

HIGH SCHOOL ORCHESTRAS IN TEXAS

---

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND FINE ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC AND DRAMA

BY

MARY WARD BUTLER, B.M.E.

---

DENTON, TEXAS

DECEMBER 1981

The Graduate School  
Texas Woman's University  
Denton, Texas

August 25, 19 81

We hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under  
our supervision by Mary Ward Butler  
entitled HIGH SCHOOL ORCHESTRAS IN TEXAS

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

Committee:

R. L. Bentley  
Chairman  
Anna R. Simpson  
Nancy D. Hudson

Accepted:

[Signature]  
Dean of The Graduate School

Thesis  
T1981  
B986 A  
c2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	4
CHAPTER THREE: RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY.....	19
Graphic Presentation of Responses.....	19
Categorical Presentation of Responses.....	30
Feeder Program.....	31
Teaching.....	43
Budget and Facilities.....	56
People and Public Relations.....	63
CHAPTER FOUR: SUMMARY.....	67
.....	
APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE.....	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	86

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to develop a clear perception of the overall condition of high school orchestra programs in Texas. Most directors know only about their own situation, and perhaps the general situation in their district; however, it is difficult for directors to know whether what they do in their programs is typical of what their colleagues are doing.

A questionnaire consisting of sixty questions was developed to elicit responses which would help the directors describe their own situations and show degrees of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with certain elements. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. Part I contained nineteen questions. In response to each, the directors were to mark one of four numbers, according to the following scale: 1--poor-or-missing, 2--fair, 3--good, and 4--excellent. Part II contained twenty-four questions which the directors were to answer yes or no. Part III contained seventeen questions. The directors were to give individualized answers in their own words, with additional comments invited.

The questionnaire was distributed at the 1980 convention of the Texas Music Educators Association (TMEA). A stamped return envelope was attached to each questionnaire. Of the 105 high school orchestra directors listed in the Directory of Texas Orchestra Directors Association (TODA), sixty attended the TMEA convention. Thirty directors, fifty per cent of those in attendance, returned the completed questionnaire. Therefore, the survey sample for this study represents between twenty-five and thirty per cent of all high school orchestra directors in Texas.

The responses were tabulated and analyzed. The analysis of the responses determined common practices of the high school directors in the following areas: (1) the feeder program, (2) teaching, (3) budget and facilities, and (4) people and public relations.

Chapter Two of this study contains a review of relevant literature. Handbooks for orchestra programs are included, and several state studies are discussed.

Chapter Three deals with the directors' responses. Responses tabulated from Parts I and II are presented in graphic form. The remainder of the chapter organizes the responses into the four categories previously mentioned, and presents them in an expository manner.

Chapter Four contains a summary of the majority responses to the questionnaire in order to achieve an overall perception of what is typical in high school orchestra programs in Texas. It is not the aim of this study to make an overall evaluation of the programs, but to let the directors' personal evaluations of their own programs speak for themselves. This study does attempt to describe the overall condition of high school orchestra programs in Texas in order to promote an awareness of what is typical among colleagues.

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Handbooks, articles, and books to assist the director teaching orchestra in public schools are scarce. Vast amounts of books reviewed were written between 1920 and 1950, and had little or no application to the present orchestral situation; these have not been included in the Bibliography. The particular books, articles, Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) documents, and dissertations reviewed in this chapter were chosen for their interest value and potential usefulness to the experienced or beginning orchestra director. The Bibliography contains a listing of relevant materials studied.

Paul Barton Grover wrote an informative dissertation on "The History of String Class Instruction in American Schools and Its Relationship to School Orchestras."<sup>1</sup> The study covers the period 1911-1960. The chapters were divided by years:

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul Barton Grover, "The History of String Class Instruction in American Schools and Its Relationship to School Orchestras" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1960).

1911 to World War I--The first string class started in Boston in 1911.

After World War I to the beginning of the Depression--At this time, orchestra had the largest growth, due partly to the National Music Camp and All-State and National Orchestras.

1930 to 1950--Orchestra suffered a sharp decline because of the Depression, movies with sound, and the school band movement.

1950 to 1960--The American String Teachers Association emerged, as did the Music Educators National Conference String Instruction Committee.

Two of his main conclusions were: (1) After enrollment in string classes dropped significantly, private teachers' attitudes changed favorably toward the classes. (2) Quantity and quality of literature for string class instruction has increased.

The author felt two recent developments (as of his writing in 1960) were significant for strings: Talent Education initiated by Shinichi Suzuki, and the International Congress of Strings sponsored by the American Federation of Teachers.

In 1970, the Texas Education Agency published a handbook of vital information for the orchestra director.



A Handbook for the Development of the Orchestra Program<sup>2</sup> covers the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels of the elementary, junior high, and high school programs. It discusses scheduling, instrumentation, literature and repertoire, seating, and performance. The appendices had some helpful contents, such as minimum standards for string instruments in the schools, adjustments for the instruments, sources for literature and repertoire, educational films on strings, books on string playing and teaching, and the Music Code of Ethics. Even though this handbook is over ten years old, it had some useful information for any orchestra director, especially for the new and inexperienced teacher.

The most valuable tool in formulating the questionnaire for the present study was the Self-Evaluation Checklist for School Music Programs, by the Oregon State Department of Education.<sup>3</sup> It was developed by a committee of teachers and administrators throughout the state of Oregon for school districts to evaluate the concrete elements of the orchestra program in each district.

---

<sup>2</sup>Texas Education Agency, A Handbook for the Development of the Orchestra Program (Austin: Texas Education Agency, 1970).

<sup>3</sup>Oregon State Department of Education, Self-Evaluation Checklist for School Music Programs: Orchestra Music, Grades 4-12 (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 152 552, 1977).

The opening sections of the document describe the advantages of having a school orchestra, and describe its goals and needs. The document includes checklists for "student skill, curriculum offerings, and materials and facilities for each of the three levels: elementary, junior high, and senior high. The checklists enable teachers and administrators to rate their school's program on a scale of one to four for specific elements."<sup>4</sup>

Especially effective is the "Orchestra Teacher and Administrator Section: High School." The checklist covers the following:

(1) Offerings--e.g., "There is string instruction for beginning, intermediate, and advanced performers at the senior high school level."<sup>5</sup>

(2) Scheduling and Staffing--e.g., "Orchestra and band are scheduled simultaneously in order that instruments may be drawn from the band when full orchestra is required."<sup>6</sup>

(3) Materials--e.g., "Adequate provision is made for the purchase of sheet music and method books for all classes and performing groups."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 37.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

(4) Equipment--e.g., "Adequate provision is made for the purchase, repair and replacement of quality equipment for a balanced instrumentation."<sup>8</sup>

(5) Fees--e.g., "Adequate budgetary provisions are made for directors' registration fees, expenses, and travel to Oregon Music Educators' events such as state and regional meetings, contests, festivals, and clinics."<sup>9</sup>

(6) Facilities--e.g., "Space is provided for lockable storage of instruments and percussion equipment."<sup>10</sup>

In the "Overall Evaluation," some key items were: "In what areas is the orchestra program most in need of improvement?--What are the limitations on the orchestra music program because of lack of facilities or equipment?--Recommend, in order of priority, steps for the improvement of limitations in the orchestra music program: Immediate and Long Range."<sup>11</sup>

This document has been most useful to this study of high school orchestras in Texas. Many of the items on

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

the checklist have been considered in formulating questions to be asked of Texas high school directors on the questionnaire in the Appendix.

Roger William Strong wrote "Practices Which Are Common to Successful Public School Orchestra Programs"<sup>12</sup> in order to develop an effective tool for the director wanting to make the existing orchestra program stronger, or the director starting a new program.

He sent questionnaires to directors who had an orchestra involved in performance at a professional music conference, workshop, or clinic during the preceding six years (1961-1967). Nation-wide, ninety (90) orchestras met that criterion, and fifty-seven (57) directors responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire covered the following areas: teaching methods, teacher qualification, enrollment practices, rehearsals and concerts, and physical facilities.

Some interesting conclusions were reached. For example, "the majority of the responding directors had a tenure of eight years or longer."<sup>13</sup> Also, an average of

---

<sup>12</sup>Roger William Strong, "Practices Which Are Common to Successful Public School Orchestra Programs" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968).

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

fifty per cent of stringed instrument students dropped out from grade school to junior high, and fifty per cent of the remainder dropped out from junior high to high school.<sup>14</sup>

Strong suggests that directors who wish to maintain a high participation in strings should employ the following: other avenues of musical instruction besides strings, recommendation by teachers, and recruitment of students who maintain a certain grade point average.<sup>15</sup>

Some thoughts and ideas from the dissertation were used as a basis for the questionnaire in high school orchestras in Texas. This document contains effective teaching techniques and is informative for the string educator.

Irvin Gattiker's Complete Book of Rehearsal Techniques for the High School Orchestra<sup>16</sup> is very detailed and would be a help for the beginning orchestra director or the experienced director desiring to strengthen the existing program. Gattiker covers all subject areas necessary for working in a high school orchestra situation. He gives tested techniques of coping with all aspects of teaching. Gattiker states that the theories written down are not the

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>16</sup>Irvin Gattiker, Complete Book of Rehearsal Techniques for the High School Orchestra (West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1977).

only solutions or techniques, but have been tested by himself, over a thirty year period, and other experienced orchestra directors.<sup>17</sup>

The contents of the book were specific. Chapter I concerned "Selecting and Developing an Efficient Rehearsal Schedule"--time of day for rehearsal, reasons for sectionals, and frequency of rehearsals. Chapter II contained "Practical Guidelines for Conducting Tryouts and Placement." Other chapters included "How to Plan a Productive Orchestra Rehearsal," "The Non-Musical Aspects of Rehearsals and How to Handle Them," "Key Musical Preparations for the First Rehearsal," and more. This is a helpful book for any orchestra director and recommended to be read in its entirety.

Joseph LaRosa's dissertation, "High School Curriculum for the Development of Musicianship in Individual Orchestral Players,"<sup>18</sup> explored a fundamental approach to music theory, improving technical skills, excelling through performance, and increased skills in listening to music. It also included aesthetic sensibility, music history, and performance interest. The author suggested that his ideas

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>18</sup>Joseph LaRosa, "A High School Curriculum for the Development of Musicianship in Individual Orchestral Players" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona, 1965).

could enhance the musicality of the high school orchestra student.

In "The Development of the High School Orchestra in the State of California," by J. Justin Gray,<sup>19</sup> the title was deceptive. There was some discussion of school orchestras, but the main thrust of the article dealt with youth orchestras in the state of California. A questionnaire was sent to 640 public high schools, and 276 responded. Of the respondents, 137 had an orchestra program in the schools (early 1960's). The author was particularly interested in the directors' replies to "Do you feel that this youth orchestra helps or hinders your school program?"<sup>20</sup> Several directors' responses were listed in detail.

The writer recommended the following for youth orchestras in California: "(1) to follow-up on the information identifying youth orchestras; (2) to make a detailed investigation of the more successful youth orchestras; and (3) if it then seems advisable, to draw up a model constitution and methods of organization for publication."<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>J. Justin Gray, "The Development of the High School Orchestra in the State of California," American String Teacher, Spring 1964, pp. 12-17.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

A favorable comment was made for the high school orchestra program: "The high school symphony should be the organization which, first and foremost, receives all of the cooperation, emphasis, and intelligent planning that we can possibly provide."<sup>22</sup>

In Eugene Crabb's study of "The High School Orchestra as an Integral Part of the Music Curriculum in Florida, 1920-1957,"<sup>23</sup> the purpose was to evaluate data on high school orchestras in regards to (1) a history of high school orchestras in Florida, (2) factors of success or decline, and (3) responses regarding the problems of initiating and maintaining orchestra programs in secondary schools in Florida.

In the study of orchestra history in Florida, growth and development had been unstable. The future of orchestra was dependent on cooperation from the Florida Bandmasters Association, the Florida Orchestra Association, and secondary school administrators in Florida. In all but one response, secondary schools that had an orchestra program had an enrollment of 850 or more.

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>Eugene Crabb, "The High School Orchestra as an Integral Part of the Music Curriculum in Florida" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1959).



Some of the main recommendations were: (1) that the high school orchestra in Florida should be given opportunities to perform as much as possible for schools and communities; (2) that only qualified personnel in orchestra be hired; and (3) that an analysis be made of the secondary schools with 850 or more enrollment that do not have a string program.

The "Survey of Michigan High School Bands and Orchestras," by Dacho Dachhoff,<sup>24</sup> was to determine how many high schools in Michigan had organized bands and orchestras (in 1970). A questionnaire was mailed to all public and private high schools in the state, and 71% responded. Some generalizations of the survey were: (1) 92% of all high schools in Michigan had a band program; (2) 22% had an orchestra; and (3) 54% of the orchestras did not have the same conductor as the band.

Because of the response, it was assumed that 62 high schools had no instrumental music program. Also, at least 609 Michigan high schools had no orchestra in 1970. The author suggested that additional studies be made to determine how many school systems without a program were considering the future development of an orchestra program.

---

<sup>24</sup>Dacho Dachhoff, "Survey of Michigan High School Bands and Orchestras," The Instrumentalist 25 (September 1965): 61.

He also suggested a state-wide study to identify problems related to the school orchestra.

In 1964, a study of orchestra programs in the state of Minnesota attempted to determine "Factors Affecting the Development of the Orchestra and String Program in Minnesota Secondary Schools, 1940-1960," and then to propose methods to increase and improve the program in the future. The study was made by Patricia M. Fergus and was published in the Journal of Research in Music Education.<sup>25</sup>

Fergus selected "secondary schools that offered orchestra in their curriculum in 1940 and those that added orchestra between 1950 and 1960."<sup>26</sup> A four-page questionnaire was sent to the selected schools to be completed by the orchestra director or the administrator. The results of the study were informative. It was suggested that the change from junior-senior high schools to separate junior high and senior high schools had resulted in a decline in the total number of orchestras. The factor "most often cited by school officials as bringing about the decline of the school orchestras in Minnesota was the shortage of

---

<sup>25</sup>Patricia M. Fergus, "Factors Affecting the Development of the Orchestra and String Program in Minnesota Secondary Schools, 1940-1960," Journal of Research in Music Education 12 (Fall 1964): 235-43.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 237-238.

qualified teachers."<sup>27</sup> Several administrators, string specialists, and music teachers felt "that many individuals serving in school administrative positions or teaching instrumental music do not possess a philosophy of a well-balanced music program."<sup>28</sup> They also felt "that the teacher training institutions are not properly preparing the music teacher in string and orchestral work."<sup>29</sup>

The respondents gave recommendations to promote an interest in orchestra and strings. These included "better courses of study by institutions as first choice, followed by education of music teachers and administrators in the philosophy of a well-balanced music program, more appearances of string groups, orchestras and string festivals, and workshops and clinics."<sup>30</sup>

From the state of New York, a 1971 guide called Teaching Strings<sup>31</sup> was developed for music teachers who did not have a major concentration in strings. The guide

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 240.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 242.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>New York State Education Department, Teaching Strings (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 056 052, 1971).

discusses choosing proper method books, and provided expectations of teaching and learning at all levels for all stringed instruments. The guide also included bibliographies for both resource materials and instructional materials for teaching strings.

Another dissertation reviewed was "The Development of a Manual for the Incipient School Orchestra Director," by Donald Ward Dillon.<sup>32</sup> This document was developed primarily for the band director who might find it necessary or desirable to accept a junior high or high school orchestra position. The author reviewed materials relating to orchestra and teaching strings, and he reported interviews with orchestra directors and string specialists. The work seems useful for band directors needing to better familiarize themselves with basic string techniques, but this work has little application for the experienced string teacher.

Public Relations and the Music Educator is a handbook developed in 1979 by the Public Relations Workshop of Texas' Music Educators Association.<sup>33</sup> In an introductory

---

<sup>32</sup>Donald Ward Dillon, "The Development of a Manual for the Incipient School Orchestra Director" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970).

<sup>33</sup>Public Relations Workshop Sponsored by the Texas Music Educators Association, 1979-1980, Public Relations and the Music Educator: A Detailed Guide to the Development of Effective and Profitable P.R. Skills in Dealing with Seven Basic Constituencies (Austin: Texas Music Educators Association, 1980).

message, TMEA President Henry Schraub said, "The Handbook details specific actions that music educators may use to develop a successful professional relationship with the school administration and general public of a community."<sup>34</sup> Several vital areas of public relations are covered: Parents, Business Community, Teachers and Support Staff, Community Arts Groups, Getting the most out of the media, Administration, and Students. Public relations is a subject that music educators need to work on constantly, and this book could be beneficial to the conscientious director.

The literature reviewed in this chapter was chosen on the basis of interest and usefulness. Additional relevant materials are included in the Bibliography.

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

## CHAPTER THREE

### RESPONSES

In February of 1980, the questionnaire in the Appendix was distributed to high school orchestra directors attending the annual convention of the Texas Music Educators Association (TMEA) in San Antonio. Of the 105 high school directors listed by the Texas Orchestra Directors Association (TODA), sixty attended the TMEA convention. Thirty questionnaires were returned within six months, creating a survey sample of 50% of the recipients of the questionnaire, or 29% of TODA affiliated high school directors.

Included in this chapter are two presentations of the responses to the questionnaire. The first is a graphic presentation of the responses to Parts I and II. The second is a presentation in expository prose of all the responses, broken into four categories: (1) Feeder Program, (2) Teaching, (3) Budget and Facilities, and (4) People and Public Relations.

#### Graphic Presentation of Responses

Since the presentation of responses later in this chapter regroups the questions, a graphic presentation

follows of the responses to Parts I and II, in the sequence used in the questionnaire. All fractions have been rounded to the nearest percentage point.

Part I of the questionnaire contained nineteen questions, one of which had two parts. In response to each question, the directors were to mark one of four numbers, according to the following scale: 1--poor-or-missing, 2--fair, 3--good, and 4--excellent. Part II contained twenty-four questions. The directors were to mark yes or no. Part III contained seventeen questions. The directors were to give individualized answers in their own words, with additional comments invited; therefore, no graphs of responses are presented.

### Part I

1. Do you have good rapport with your principal?

exc	4	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	(67%)
good	3	xxxxxxxxxx	(30%)
fair	2	x	(3%)
poor	1		(0%)

2. Is the orchestra program in your school district recognized as part of the curriculum?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(63%)  
 good 3 xxxxxx(20%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxx(17%)  
 poor 1 (0%)

3. Are there enough string teachers in your area to adequately cover the schools of your feeder program?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxx(33%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxx(27%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxxxxxx(33%)  
 poor 1 xx(7%)

4. Do you have good vertical alignment for your high school?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxx(30%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxx(30%)  
 fair 2 xxx(10%)  
 poor 1 xx(7%)  
 blank xxxxxxxx(23%) (because of unfamiliar  
 terminology)



5. Is your schedule acceptable for visiting your feeder schools?

exc 4 xxxxxxxx(23%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxx(37%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxx(17%)  
 poor 1 xxxxxxxx(23%)

6. Do you frequently visit the middle schools or junior high schools that feed your program?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxx(40%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxx(30%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxx(20%)  
 poor 1 xxx(10%)

7. Do you have the necessary instruments, equipment needed for your program?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxx(43%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxx(43%)  
 fair 2 xxx(10%)  
 poor 1 x(3%)

8. Do you have access to a good sound system for your orchestra (or one that you could comfortably borrow if the orchestra does not own one)?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(57%)  
 good 3 xxx(10%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxx(16%)  
 poor 1 xxxxxx(16%)

9. Do you have adequate storage space for the instruments?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxx(30%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxx(30%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxxxx(23%)  
 poor 1 xxxxxx(17%)

10. Is office space adequate for your needs?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxx(40%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxx(30%)  
 fair 2 xxx(10%)  
 poor 1 xxxxxx(20%)

11. Do you have cooperation from your band director?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(47%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxx(37%)  
 fair 2 xxxx(13%)  
 poor 1 x(3%)

12. Do you have cooperation from your principal?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(53%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxx(33%)  
 fair 2 xxx(10%)  
 poor 1 x(3%)

13. Do you have cooperation from your supervisor?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(60%)

good 3 xxxx(13%)

fair 2 xxxx(13%)

poor 1 xx(7%)

14. How successful is the band program in your high school?

exc 4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(47%)

good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(40%)

fair 2 xxx(10%)

poor 1 x(3%)

15. How successful is your orchestra program?

exc 4 xxxxxx(17%)

good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(63%)

fair 2 xxxxxx(17%)

poor 1 x(3%)

16. Do you feel your elementary teachers do an acceptable job of teaching?

exc 4 xxxxxxxx(24%)

good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(42%)

fair 2 xxxxxxxx(24%)

poor 1 xxx(10%)

17. Do you feel your elementary teachers do an acceptable job of recruiting?

exc 4 xxxxx(17%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(48%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxx(21%)  
 poor 1 xxxx(14%)

18. If you have a booster club, is it effective?

exc 4 xxxx(14%)  
 good 3 xxx(10%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxx(5%)  
 poor 1 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(59%)

19a. How would you describe the overall orchestra program at each level in your cluster? Elementary?

exc 4 xxxxx(17%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(38%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxx(24%)  
 poor 1 xxxxxx(21%)

19b. How would you describe the overall orchestra program at each level in your cluster? Middle school or junior high?

exc 4 xxxxxx(21%)  
 good 3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(41%)  
 fair 2 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(35%)  
 poor 1 x(3%)

Part II

1. Do you have frequent conversations with your principal, at least once a week?

yes           xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (66%)

no            xxxxxxxxxx (34%)

2. Is a telephone in the rehearsal hall area?

yes           xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (83%)

no            xxxxxx (17%)

3. Do you have a separate office from the band director or other personnel?

yes           xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (62%)

no            xxxxxxxxxx (38%)

4. Do you have individual practice rooms?

yes           xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (72%)

no            xxxxxxxxxx (28%)

5. Do you have ensemble rooms?

yes           xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (62%)

no            xxxxxxxxxx (38%)

6. Do you have adequate planning time during the day?

yes           xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (69%)

no            xxxxxxxxxx (31%)

7. Does your group have to raise money for UIL and festival contests?

yes        xxxx(14%)

no        xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(86%)

(Because of added comments, a more complete analysis of responses to this question is presented in the Categorical Presentation.)

8. Does your group have to raise money for music purchases?

yes        xxx(10%)

no        xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(90%)

9. Is release time allowed without penalty for attendance at professional meetings?

yes        xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(82%)

no        xxxxx(18%)

10. Do you have adequate space to store music, filing cabinets, shelves, etc.?

yes        xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(62%)

no        xxxxxxxxxxxxx(38%)

11. Do you have a fund for emergency repairs?

yes        xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(100%)

no        (0%)

12. Are all the teachers in your cluster program string specialist?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(69%)

no xxxxxxxxx(31%)

13. Are you a string specialist?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(79%)

no xxxxxx(21%)

14. Are fees required for elementary instruction in your district?

yes xxxx(14%)

no xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(86%)

15. Does your high school orchestra perform for elementary schools for recruiting?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(80%)

no xxxxxx(20%)

16. Do you have media coverage for the orchestra activities and concerts?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(70%)

no xxxxxxxxx(30%)

17. Do you have an ample music budget?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(80%)

no xxxxxx(20%)

18. Does your high school have a performance of a musical every year?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(50%)

no xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(50%)

19. If there is a musical, do you direct it?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(43%)

no xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(40%)

blank xxxxxx(17%)

20. Do you help in preparing the students for the performance?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(67%)

no xxxxxx(17%)

blank xxxxxx(17%)

21. Do you play or direct in a community orchestra?

yes xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(60%)

no xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(40%)

22. Do you teach any of your students privately?

yes xxxxxxxx(23%)

no xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(77%)

23. If you have full orchestra, do you rehearse them during a regularly scheduled class?

yes xxxxxxx(20%)

no xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(60%)



24. Do you have a certain number of regularly scheduled concerts during the year?

yes	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx(90%)
no	xxx(10%)

#### Categorical Presentation of Responses

The remainder of the chapter is devoted to an organized presentation of the responses to the questionnaire, in order to gain a clear understanding of specific situations in the orchestra programs. Four categories have been chosen to cover the main aspects of the directors' programs: (1) Feeder Program, (2) Teaching, (3) Budget and Facilities, and (4) People and Public Relations.

The questions have been regrouped and presented in sequences intended to present a comprehensive view of orchestra programs in Texas. Responses to questions from all three parts of the questionnaire are grouped according to the four categories given above, and then presented in an expository manner. The graphic presentation given earlier of responses to Parts I and II was the basis for the expository presentation which follows. Responses to questions in Part III did not lend themselves to graphic presentation, so they are presented in the following sections as they help clarify the existing situations reported by the directors.

The presentation which follows concentrates on developing a clear picture of each category. An overview of the responses in each category, emphasizing comparisons, implications, and conclusions, will be found in Chapter Four.

It is to be noted that one question on the questionnaire did not fit neatly into any of the categories for presentation, and so is presented here before proceeding. Question II-21 asked if the director played in or directed a community orchestra. Forty per cent (40%) did not participate in a community orchestra; perhaps some had no community orchestra available. However, 60% of the directors did participate: 50% played but did not direct; 7% played and directed; and 3% directed only.

#### Feeder Program

The Feeder Program section of the chapter is devoted to a presentation of the responses to questions that are related to the overall orchestra program, from elementary through middle or junior high school, and the relationship of beginning or intermediate string instruction to the high school program. The questions that are related exclusively to the high school program are covered in the next three sections of this chapter.

Also included in this section are limited discussions of any broad, general questions that drew some responses about the feeder program. These discussions are limited to the concerns of this section only. These overall questions are presented again in following sections as the responses apply to that section.

Since the success of the high school orchestra program does depend on the teachers in the elementary and middle schools, the high school directors were asked questions designed to elicit descriptions of their feeder programs, and to determine the degree of satisfaction with these programs.

The presentation in this section does not follow the order of questions on the questionnaire. Instead, the presentation is a sequence of questions designed to give an overall understanding of feeder programs in Texas. The order of discussion is as follows:

- III-3     In what grade are students allowed to start strings?  
Do you feel this is too early or too late? Please explain.
- I-3       Are there enough string teachers in your area to adequately cover the schools of your feeder program?
- II-12     Are all the teachers in your cluster program string specialists?
- II-13     Are you a string specialist?

- I-4 Do you have good vertical alignment for your high school?
- I-5 Is your schedule acceptable for visiting your feeder schools?
- I-6 Do you frequently visit the middle schools or junior high schools that feed your program?
- I-16 Do you feel your elementary teachers do an acceptable job of teaching?
- I-17 Do you feel your elementary teachers do an acceptable job of recruiting?
- II-15 Does your high school orchestra perform for elementary schools for recruiting?
- I-19 How would you describe the overall orchestra program at each level in your cluster?
- (a) Elementary?
- (b) Middle school or junior high?
- II-14 Are fees required for elementary instruction in your district?

The responses to the two overall questions listed below are presented as they relate to the feeder program:

- III-10 In what area is the total orchestra program most in need of improvement?
- III-11 How would you improve your program?

Also, responses about feeders are presented from the following question:

III-9      Are there any unique things done in elementary or secondary level that you would like to share?

Concerning the four possible answers to the questions in Part I, an additional breakdown of satisfactory and unsatisfactory sometimes has been used for clarification: excellent and good are considered satisfactory, fair and poor-or-missing unsatisfactory. In presenting the yes-or-no answers in Part II, frequently only the larger percentage is given, with the understanding that the others gave the opposite answer. The individualized answers in Part III have been organized into significant common groups when necessary.

In the presentation that follows, the emphasis is on the percentages, which are given to the nearest percentage point. An overview of the responses given here, emphasizing comparisons, implications, and conclusions, will be found in Chapter Four.

### Responses

When asked in III-3 about the entry level of students into their programs, 60% of the respondents said their elementary students start in the sixth grade;

23% indicated the fifth grade, while 13% said students are allowed to start in the fourth grade or younger. The second part of III-3 asked if the respondent thought the entry level in his district was too early or too late. Adding comments to the effect that three years of study before entering competition was too long to hold a young child's interest, 6% responded that the fourth grade was too early to start. However, 66% indicated the fourth grade was not too early, and another 20% said starting in the fifth or sixth grade was too late. Thus, the consensus of the teachers, 86%, was that students should start earlier than most programs now permit.

Responding to I-3, 40% of the respondents indicated there were not enough teachers to cover the feeder schools as they should be covered (33% fair, 7% poor). However, a 60% majority indicated enough teachers to cover the feeder schools adequately (27% good, 33% excellent).

Two questions II-12 and II-13, concerned the correlation of orchestra programs and string specialists. To question II-12, 69% replied that all teachers in their respective cluster were string specialists. Answering II-13, 79% of the directors said that they were themselves string specialists.

Question I-4 asked if there was good vertical alignment for the director's high school. Sixty per cent of the respondents said they had good (30%) or excellent (30%) vertical alignment, indicating they know what elementary schools fed into their middle or junior high schools. Very few, 7%, marked poor-or-missing, and 10% marked fair. However, 23% of the respondents left the question blank. Since they chose to leave it blank rather than mark the poor-or-missing category, this indicated unfamiliarity with the term "vertical alignment." Thus, the 60% response for good or excellent vertical alignment may be lower than the actual percentage of string programs with superior alignment.

The response to I-5 showed an interesting split: 23% indicated they had excellent schedules for visiting their feeder schools, but another 23% indicated poor schedules or none. Fair schedules were reported by 17% of the directors. That leaves 37% who said their schedules were good, thus raising the percentage of those who had acceptable schedules (good or excellent) to 60%. That leaves 40% with less than adequate scheduling; however, the response to the next question, I-6, indicates that many of those were nonetheless able to maintain satisfactory contact with their feeder schools.

In response to I-6, 40% of the teachers said they were able to visit their feeder schools frequently (excellent), while an additional 30% indicated they were able to visit on a regular basis (good). Thus, 70% of the teachers were indeed able to maintain satisfactory contact with their feeder schools. Only 20% of the teachers indicated very little contact (fair), and only 10% indicated seldom or not at all (poor).

In response to I-16, 24% said there was some excellent teaching in the elementary schools, and 42% said they did a good job. Not really satisfied, 24% replied fair, and 10% answered poor. Thus, while 34% are not satisfied with the teaching in the elementary schools, 66% approve of their feeder teachers in elementary school.

Question I-17 concerned recruiting of elementary students by the elementary teachers. Almost two-thirds, 65%, were satisfied with the recruiting efforts of the elementary school teachers in their programs (48% good, 17% excellent). More than a third of the directors, 35%, indicated that recruiting efforts needed improvement (21% fair, 14% poor-or-none).

In response to II-15, 80% of the directors said that their high school orchestras participated in recruiting



efforts by performing for elementary schools, while 20% did not perform for elementary school audiences.

In describing the overall orchestra program at each level, in I-19, the junior high or middle schools received more praise than the elementary schools. Regarding elementary schools, 55% of the high school directors were satisfied (17% excellent, 38% good); 45% had reservations (24% fair, 21% poor-or-none). But in the junior high or middle schools, 62% were satisfied (21% excellent, 41% good), while 38% were not (35% fair, but only 3% poor).

In addition to all of the preceding questions, a portion of the answers to III-10 and III-11 are pertinent to the subject of feeder programs. As has been stated, these two questions try to pinpoint areas in need of major improvement within the total program with which the director is identified. When the identical area is mentioned in response to both questions, that response has been entered only once for tabulation. But each different area pinpointed in response to either III-10 or III-11 has been entered as a separate response. However, the total of the responses concerning each area for improvement is reported as the percentage of the total number of completed questionnaires, though many pinpointed two or more areas for improvement. This breakdown ignores the number of areas pinpointed

in order to emphasize the actual frequency of recurrence among the respondents of the same area of concern.

Accordingly, 7% of the respondents left the two questions blank; they had no major complaints to report. Half of the directors, 50%, mentioned other or additional areas not directly concerning the feeder program, and these are discussed in other sections of this chapter. More than three-fourths of the respondents, 77%, reported major improvement was needed in their feeder programs.

The 77% concern for feeders calls immediate attention to itself. The responses concerning feeders covered a spectrum of six concerns: (1) elementary fees, (2) the entry level of beginners into the program, (3) the recruiting program or lack thereof, (4) communication and cooperation within the feeder program, (5) the number of teachers, and most frequently (6) the quality of teaching in the feeder program. Again the frequency of recurrent responses is the basis of the percentages reported, because even when describing feeder programs, some respondents mentioned two or more of the six concerns listed above. Also, the percentages are of the total response, not just responses about feeder programs.

(1) The most infrequent response, 3% of all respondents, was that the best major improvement would be to

eliminate fees for string instruction in elementary schools. Responding to the earlier question about fees, II-14, only 14% of the directors reported that the district required fees for elementary instruction.

(2) In response to an earlier question, III-3, 86% of the directors thought students should start earlier than the present entry level. In responding to these two questions, III-10 and III-11, 17% of all respondents specified the entry level as an area of major concern, and that students in their feeder programs truly need to start earlier than the sixth grade.

(3) One-fifth of all respondents, 20%, suggested major concerns regarding the recruiting program. Half of this group (10% overall) specified the need for more students in the high school program. Only 3% of the total respondents specified the need for more beginners. The remainder of the responses were not specific about which level, although 3% specified that the recruiting program lacked organization or coordination.

(4) Communication and cooperation within the feeder program make up another area of major concern for 24% of all the respondents. Included within this 24% are 7% who complained of lack of cooperation with the band personnel and elementary principals, and 17% who said the

feeder program had poor supervision or none--resulting in a lack of standards or guidelines, isolated teachers with little contact with colleagues, and poor communication in general between the high school and feeders.

(5) The number of teachers to service the feeders was a major concern for 20% of all respondents. Of this group, 3% of all respondents complained of too many teachers in the program, while 17% reported there were too few.

(6) The most frequent response, 37% of all respondents, was concern for the quality of teaching in the feeder program. (However, compare the response to I-16 earlier in this section, to which a slightly lesser percentage, 34%, answered fair or poor.) In every case, the respondents wanted teachers with more experience and training in teaching strings.

In spite of the large concern about feeders, there are some positive things reported by many of the directors. Question III-9 asked if there was anything unique in their programs that the directors wanted to share. Quite a few, 40%, did not respond. However, 60% commented about either elementary or secondary situations they would like to share. The majority of the actual responses, 40% overall, dealt with the feeder program.

Several, about 10% overall, cited activities such as all-city elementary solo contests, sixth-grade string

festivals, or sixth-grade honor orchestra. About 7% overall mentioned starting beginners in the fourth grade. A little more than 13% said they tried to find innovative recruiting techniques such as using the sixth-grade honor orchestra for special recruiting concerts.

In addition, one director reported that feeders used the incentive of allowing students to earn an orchestra pin by accumulating gold stars awarded for songs learned. Another director composed and arranged most of the music used in elementary. One director said that the use of elementary string students in PTA programs and other activities was great for recognition and morale. One director mentioned that the vertical progression within the program was reinforced with two-level instruction--having the same teacher in elementary and junior high, and he also taught in junior high for that reason. Also, one director said the middle school had a separate room for orchestra.

This section of the chapter has been devoted to presenting the responses related to the overall feeder Program. An overview of the responses presented in this section, emphasizing comparisons, implications, and conclusions, will be found in Chapter Four.

The next three sections of this chapter present responses to questions which are related exclusively to the high school program.

### Teaching

The Teaching section of the chapter is devoted to a presentation of the responses to questions that are related to the high school director's teaching situation. Also included are limited discussions of broad, general questions that drew some responses about the concerns of this section of the chapter. These overall questions are also discussed in other sections as the responses apply to that section.

Since the ability to educate the students is most important to the existence of an acceptable orchestra program in the school, the directors were asked questions designed to elicit responses describing the teaching situation in the director's high school.

A more coherent sequence of questions is attempted in this presentation than the order on the questionnaire. The order of discussion is as follows:

- III-7      How long have you been in your present position?
  - III-5      What is the UIL classification of your high school?
  - III-4      How many students are in your orchestra program?
- strings\_\_\_\_\_ winds\_\_\_\_\_

- III-6 How many performing groups do you have?  
advanced orch., int. orch., mid. school or junior  
high, ele. Please underline what you have.
- II-24 Do you have a certain number of regularly scheduled  
concerts during the year?
- III-2 How many concerts does your high school perform  
each year?
- II-18 Does your high school have a performance of a  
musical every year?
- II-19 If there is a musical, do you direct it?
- II-20 Do you help in preparing the students for the  
performance?
- III-13 What contests, festivals, has your orchestra  
entered in the last three years?
- III-14 Please give your UIL ratings the last three years.  
THIS WILL BE CONFIDENTIAL.  
1977                      1978                      1979
- III-8 How many string players in your orchestra study  
privately?
- II-22 Do you teach any of your students privately?
- III-15 What do you do to get students in your program?  
What about wind players?
- II-23 If you have full orchestra, do you rehearse them  
during a regularly scheduled class?

- III-12     What is the orchestra schedule outside of school time? (sectionals, individual work, full orchestra, etc.)
- II-6        Do you have adequate planning time during the day?
- III-16     What are the most important things you do during a rehearsal?
- III-17     Please elaborate on your teaching philosophy. This could pertain to anything: managing the rehearsal, specific point in teaching you wish to discuss, anything you might wish to share.
- III-10     In what area is the total orchestra program most in need of improvement?
- III-11     How would you improve your program?
- III-9       Are there any unique things done in elementary or secondary level that you would like to share?
- I-15        How successful is your orchestra program?

Only one question from Part I, I-15 above, is presented. Of the yes-or-no answers in Part II, frequently only the larger percentage is given. The individualized answers in Part III have been organized into significant common groups when necessary.



### Responses

Question III-7 elicited responses concerning the relative experience of the high school directors. Half of the directors, 50%, had been at the same high school for less than five years (23% for four years, 27% for two years or less). Of those directors with more tenure, 27% of all respondents had been in the same school for five to nine years, 17% for ten to fourteen years, and 6% for fifteen years or more.

The conference to which the UIL assigns a high school is determined by the student population. Thus, by giving their UIL classification in III-5, the respondents gave a clear indication of the student population in which their programs operate. Answering concerning the 1979-1980 school year, 97% of the directors said their schools were AAAA (1,260 students or more), and 3% said AAA (580-1,259 students). Since that time, UIL has amended the conference classification system, but AAAA was the highest level at that time.

To question III-4 regarding students in the orchestra program, 13% of the responses could not be usefully compared with others because the number of strings given was the total in the entire cluster, including feeder elementaries, and did not specify the number in the high school; yet the number of winds was

given for high school and middle school, or for high school only. It is quite possible that the wording of the question and its placement in the questionnaire was misleading. The remaining responses to III-4 can be easily grouped: 23% had 7-20 strings; 23% had 21-35; 30% had 36-50; and 10% had 60-80.

Answering the second part of III-4, 20% of the respondents did not use wind players. Discounting these 20% with strings only and 13% unusable responses, the remaining responses show that 10% had more winds than strings, that 10% had as many winds as strings, and that the remaining 47% of the respondents generally had from one-half to two-thirds as many winds as strings. For example, directors who reported 50 high school strings also reported 25-33 high school winds.

Question III-6 asked about the number of performing groups each director had. Most of the directors do have at least one other group in addition to their main high school performing group, generally an elementary or middle school. One or two groups are usual: 67% split their replies evenly between one group and two groups. Another 23% had three groups; 7% had four groups; and 3% had five.

Responding to II-24, 90% of the directors said there was a certain number of regularly scheduled concerts they were expected to perform during the year. However, in response to III-2, all of the directors did perform at least one concert. Most directors, 53%, performed four to six concerts a year (13% four, 27% five, 13% six). One-fifth of the directors, 20%, performed less (10% two, 10% three). Some said they performed more (17% eight to ten, and 10% twelve to fifteen); some of these indicated they included musicals in the total number of concerts, and others may have. The directors did include UIL contest performances in their totals.

Questions II-18, II-19, and II-20 covered the subject of school musicals. The following information is the result of studying the responses to all three questions. Some of the high schools 17%, do not have musicals. Half of the high schools, 50%, had musicals annually; 33% had musicals, but not on a regular basis. Of the 83% of high schools which do have musicals, four out of five directors help their students prepare for the musical, and a little more than half of those directors conduct the performances.

Questions III-13 and III-14 were asked in order to get some indication of (1) how often the directors had their orchestras perform in competitive situations and (2) how well they performed. III-13 asked what contests and festivals the orchestra had entered in the past three years (meaning 1977, 1978, 1979). However, the following summary of the responses is not as precise as could be hoped, because only 7% of the responses gave a year-by-year breakdown. For the remainder of the responses, a listed festival might have been attended only once or as many as three times in a period of three years.

Only three findings are reliably accurate: (1) 3% of the orchestras entered no contests at all--UIL or otherwise; (2) 17% attended UIL at least once in the three-year period, but entered no other contests or festivals; and (3) 7% did not attend UIL, but entered at least once in other contests. All that can be reliably reported about the remaining 73% is that they attended UIL at least once in the three-year period, and attended one to three (30% one, 23% two, and 20% three) other festivals at least once in the past three years.

A great majority of the respondents, 90%, did participate in UIL at least once in the three-year period, 1977, 1978, and 1979. Question III-14 asked for the

UIL ratings for those three years. Again the responses were not always as complete as could be hoped. Three per cent (3%) left the entire question blank even though they had previously indicated they did attend UIL. Some, 10%, indicated they had not attended at all for the past three years. There were quite a few, 27%, who gave ratings for only one or two of the three years--because they did not attend every year, were disqualified, or did not remember the scores. The majority, 60%, gave scores for all three years. The concert ratings for the three-year period were as follows:

<u>Rating</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
I	40%	50%	50%
II	27%	13%	23%
III	-	-	7%
IV	3%	-	-
Blank	30%	37%	20%

As can be seen above, there was an overall increase in the ratings from each year to the next. There was a 10% increase in the top rating from 1977 to 1978, when half of all respondents received I's. By 1979, participation in UIL seems to have increased, and although the top rating again went to half of the respondents, almost three-fourths (73%) received one of the two top ratings.

The next series of questions covered elements which could contribute to the overall quality of the orchestra--such as private study, recruiting quality players, rehearsal schedules, and rehearsal technique. III-8 asked how many string players in the orchestra studied privately. A few directors, 10%, reported that two-thirds or more of their students studied privately--with one respondent reporting nine out of every ten students involved in private study. Most responses, 57%, ranged from one-fifth to a little more than half (14% at least a half, 20% at least a third, and 23% at least a fifth). About a third of the respondents, 33%, reported that less than a fifth studied privately--with one director reporting only one out of his thirty-six players, and another reporting none out of his eleven. If the responses are regrouped slightly, it is seen that 24% reported at least half, 20% at least a third, and 56% less than a third of their students in private study. The directors were also asked (II-22) if they taught any of their own students privately: 23% of the directors did, but 77% did not.

Because of the latitude given the respondents for individualized responses in Part III of the questionnaire, summaries of responses cannot always be grouped neatly into exact percentages. Instead, the presentation emphasizes

examples of the types of responses given, so that the reader may see the various approaches to situations which are common in high school orchestra programs.

Such is the case with question III-15, which asked for specific ways the directors get students into their programs, especially wind players. Most directors, 80%, responded to the first part of the question. Most of the respondents visited their feeder schools as much as possible so the students would know the high school director. Many high school orchestras play special concerts so the students can see what awaits them. To the second part of the question, regarding wind players, 47% of the directors responded. Most respondents indicated close cooperation with band directors, and in most cases wind players auditioned for the orchestra. In a few schools, the winds could not audition unless they had an invitation from the director to do so.

A couple of questions concerned rehearsal schedules. For the most part, regularly scheduled rehearsals are for strings, and the winds for full orchestra are added at special times as needed. In response to II-23, only 20% of the teachers had full orchestra as a regularly scheduled class during school hours; 60% did not. The remaining 20% indicated only strings in the orchestra.

In responding to III-12, the same 60% who said they did not have full orchestra during the school day all found some time for scheduling a rehearsal for full orchestra--before school, after school, or at night. Many directors, 33%, whether they had full orchestra or not, did have regular sectional string rehearsals scheduled other than during the school day; another 10% said they occasionally but infrequently scheduled extra sectionals out of school, usually before an upcoming contest or concert. Seven per cent (7%) reported extra rehearsal time for special groups such as a chamber music group or a pit orchestra. Some, 13%, scheduled regular times out of school for work with individual students. There were some directors, 13%, who did not schedule any rehearsals outside of school time.

Although many directors did not have adequate rehearsal time during school, the response to II-6 showed that 69% felt they did have adequate planning time during the day; 31% felt they did not.

Question III-16 called for individual responses regarding the most important things the directors did during a rehearsal, and 93% of the directors responded. Some comments were very brief, often only one word, and some were longer and more detailed. The majority listed classroom planning as the most important thing that is done



during a rehearsal. This included keeping a steady pace, reviewing basic skills, maintaining effective discipline, and using time efficiently. Eighty per cent (80%) of the comments related to classroom planning and basic teaching techniques. The remainder of the comments (20%) dealt with motivation and giving the student a good musical experience. Many statements mentioned motivating and inspiring the students, establishing good rapport with the players, and maintaining a positive mental attitude.

Only 70% of the directors responded to III-17, which urged them to elaborate on their individual teaching philosophies; 30% left it blank. Of those who answered, the comments generally fell into three basic categories: (1) technique, (2) positive attitude, and (3) teaching the students a love of music.

Half of those who answered, or 35% of all the respondents, listed items relating to technique. These included showing the students how to rehearse, making music the important factor, and knowing how and what to rehearse.

Positive attitude accounted for one-fourth of the answers given, nearly 18% overall. These included keeping music a vital part of a person's life and well-being, remaining optimistic about teaching and about the students, and providing a congenial atmosphere for rehearsals.

The remaining fourth of the responses, again nearly 18% overall, stated love of music as their teaching philosophy, and they desired to instill a love of music in each student. One director summed up his teaching philosophy in three terms: responsibility, love of music, and technique.

In addition to the preceding questions, a portion of the answers to III-10 and III-11 are pertinent to the concerns of this section on teaching. As has been stated previously, these two questions try to pinpoint areas of major concern within the respondent's total program. Of the total response, 40% of the directors reported major improvement was needed in the area of teaching at the high school level: (1) Scheduling problems were a major concern for 13% of all respondents; some specified lack of planning time or full orchestra rehearsal time. (2) Another 13% said that more private lessons would be a big improvement. (3) More team teaching was called for by 7% of the directors. (4) Some, 3%, said the students needed much more solo and ensemble training. (5) And another 3% said student practice of instruments was a major concern.

Question III-9 asked if there was anything unique in their programs that the directors wanted to share. Only a very few responses are applicable here. One director

reported private lessons offered during school time. Another reported a profitable experience with chamber music as a regular class. Still another reported frequent concerts with chorus and community symphony. One director reported a yearly solo recital and concerto concert prior to Solo and Ensemble Contest. One director composed some of the music for his orchestra.

Perhaps the most significant question, I-15, asked the directors to evaluate the success of their programs. Most, 80%, were pleased (63% good, 17% excellent), while 17% replied fair and 3% replied poor.

This section of the chapter has been devoted to presenting the responses related to the high school teaching situation. An overview of the responses, emphasizing comparisons, implications, and conclusions, will be found in Chapter Four.

### Budget and Facilities

The Budget and Facilities section of the chapter is devoted to a presentation of the responses to questions that are related to the high school orchestra budget and the facilities for the orchestra. Discussion of broad, general questions is limited by the concerns of this section.

Since what a high school orchestra program can accomplish depends heavily on the amount of money available,

its budgetary allocation, and on the building and support facilities, the high school directors were asked questions designed to elicit descriptions of their budgets and facilities.

As in previous sections, the presentation attempts a more coherent sequence of questions than their order on the questionnaire. The order of discussion is as follows:

- I-7        Do you have the necessary instruments and equipment needed for your program?
- III-1     What instruments are furnished by the school?  
          Strings only.
- I-8        Do you have access to a good sound system for your orchestra (or one that you could comfortably borrow if the orchestra does not own one)?
- II-17     Do you have an ample music budget?
- II-8       Does your group have to raise money for music purchases?
- II-11     Do you have a fund for emergency repairs?
- II-7       Does your group have to raise money for UIL and festival contests?
- II-9       Is release time allowed without penalty for attendance at professional meetings?
- I-10       Is office space adequate for your needs?

II-3 Do you have a separate office from the band director or other personnel?

II-2s a telephone in the rehearsal hall area?

II-4o you have individual practice rooms?

II-5o you have ensemble rooms?

II-10o you have adequate space to store music, filing cabinets, shelves, etc.?

I-9 Do you have adequate storage space for the instruments?

Also, responses concerning the high school orchestra budget or the facilities are presented from the overall questions listed below:

III-10 In what area is the total orchestra program most in need of improvement?

III-11 How would you improve your program?

III-9 Are there any unique things done in elementary or secondary level that you would like to share?

As in previous sections regarding the answers in Part I, excellent and good are considered satisfactory, fair and poor-or-missing unsatisfactory. For the yes-or-no answers in Part II, frequently only the significant percentage is given. The individualized answers in Part III have been organized into significant common groups.

## Responses

With regard to budgetary matters, the high school directors responded to questions concerning school instruments, sound systems, music, repairs, contest fees, and release time for professional development.

Question I-7 asked if the respondent had the necessary instruments and equipment needed for his or her program. A large majority, 87%, split their replies evenly between excellent and good. Only 10% replied fair, and 3% poor.

To question III-1, all respondents, 100%, replied that double basses were furnished by the district. Cellos were furnished to 93% of the respondents, and violas to 73%. Only 10% said the district furnished violins, but to only a few carefully screened students. (Also, see response to III-9 at the end of this section.)

Responding to I-8, the majority of the teachers, 67%, had satisfactory access to a good sound system (57% excellent, 10% good). However, 33% split their replies evenly between fair and poor-or-missing.

In spite of the increasing cost of music, 80% of the directors said in II-17 that they had an ample music budget. But 20% had very little money with which to work. Responding to II-8, 10% of the directors said they had to raise money for music purchases, though 90% did not.

Responding to II-11, all of the directors, 100%, had an emergency repair fund for the times when immediate instrument repairs could not wait for the necessary paperwork to be processed.

The majority of directors, 55%, did not have to raise money for either UIL or festival contests, according to the responses to II-7. However, another 28% added the comment that they did have to raise money for festivals, but not the UIL contest. Therefore, although the district paid festival fees for 55% of the directors, it paid UIL fees for 83%. Only 14% of the directors said they had to raise money for both, and 3% did not attend either UIL or festival contests.

According to II-9, most of the directors, 82%, had release time from school for professional meetings such as the annual convention of the Texas Music Educators Association (TMEA). But 18% reported difficulties. Some commented that the district allowed release time without penalty only if the director had a student participating in an All-State Orchestra or if the director had been appointed to fulfill an official function at the convention. One director complained of a compounded penalty for attending TMEA conventions: He was not allowed to take a personal business day, and his paycheck was docked for both the time he missed and the substitute's pay.

Several questions concerned the satisfaction of the directors with the high school facilities for the orchestra. The directors responded concerning office space, telephones, practice rooms, and storage for music and instruments.

Responding to I-10 concerning adequate office space, 70% of the directors indicated satisfaction (40% excellent, 30% good), and 30% dissatisfaction (10% fair, 20% poor-or-missing). Answering II-3, 62% had a separate office from the band director, while 38% did not. In II-2, 83% said a telephone was in the rehearsal hall area, but 17% had no phone available.

Questions II-4 and II-5 asked about practice rooms for individuals and ensembles. Most of the directors, 62%, indicated rooms for both. A few, 10%, had at least one individual practice room, but no rooms for ensembles. A lesser group, 7% of the directors, had at least one room large enough for an ensemble. More than one-fifth of the directors, 21%, had no practice rooms available.

Storage facilities were satisfactory for most of the directors. In II-10, 62% said they had adequate space in filing cabinets, on shelves, etc., to store music. However, the storage of instruments is critical, because special consideration has to be given to the physical properties of the area of the building assigned to the orchestra. Conditions such as excessive heat or cold,



direct sunlight, or student traffic may adversely affect the condition of the instruments. Most of the respondents to I-9, 60%, were satisfied with instrument storage (30% excellent, 30% good) while 40% were not (23% fair, 17% poor).

Three additional questions in Part III drew a few responses about either budgetary matters or facilities. Responding to III-10 and III-11, which jointly attempt to pinpoint areas for improvement, 10% of all respondents said that more money and better budgets were major concerns: 7% overall specified that they needed the money for better instruments; other budgetary needs mentioned were for uniforms and music. Concerning facilities, an additional 7% of all respondents said their major concern was finding adequate rehearsal space.

Question III-9 asked if there was anything unique in their programs that the directors wanted to share. Only one response is applicable here: one director said his school was able to furnish both harp and harpsichord, in addition to the usual complement of school-owned strings.

This section of the chapter has been devoted to presenting the responses concerning the high school orchestra budget and the facilities for the orchestra. An overview of these responses, emphasizing comparisons, implications, and conclusions, will be found in Chapter Four.

### People and Public Relations

The People and Public Relations section of this chapter is a presentation of the responses to questions related to the people with whom the orchestra director must work on a regular basis.

Since the public relations ability of the orchestra director has a great effect on whether or not the orchestra program succeeds in a school, the high school directors were asked questions designed to elicit responses regarding these relationships.

The presentation attempts, as in the previous sections, a more coherent sequence of questions than their order on the questionnaire. The order of discussion is as follows:

- I-14      How successful is the band program in your high school?
- I-11      Do you have cooperation from your band director?
- I-12      Do you have cooperation from your principal?
- II-1      Do you have frequent conversations with your principal, at least once a week?
- I-1      Do you have good rapport with your principal?
- I-13      Do you have cooperation from your supervisor?
- I-2      Is the orchestra program in your school district recognized as part of the curriculum?

I-18 If you have a booster club, is it effective?

II-16 Do you have media coverage for the orchestra activities and concerts?

As in previous sections regarding the answers in Part I, excellent and good are considered satisfactory, fair and poor-or-missing unsatisfactory. For the yes-or-no answers in Part II, frequently only the significant percentage is given. Only one response to an answer in Part III applies to this section. An overview of the responses presented here will be found in Chapter Four.

### Responses

Two questions touched specifically on the band program at the director's high school. Question I-14 called for the orchestra director's evaluation of the success of the high school band program. Although 13% felt the band program was not as successful as it could be (10% fair, 3% poor), satisfactory success was indicated by 87% of the respondents (40% good, 47% excellent). Similarly, when asked in I-11 about cooperation from the band director, 84% reported satisfactory cooperation (37% good, 47% excellent). However, 16% replied that cooperation from the band director was less than satisfactory (13% fair, 3% poor). Also pertinent here is one response to the general question

on major needed improvements, III-11; the respondent stated simply--"better cooperation from the band director."

Three questions concerned the director's relationship with the high school principal. In I-12, only 13% reported less than satisfactory cooperation from their principals (10% fair, 3% poor). However, 87% stated that cooperation was good (34%) or excellent (53%). When asked in II-1 if the director had frequent conversations with the principal, 66% replied they did talk with the principal at least once a week, while 34% indicated their conversations were less frequent. Significantly, a high degree of satisfaction was shown with the general rapport between the director and the principal. Responding to I-1, 97% said rapport was good (30%) or excellent (67%), while only 3% said fair.

Responding to I-13 concerning their supervisor, 60% said that cooperation from the supervisor was excellent, and 13% said good. Another 13% said cooperation was fair. and 7% replied poor-or-missing. An additional 7% did not respond because they were supervisors as well as teachers.

When asked in I-2 if the orchestra program was recognized as a part of the curriculum in the director's district, 83% of the directors felt satisfied (20% good, 63% excellent), and the remaining 17% replied fair.

Responding to I-18 concerning an effective booster club, a 59% majority reported poor-or-missing. One respondent added the comment that his district allowed no booster club except for the football program. Of the remaining 41%, 24% overall said it was effective (10% good, 14% excellent), and the remaining 17% replied fair.

Question II-16 asked about media coverage for the orchestra activities and concerts. Most of the directors, 70%, replied they did have such coverage, while 30% did not have media coverage on a regular basis.

This section of the chapter has been devoted to presenting the responses concerning people and public relations. An overview is in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### SUMMARY

In order to summarize the responses to the questionnaire, it is necessary to use a method of presentation that allows one to concentrate on the majority of the responses to each question. For that reason, the device of a hypothetical typical high school orchestra director in the state of Texas is used. Such a director would be one who consistently gave responses which agreed with the majority of all respondents. This method allows one to achieve an overall perception of what is typical in high school orchestra programs in Texas. Unless a minority response is significant to this summary, it is not mentioned.

The typical high school orchestra director in the state of Texas in the Spring of 1980 had held his present position for four years (50% one to four, 50% five or more: III-7). The director had maintained his professional skill by playing in or directing a community orchestra (60%: II-21).

In the director's feeder program, students began string instruction in the sixth grade (60%: III-3). However, the director felt that students should start earlier (86%: III-3), preferably in the fourth grade (66%: III-3).

The typical director thought there were enough teachers to cover the feeder schools adequately (60%: I-3). Most of the time, the director was satisfied with the quality of teaching, but sometimes he might not be sure. For example, when he was asked directly if his elementary teacher did an acceptable job of teaching, he would show satisfaction (66%: I-16). Yet when asked to describe the overall program at each level, the elementary programs did not receive as much approval (55%: I-19) as the middle school programs (62%: I-19), although teaching might not be the reason for the decline in satisfaction.

However, when asked to pinpoint specific areas for major improvement, the typical director would indeed mention the feeder program as an area of concern (77%: III-10, III-11), and the most likely specific indictment would be the quality of teaching (37% of all respondents: III-10, III-11). Compared with the 66% endorsement of elementary teaching in I-16, only 63% failed to show specific concern with the feeder teachers in III-10 and III-11. In every case of concern, the respondents wanted teachers with more experience and training in teaching strings, in spite of the fact the typical director was likely to have all string specialists handling the feeder schools (69%: II-12). The director himself was also a string specialist (79%: II-13).

The typical high school director knew exactly what schools fed into his high school program, and was satisfied with such vertical alignment (60%: I-4). He had an acceptable schedule for visiting his feeder schools (60%: I-5), but even if he had scheduling problems, he still was able to maintain frequent contact with his supporting teachers (70%: I-6).

Concerning recruiting efforts by the elementary teachers, the typical director was satisfied (65%: I-17). In addition, he had the high school orchestra perform for elementary schools as a recruiting effort (80%: II-15). The typical director's district did not require extra fees for elementary instruction (86% no: II-14).

As stated before, the typical director was satisfied (17% excellent, 38% good) with the elementary program (55%: I-19a), and was even more satisfied (21% excellent, 41% good) with the middle schools (62%: I-19b).

Most major areas of concern have been discussed previously; however, the typical director mentioned the feeder program (77%: III-10, III-11), and if he did not specify the most frequent concern with the quality of teaching (37% of all respondents: III-10, III-11), he probably said there were too few elementary teachers (17% of all respondents: III-10, III-11) or there was poor supervision in the feeder schools (17% of all respondents: III-10, III-11).



On the positive side, the typical director commented about some unique things he did at either elementary or secondary level (60%: III-9), and most likely the response concerned the feeder program (40% of all respondents: III-9). Typical responses are found in Chapter Three.

The respondents filled out the questionnaire in the Spring Semester of 1980, and since that time, UIL has amended the conference classification system. However, at that time AAAA was the highest level. The typical director in 1980 said his high school was AAAA, which at that time was 1,260 students or more (97%: III-5).

In his high school program, the director probably had twenty-one to fifty string students (53%: III-4) and from one-half to two-thirds as many winds (47% of all respondents: III-4). For example, a director with 30 strings had 15-20 winds, and a director with 50 strings had 25-33 winds.

The typical director had more than one performing group (66%: III-6); the main high school orchestra and an elementary or middle school orchestra was the most common combination (33% of all respondents: III-6). A certain number of regularly scheduled concerts was expected (90%: II-24), usually four to six in all (53%: III-2). UIL contest performances were included in the total.

The director often found himself or his students involved in a school musical (50% annually, 33% occasionally: II-18, II-19, II-20), and he helped his students prepare for the musical, while he either played or conducted the performance (See discussion in Chapter Three--Teaching.).

He took his student to UIL contest every year (60%: III-14), and his orchestra received one of the two top ratings (67% in 1977, 63% in 1978, and 73% in 1979: III-14). There was an even chance that for the past two years his orchestra received the top rating of "I" (only 40% in 1977, but 50% in both 1978 and 1979: III-14). The director did indeed think his overall high school program was successful (63% good, 17% excellent: I-15).

Concerning elements which contribute to the overall quality of the orchestra, the typical director reported the following items:

(1) Less than a third of his string students studied privately (56%: III-8), and the director did not normally teach any of his own students privately (77%: II-22)

(2) In order to get students into his high school program, the director would visit his feeder schools as much as possible, and might have his high school students play concerts for the feeder school. He normally relied on the

band program to furnish wind players, who usually had to audition. (See discussion in Chapter Three--Teaching.)

(3) Full orchestra rehearsals had to be held outside school hours (60%: II-23, III-12), and there was an even chance that extra time outside of school was also used for sectional rehearsals or special groups (50%: III-12).

(4) The director did have adequate planning time during the day (69%: II-6).

(5) For rehearsals, the director found planning to be important in order to keep a steady pace, review basic skills, maintain discipline, and use time efficiently (80%: III-16)

For other matters concerning teaching, but which cannot necessarily be considered typical, see the discussions of III-17, III-9, III-10, and III-11 in Chapter Three--Teaching.

The typical high school director said he did have necessary instruments and equipment for his program (87%: I-7). Except for violins, the typical director's district furnished necessary instruments (100% basses, 93% cellos, 73% violas, but only 10% violins: III-1). The director had satisfactory access to a good sound system (57% excellent, 10% good: I-8). In spite of the increasing cost of music, the director said he had an ample music budget (80%: II-17)

and did not have to raise money for any music purchases (90%: II-8). Also, there was an emergency repair fund for times when immediate repairs could not wait for the necessary paperwork to be processed (100%: II-11).

The district typically paid fees for participation in UIL (83%: II-7) and festivals (55%: II-7). The director had release time from school to attend professional meetings (82%: II-9).

Concerning the high school facilities for the orchestra, the typical director had adequate office space (70%: I-10) separate from other personnel (62%: II-3), with a telephone in the rehearsal hall area (83%: II-2). Rehearsal rooms were available for both individuals (72%: II-4) and ensembles (62%: II-5). The director was satisfied with the storage space for music (62%: II-10) and instruments (60%: I-9).

For atypical matters concerning the budget or facilities, see the discussions of III-9, III-10, and III-11 in Chapter Three--Budget and Facilities.

Not only did the typical director feel that his high school orchestra program was successful (60% good, 17% excellent: I=15), but he also felt the high school band program was quite successful (40% good, 47% excellent: I-14). The orchestra director was pleased with the cooperation he received from the band director (37% good, 47% excellent:

I-11). Cooperation from the high school principal was extremely satisfactory (53% excellent: I-12), perhaps because he spoke with the principal at least once a week (66%: II-1) and was able to maintain an excellent general rapport with the principal (67% excellent: I-1). Cooperation from the supervisor was also excellent (60% excellent: I-13). The director was satisfied that the orchestra program was recognized as a regular part of the district curriculum (63% excellent: I-2).

The typical high school director reported there was no supportive booster club for the orchestra program (59%: I-18). In spite of this, he was able to obtain regular media coverage for orchestra activities and concerts (70%: II-16).

The chapter thus far has summarized the responses to the questionnaire by describing the situation of a typical high school orchestra director in Texas in 1980. Such a hypothetical teacher, one who agreed with the majority of respondents to each question, seems fairly well off in the areas covered by the questions. The atypical responses, those in the minority, have been previously presented in Chapter Three. Directors with negative experiences or situations normally showed up in the presentations in that chapter. Only a few negative indications appeared in this chapter's summary of the typical situation.

Some situations seem to be negative mainly because they are measured against what every director considers ideal. For example, if one considers it ideal to have an orchestra full of students who also study with private teachers, the reality of having less than a third of his students in private study (56%: III-8) seems sadly negative. All one can do is encourage private study, but continue to teach all the students in his orchestra. Also, having a booster club for the orchestra may not be possible in every high school in Texas with an orchestra program, though every director might wish he had an effective one; therefore, the fact that most directors did not have a supportive booster club (59%: I-18) seems quite negative.

Of more importance are those negative indications that can at least be alleviated or improved, even if they cannot be totally corrected. Even though most directors indicated their feeder programs contained an element in need of major improvement (77%: III-10, III-11) and pinpointed string teachers with little training or experience (37% of all respondents), most directors seemed to be coping with the situation satisfactorily, because they marked good (42%) or excellent (24%) when asked to evaluate the teaching in the elementary schools in I-16.

Other negative indications seem to be typical inconveniences which confront most directors, but most seemed

able to work around them. Most directors had no opportunity to rehearse the full orchestra with winds during school, but they did have a full performing orchestra because they rehearsed at other times (60%: II-23, III-12). Many did not have an acceptable schedule for visiting their feeder schools (40%: I-5), but a fewer number said their actual contact with the feeder schools was unsatisfactory (30%: I-6); therefore, some of those with real scheduling problems were still able to work around them and maintain satisfactory contact. Also, even though 83% had UIL fees paid by the district (II-7), a larger 90% had participated in UIL at least once in a three year period (III-13), indicating some initiative on the part of many for whom UIL fees were not paid. These three examples of coping with inconvenience actually allows one to perceive a positive indication: The typical high school director was resourceful, ingenious, and determined to have a successful program.

The obvious method of alleviating any concerns with the elementary teachers is to afford them opportunities to gain experience, including making the elementary teacher aware of useful materials. Chapter Two of this study contains three works which may be useful. The Handbook for the

Development of the Orchestra Program, by the Texas Education Agency,<sup>1</sup> is over ten years old, but contains some useful information for any orchestra teacher, especially the new and inexperienced teacher. The Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) Document Teaching Strings<sup>2</sup> has been available almost as long as the TEA Handbook, and was intended for use by music teachers who did not have a major concentration in strings. The Ph.D. dissertation by Donald Ward Dillon<sup>3</sup> has also been available for over ten years, and is especially useful for band directors who take an orchestra position and need to better familiarize themselves with basic string techniques.

The responses to two questions on the questionnaire compare favorably with conclusions reached by Roger William Strong in his Ph.D. dissertation, "Practices Which Are Common to Successful Public School Orchestra Programs."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Texas Education Agency, A Handbook for the Development of the Orchestra Program (Austin: Texas Education Agency, 1970).

<sup>2</sup>New York State Education Department, Teaching Strings (Schaumburg, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 056 052, 1971).

<sup>3</sup>Donald Ward Dillon, "The Development of a Manual for the Incipient School Orchestra Director" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970).

<sup>4</sup>Roger William Strong, "Practices Which Are Common to Successful Public School Orchestra Programs" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968).



Strong's study was based on a nationwide survey of orchestra programs in order to determine what practices and situations affected student participation, whether adversely or beneficially.

One of his conclusions was that "districts with an adequate supply of school owned instruments have a considerably higher student participation rate than those not having an adequate supply."<sup>5</sup> In the present study, the responses to III-1 showed that Texas school districts usually expected students to provide their own violins, but other string instruments were usually adequately supplied (100% basses, 93% cellos, 73% violas, 10% violins).

Strong also concluded that orchestras with the highest student participation gave at least four performances each year and no more than eight. Student participation declines as the number of performances rises to nine or more, but "presenting too few concerts each year is apparently far more detrimental to the per cent of student participation than too many performances."<sup>6</sup> In the present study, the responses to III-2 showed that a 53% majority of high school orchestras in Texas performed four to six concerts per year, with five as the median number.

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 78.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

The present study has attempted to develop a clear perception of what is going on in high school orchestra programs in Texas. It has not been the aim of this study to make an overall evaluation of the programs, but to let the directors' personal evaluations of their own programs speak for themselves. It may be true that no actual director in Texas fits exactly into the hypothetical typical situation summarized in this chapter. However, it is to be hoped that the study will be useful for any director who finds significant similarities or differences between his own program and the typical program as presented in this study. Such a study as this might serve as a starting point in making directors aware of how their programs compare with other orchestra programs in Texas, and might lead the directors to at least develop a personal checklist or to work with others to develop objective means of studying and evaluating each program in its own district. Simple awareness is a necessary beginning, and if the present study has helped promote such awareness of what is going on in Texas orchestra programs, then it has succeeded.

## APPENDIX

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### Part I

1--poor-or-missing    2--fair    3--good    4--excellent

1   2   3   4      1. Do you have good rapport with your principal?

1   2   3   4      2. Is the orchestra program in your school district recognized as part of the curriculum?

1   2   3   4      3. Are there enough string teachers in your area to adequately cover the schools of your feeder program?

1   2   3   4      4. Do you have good vertical alignment for your high school?

1   2   3   4      5. Is your schedule acceptable for visiting your feeder schools?

1   2   3   4      6. Do you frequently visit the middle schools or junior high schools that feed your program?

1   2   3   4      7. Do you have the necessary instruments and equipment needed for your program?

- 1 2 3 4 8. Do you have access to a good sound system for your orchestra (or one that you could comfortably borrow if the orchestra does not own one)?
- 1 2 3 4 9. Do you have adequate storage space for the instruments?
- 1 2 3 4 10. Is office space adequate for your needs?
- 1 2 3 4 11. Do you have cooperation from your band director?
- 1 2 3 4 12. Do you have cooperation from your principal?
- 1 2 3 4 13. Do you have cooperation from your supervisor?
- 1 2 3 4 14. How successful is the band program in your high school?
- 1 2 3 4 15. How successful is your orchestra program?
- 1 2 3 4 16. Do you feel your elementary teachers do an acceptable job of teaching?
- 1 2 3 4 17. Do you feel your elementary teachers do an acceptable job of recruiting?
- 1 2 3 4 18. If you have a booster club, is it effective?

19. How would you describe the overall orchestra program at each level in your cluster?

1 2 3 4

Elementary?

1 2 3 4

Middle school or junior high?

### Part II

yes or no

1. Do you have frequent conversations with your principal, at least once a week?

yes or no

2. Is a telephone in the rehearsal hall area?

yes or no

3. Do you have a separate office from the band director or other personnel?

yes or no

4. Do you have individual practice rooms?

yes or no

5. Do you have ensemble rooms?

yes or no

6. Do you have adequate planning time during the day?

yes or no

7. Does your group have to raise money for UIL and festival contests?

yes or no

8. Does your group have to raise money for music purchases?

yes or no

9. Is release time allowed without penalty for attendance at professional meetings?

yes or no

10. Do you have adequate space to store music, filing cabinets, shelves, etc.?

yes or no

11. Do you have a fund for emergency repairs?

- yes or no      12. Are all the teachers in your cluster program string specialists?
- yes or no      13. Are you a string specialist?
- yes or no      14. Are fees required for elementary instruction in your district?
- yes or no      15. Does your high school orchestra perform for elementary schools for recruiting?
- yes or no      16. Do you have media coverage for the orchestra activities and concerts?
- yes or no      17. Do you have an ample music budget?
- yes or no      18. Does your high school have a performance of a musical every year?
- yes or no      19. If there is a musical, do you direct it?
- yes or no      20. Do you help in preparing the students for the performance?
- yes or no      21. Do you play or direct in a community orchestra? Underline which.
- yes or no      22. Do you teach any of your students privately?
- yes or no      23. If you have full orchestra, do you rehearse them during a regularly scheduled class?
- yes or no      24. Do you have a certain number of regularly scheduled concerts during the year?

Part III

1. What instruments are furnished by the school? Strings only.
2. How many concerts does your high school perform each year?
3. In what grade are students allowed to start strings?  
Do you feel this is too early or too late?  
Please explain.
4. How many students are in your orchestra program?  
strings\_\_\_\_\_ winds\_\_\_\_\_
5. What is the UIL classification of your high school?
6. How many performing groups do you have?  
(advanced orch., int. orch., mid. school or junior high, ele. Please underline what you have.)
7. How long have you been in your present position?
8. How many string players in your orchestra study privately?
9. Are there any unique things done in elementary or secondary level that you would like to share?
10. In what area is the total orchestra program most in need of improvement?

11. How would you improve your program?
12. What is the orchestra schedule outside of school time?  
(Sectionals, individual work, full orchestra, etc.)
13. What contests, festivals, has your orchestra entered  
in the past three years?
14. Please give your UIL ratings the last three years.  
This will be confidential.
- | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 |
|------|------|------|
|------|------|------|
15. What do you do to get students in your program?  
What about wind players?
16. What are the most important things you do during a  
rehearsal?
17. Please elaborate on your teaching philosophy. This  
could pertain to anything: managing the rehearsal,  
specific point in teaching you wish to discuss,  
anything you might wish to share.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Bekker, Paul. The Orchestra. "The Norton Library."  
New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1964.
- Gattiker, Irvin. Complete Book of Rehearsal Techniques  
for the High School Orchestra. West Nyack, N.Y.:  
Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1977.
- Green, Elizabeth A.H. The Modern Conductor. Englewood  
Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Malko, Nicolai. The Conductor and His Score.  
Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Pottinger, Harold. Instrumental Handbook: A Guide to the  
Intelligent Use of Band and Orchestral Instruments.  
Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Music, 1971.
- Public Relations Workshop Sponsored by the Texas Music  
Educators Association, 1979-1980. Public Relations  
and the Music Educator: A Detailed Guide to the  
Development of Effective and Profitable P.R. Skills  
in Dealing with Seven Basic Constituencies. Austin:  
Texas Music Educators Association, 1980.
- Texas Education Agency. A Handbook for the Development of  
the Orchestra Program. Austin: Texas Education  
Agency, 1970.
- Young, Phillis. Playing the String Game: Strategies for  
Teaching Cello and Strings. Austin: University of  
Texas Press, 1978.

### Dissertations

- Boney, Joan Ellen. "The Effect of Two Methods of Program-  
ming Upon the Development of the Orchestra in a  
Secondary School." North Texas State University,  
1966.

- Crabb, Eugene. "The High School Orchestra as an Integral Part of the Music Curriculum in Florida." University of Southern California, 1959.
- Crockett, Frank M. "An Analysis and Evaluation of the University of Texas Program of String Teacher Preparation." University of Illinois, 1960.
- Dillon, Donald Ward. "The Development of a Manual for the Incipient School Orchestra Director." University of Oklahoma, 1970.
- Fullbright, Ercy Glenn. "An Investigation of Relationships Between Cultural Background and Attitudes Toward Classical Orchestral Music Among College Undergraduates." Indiana State University, 1964.
- Goodman, Alvin Harold. "Development of the Symphony Orchestra in Higher Education." University of Southern California, 1960.
- Grover, Paul B. "The History of String Class Instruction in American Schools and Its Relationship to School Orchestras." University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1960.
- Hoffer, Charles R. "A Study of the Common Efforts of the Community Orchestra and the Public School Music Program in Providing Listening Experiences for School Students." Michigan State University, 1956.
- LaRosa, Joseph. "A High School Curriculum for the Development of Musicianship in Individual Orchestral Players." University of Arizona, 1965.
- Patnoe, Herbert D. "Preparation of Public School Music Teachers in Selected Cities Maintaining Professional or Semi-Professional Civic Orchestras (Research Study No. 1)." Colorado State College, 1962.
- Strong, Roger William. "Practices Which Are Common to Successful Public School Orchestra Programs." University of Oklahoma, 1968.
- Wortmen, Robert Lee. "The Role of the Liberal Arts in the Training of Stringed Instrument Orchestral Players." Florida State University, 1961.

### Microform Reproductions

Biringer, Frank A., Jr., and Ronci, Sal. Music: Beginning Strings, Instrumental Techniques--Strings. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 061 241, 1971.

McCall, Jim and others. Music: Orchestra. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 061 237, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_ and others. Orchestra, Junior. Course Number: Music: 5601. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 075 313, 1971.

New York State Education Department. Music in the High School: A Syllabus in Music, Grades 9-12. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 069 595, 1972.

\_\_\_\_\_ Teaching Strings. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 056 052, 1971.

Oregon State Department of Education. Self-Evaluation Checklist for School Music Programs: Orchestra Music, Grades 4-12. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 152 552, 1977.

Rolland, Paul and others. Development and Trial of a Two Year Program of String Instruction, Final Report. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 063 323, 1971.

Ryan, Philip. Music: Instrumental Techniques, Strings. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 061 242, 1971.

### Periodicals

Dachoff, Dacho. "Survey of Michigan High School Bands and Orchestras." The Instrumentalist 25 (September 1965): 61.

Fergus, Patricia M. "Factors Affecting the Development of the Orchestra and String Program in Minnesota Secondary Schools, 1940-1960." Journal of Research in Music Education 12 (Fall 1964): 235-43.

Gray, J. Justin. "The Development of the High School Orchestra in the State of California." American String Teacher, Spring 1964, pp. 12-17.