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Post-Graduate

2) What is your current major?
- Bachelor of Arts
- Bachelor of Music
- Bachelor of Music, Music Education
- Other

3) What degree do you anticipate graduating with?
- Bachelor of Arts
- Bachelor of Music
- Bachelor of Music, Music Education
- Other

Fill in the bubble that best describes your opinion.

4) Within your degree, what do you expect to be the most useful courses? Fill in all that apply.
- Ensembles
- Eartraining/Theory Courses
- Applied Lessons
- Music Electives
- Non-Music Electives
- General Education Requirements
- Other (Please specify)

5) General Education courses are useful to my development as a professional.
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
For the following questions, please fill out a short (two to three sentences) answer.

6) What skills developed in the department do you feel are the most important?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

7) What type of career(s) do you anticipate upon graduation?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

8) What skills do you anticipate using most when you graduate?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

9) How will the Music Department help you reach your anticipated career(s)?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

10) What do you feel are the aims of the Department of Music?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
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