

379
N81d
No. 402c

THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION OF ARKANSAS MUSIC
TEACHERS AS MUSICIANS AND EDUCATORS: THE ROLE
OF INFLUENTIAL PERSONS FROM CHILDHOOD TO
POST-COLLEGE YEARS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Patricia Huff Cox, B.S., M.Ed.
Denton, Texas
December, 1994

379
N81d
No. 402c

THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION OF ARKANSAS MUSIC
TEACHERS AS MUSICIANS AND EDUCATORS: THE ROLE
OF INFLUENTIAL PERSONS FROM CHILDHOOD TO
POST-COLLEGE YEARS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Patricia Huff Cox, B.S., M.Ed.
Denton, Texas
December, 1994

Cox, Patricia H., The Professional Socialization of Arkansas Music Teachers as Musicians and Educators: The Role of Influential Persons from Childhood to Post-College Years. Doctor of Philosophy (Music Education), December, 1994, 317 pp., 28 tables, 4 figures, references, 125 titles.

The purpose was to investigate the role of influential persons in the professional socialization process of music educators as musicians and teachers. The problems were to determine: who encouraged subjects toward music and teaching during pre-college, college, and post-college years; and the interrelationships of gender and teaching specialty with influential persons in subjects' lives. A 29 item questionnaire, divided into five sections, was mailed to a stratified, random sample of Arkansas music educators (n=500) made available from Market Data Retrieval Service. The total response rate was 62%. The results were confirmed by 50 interviews.

Subjects were able to recall family members, especially mothers who were pleased with their childhood musical performances. School music or ensemble directors reinforced the early encouragement of family during adolescence. Subjects were unable to recall similar encouragement towards pursuit of teaching as a future career during pre-college years. The anticipated findings of significantly fewer influential persons for the role of educator than for musician during pre-college years supports prevailing theories.

df

Influential persons from pre-college years were the same as the ones for college and post-college years with the addition of persons from institutional environments. College faculty members were listed less frequently than were family members and instructors' influence did not continue into post-college years. Evidence suggests that identity as musician was already substantiated by important persons in subjects' social environment before choosing a college major field.

During pre-college years, the women, more than the men, named a private music teacher in support of their musician role. The men, more than the women, were influenced by their school music or ensemble directors. Other directors or colleague music teachers offered support for both roles during post-college years. Evidence from this investigation suggests that professional socialization of music educators is life-long and not fully developed until post-college years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special acknowledgement goes to my major professor, Hildegard Froehlich, for her remarkable skill and enthusiasm toward the task of research. My appreciation extends to the other members of my graduate committee for their friendly and helpful advice.

On the Harding University (Searcy, Arkansas) campus, I am indebted to Dr. Dean Priest and the Executive Committee for a Faculty Development Grant which partially funded the survey. Dr. Travis Thompson of the Mathematics Department helped me with statistical analysis and computer technique and Drs. Cathleen and Sam Shultz of the School of Nursing were continually encouraging and helpful throughout this project, as was the Music Department faculty and staff.

From Memorial University of Newfoundland, I would like to acknowledge the help of Dr. Brian Roberts. Not only did he offer many suggestions, but he also allowed my repeated inquiry into the theoretical aspects of his own research.

I acknowledge the following people: my parents for encouragement and for a heritage of valuing education; my children, Deborah, Michael, Rebekah and Leah, for their patience and understanding; my dear friends Neva White, Alice Bell and Jacqueline Harris for keeping a positive approach and for providing inspiration and companionship when I needed it most.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE AND PROBLEMS.....	1
Socialization and significant others	
Background of the study	
Purpose and research problems	
Definition of terms	
2. RELATED LITERATURE.....	13
Primary and secondary socialization	
Occupational socialization	
The occupational role of musician	
The occupational role of teacher	
The occupational role of music educator	
3. METHODOLOGY.....	55
Introduction	
The pilot studies	
The main study	
4. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS.....	78
Introduction	
Consistency of Responses	
Individual Profiles of Subjects	
Contributions toward Music, Pre-College Years	

College Years
Influences in Post-College Years
Interrelationships of Subjects' Profiles and Responses

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION..... 117

Summary
Conclusions
Recommendations

APPENDICES..... 134

REFERENCES..... 306

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Rank Order of Support During Pre-College Yrs.....	66
2 Rank Order of Support During College Yrs.....	68
3 Rank Order of Support During Post-College Yrs.....	68
4 Significance Test-Role of Musician, Life-Cycle.....	70
5 Significance Test-Role of Teacher, Life-Cycle.....	71
6 Description of Subjects.....	79
7 Influential Persons in Lives of Subjects.....	82
8 Family Members Who Were Also Musicians.....	84
9 Family Members Who Were Also Teachers.....	85
10 Support for Musician Role, Pre-College Yrs.....	86
11 Support for Musician Role, College Yrs.....	87
12 Support for Teacher Role, Pre-College Yrs.....	89
13 Support for Teacher Role, College Yrs.....	91
14 Male Musician Role, Post-College Yrs.....	92
15 Female Musician Role, Post-College Yrs.....	94
16 Male Educator Role, Post-College Yrs.....	95
17 Female Educator Role, Post-College Yrs.....	96
18 Continuing Influences.....	98
19 Wilcoxon Tests, Pre-College Years.....	100
20 Wilcoxon Tests, College and Post-College Yrs.....	101
21 Wilcoxon Tests, Teacher, Life-Cycle.....	102

22	Wilcoxon Tests, Musician, Life-Cycle.....	104
23	Wilcoxon Tests, Specialty Groups, Musician and Teacher, Pre-College Yrs.....	105
24	Wilcoxon Tests, Specialty Groups, Musician and Teacher, College and Post-College Yrs.....	106
25	Wilcoxon Tests, Instrumentalists, Pre-College, College, and Post-College Yrs.....	107
26	Wilcoxon Tests, Vocalists, Pre-College, College, and Post-College Yrs.....	108
27	Wilcoxon Tests, Instrumentalists, Life-Cycle.....	108
28	Wilcoxon Tests, Vocalists, Life-Cycle.....	109

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Pilot Questionnaire	60
2	Questionnaire.....	75
3	Interview Questionnaire.....	77
4	Summary of Wilcoxon Tests.....	111

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND PROBLEMS

Introduction

Research on occupational role perception and socialization dates back to the early 1950s. Since that time, employees' role perceptions within the various occupations have been studied extensively by researchers such as Becker, Geer and Strauss (1961); Burchard (1954); Burke (1991); Faulkner (1971); Frederickson and Rooney (1988); Seashore and Taber (1975); Simpson (1972); and Zurcher, Meadow and Zurcher (1965). Investigations have ranged from individuals' societal roles and how their role perceptions affect occupational behavior, to job satisfaction and the part that socialization experiences play in professional identity development.

Teachers' occupational role perceptions have also been studied. Some researchers have explored teachers' tasks from a role perspective such as duties as a counselor for students or a speaker for assemblies (Biddle, Twyman & Rankin, 1962; Braga, 1972; Fishburn, 1962). Bullough (1992) and Sears, Marshall, and Otis-Wilborn (1989) investigated the role perceptions of teachers by using metaphors to symbolize their work. Conflict in role perceptions among teachers who were military personnel was the focus of a

study by Getzels and Guba (1954), and commitment to the role of teacher was studied by Gordon (1955).

Research on role perception in the field of music education has been concentrated primarily on the ambivalent nature of music educators' identity as either teacher and educator or musician and performer (Clinton, 1991; Harris, 1991; L'Roy, 1983; Roberts, 1990, 1993). This study acknowledges ambivalence as a part of the role of music educator. The question is how the ambivalence is developed in individuals as they prepare to teach music in our schools.

Socialization is considered to be continuous over an individual's entire life cycle. Individuals who enter the lives of students during the secondary phases of adolescence, college, and post-college years may have as significant an impact on the latter's occupational roles as can persons of importance during the primary phase. If this is indicated, then the students' socialization and identification with significant others as a result of teacher education programs becomes critical. None of the research in the area of music education has focused specifically on the developmental process of the adult socialization of music educators. In order for the rationale for this study to be clear, it is necessary to understand socialization and the impact of influential persons in the process.

Socialization and Significant Others

Socialization has been defined as the process by which individuals acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to function within a group or society (Brim, 1966). More simply stated,

socialization is the process by which persons come to find their niche as a member of society. Berger and Luckman (1966) described the process of socialization as a means of coming to understand common knowledge or common sense. This life-long process of adjustment can be categorized into primary and secondary phases.

Primary Socialization Phase

The term, primary socialization, first introduced by Cooley (1922), describes the earliest and most fundamental impact of reality upon the individual's person as a member of society. Mainly involving family members as significant others (Denzin, 1977; Elkin, 1960; Mead, 1934; Stryker, 1967; Sullivan, 1940, 1953), primary socialization prepares individuals to function in society at large and provides the framework from which their later social developments emanate and are analyzed (Brim, 1966). The term significant others is a sociological one (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Cooley, 1922; Sullivan, 1940). Because its current use is not understood by the general public, the term influential persons is substituted or interchanged for significant others throughout this study.

Berger and Luckman (1966) described this initial process as emotionally charged because during this phase individuals form strong attachments to their significant others and take on the roles and attitudes of those of greatest influence. This role taking includes the recognition of gender differences. Children learn the expectations of their own family roles and come to expect characteristic behavior from influential family members. Because the children have no choice in this process and know no other social

structure, the primary phase becomes the foundation or the process of identification most firmly instilled in them.

Denzin (1977), Stryker (1967) and Elkin (1960) agreed that social knowledge, such as gender, age and kinship, are transmitted during childhood by significant others. Rosenberg (1973) confirmed the influence of family members during childhood. Woelfel (1972), Saltiel (1986) and Clark-Lempers, Lempers and Ho (1991) supported the claim that the influence instigated by significant others during the primary socialization phase, continued into adolescence. Although both father and mother were described as role models for occupational aspirations by adolescent subjects (Saltiel, 1986; Woelfel, 1972), fathers were considered more significant as role models for occupational aspirations by male subjects than were females.

Although there is evidence for a continuation of influence among family members, primary socialization ends when the concept of generalized other is grasped (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Mead, 1934). The generalized other involves more than just one significant other. It may involve several family members such as aunts or grandparents as a reference group. Social knowledge that has been acquired through interaction in which similar norms and values of influential persons (e.g., parents) are reinforced is also a part of the generalized other concept.

Secondary Socialization Phase

During the secondary socialization phase, social knowledge

acquired during earlier years is maintained and continued (Berger and Luckman, 1966). Schooling and, ultimately, education toward a specific occupation are parts of this phase. The already learned processes from the primary phase persist while new knowledge, skills, and influence by significant others are added.

Influential persons, as they relate to the socialization processes during the secondary phase, have been studied by Clark-Lempers et al. (1991), Denzin (1966), Hendry, Roberts, Glendinning and Coleman (1992), and Saltiel (1986). The results of these studies imply that subjects are able to list important persons in their lives who had specific kinds of influences (e.g. friendships). In the area of occupational role models, these studies show evidence that socialization for males is different from the process for females.

Music teachers' childhoods may have included important persons who influenced the former to become involved with music: many children take private music lessons. Because parents usually encourage their children to study music, private music teachers can have significant influence on children who later pursue music education as a career. Parents often encourage children to become involved in church music as well. When parents control children's religious choices, the church becomes an extension of the home. Therefore, significant others, such as ministers or church choir directors should be considered a part of primary socialization (Berger & Luckman, 1966).

Does the same encouragement exist during the primary socialization phase for a child's developing an interest in teaching

and education? Is it likely that parents and other significant family members such as grandparents can influence children regarding the role of music teacher during the primary socialization phase? If we are able to find evidence that music teachers, as children, are influenced by persons around them, what is the outcome for career perceptions as it relates to the dual role of musician and educator experienced by many music teachers?

Background of the Study

Although none of the research in the field of music education on occupational role perceptions has included the developmental process of socialization over the life cycle, some studies have been focused on music teachers' occupational role perceptions. L'Roy (1983) and Roberts (1990, 1993) studied undergraduate music education majors' role perceptions. Clinton (1991) and White (1964) investigated music teachers' professional role perceptions.

Research on the Role Perception of Undergraduate Music Education Majors

L'Roy (1983) used role theory and symbolic interaction theory as paradigms for analyzing the socialization process and role identities of music education students who received their training at the University of North Texas, Denton, Texas. She found that subjects often viewed their career choice of music education as a second or third option after their first choice of wanting to be seen as a musician. The reason most frequently given for choosing music education as a major was the respondents' musical experiences and

specific influences by music teachers in high school. L'Roy also found that the subjects chose best friends and applied music faculty members rather than music education faculty to evaluate their work. She found little evidence among the subjects of loyalty to a reference group comprised by music educators. The strongest evidence for loyalty to a music education reference group or significant others was found among freshmen who often identified with high school ensemble directors. This trend, however, lessened as academic classification increased. Freshmen were more likely to prefer the title of ensemble director than were upper classmen. L'Roy concluded that the performance demands within the music school at the University of North Texas created a social environment where music education students relied upon their applied music teachers and friends rather than music education faculty for the evaluation of their work.

Because L'Roy's (1983) study was conducted at only 1 university it leaves the question unanswered whether the emphasis on performance and the role of musician could be observed in other college or university settings as well. Roberts (1993), however, offered considerable evidence for the existence of a master status as a musician in several music schools. This finding may account for much of the high value placed by students on applied teachers as significant others. In the context of Roberts study, the term significant others suggested more than just persons who were liked or admired. Individuals designated as significant others had significance for role construct. Individuals who were labeled

significant validated persons within reference groups. This meant that music education students developed a sense of belonging by obtaining approval from applied music teachers and from other music students.

Roberts (1993) also studied the developing self-perceptions of music education students and the importance of significant others in the context of a school of music. The subjects in his study could not only identify applied music faculty and ensemble directors, but also were able to select peers as significant others.

In 1990, Roberts reported that music education students valued the ability to function in the role of musician or performer and used positive descriptors for others who, in their own opinions, had abilities as musicians or performers. Students identified themselves as players of instruments or as singers rather than as music education majors (or future teachers). Roberts found that the music students kept these role identities even after they entered the schools of education for professional courses in teacher-education.

Research on the Socialization Process of Music Teachers and Educators

The occupational status and role of music educators within American society was first investigated by White (1964). Although he focused on social status rather than role perception as the result of a person's socialization process, White found that music teachers chose their profession for two basic reasons, the love of music and the desire to work with children. White recommended that more

research be done within the field of music education to gain a better understanding of individual teachers' role and status in society.

Clinton (1991) studied the self-perceptions of fine arts teachers, including music teachers. He found that, when compared with art and drama teachers, music teachers identified more with the role of educator than with the role of musician or artist. Although music teachers valued performance, they expressed a stronger commitment to the tasks and role perception of teacher-educator than to that of musician-performer. He, thus, concluded that music educators placed a higher value on, and identified more closely with, the role of teacher-educator than had been suggested by previous research.

Considering the evidence for role ambivalence in the perceptions of music educators, a lack of knowledge to explain the differences in the results of the studies by L'Roy (1983) and Clinton (1991) is evident. L'Roy reported stronger identification with the role of musician than with the role of educator among undergraduate music education majors. Her study was conducted at only one university. Clinton's study of fine arts teachers included music teachers as well as art and drama teachers. There is evidence in both L'Roy's and Clinton's studies that two distinctly different socialization phases were responsible for the different perceptions of the subjects. Perhaps music teachers, working in school situations, identify with others who are influential in their social environments and, thereby, redefine their occupational roles.

No researcher in the field of music education thus far has considered the socialization processes and the contributions of influential persons during the life cycle of music educators. The influence of persons who occupy roles in the lives of music educators do not begin with their entrance into formal schooling, or cease upon graduation. There is reason to assume that the influences of persons on music teachers' developing role perceptions may be as powerful as formal instruction (Berger & Luckman, 1966).

Purpose and Research Problems

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived role of influential persons in music teachers' professional socialization as musicians and educators.

The research problems were to determine:

1. who contributed most to subjects' involvement in music during pre-college years;
2. who encouraged subjects most as musicians during their college years;
3. who encouraged subjects most during their pre-college and college years to think of themselves as future teachers;
4. who influenced subjects most during their post-college years in the roles of musician and teacher; and
5. the interrelationships between gender and teaching specializations and the influences reported by the subjects.

Definition of Terms

Socialization: the process by which people learn to become

members of society (Berger & Berger, 1975). Continuing through the life-cycle, socialization is separated into two phases, primary and secondary. Primary socialization is the earliest phase of the life-long process, beginning at birth and continuing through childhood or pre-college years. This phase is the foundation for later socialization and development and, therefore, establishes a framework from which later processes are built (Berger and Luckman, 1966). In this phase, which usually involves primarily family members, the individual has no control over the social environment. Thus, church, as an extension of the home and family, is classified in this phase.

Secondary socialization is the phase in the life-long process which begins after an individual has been inducted into personal relationships with family and has learned the expected behavior as a member of a family. In this phase, interaction with other people increases to include not only parents and siblings, but also teachers and friends (Berger & Luckman, 1966). Schooling is a part of this phase and includes college and post-college years.

Significant others: a sociological term (Berger and Luckman, 1966; Cooley, 1922; Sullivan, 1940), referring to individuals who are important to persons in the process of social identification. In the context of this study, these people have influenced music teachers to perceive themselves as musicians and educators. These influential persons are categorized as family, peers, teachers, directors, church leaders, administrators and self. As experiences change during the life cycle, significant others and their roles may also change (Berger and Luckman, 1966; Brim, 1966; Sullivan, 1953). Because the term is

misunderstood by the public in its general use, it has been substituted with the term influential persons.

Pre-college years describes the phase of the life-cycle of music teachers that includes childhood and adolescence.

College years describes the phase of the life-cycle of music teachers when they pursue a bachelor's degree in music education. This period usually occurs after high school or adolescence.

Post-college years is the phase of the life-cycle of music teachers following completion of a music education degree. This phase includes individuals who are working in schools as music teachers and ensemble directors. Graduate study toward higher degrees is also included in this phase.

CHAPTER 2

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The concept of occupational roles as learned social behavior has been investigated by many researchers within the context of symbolic interaction theory, first espoused by Mead (1934), Cooley (1922), and Dewey (1922). Symbolic interactionists emphasize the meanings that symbols have for individuals or actors (Becker, 1970; Carper, 1970c; Becker, Geer & Hughes, 1968; Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961; Goodlad, 1990; Lortie, 1975; Roberts, 1990). From this perspective, not all symbols are equally significant for each person, but may be selectively identified according to the situation. Symbols must also have the same definition for each actor in the situation or an agreed-upon meaning within society. Symbols control the actions of actors within situations and may be defined as stimuli that have meaning for individuals and that elicit a response that is based upon meaning rather than on a physical object (Mead, 1934). When individuals or actors take on the role (expected behavior) of others, the meaning of the symbol or gesture is shared and behavior is controlled or constantly modified by the continual interaction of actors. Thus, the taking of a role is a complex process of interacting with others in the social context.

The exploration of other in recent research has led to the definition of this concept in more specific terms. Beginning with Mead's (1934) generalized other, researchers have investigated the complexity of other and self and extended its meaning to include particular groups, such as an occupational group or a family, and specific others, such as a teacher or a family member (Clark-Lempers, Lempers, & Ho, 1991; Galbo, 1986; Hendry, Roberts, Glendinning & Coleman, 1992; Hyman, 1942; Saltiel, 1986; Stryker, 1967; Sullivan, 1953; Woelfel, 1972). It is this latter concept of a specific or significant other that is addressed in this study.

This investigation is intended to add to the body of knowledge in the field of music education concerning music teachers' perception of significant others or influential persons and their contributions to the subjects' identification as musicians and teachers during childhood and adulthood. Therefore, the literature described in this chapter has been divided into two sections: (a) studies that investigated primary and secondary socialization during pre-college years, and (b) studies that investigated occupational socialization during college and post-college years.

Primary and Secondary Socialization During Pre-College Years

From infancy, the socialization processes begin to unfold between individuals and their caretakers or significant others. The significant other, through language and movement, symbolically presents the social order to the infant (Denzin, 1977). According to

Sullivan (1953), by the 8th or 9th month infants are able to respond with syllables. If the response is rewarded or noticed, it is reinforced and repeated. Sullivan speculated that many of the verbal sounds made by infants are probably never noticed and are therefore unrewarded. Thus, the significant other becomes a critical variable in the development of language skills during infancy and early childhood (Denzin, 1977).

In addition to language, Elkin (1960) proposed that social knowledge is transmitted during childhood through significant others. This knowledge includes identity based on gender, age, and kinship. Both Elkin (1960) and Stryker (1967) agreed that not all individuals have an equal influence on the child. It is not only the position persons hold, but also the time within the life cycle in which these persons appear that contributes to their significance. Three functional categories exist for significant others during childhood: (a) patterned behavior that a child can expect and family roles with predictable personality characteristics; (b) definitional behavior by significant others which may include actual instruction or rewards and punishment that stress desired norms and values; and, (c) modeling behavior that helps children to define their social world (Elkin, 1960). The behavior of significant others is closely related to personality development and structure.

Rosenberg (1973) interviewed students from grades 3 to 12 in randomly selected Baltimore schools. The 25 randomly selected schools had an acceptable proportion of nonwhite students. The total

number of children interviewed was 1,917, or 79% of the sample. Of this total, 63% were black.

Rosenberg's (1973) results showed that the subjects rated their mothers as most significant in all categories; fathers were rated second, teachers third, and classmates fourth. However, Rosenberg found that the subjects reacted to their social environment in a selective way. If they felt that their mother, father, teachers or classmates thought poorly of them, they were more likely to decide that the opinion of the person did not matter. Thus, Rosenberg conjectured that the subjects in this category were able to protect their self-images.

Overall, the subjects were more likely to trust their mothers' and fathers' judgements of themselves more than their own. Rosenberg (1973) asked the subjects who would be right if they disagreed with their mother or father about how smart they were? Would subjects trust their own opinions of themselves more or their parents' opinions? The subjects' responses indicated that it was their parents' opinions that they valued. This observable confidence and trust in others' judgments declined with age.

Rosenberg (1973) found that the stronger the belief that the significant other was right about the individual, the greater the effect of the judgment on the self-esteem of the subject. If subjects trusted the judgment of teachers and the judgment was positive, then they tended to think well of themselves. The subjects valued the judgment of teachers, but were less likely to believe that their teachers understood their most intimate feelings. In this regard,

mothers, followed by fathers, siblings and teacher, friends, and classmates were described as most likely to understand their inner thoughts.

Rosenberg (1973) found that white children' concern with what adults thought of them declined with increasing age. The concern of black children remained the same. Whites also showed an increase in caring about friends' opinions as they grew older, but blacks did not. Rosenberg reported that the general categories for significant others were consistent among all groups of children.

Woelfel (1972) located similar evidence among high school juniors. To a sample of 90 students living in a Wisconsin city of 37,987, he administered three portions of the Wisconsin Significant Other Battery (Haller & Woelfel, 1969), the Significant Other Elicitors, the Occupational Aspiration Scale, and the Student Identification Form. Woelfel reported the results in percentage tables.

Woelfel (1972) reported that fathers ranked highest on the lists of significant others. Because occupational and educational aspirations were related, this finding was not surprising. However, among female subjects, Woelfel found that mothers were ranked higher than among male subjects, as were peer friends of the same sex. Other categories of significant others reported by subjects were siblings, other relatives, peer friends of the opposite sex, teachers, adult friends, and unspecified friends. Categories for significant others relevant to the subjects' educational and occupational aspirations remained stable across classification of race and parents' occupations.

Saltiel (1986) investigated high school students' perceptions of significant others for educational or occupational ambitions. Data were obtained from a high school population in a rural western town (population 1,200). A total of 152 students who were present on the day of investigation completed a written questionnaire. One-hundred-forty-two usable forms were returned, 78 from males and 64 from females.

Saltiel (1986) asked subjects to identify by name and relationship each individual with whom they had spoken or whom they knew as examples of educational and occupational attainment. Separate versions of the Wisconsin Significant Other Battery (Haller and Woelfel, 1969) were used to elicit significant others for educational aspirations and significant others for occupational aspirations. Persons identified as significant others were coded as either occupational only, educational only, or both.

The results, reported in percentage tables, showed that the educational and occupational aspirations of the subjects represented distinct domains. Males were more likely to name specific others for occupation than were females. Females were more likely to cite others who were influential over both aspirations. Saltiel (1986) suggested that this tendency might reflect a greater availability of occupational role models for males.

The likelihood that peer friends and teachers would exert influence over either occupational or educational ambitions was about equal. Adult friends or employers tended to be influential over occupation only, but opposite sex peer friends were most

influential over education. Mothers were more likely to be influential in both aspects among their daughters than they were among their sons. Teachers were more likely to be influential over occupational aspirations for female subjects than for male subjects. Saltiel (1986) pointed out that these results are indicators of adolescents' specificity in the way they seek information from others.

Clark-Lempers, Lempers and Ho (1991) investigated adolescents' perspectives of the functional nature of their relationships with mothers, fathers, most important siblings, peer friends of same gender, and most important teachers during early, middle and late adolescence. Using Furman and Buhrmester's (1985) Network of Relationships Inventory, they studied specified aspects of different relationships: admiration, affection, companionship, counsel and support, intimacy, nurturance, and reliable alliance or dependable bond. The Furman and Buhrmester Inventory was designed to assess the nature of children's and adolescents' relationships by differentiating the resources that were provided by specific significant others in their social environments. The terms specified above represent basic social needs of individuals.

Two hypotheses were advanced by Clark-Lempers et al. (1991) that related to the mother, father, and peer friend as influential persons. First, it was expected that a moderate decrease in functional importance between adolescent and parents would be observed in older subjects. Second, it was expected that an increase in functional importance between adolescents and peer friends of the

same gender would be observed in older subjects. No specific hypotheses about teacher relationships or sibling relationships were stated.

A sample of 1,110 adolescents between the ages of 11 and 19 years from several schools in rural midwestern towns served as subjects. Of the sample, 529 were males and 581 were females. The sample was divided into early, middle and late adolescent groups. Usable questionnaires administered during school sessions totaled 771. The remaining 339 subjects were given the inventory in their own homes in the presence of a trained interviewer. These subjects were chosen so that they would be representative of all students attending schools in Iowa (Clark-Lempers et al., 1991). Each group was scored using a Likert-type scale to measure attributes ascribed to perceived significant others.

The results, obtained by means of a 3 (group) X 2 (gender) X 5 (type of relationship) MANOVA showed that both the mother-adolescent relationship and the father-adolescent relationship had significant interaction for all groups. This meant that both male and female subjects, in all three age categories, used parents to some degree for the attributes mentioned above. There was, however, evidence that levels of interaction with parents decreased with age. Younger adolescents reported higher levels of interaction with parents than did middle adolescents, and the middle group reported more interaction than did the older group. Contrary to the hypothesis, interaction scores with peer friends of the same gender decreased much the same as did scores on parent relationships. The

same trends were observed in the other two categories of siblings and teachers (Clark-Lempers et al., 1991).

Hendry, Roberts, Glendinning and Coleman (1992) also observed that parents remained significant in the lives of adolescents. Their study of early and mid-adolescents in a secondary school in northeast Scotland supported the premise of continued parental significance. Their study provided information on how other adults, such as teachers, may be significant in the lives of adolescents for specific reasons.

A questionnaire was administered by Hendry et al. (1992) to 360 pupils, 90 girls and 90 boys, in their first year of secondary school (ages 11 and 12 years); and to 90 girls, and 90 boys in their fourth year of secondary school (ages 15 and 16 years). On front and back pages of the questionnaires 20 statements were listed, in pairs, under 10 categories that described the roles of significant others. The front page was specifically for adults who were related to the subjects and the back page contained questions for adults who were not related to the subjects.

Seventy-nine percent of the young people selected parents as significant others from within the family; 56% chose their mother and 23% their father. Siblings were reported by 13% of the subjects, and another 8% indicated other adults (mostly grandparents). Mid-adolescent males were more likely to choose their father than their mother as a significant family member, but mid-adolescent females were more likely to indicate their mother than father as a significant family member (Hendry et al., 1992).

Outside the family, 60% of the subjects reported friends of the same gender, while 34% selected adults as the most significant non-family member in their lives. Teachers were chosen by 20% of the subjects. Both early and mid-adolescent females were unlikely to indicate teachers. However, females were more likely than males to list friends of the same gender as the most significant non-family member.

Occupational Socialization During College and Post-College Years

One of the basic studies in the theoretical framework of occupational socialization was begun in 1956 (Becker, Geer, Hughes and Strauss, 1961). From their detailed and lengthy data on medical students' occupational role perceptions, these researchers were able to define perspectives by which to address the role of medical schools in the training of students and how the schools function other than by providing a technical education.

Becker, Geer, Hughes, and Strauss (1961) found that freshmen medical students had an unspecified and idealistic perspective due to their previous socialization experiences and identification with significant others. The students believed medicine to be the best of all professions and they wanted to practice in order to help people. Although a comfortable living as a goal was expressed, it was not seen as a primary purpose for their career choice.

As the socialization process progressed during their freshman year, their final perspective changed to encompass the expectations of faculty. Previous perspectives were changed in order to meet the

expectations of new significant others in the social environment of medical school (Becker, Geer, Hughes and Strauss, 1961).

Based upon their observations, Becker, Geer, Hughes, and Strauss (1961) reported four demeanors--responsibility, experience, academic standing, and cooperation. All four of these demeanors involved patients, faculty and other students as significant others. Medical responsibility meant that physicians were responsible for their patients' well being. The medical experience demeanor was defined as actual clinical contact with patients and disease which differed from book knowledge. Medical students believed that experience was important and that schooling or training activities were only as good as they were able to provide experience opportunities.

The academic and cooperation demeanors described by Becker, Geer, Hughes, and Strauss (1961) involved pleasing the faculty in order to pass written examinations and tests of clinical procedures. From this academic demeanor medical students found it necessary to band together in order to get the work done that was assigned by faculty. Because many assignments were not specific as to the amount of work expected, students established and agreed upon the amount of work so that no one student would needlessly out-do the others and cause an unfavorable response from the faculty.

One of the most surprising conclusions reported by the researchers was that the medical students did not take on the professional role of physician while they were students because the system did not allow for such role. Although clinical experience was

a valued perspective and medical responsibility was agreed to be important, these values were incorporated into actual behavior only as actually needed in the context of their role as medical students. Residents, interns, and faculty physicians were always around to make decisions and to answer questions, and students were not permitted to have full responsibility. While faculty reported the medical students' attitudes as irresponsible and unprofessional in not accepting responsibility and perhaps devoting fewer hours to clinical duties than experienced physicians thought necessary, the students held quite a different perspective. The students' perspective related only to surviving as a medical student. Because the full responsibility was not actually their own, behavior suited to the role of physician was considered unnecessary and irrelevant.

In a later study, also in an institutional setting, Denzin (1966) focused on college students' significant others. He investigated two categories of significant others, role specific and orientational. His data were gathered from 67 students enrolled in an introductory sociology course at a large, midwestern state university. Twenty-six of the subjects were males and 41 were females. Forty-three were between the ages of 18 and 20 years , and 27 were over 20 years of age. Major areas of subjects' study were as follows: 3 business, 19 nursing, 10 education, 4 music, and 31 liberal arts and sciences. Forty were freshmen and sophomores, 18 were juniors and 9 were seniors.

Two open-ended questions were asked in order to identify categories of significant others. One was termed role specific and the

question asked for a list of persons whose evaluations of the subject as a student on the university campus meant the most. The other was termed orientational and merely asked for a list of persons or groups whose encouragement was most important to the respondent. Denzin (1966) found that students chose faculty in response to the question regarding their specific roles as college students more often than they chose friends, family, or students. However, in answer to the orientational question, priority was given to friends and family with faculty falling to third place.

Denzin's (1966) data support the contention that different types of others are significant to individuals based on the relationship that they had to subjects. The role specific items verified subjects' claim to the role of student while the orientational items were associated with broader aspects of the subjects' lives.

Denzin (1966) also compared lists with gender differences and with the classification of students. He found a tendency for women to choose family and friends above faculty when they were in their junior and senior years. Men also were more likely to choose family and friends as significant above faculty, but the percentages of men choosing faculty as significant did not decline among upper classmen as it did with women.

Simpson (1967) hypothesized that occupational socialization takes place in three phases. In the first phase, attention is shifted from the broad concepts that lead from choosing a profession into specific work tasks. During the second phase, significant others from within the work setting become a reference group. In the third

phase, the values of the occupational group are internalized and the person takes on the behavior prescribed by the group. Simpson tested her hypothesis on nursing students enrolled in a degree program. The school was only 3 years old and contained 57 freshmen, 21 sophomores and 17 juniors. Data were obtained from observation in the hospital, interviews, school records, questionnaires and from observations in the subjects' dormitory.

Simpson (1967) found that during the first year, students shifted their focus from patients and the humanitarian values of caring for the sick that had motivated them to choose nursing to specific skills that marked the role of a nurse. During their sophomore year, academic training was completed and clinical experience was begun. Simpson found evidence that significant others changed from patients and persons outside the occupational field of nursing to hospital personnel who were thought to be competent to judge their work. During their third year, the students' working experiences within the clinical setting provided opportunities for professional values to be grasped and the occupation of nursing to become a reference group. Simpson concluded that her hypothesis in which students shift attention from broad concepts to more specific work tasks, adopt significant others from work place as reference group, and internalize the professional behavior of the group was correct.

Becker, Geer, and Hughes (1968) studied three areas of college life and reported on the academic area. They analyzed the patterns of collective action that students develop in their academic work

under the control of faculty and administration. Their methodology was used for the investigation was participant observation in which the researchers actually went about the daily rounds of students, asking questions and seeking to capture patterns of collective action as they occur in real life.

Becker, Geer, and Hughes (1968) supported the observation that students did not assume the expected perspectives of faculty. They found that subjects assumed the role of student because they were treated as students and not as professionals engaged in professional activity.

Much of the theoretical foundation for research in the area of occupational role perception has been influenced by the work of Becker (1970) and Carper (1970). Their research has provided a theoretical basis for the study of occupational role development through socialization. Becker and Carper studied and compared three groups of graduate students in a large midwestern university. Of the three groups (physiology students, mechanical engineering students and philosophy students), the physiology students showed the most evidence of a changed occupational perception as a result of the socialization during graduate school.

The data for Becker and Carper's (1970c) study were collected by means of tape recorded interviews. Fifty subjects were randomly selected from a population of students from which female and foreign students had been eliminated in order to control for gender differences and for cultural misinterpretations. The interviewees

ranged from first year graduate students to those about ready to receive their Ph.D. degrees.

Becker and Carper (1970) found that the physiology students differed from the other groups in that they had expected, at one time in their earlier, formal education, to enter medical school and become physicians, but changed their occupational goals. The answers obtained by interviewers were different for first-year graduate physiology students than for students who were about to receive their degrees. While the former still identified themselves with goals of medical school and medicine, the latter formed sharp distinctions between themselves and physicians, and identified with a larger scientific world than just medicine.

From the results of their study, Becker and Carper (1970) were able to identify specific processes by which occupational roles are identified within the context of the four basic elements of responsibility, experience, academic standing, and cooperation. These processes are (a) the acquisition of a professional ideology and the tendency to identify oneself with an occupational title; (b) the development of a commitment to new skills and tasks; (c) investments of time and money; and, (d) the acquisition of mentors or sponsors within the occupation, interaction that strengthens identification with title and ideology.

Becker and Carper (1970) also observed that graduate students were able to participate in three different kinds of groups. Interaction within these groups provided experiences that affected self-images. The three groups were peers, professors and the formal

academic structure of the university. Each of these groups provided specific experiences with others that contributed to the four aspects of occupational role identification.

Becker and Carper (1970) reported that the first of these processes, acquisition of ideology, related to a commitment to occupational title. This mechanism for occupational role identity appeared to be closely related to interaction with informal student groups and to classroom and informal participation with teachers. When questions were raised about the worth of a chosen activity or occupational role, interaction with older students and with professors caused individuals to take the perspective of these significant others. With this new strength, graduate students could articulate reasons why their chosen field was the best of all possible choices. Becker and Carper observed this to be especially true of the physiologists and the engineers because they were more interactive with student and faculty groups on both formal and informal levels.

Becker and Carper (1970) found that commitment to a task and skills, seemed to be connected to formal classroom settings and the formal academic structure of the university. These settings placed students in contact with new methods and materials. While undergraduate instruction had presented students with facts, their graduate studies presented questions and required analysis. Graduate students were able to observe professors who used questions and analytical skills and to incorporate them into their own behavior. Thus, in the eyes of other students, graduate students became associated with a particular occupational role.

Investment of time and money was observed by Becker and Carper (1970, pp. 177-201) in the formal academic structure. Entering graduate school and paying tuition initiated the investment. Once time and money were involved, failure to follow chosen careers would have meant a loss of the investment. Philosophers and physiologists seemed to have the most to lose by failing to follow through with graduate degree programs, while engineers, having already developed a professional role identity, had very little to lose by leaving graduate school.

Becker and Carper (1970) observed the fourth mechanism, sponsorship, from a social-psychological perspective and described the complex interaction of persons involved in the process--the sponsor, the colleagues and the individual or actor who was sponsored. The sponsor felt an obligation to colleagues for the behavior of the individual; the colleagues felt responsible for their behavior toward the individual and the sponsor, and the individual felt a responsibility to meet the expectations of both the sponsor and the colleagues. Thus, the sponsor and colleagues became significant to individuals who graduated and moved up the social ladder.

The Occupational Role of Musician

In the mid 1950's, Nash (1954) investigated the vocational role of American composers. The part of his study that is relevant to the present investigation involved the determination of social and psychological factors in the life histories of his subjects. Nash chose his sample by submitting a list of 40 composers to the music

department faculty at the University of Pennsylvania asking them to rank order the names, adding to or deleting from the original list at the discretion of the faculty members. This process yielded 62 names of American composers. Nash then checked the names with membership rosters of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers and the National Institute of Arts and Letters to verify their membership. Letters were mailed to the 62 composers asking them to participate in the study. Thirty-four responded and 23 actually participated as subjects.

Nash (1954) interviewed his subjects, collecting his data by means of a wire recorder. He found that the composers were often the oldest sibling in their families; that they were independent yet passive. Composers were described as unengaged in competitive activities as children and less socially compromising. Nash found that subjects reported no conflict with their mothers.

Nash (1954) concluded that there was a closer bond among his subjects with their mothers than there was with their fathers. He described the musical fantasy of his subjects as a heritage of their mothers and said that composers' emotional life was bound to their mothers (p. 120).

Kadushin (1969) studied music students at two New York conservatories, Julliard and Manhattan. He reasoned that music students were more likely to engage in professional activity during training than were medical students because music students tend to exhibit advanced skills as musicians when they enter the programs. Kadushin's purpose, therefore, was to investigate the factors that

might be associated with a concept of professional musician during training.

Of the 700 undergraduates from all over the world who were enrolled in Julliard at the time, 70% were in the degree program (dance majors and graduate students were excluded from the sample). An education degree was not offered at either the graduate or the undergraduate level. The emphasis was on performance and upon the student-master relationship. Julliard students were more likely to have come from upper social class families and to have won competitions before entering school. Because of this factor and because they were not members of a union, they had fewer opportunities to perform professionally.

Manhattan School of Music had 500 undergraduates and 100 graduates enrolled at the time of the study. All of the students were sent questionnaires. All but 4% were enrolled in degree programs. Manhattan offered a master's degree in education and seemed to attract more students from the New York area than Julliard. Only 25% of Manhattan's students were pianists, whereas 45% of Julliard's were piano students. Manhattan's students were generally from lower social classes and were more likely to be members of unions. Therefore, they had more opportunity to engage in professional performances, such as club work than did students from Julliard (Kadushin, 1969).

Kadushin (1969) asked the music students to rate themselves on a scale, marked at intervals. The low end of the scale was labeled "music student" and the high end of the scale was labeled

"professional musician" (p. 393). He compared the students' self-ratings with their classifications or number of years they had been enrolled and their professional activity. The factors most related to their perception as professional musicians were performance experiences outside of the academic setting and the length of time they had been enrolled as a student in the music school. Professional performance was less important to future teachers. Contacts with professional musicians was more closely related to the professional concept than was a relationship with subjects' applied music teachers. Kadushin concluded that anticipatory socialization takes place only when the social structure of the school allows the student to engage in actual professional activity or to play the role that eventually will be their occupational endeavor or livelihood.

Rumbelow (1969) studied the occupational role perceptions among musicians. He wanted to determine if the role and status of musicians in the 1960's could be explained by means of social interaction (symbolic interaction) theory. Rumbelow studied musicians who were members of a local union in a city of about 400,000 population by means of a 36 item survey form. Of the 614 forms mailed to union members, only 196 were returned, or 38%. Rumbelow asked subjects to equate themselves as musicians with a list of 20 other occupations. The respondents tended to choose professional groups such as physicians, lawyers, and teachers, indicating that they believed their skill as a musician served society.

Rumbelow (1969) observed evidence that musicians interacted with persons who were musicians and with persons who were not.

Because most of the subjects were part-time musicians, this was not unexpected. He found that more than half of the subjects had means of income other than from performing. Even though only 25% actually depended on their work as professional performers for all of their income, they still viewed themselves as musicians. Identity as a musician was acquired through social interaction or successful experiences in the performing role. When asked if they favored a test of musicianship for new members, the majority of respondents indicated that they did. Rumbelow concluded that this surprisingly professional attitude was an indication of subjects' confidence regarding their personal identity as musicians.

Faulkner (1971) used another theoretical framework to study the role of musicians. He tested Marx's theory of social alienation when a skilled person such as a musician is forced to adapt to an industrialized society, as represented by the film industry, and can no longer engage in self-expression, as during training. Assuming that musicians are highly skilled craftsmen who are committed to the task of self-expression through performance, Faulkner asked questions during lengthy, tape recorded interviews with 73 commercial musicians working in Hollywood motion picture, television film, and recording industries. The questions were designed to establish the musicians' self-perception and levels of job satisfaction.

Faulkner (1971) observed that many of the string players had aspired to the role of concert performer and, in several cases, had played with professional symphony orchestras. String players

reported some dissonance in occupational roles due to less demanding parts in the commercial studio. However, they also reported the same frustration with symphony work because they saw those jobs as dead ends with little hope for adequate pay or significant input from a performer's perspective. Faulkner found that musicians were attracted to the better pay in commercial studios, even though there were no contracts and musicians were considered to be free lance or hired for each individual job or movie. Studio musicians' salaries were described as much higher than the salaries of symphony musicians or of music teachers. The higher salaries and the variety of musical challenges seemed to offset any loss in ideals among those studied.

Although Faulkner's (1971) investigation was not based upon symbolic interaction theory, it is, nevertheless, important to the present study for two reasons. First, it is one of the few studies available on musician's occupational role perceptions. Second, it showed differences among musicians in career aspirations according to the instruments that they played. String, woodwind, and French horn players had career aspirations that were more alike. Brass, saxophone, and percussion players shared similar career aspirations. Evidence of this kind among studio musicians may mean that the socialization processes and previous experiences with significant others were different for players of different instruments.

Faulkner (1973) also studied orchestral musicians who were working in a major symphony orchestra in the eastern part of the country. He collected data from taped interviews with 50 musicians,

a sample of the orchestra that included most of the wind and percussion sections plus equal proportions from string sections. Faulkner studied the personal feelings and ideas of musicians concerning mobility in the orchestral world. His perspective was not to clearly define career lines, but rather to investigate the sociological processes in regard to upward mobility, job stability and satisfaction.

The results of Faulkner's (1973) study were reported in tabulations that were based on content analyses of answers given to several structured questions asked during the interviews. Faulkner found three mechanisms at work in the socialization processes of the orchestra and lives of the musicians. Support from significant others, such as colleagues who had made similar choices, commitment to the conveniences of the local setting, and shifting of interest from high career sights to the private life all contributed to musicians' adaptation to staying in their present positions. Musicians who were less adapted and less satisfied did not report these mechanisms. Rather, they identified more with reference groups in orchestras where prestige was higher and anticipated moving up to one of these groups.

Frederickson and Rooney (1988) studied the occupational role of free-lance musicians who were professionally trained, but lacked permanent membership in any musical organization. Their reason for studying this phenomenon was to refine the concept of "non-personhood" (Goffman, 1959) or the lack of opportunity to be unique,

creative, expressive, and to have the focus of attention from others that accompanies work.

According to Frederickson and Rooney (1988), free-lance musicians work as support personnel housed in orchestra pits and are sometimes hired to perform their skill for one specific occasion. They lack the respect that accompanies permanent attachment to an organization, yet have been trained to perform as artists who expect the focused attention from their audience.

Data for Frederickson and Rooney's (1988) study were collected during formal interviews with 23 free-lance musicians as well as during informal interviews. Their study was designed to elicit responses to the concept of "free-lance classical music as a career" (p. 222). Five variables were used in the selection of participants for formal interviews: age, sex, degree of financial success, and instrumental category (string, woodwind, brass, or percussion). Subjects' ages ranged from 20 to 59 years; half were male and half were female.

Frederickson and Rooney (1988) found evidence that the free-lance musicians considered their work to be second choice, below solo performance and membership in a symphony orchestra. They gradually came to view themselves as "non-persons" or even servants. Besides this view, however, Frederickson and Rooney also found that free-lance musicians gained esteem from each other as a peer group by realizing that nobody belonged. Further, this esteem was based upon how each musician functioned within the group and involved esteem accorded to individuals according to the type of

performance for which they were hired, the size of their fees, and the perceived musical skill required to perform the task.

Frederickson and Rooney (1988) observed that although the free-lance musicians viewed themselves as "non-persons", they also developed coping skills which they used during performances. These coping skills were classified as creating a private world, playing pranks, and redefining their roles. In creating a private world down in the pit, the musicians read, wrote, knitted, whispered or, if the structure permitted, played games. Their pranks were silent and invisible to the audience but were designed to provide relief from the routine. Other pranks were for a different purpose and involved the attention of stage performers, but not the audience. The purpose of these pranks was to draw attention to the importance of the orchestra and to remind stage performers where the real power rested. Redefining the role by describing the work as a hobby or as something other than a musical performance was employed by some subjects as a coping mechanism. Other subjects redefined the role by engrossing themselves in their music rather than in the actual audience that was perceived as apathetic to their musicianship.

Frederickson and Rooney (1988) concluded that free-lance musicians were "real" persons to each other and were accepted into their own peer group on the basis of their musicianship. Thus, subjects interacted on the basis of non-personhood and by standards through which they achieved personhood within their group.

The Occupational Role of Teacher

Music educators are not alone in the matter of ambivalence in role perception among teachers. Goodlad (1984) said that teachers who specialize in their major academic field, such as English or mathematics, are likely to experience role ambivalence. Among art teachers, there is evidence of conflict in role identities (Anderson, 1981; Foley & Templeton, 1969; Szekely, 1977). Geer (1966) addressed the same issue in regard to women who choose teaching as a second occupational choice when their first preference was homemaking.

Getzels and Guba (1954) studied the role perceptions of educators who also were military officers. They found evidence of role conflict. Participants in their study included 300 officer-instructors and supervisors who provided advanced training for other officers. Although Getzels and Guba specifically studied conflict in roles and how conflict relates to teacher effectiveness, their research is relevant to this study for two reasons. First, role conflict was shown to be related to identity. If participants identified with the role of officer, they showed less conflict with work roles than did participants who identified with the role of educator. Getzels and Guba concluded that because advancement and pay scales were connected to rank as an officer and not to ability as an educator, the officer role was more congruous with the system. They also concluded that years of experience as an officer was an important factor in the resolution of conflict in role perceptions.

Lortie (1975) studied classroom teachers and their self perceptions in two geographical regions of the country. The first part of his research was done in the greater Boston area and was subtitled "Five Towns." The second part of his research was done in Dade County, Florida. The Boston sample was obtained by means of a random selection and judgment to insure that a large range of socio-economic levels were represented among the school districts where the 94 teachers were chosen for interviews. The Dade County data were collected by means of a survey in which teachers were assembled at 12 locations to fill out the questionnaire during school hours. Thus, the teachers who participated represented the normal daily attendance pattern for teachers in the school system.

Lortie (1975) found that teachers' outlook or self-perceptions changed from their student days and that teacher-training had a low impact on trainees. As a whole, teachers were critical of their professional education courses and training and felt that beginning teachers were mostly on their own when learning to cope with the demands of classroom instruction. Lortie reported that teacher training failed to force student teachers to analyze, compare and reflect and to learn to make choices based upon new knowledge gained as a result of training and socialization during formal education. Teachers who participated in Lortie's study reported that their own experiences as students (even in childhood) had influenced their self-perceptions and that they had role models or other teachers with whom they identified as a child.

Lortie (1975) suggested that teaching as an occupation is mostly guided by individualism and past traditions. His findings confirm Becker's (1952) and Geer's (1966) conclusions about the occupational role of teachers. According to Becker, promotion for most of the teachers meant that they were transferred to the school of their choice. Unlike other occupations, teachers' promotions did not mean a change in the level of work. Geer concluded that this lateral structure was related to the commitment of teachers. She suggested two reasons for this trend. First, teacher-education programs lacked long years of arduous work for entry into the profession, and; second, because candidates had already experienced years of association with schools as students, no great investment would be lost if they chose not to work as teachers after graduation. Furthermore, the work of teachers was done mostly in isolation. Their clients, the children and adolescents in their classrooms, were powerless as a social group.

Goodlad (1990) studied nearly 3,000 college students nearing completion of programs as candidates for baccalaureate degrees and teaching certifications. Using a questionnaire and more than 650 interviews, data were gathered by visiting campuses from eight of the nine census divisions of the United States, 29 research sites in all. In addition to interviews, questionnaires, and classroom observations, nine historians studied relevant documents at the research sites and prepared brief case histories. Both public and private institutions were selected, with slightly more representation

from regional, public colleges and universities and less representation from 4-year liberal arts institutions.

Goodlad (1990) found that teacher-training programs in the institutions studied failed to socialize students toward an occupational role identity. Only in the student teaching experience did Goodlad find evidence of occupational socialization during the college program, and then it was associated with the cooperating teacher and not a university professor. The subjects in Goodlad's study reported that foundations courses, such as the history and philosophy of education, were not designed to help prepare them for the task of teaching.

Goodlad (1990) reasoned that the Western cultural standard of accomplishing tasks by individual effort is a typical attitude among candidates in teacher-training. Thus, teacher trainees are not aware of each other as a class composed of individuals who have endured the rigors of training together and merged victorious. He concluded that the transition from student to teacher seemed to be more a task-centered or occupational change than an attitude or intellectual change. Second, ideas about classroom management and teaching techniques were grasped by trainees more often than the broader theoretical basis for inquiry and knowledge of alternative approaches. Students were better able to acquire teaching skills through experience due to the effect of socialization (or lack of it) in training programs.

The Occupational Role of Music Educator

White (1964) studied the social characteristics and occupational role of public school music teachers in the United States. His questions were concerned with music teachers' (a) social origin, (b) social mobility, (c) gender differences, (d) role models who influenced career choice, (e) reasons for occupational choice, (f) reasons for leaving the profession, and (g) occupational role behavior and social environment of situations (p. 5). White mailed 2,000 questionnaires to music teachers in randomly chosen states, two for each geographical region of the country as determined by Music Educators' National Conference. The states chosen were New York and Delaware, Indiana and Iowa, Alaska and Idaho, Florida and Tennessee, Oklahoma and New Mexico, and Nevada and Arizona. Of the 2,000 questionnaires sent, White used the first 1,000 responses in his study.

The results of White's (1964) investigation showed that almost 37% of the teachers had a desire to become professional musicians. When asked why they had not pursued a career as a musician, 30% gave lack of ability as the reason and 20% cited economic insecurity as the reason. Of the 1,000 subjects who participated, only 91 had 5 years or less of experience as a music teacher and almost 50% had advanced degrees. Perhaps the finding from White's study most relevant to this investigation is his finding that new music teachers were usually recruited into the occupation by another music teacher.

Based upon the data gathered, White (1964) concluded that the social origin of music teachers was from upper-lower and lower-

middle classes, predominantly White, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant backgrounds. Music teachers seemed to be geographically stable, but socially, upward mobile. The men were younger, had better salaries, were usually instrumentalists, had attained higher educational degrees, but originated from lower social classes than the women. White noted that the music teachers chose their occupation because they loved music and desired to work with children. They believed that their work served humankind and transmitted cultural heritage to their students. White pointed out that as purveyors of traditional aesthetic values in society through the schools, music teachers' role is a part of the core-value system of society and, therefore, is resistant to change. White also emphasized that the personal role perceptions of music teachers were important for their impact in the future. Because the music teachers studied tended to be somewhat homogeneous as a group, White concluded that they were inclined to perpetuate their own values.

L'Roy (1983) studied music education majors at the University of North Texas. In her research, which was based upon the work of Becker and Carper (1970), she analyzed the training and socialization process of schooling in three major areas: (a) the identification of occupational norms and values of undergraduate music education majors, (b) the determination of commitment of undergraduate music education majors to specific skills and knowledge, and (c) the determination of undergraduate music education majors' career commitments (p. 6). Questionnaires were sent to 273 students and returned by 165. Students were classified as freshman, sophomore,

junior, or senior by the number of hours they had completed. The study was enhanced and clarified by 38 interviews with students who volunteered.

The most frequently chosen title among subjects was performer. Music education was often chosen as a major because it offered stability of employment that performing as an occupation did not. Students also ranked performing as their first choice of professional activity. When the ranking of role labels were compared by class year, the title of performer or musician increased by year from the first to the fourth. Freshmen were more apt to choose the titles of choir director or band director than were upper classmen. Training seemed to decrease choice of labels. Freshmen who had experience as high school students in conducting seemed more likely to choose the titles of band director and choir director.

L'Roy (1983) reported differences in respondents based on their area of music speciality. Students who specialized in stringed instruments were the most likely to choose performer as a title and indicated that they planned to perform as a professional activity. They chose music education as a major because of perceived economic needs. Band and choir students also tended to choose performer and performing as professional titles and tasks, but perceived reaching these goals within a school setting.

L'Roy (1983) concluded that symbolic interaction theory is a viable paradigm for research in the field of occupational role perception in music education. She confirmed the developmental process of socialization resulting from the interaction of students,

faculty, and the university environment in explaining the role perceptions of music education majors on one university campus. She found very little commitment to a professional ideology of music education.

Roberts (1990) studied music education students at 5 Canadian universities over a period of 18 months. His data, collected by means of participant observation and interviews, were purely qualitative. He investigated the role perception known to students as musician. Because music faculty at Canadian universities seemed to specify goals in terms of preparing students as musicians as higher priority than preparing them as teachers, Roberts saw a need to study music education students' understanding of the title musician and the symbolic meaning of this title in their interaction with other students, with faculty, and with outsiders.

Roberts (1990) found that his subjects believed that persons cannot merely borrow knowledge about music. Instead, a person must actually be a musician in order to function as a music teacher. His research supported L'Roy's (1983) findings in that status was gained in a music school for ability to function in the role of musician-performer. L'Roy had reported that seniors were more likely to identify with the title of performer than were freshmen. Roberts confirmed that students saw themselves as players of instruments, such as trombone player or pianist, rather than as educators or teachers. Roberts concluded that these titles followed music education students even after they entered their chosen schools of education.

In a later study, Roberts (1993a) investigated music education majors from 1987 to 1990. From his previous work (Roberts, 1990, 1991), Roberts had concluded that music education students appear to seek an identity as musician-performer based upon the social reality of music schools (Berger & Luckman, 1966). He had further concluded that this social identity rested upon the reactions of others. Therefore, his more recent research was an attempt to investigate who those others might be.

Roberts (1993a), adapting a methodology based upon the research of Glaser and Strauss' (1967), conducted extensive interviews with music education students. Analysis was done between interview sets so that one set of interviews could provide information for the next. In addition to this approach, Roberts also used participant observation techniques which he described as rather passive; he observed social behavior in the music school lounge and in classes.

Roberts (1993a) found that music schools had their own social climates and were somewhat set apart from the rest of the university. Although interviewees reported interaction with others in their same classification by year in school, most of their identity as musicians or performers was achieved by interaction with instrumental reference groups. In the case of singers, the voices were their instruments. Applied music teachers were reported as significant others, as were ensemble directors.

Roberts (1993a) acknowledged that the interviewees were mostly successful music education majors and, therefore, were

unable to provide all of the information necessary to understand fully the social reality of the music schools. However, he interviewed some students who had dropped out of the music education programs. The evidence provided by these students was also supportive of the claim that performing successfully and becoming known as a musician in the eyes of other music students was necessary for positive identification and interaction within a music school.

Roberts, Brennan, Dundas, Walsh, and Warren (1993b) studied music students at the Memorial University of Newfoundland, the University of Toronto, and several Canadian high schools where music students had made applications for admission to music degree programs (N=120 questionnaires and 42 interviews). The investigation was divided into two parts, a general survey and interviews. Three questions were asked of each subject. First, why did you choose to major in music in a college level degree program? Second, what persons or groups have positively influenced you to make your decision? Third, what negative influences have you experienced and overcome while you were making your decision?

The subjects indicated that they chose to major in music because they loved music, had been constantly involved with music from childhood, and had excelled in music as a school subject. Music education majors said that they wanted to work with children. The persons that the subjects mentioned as having the strongest influence on their decision were private music teachers, family members (especially mothers), school music teachers. Although the

responses to the question concerning negative influences were few, school music teachers (band directors and choir directors) were mentioned.

Roberts et al. (1993b) concluded that the private music teacher was the person who most influenced music students to choose a music major. Because performance ability is a major factor of consideration in admission to university music programs, private music teachers' influence on students is considerable. Performance ability was valued by all persons concerned with career decisions.

Clinton (1991), on the other hand, reported that although music teachers valued performance tasks, they were committed to the task of teaching. His subjects valued performance skills because they believed these skills helped them as music teachers.

Clinton (1991), studying the self-perceptions of certified fine arts teachers in selected Oklahoma public schools, used Becker and Carper's (1970) design for the study of occupational role perceptions to study the implications of occupational titles and ideologies. Participating in the study were 72 fine arts teachers from 8 schools. The 8 schools were selected because they were all 5A high schools and, therefore, staffed fine arts teachers in each of the areas of art, drama, and music. Of the 72 participants, 31 were music teachers, 22 were art teachers, and 19 were drama teachers. Using biographic data sheets and taped interviews, Clinton examined his results using content analysis. He reported data in tables that illustrated the comparisons between the 3 groups of teachers.

Clinton's (1991) results yielded some significant differences between the groups of teachers. Art teachers preferred the title of artist or educator-artist, whereas drama and music teachers preferred the title of either educator-artist or educator. Only a few selected the term artist-performer. Art and drama teachers considered the time spent in activities of professional artists was valuable to them even though it was not related to teaching. Music teachers, on the other hand, reported strong influence from within the music education profession and indicated that while artistic development was important to them, it was valuable mostly because it helped them in their teaching. Art and drama teachers selected other educators, professional artists, and persons outside these areas as reference groups, and music teachers selected other music educators as reference groups. The majority of teachers in all three groups felt that teachers had a good social standing, but perceived their own status as lower than that of artists/performers.

Clinton (1991) found that his results tended to contradict previous research in that music teachers were portrayed as "frustrated performers" (p. 107). His investigation indicated that music teachers labeled themselves as educators first and performers second. While some of the music teachers also had part-time playing jobs, as a group, they reported that they would choose teaching over playing if they were forced to make such a choice. Actually, they enjoyed both.

Evidence for an ambivalence of music teachers' occupational role was not as apparent in Harris' (1991) investigation. Harris

studied the relationship between the role identification of college-level music teachers and their level of job satisfaction. He selected his subjects randomly from a pool of college music teachers who were listed in the College Music Society Directory and were working at doctoral degree granting institutions accredited by National Association of Schools of Music. Of the 332 randomly chosen college music teachers, 227 returned the 50-item questionnaire.

The questionnaire used by Harris (1991) was designed to measure job satisfaction by comparing the amount of time spent on tasks with the amount of enjoyment respondents received from each category of tasks. These enjoyment data were then combined to form what Harris called a "predilection profile" for each respondent (Herzberg, 1976; Kuhlen, 1976; Lawler, 1976; p. 44). The results were confirmed with follow-up interviews.

Harris (1991) found that respondents who identified with the role of teacher also showed more intrinsic satisfaction with such job-related tasks as administrative duties, grading papers, attending meetings and advising students. Respondents who identified more closely with the occupational role of musician showed less satisfaction with tasks of this category. Harris noted that most college music teachers identified with the role of performer and that their choice of the role of teacher did not appear to increase much with increased years of experience. Only college music teachers who had public school experience tended to identify with the role of teacher. All of the subjects reported high levels of enjoyment with tasks that were termed scholarly or creative. Perhaps the most

significant information reported by Harris was that the teacher role identification rather than the area of specialization was the factor that contributed most to overall job satisfaction. The majority of the music teachers in Harris' study seemed to enjoy music more than they enjoyed teaching.

Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter shows evidence that the process of occupational socialization begins before formal training and education. Significant others are a part of primary and secondary socialization processes. Not all persons who interact with children are equally significant. Evidence from the literature suggests that fathers may be more influential in matters regarding occupations and that mothers influence subjects in less specific aspects of social development. Although parents are most significant, there is evidence that other family members and non-family members influence individuals during childhood and adolescence. Collectively, the literature on significant others and their interaction during pre-college years suggests a need for further research which considers gender differences in analysis of data. The literature also suggests that individuals are generally able to point to specific persons as influential in various areas of their lives.

Early studies on occupational socialization and the process of identifying with a profession were not only been influenced by the symbolic interactionists (Cooley, 1922; Dewey, 1922; Mead, 1934), but also by the writing of Hughes (1958), who said that training

should make a difference in the socialization of individuals toward occupational roles. The questions have clustered around how individuals acquire the necessary social knowledge to survive in their chosen fields and whether it is possible to systematically document evidence of interaction with self and others who are significant in the social environment.

Considerable evidence has been presented to support the concept that candidates who are training to enter an occupational field do not take on the entire role perspective until training is completed and they actually enter the work arena and assume total responsibility for the tasks. However, there is little indication of the identity of the persons who influenced candidates throughout their entire life-time.

The evidence from research on occupational socialization within the teaching professions indicates that undergraduate training programs fail to socialize students toward the occupational role of educator. Goodlad (1990) observed that professional education programs failed to socialize students toward an occupational role identity as teacher. Instead, students identified with whatever role they were actually experiencing and adapted to the social environment around them. In regard to significant others, Goodlad (1990) found evidence among subjects that cooperating teachers influenced their student-teachers. The strongest evidence of the influence of significant others, however, was subjects' statements about their grade school teachers.

There is considerable evidence within the literature that music educators choose their major field based upon values and socialization processes that involve significant others from areas of musicianship and performance as well as teaching and education. Many music educators also work as free-lance musicians. The overriding implication from the literature concerning the role of musician is that the musicians develop a role concept based upon the experiences in which they were working at the time they were studied. Evidence also suggested that previous experiences continued to contribute to the role perceptions of the subjects. It is not clear from the literature how or when significant others influenced subjects' occupational role concepts.

Most of the research in the area of music education has involved college students who were majoring in music education. From these examples, it is evident that the social environment of music schools creates more opportunities for students to function in the role of performer than in the role of educator. Therefore, significant others who influence students choices are likely to be other performers and applied music faculty. No research has been done to address the role of significant others in pre-college years. Subjects who were influenced by private music teachers during pre-college years may be influenced by applied music instructors in college. The discrepancies in the literature show a need for more study on music educators' occupational role perceptions and research that will define the significant others and the developmental periods when their influence begins.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of influential persons in music teachers' professional socialization as musicians and educators. The problems were: (a) to determine who had most contributed to subjects' involvement in music during pre-college years; had most encouraged subjects as musicians during their college years; had most encouraged subjects during their pre-college and college years to think of themselves as future teachers; had most influenced subjects during post-college years in the roles of musician and teacher; and, (b) to determine interrelationships between gender and teaching specializations and the subjects' responses to the questions under (a). All methodological considerations will be discussed in chronological order, including all pilot studies.

Pilot Studies

The pilot studies focused on: (a) interviews with teachers and music education students, using an open-ended questionnaire; (b) development of a questionnaire from results of interviews; (c) piloting and revision of the questionnaire.

Informal Interviews

Informal interviews (Appendix A) were conducted with 5 music educators who agreed to participate in the first phase of the pilot study. They were an elementary general music teacher, a junior-senior high school choir director, a junior high school band director, a high school band director and a college level band director. The purposes of the interviews were: (a) to study the language needed that would elicit responses from music teachers regarding the persons who influenced them towards the roles of musician and educator; (b) to study the feasibility of undertaking the investigation; and (c) to learn how to separate questions into life-cycle phases. All of the interviews were conducted at the convenience of the subjects.

All of the teachers worked in the state of Arkansas and all of them had at least three years of teaching experience. With only one exception, all of the participants taught only music classes or directed musical ensembles. The duties of one music teacher who taught at a church-related, private academy included coaching a softball team and teaching a Bible class.

The teachers who agreed to be interviewed were diverse in their specialties. The elementary generalist was an accomplished clarinetist. She also played alto recorder and was certified in Orff techniques. The secondary-level choir director was a baritone and a guitarist, and performed regularly in the central Arkansas area. The junior high band director, a woodwind specialist, played with a jazz

band. The high school band director was a brass specialist and director of a community band. Finally, the college level band director, a woodwind specialist, performed with a jazz combo.

The music teachers were asked broad questions on who influenced them in the areas of music and education during childhood, during college, and after college. It was during this phase of the study that the term significant other was replaced with the term influential person. The first part of the interview focused upon childhood experiences related both to family (primary socialization), and to school (secondary socialization). Later in the interview, the discussion was focused upon college training years and post-college years.

The interviews confirmed the concept that influential persons are related to the life-cycles of music teachers. Participants were able to remember specific persons who had influenced their study of music in childhood, and, in a few cases, had encouraged them to pursue teaching as a career. It was also noted that the participating music teachers could recall their initial introduction to music, but had difficulty doing the same in regard to teaching and education.

As a result of the informal interviews just described, additional interviews were conducted, using 5 music education majors who were in the second semester of their freshman year at Harding University in Searcy, Arkansas. These interviews were done during one class period and all questions focused only on influential persons from childhood. The two areas of involvement (music and education)

were discussed for the purpose of confirming what had been observed among the 5 previously interviewed music teachers: that influential persons from primary and secondary socialization processes during childhood and specifically related to music involvement were more easily remembered than persons specifically influential in regard to teaching and education.

During childhood, all participants' mothers and fathers encouraged them to become involved with music. School ensemble directors were mentioned in all cases, sometimes significant for both music and education. During training or college years, ensemble directors had become important to the teachers interviewed. All subjects had been influenced by an applied music instructor and 3 of the 5 mentioned a music education instructor. Interestingly, all of the teachers recalled other classroom teachers as role models with whom they were working during the post-college years. Other influential persons mentioned were Arkansas School Band and Orchestra Association (ASBOA) members, Arkansas Choral Directors Association (ArkCDA) members, other ensemble directors, students' parents and their own students.

Development of Questionnaire

Based upon the information gathered during the interviews and examples of previous research in other fields of study involving significant others and occupational choice, a questionnaire was developed and mailed to 10 music teachers. Of the 10 mailed, 7

were returned and considered usable. All but two of the teachers who returned the questionnaire, were certified music educators working in the state of Arkansas. The other two were certified and working in Texas. The purpose of this second phase in the research was to gather more information for the final questionnaire that would be used during the main study (Haller & Woelfel, 1972; Oleson & Whittaker, 1968; Woelfel, 1972).

The 7 music teachers, 4 male and 3 female, who returned the form represented a variety of specialties and experiences. Three were vocal-choral specialists (one K-12th grades, one 7-12 grades, one 10-12 plus college). Three were band directors and brass specialists, but working with different levels (7-12 grades, 6-12 grades, college level). One was a string specialist whose experience included all levels of instruction (K-college).

The questionnaire was divided into four sections (Appendix B): background information, pre-college years (childhood adolescence), college years and, post-college or working years. Each of the research problems were addressed by items included in the four sections.

Figure 1 lists the specific items on the questionnaire for each research problem. The first part of the questionnaire involved the identification of individual profiles of each music teacher by gender, degrees held, years of experience and area of specialization. This personal information section preceded the items that specifically addressed the research problems

Figure 1

<u>Pilot Questionnaire Items for Research Problems 1-4</u>	
<u>Individual Profiles</u>	<u>Items</u>
Profiles of music teachers: gender, degrees held, years of teaching experience, teaching specialization, and levels.	1. What degrees do you hold? 2. How many years have you been teaching? 3. What is your area of specialty? 4. What is your gender? 5. On what educational level/s do you teach?
<u>Research Problem 1</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who contributed to subjects' involvement with music during pre-college years.	Childhood: 1. Did you have a family member who worked as one or more of the following? ___Yes, ___No. Check all that apply. ___Music teacher/educator ___Teacher/educator ___Musician/performer 2. Who most encouraged you to sing or play an instrument during childhood? 4. Did your ability to perform (play/sing) as a child seem to please someone close to you? 6. Did you experience discouragement from any of the above people for your interest in music? Adolescence: 8. During adolescent years, who influenced you most to continue playing your instrument or singing? 10. Who encouraged you as a young musician? 12. Did anyone help you to see yourself in the role of a musician during adolescence? 14. Did you feel that an influential person discouraged your interest in music as an adolescent?
<u>Research Problem 2</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who encouraged subjects as musicians during college years.	16. Who most influenced you to major in music? 18. Did anyone affirm your claim to the title of musician/performer during college? 20. Did anyone serve as role model for you as a musician/performer? 22. Did anyone discourage you as a music major during college years?
<u>Research Problem 3</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who encouraged subjects towards teaching during pre-college and college years.	Childhood: 1. Did you have a family member who worked as one or more of the following? ___Yes, ___No. Check all that apply. ___Music teacher/educator

Figure 1 continued

	<p>___Teacher/educator</p> <p>___Musician/performer</p> <p>3. As a child, did someone encourage you to become a teacher?</p> <p>5. Was your getting a college education encouraged or valued by someone close to you?</p> <p>7. Did you experience discouragement from any of the above people for your interest in education?</p> <p>Adolescence:</p> <p>9. During adolescent years, who influenced you most to think about becoming a teacher?</p> <p>11. Who encouraged you to think of yourself as a future teacher?</p> <p>13. Did anyone help you to see yourself in the role of a teacher during adolescence?</p> <p>15. Did you feel that any influential person discouraged your interest in education as an adolescent?</p> <p>17. Who most influenced you to certify to become a teacher?</p> <p>19. Did anyone affirm your claim to the title of teacher/educator during college years?</p> <p>21. Did anyone serve as a role model for you as teacher/educator?</p> <p>23. Did anyone discourage you as a future teacher/educator during college years?</p>
Research Problem 4	Items
Persons who influenced subjects towards roles of musician and educator during post-college years.	<p>Musician:</p> <p>24. Does anyone affirm your claim to the title of musician/performer?</p> <p>26. Who has served as role model to you as a musician/performer?</p> <p>28. During faculty meetings or in-service training sessions, who affirms you as a musician?</p> <p>30. Who causes you to doubt yourself as a musician/performer?</p> <p>Educator:</p> <p>25. Does anyone affirm your claim now to the title of teacher/educator?</p> <p>27. Who has served as a role model to you as teacher/educator?</p> <p>29. During faculty meetings or in-service training sessions who affirms you as a teacher?</p> <p>31. Who causes you to doubt yourself as a teacher/educator?</p>

Above each section on the questionnaire (pre-college years, college years, and post-college years), a list of possible choices for influential persons was given so that subjects could more easily understand that only role examples were needed as responses and not names of individuals. The lists were categorized under headings of relatives, directors, teachers, instructors, administrators and others.

Each questionnaire was analyzed and scored by first counting the number of different roles for influential persons listed by respondents and then by placing the responses under the various categories according to the catalog of terms (Appendix C). For example, if a subject indicated brother as a response to an item, brother would fall under the term sibling in the coding of terms. When the same response was given for an influential person toward one role, e.g. musician on items 2 regarding musical encouragement, and item 4 relating musical performance to the pleasure of important persons, it was counted only once. Thus, the same influential person (e.g. brother) was counted only one time per section during the scoring process even though the subject may have listed the person on several items. If brother had been listed again in response to item 5, however, it would have been counted again, but for the role of teacher. Another example of this analysis occurred when a subject listed a band director as an influential person for both roles of musician and teacher. The term band director is listed under ensemble director in the catalog of terms. Ensemble director was

then counted as influential for both roles and scored in two categories. The same procedure was followed in the main study.

The terms for coding the responses (Appendix C) were chosen for two reasons. First, they were based upon the theoretical framework of Berger and Luckman (1966), Brim (1966), Denzin (1977), Elkin (1960), Stryker (1959) and Sullivan (1953) discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Second, they were chosen as a result of the pilot study interviews. Tables 1 illustrates the frequencies of the responses according to each category.

The 7 pilot study questionnaires were scored by 2 raters, each working independently of the other. The results were compared for differences. The scoring was done by recording exactly what subjects reported, and 100 percent agreement was obtained. To control for bias during the main study, two individuals filled out tally sheets and frequencies for each listing in items 6-29 of the questionnaire. Separate tally sheets (Appendix F) were used by each rater so that the second rater would not have access to the results of the first rater. Neither of the raters made qualitative judgements when tallying the results, but were instructed to code exactly what each subject wrote on the questionnaires. Two different persons were hired to check the work of rater 1 for accuracy and to correct items where information had been overlooked. A person was also hired to check the work of rater 2 for accuracy and to include any information omitted by rater 2. When this was accomplished, the two tally sheets were compared, item by item. Of the 310

questionnaires, there were only 11 that had an inconsistency. These inconsistencies were corrected by means of conference with the raters.

Qualitative analysis was necessary in regard to placing influential persons into life-cycle stages during the pilot studies. Only one subject listed a parent (mother) after the pre-college years in the pilot study. For the analysis of the data, this response was considered a part of pre-college years or primary socialization. This same subject had already listed mother as influential in the childhood section of the questionnaire. Therefore, parent (mother) was counted only once. This procedure was modified on the main study so that each category was scored only once per life-cycle segment. Therefore, mother could be counted again as an influential person for another life cycle phase, giving a more complete profile for each phase of socialization. This was important since some persons remained significant to an individual across the entire life-cycle.

The response of husband, wife, or spouse on the pilot study questionnaire was considered to be a part of secondary socialization as discussed in Chapter 1. Individuals have no control over who is included in social interaction during primary socialization. This characteristic does not apply to choosing a spouse. Therefore, this response was coded as a part of the life-cycle for college and post-college years (Berger and Luckman, 1966).

Comparison of Contributions of Influential Persons Across Life-Cycle Phases

Research problem 6, the determination of interrelationships between gender and teaching specializations and the subjects' responses to the influences on their respective roles as teachers and musicians, required both qualitative and quantitative evaluation. The catalog of coding terms (Appendix C) has already been described. From the responses on the pilot study, terms like band director, orchestra director and choral director were coded as ensemble director. Mother and father were listed as parents, but were they reported separately. Brother and sister were coded as siblings. Any use of the first person form of I was listed as self along with responses of myself and me. Private music teacher was the coding term for any one of such responses as violin teacher, voice teacher, or clarinet teacher. History, math, or English teachers were examples of responses coded as teachers. Instructors of theory, history, literature, ear training or conducting were listed under other music instructor. Principal and superintendent were coded as administrators.

Because the questions specifically addressed persons influential for the role of musician on the one hand and for the role of teacher on the other hand, the evaluation was a matter of totaling the codings for all responses. Table 1 shows the results of this process. The raw frequency scores for the pilot study are included in Appendix D. In Table 1, the lists reflect the coded responses for persons who had encouraged subjects toward music and teaching

Table 1

Rank Order of Influential Persons for Roles of Musician and Educator
During Pre-College Years

Childhood				Adolescence			
Musician		Teacher		Musician		Teacher	
parent	6	grandparent	2	ens. dir.	6	ens. dir.	3
pvt. mus. tea.	3	self	2	parent	5	self	2
grandparent	1	parent	1	peers	3	parent	1
self	1	pvt.mu.tea.	-*	pvt.mu.tea.	3	pvt. mu. tea.	-*
brother	1	brother	-	contest judge	1	contest judge	-
gd. sch. tea.	1	gd.sch.tea.	-	other tea.	1	other tea.	-
				self	1	peers	-

Note: N=7

* indicates no response

during their childhood or adolescent years. The figures in the column for music give the total number of subjects who reported persons as having encouraged them to become involved with music during childhood or adolescence. The figures listed in the column for teaching indicate the total number of subjects who could remember persons who encouraged them during adolescence. Thus, 5 of the subjects credited one parent with having encouraged them to become involved with music and 1 subject acknowledged parental encouragement during adolescence toward becoming a teacher.

In Tables 2 and 3, the left column contains the list of coded responses regarding persons who had encouraged the subjects

toward the roles of musician and educator, respectively. Similarly, Table 2 describes the college years and Table 3 refers to the post-college years.

As can be seen from the tables, music teachers in the pilot study named few persons who encouraged them to begin thinking of themselves as teachers during childhood or pre-college years. Pilot study data also indicated that the professional socialization toward the role of music educator among the participants was a life-long process. Because pilot study subjects reported more influential persons toward the role of teacher at a later time in the life-cycle as opposed to early evidence of encouragement toward musician, the teacher aspect of the ambivalence could have developed after the role of musician.

For women, the private music teacher had been considered as an influential person by all of the subjects in the pilot study. Among the men, however, only 1 subject reported a private music teacher as an influential person. Two women reported ensemble director as an influential person for the role of musician and all 4 of the men reported an ensemble director as an influential person for the occupational role of teacher. Three of the men listed ensemble director for both roles.

Interrelationships Between Gender and Teaching Specializations and the Subjects' Responses to the Influences on Their Roles

For the purpose of analyzing research problem 6, the interrelationships between gender and teaching specializations and

Table 2

Rank Order of Support During College Yrs.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Musician</u>		<u>Teacher</u>
other music stu.	6	mu. ed. inst.	5
applied music inst.	5	ensemble dir.	5
ensemble dir.	4	other mus. inst.	3
self	2	other mus. stu.	2
best friend	1	coop. teacher	2
other music ed. stu.	1	first students	1
coop. teacher	1	best friend	1

Note: N=7

Table 3

Rank Order of Support During Post-College Yrs.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Musician</u>		<u>Educator</u>
other mu. teachers	5	self	7
spouse	5	other mu. teachers	6
former applied inst.	2	spouse	5
former ens. dir.	1	other classroom tea.	4
self	1	administrator	4
		students' parents	3
		friends	2
		students	2

Note: N=7

the subject's responses to the influences on their roles as teachers and musicians, the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test for significance was used in the pilot studies. This test was chosen because it does not require mutually exclusive groups (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1988). Since this study dealt with influential persons in two categories (musician and teacher) for the same subjects, the Wilcoxon test was appropriate. Results of the Wilcoxon tests for pilot studies are shown in Tables 4 and 5. Because pilot study subjects numbered only 7, the gender and specialization groups were not separated as they were for the main study, but the same procedure was used.

The null hypothesis for the Wilcoxon tests stated that there was no difference in frequencies for persons called influential for the roles of musician and teacher, respectively, across life-cycles. In samples that number more than 25 subjects, the Wilcoxon test approaches the normal distribution and the test statistic must be less than .05 for a one-tailed test of significance (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1988).

Table 4 shows the Wilcoxon test results when comparisons were made for support toward the role of musician across the life-cycle phases. Only one value was significant. As can be seen, the numbers of persons who encouraged subjects towards music during childhood were significantly different from the number of persons who encouraged subjects toward music during college years. Table 5 shows that the differences in the number of influential persons

toward the role of teacher during childhood and adolescence, compared with college and post-college years were significant.

Table 4

Wilcoxon Test Values-Support for the Role of Musician Across Life Cycle

<u>Role of:</u>	<u>Musician During College</u>	<u>Musician During Post-College</u>
Influential persons for role of musician-childhood	.045*	.088
Influential persons for role of musician-adolescence	.102	.264

*Significant at the .05 level

Main Study

Barring some minor changes, the research design and procedure for the main study were the same as described in the pilot study: (a) the sample of teachers was determined; (b) the questionnaires were mailed to the subjects chosen in the sampling process; (c) the data were analyzed; and (d) 50 of the subjects were interviewed to verify the data analysis.

Determining the Sample of Teachers

A list of all the music teachers in Arkansas was obtained from Market Data Retrieval Service, Shelton, Connecticut. According to the

Table 5

Wilcoxon Test Values for Influential Persons for the Role of Teacher
Across Life-Cycle

<u>Role of:</u>	<u>Teacher During College</u>	<u>Teacher During Post-College</u>
Influential persons for the role of teacher during childhood	.009*	.027*
Influential persons for the role of teacher during adolescence	.009*	.009*

*Significant at the .05 level

list, 1,000 music teachers were working in public and private schools in Arkansas during the school year 1992-1993. Of that number, 36% were elementary music teachers, 34% were band directors, 28% were choral directors and a little over 1% were orchestra directors. Approximately 49% of the music teachers were male and 51% were female. A stratified, random sample of 50% (500 subjects) were chosen for this study. One hundred-eighty individuals within the sample were elementary specialists, 170 band directors, 140 choral directors, and 8 subjects were orchestra directors. Women numbered 255, and men numbered 245.

Each music teacher was given a four-digit code number from 0001 to 1342. A table of random numbers, generated by a computer, was used to choose the sample subjects in the following manner: (a) 4 numbers (2, 3, 4 and 5) written on slips of paper were folded and placed in a hat; (b) the slip with a 4 was drawn from the hat; (c) beginning at a random position on the table of numbers, subjects were chosen that matched the numbers on the computer table using the interval drawn from the hat. This meant that two numbers were skipped between each random selection from the table of numbers. This process continued until the percentages were chosen for each category of music teachers described earlier in the chapter. When a number on the random table matched a potential subject who had already been chosen or who fell into a gender or specialty category that had already been filled, the next name below or the next name above was selected. If neither of these could be used for the same reasons, the selection process moved to the next random number from the table.

Mailing the Questionnaire

As a result of the pilot study, some changes were made to the questionnaire (Appendix G). The items were renumbered from 1 to 29; numbers 1-5 were background information, 6-11 childhood years, 12-15 adolescent years, 16-23 college years, and 24-29 were for post-college years. Each section contained items that asked

subjects to rank-order influential persons' contributions to their socialization process. The complete, final form of the questionnaire is found in Appendix G.

In January of 1994, the questionnaires were sent to the stratified, random sample described above. Each envelope contained a questionnaire form, a cover letter (Appendix E), and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. A second mailing was done approximately two weeks after the first, and was sent only to subjects who had not already returned the form. Follow-up reminders were sent approximately one week after the second mailing. Of the 500 questionnaires mailed, 314 were returned. Four of the 314 were not usable, leaving 310 subjects (62%).

Analyzing the Data

The questionnaires were analyzed in the same way as was demonstrated in the pilot studies with one added procedure. Each section on the questionnaire contained items where subjects were asked to rank-order their responses (1, 2, and 3) for the purpose of determining consistency with the frequency tables. The results of this process are discussed in Chapter 4. For research problem 1, the data from items 1-5 were coded and tabulated using the Microvax 3600 computer and SPSS-X. The subjects were coded according to gender, music specialty, degrees held, years of experience and teaching levels.

Figure 2 shows how each research problem was addressed by the questionnaire (Appendix G). For items 6 through 29, the frequencies for each category were determined (Appendices K, L, M, N, and O). Data from these items were used to address research problems 1 through 4. For research problem 5, the frequency tabulations for all response codings also were examined by the Wilcoxon test for significance as described in the pilot study.

The qualitative analysis of the data was described in detail within the context of the pilot studies. Appendix C, the catalog of terms shows a listing of how the information from the questionnaire was collapsed into broader categories for the purpose of reporting the scored frequencies. By analyzing each life-cycle segment individually, the need for qualitative judgement concerning primary and secondary socialization did not arise. The tally sheets, therefore, accurately reflected the information obtained from the subjects.

Interviews

Subjects for the 50 interviews (Figure 3) were chosen from a list of teachers who had returned their questionnaires. Twenty-five of the teachers chosen for the interviews were male and 25 were female. The interviews were done by telephone and during the day when teachers were at school but not responsible for students. Therefore, more than one telephone call was necessary in order to schedule and to conduct the interview. The purpose of the interviews was to verify the qualitative data. A form was used for

Figure 2

<u>Questionnaire Items for Research Problems 1, 2, 3, and 4</u>	
<u>Individual Profiles</u>	<u>Items</u>
Profiles of music teachers: gender, degrees held, years of teaching experience, teaching specialization and levels.	1. What degrees do you hold? 2. How many years have you been teaching? 3. What is your area of specialty? 4. What is your gender? 5. On what level/s do you teach?
<u>Research Problem 1</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who contributed to subjects' involvement in music during pre-college years.	Childhood: 6. Who most encouraged you to become involved with music during childhood? 6b. If any of these persons were involved music, who were they? 8. If your ability to perform as a child seemed to please someone close to you, who was it? 10. If you experienced discouragement from anyone for your interest in music, who was it? Adolescence: 12. If anyone encouraged your interest in music during adolescence, who was it? 14. If you felt that someone discouraged your interest in music during adolescence, who was it?
<u>Research Problem 2</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who encouraged subjects musicians during college years.	16. Who influenced you most to major in as music? 18. If anyone helped you to think of yourself as a musician/performer during your college years, who was it? 20. Who served as role model for you as a musician/performer? 22. If anyone discouraged you as a music major during college years, who was it?
<u>Research Problem 3</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who encouraged subjects towards teaching during pre-college and college years.	Childhood: 7. Who most encouraged you to develop an interest in becoming a teacher during your childhood? 7b. If any of these persons were teachers, who were they? 9. If pursuing teaching as a future career was encouraged by someone close to you, who expressed it most? 11. If you experineced discouragement from anyone for your interest in teacher education, who was it?

Figure 2 continued

	Adolescence:
	13. If anyone encouraged your interest in becoming a teacher during adolescence, who was it?
	15. If you felt that someone discouraged your interest in becoming a teacher during adolescence, who was it?
	College Years:
	17. Who influenced you to pursue teacher certification?
	19. If anyone helped you to think of yourself as teacher/educator during college years, who was it?
	21. Who served as a role model for you as a future teacher/educator?
	23. If anyone discouraged you as a future a future teacher/educator during college years, who was it?
<hr/>	
Research Problem 4	
Support for Role of Musician	Post-College Years
	24. If anyone supports your view of yourself as a musician/performer, who is it?
	26. Who causes you to doubt yourself as a musician/performer?
	28. Please list in rank order those persons who influence you most in your present role as a musician.
Support for Role of Teacher	
	25. If anyone supports your view of yourself as teacher/educator, who is it?
	27. Who causes you to doubt yourself as a teacher?
	29. Please list in rank order those persons who influenced you most in your present role as an educator.

the interviews regarding the content (Appendix G) and a tally sheet (Appendix I) helped to analyze the results.

Figure 3

Interview Questionnaire as It Related to Research Problems

<u>Research Problem 1</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who contributed to subjects' involvement in music during pre-college years	1. As a child, who first comes to mind as having influenced you to become involved with music? 3. Can you think who most influenced you to continue to play an instrument or sing during your adolescence? 5. Did any influential person discourage you in music during childhood or adolescence?
<u>Research Problem 2</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who encouraged subjects as musicians during college years.	7. Who encouraged you as a college musician? 9. Who encouraged you toward the role of music, but also discouraged you in music during your college years?
<u>Research Problem 3</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who encouraged subjects towards teaching during pre-college and college years.	2. As a child, who first influenced you to begin to see yourself as a teacher? 4. Can you think who most influenced you to think of yourself as a future teacher during adolescence? 6. Did any influential person discourage you about education during childhood or adolescence? 8. Who encouraged you toward the role of teacher during college years? 10. Which of the influential persons also discouraged you as a future teacher during college years?
<u>Research Problem 4</u>	<u>Items</u>
Persons who influence subjects towards roles of musician and educator during post-college years	11. Who affirms you the most now as a musician or performer? 13. Do you ever feel discouraged now as a musician? Who is the source of that discouragement? 12. Who affirms you the most now as a teacher or educator? 14. Do you ever feel discouraged now as a teacher? Who is the source of that discouragement?

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of influential persons in music teachers' professional socialization as musicians and educators. The research problems were to determine (a) who had contributed most to subjects' involvement in music during pre-college years; had most encouraged subjects as musicians during their college years; had most encouraged subjects during their pre-college and college years to think of themselves as future teachers; had most influenced subjects during their post-college years in their role as musicians and teachers; and, (b) the interrelationships between gender and teaching specializations and the subjects' responses to questions under (a).

Return Rate and Consistency of Responses

Of the 500 questionnaires mailed in January of 1994, 314 were returned and 310 (62%) were usable. Table 6 shows that men comprised 43% of the subjects who returned their questionnaires (N=133) and 57% of the women returned their forms (N=177). Using information from the personal data section of the questionnaire (items 3 and 5) 151 were instrumental specialists and 159 were vocal specialists.

Table 6

Description of Subjects by Degrees Held, Years of Experience, Areas of Specialties

<u>Degrees</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>%</u>
Graduate	70	53	61	35
Undergraduate	63	47	116	66

<u>Years of Experience</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>%</u>
0-1	7	5	5	3
2-5	19	14	34	19
6-10	31	23	45	25
11-15	34	26	38	21
16+	42	32	55	31

<u>Area of Specialty and Levels</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>%</u>
Instrumental	96	72	55	31
Vocal	37	28	122	69
Elementary only	6	5	73	41
Junior high only	7	5	10	6
Middle school only	4	3	3	2
High School only	14	11	4	2
Multi-levels	101	76	87	49

Note: N =133 men, N =177 women

Over half of the male subjects held graduate degrees as compared to 35% of the female subjects (Table 6). Seventy-two percent of the men were instrumentalists and 69% of the women were vocalists. Less than 10% were beginning teachers. Only 2% of the women were teaching at the high school level only while 11% of the men were high school teachers. Forty-one percent of all female subjects were elementary general music specialists.

The questionnaire contained items in which subjects were asked to rank order their responses. The ranked results of these items and of the frequencies is shown in Appendices J, K, L, and M. Tables showing the compared ranked ordered results and the frequencies are included in Appendix N. The purpose of this procedure was to verify the responses obtained by frequencies and thereby to check for consistency of response. When the top three ranked categories from the frequency tables were compared to the top three rank-ordered categories as reported by the subjects for the 10 items on the questionnaire according to gender and music specialty groups, the total number of possible agreements was 120. A formula (Madsen and Madsen, 1981) was used to determine a coefficient of agreement:

$$\frac{\text{Total Number Agreements}}{\text{Total Number Agreements plus Disagreements}} = \text{Coefficient of Agreement}$$

When each rank-ordered position (1, 2, and 3) was considered with each of the top ranked categories from the frequency tables, a 51% reliability score was obtained. This figure resulted when the total

number of ranked positions that agreed with frequencies was 61 (divided by 120 possible agreements). However, when the top three ranked frequency categories were compared with the rank-ordered (1, 2, and 3) categories as a unit, the resulting agreement was 104 (out of a possible 120) or 87%. In this latter procedure, the 1st, 2nd or 3rd places were not considered, rather the categories that were named in the top three places by both methods of ranked-order and frequencies.

In comparing the items that addressed the role of musician with the items that addressed the role of teacher, lower numbers can be seen in most cases regarding teaching. This was especially true of the pre-college years. Table 7 shows that consistently fewer subjects responded to these items than responded to the items addressing the role of musician. Table 7 shows the totals of influential persons reported by the subjects. The columns in Table 7 are headed by numbers from 0 to 17, one section for each of the roles (musician and educator). The description to the left identifies the number of subjects who reported each total number according to life-cycle phases. For example, three subjects were unable to recall someone who encouraged or influenced them to become involved with music during childhood. Thirteen subjects were able to recall 1 person who influenced them towards music during childhood. Likewise, 75 of the subjects were unable to recall someone who had influenced them to consider teaching as a future career during childhood; 56 could recall only 1 person. The information contained in Table 7 shows

Table 7

Number of Subjects Reporting Influential Persons for Roles of Musician and Educator

Role of Musician		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Total Influential Persons		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
<hr/>																			
Childhood																			
No. of subjects who reported		3	13	18	34	60	50	48	34	25	10	9	5	0	0	1	0	0	0
<hr/>																			
Adolescence																			
No. of subjects who reported		5	28	36	86	75	41	16	13	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<hr/>																			
College																			
No. of subjects who reported		2	10	29	38	60	63	45	30	20	3	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
<hr/>																			
Post-College																			
No. of subjects who reported		3	17	22	37	31	47	38	28	30	21	14	12	6	2	1	0	0	1

Table 7 continued

Role of Educator

Total Influential Persons	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Childhood																		
No. of subjects who reported	72	56	53	59	41	19	6	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adolescence																		
No. of subjects who reported	91	78	60	56	24	13	7	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
College																		
No. of subjects who reported	3	18	47	50	71	59	30	15	8	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post-College																		
No. of subjects who reported	12	11	18	42	50	39	33	31	24	17	13	10	5	0	3	1	1	0

N=310

that subjects were able to recall more persons who had influenced or encouraged them towards music during their pre-college years than they could for those who had influenced or encouraged them towards teaching.

Subjects Who Had Musicians in Their Families

Table 8 illustrates the number of subjects who reportedly had family members who also were musicians.

Table 8

Subjects Whose Family Members Were Also Musicians

<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Relationship</u>
87	67	subjects reported a parent as a musician
47	25	subjects reported other relatives as musicians

Note: N=177 women, N=133 men

Subjects Who Had Teachers in Their Family

Table 9 shows the results when subjects were asked to list those persons who were also teachers (item 7b). Twenty percent of the men and 20% of the women reportedly had a parent who was also a teacher.

Problem 1: Teachers' Viewpoints of Who Most Contributed to Their Involvement with Music During Pre-College Years

Table 10 shows who most contributed to the teachers' involvement with music during pre-college years. The raw data

Table 9

Subjects Who Reported Family Members Who Were Also Teachers
(item 7b)

<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Category</u>
26	36	parent
11	16	other relative

Note: N=133 men, N=177 women

from which these tables are presented in Appendices J, K, L, M, and N. As can be seen, in most instances, the source of greatest encouragement was the mother (Table 10). Father was also listed consistently. The women often included a private music teacher in their responses. School music or ensemble director was likely to be listed as a source of encouragement toward musical involvement during pre-college years by both men and women. Inspection of the raw data revealed that the male vocalists also listed church ensemble directors as persons who encouraged them during their childhood and adolescent years more often than did the women vocalists or all instrumentalists (Appendix K).

Problem 2: Teachers' Viewpoints of
Identification as Musicians
During College Years

Table 11 illustrates the results for the items on the questionnaire that related to the role of musician during college years. Table 11 was compiled from information shown in

Table 10

Three Top Ranked Persons Most Supporting Music, Pre-College YearsPersons Who Encouraged Subjects as Children

<u>Male Subjects-</u>	<u>Frequencies</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Female Subjects-Frequencies</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	89	67	Mother	141 80
Sch.music or ens.dir.	62	47	Father & sch. music or ens.dir.	89 50
Father	56	42	Pvt.music teacher	85 48

Persons Who Most Expressed Pleasure at Musical Events During Childhood

Mother	112	92	Mother	159 90
Father	81	61	Father	130 73
Sch.music or ens.dir.& grandparent	63	47	Sch.music or ens.dir.	109 62

Persons Who Encouraged Subjects' Interest in Music During Adolescence

Sch.music or ens.dir	103	77	Mother	135 76
Mother	92	69	Sch.music or ens.dir.	122 69
Father	65	49	Pri.music teacher	100 56

Note: N=310

Appendices J, K, L, and M.

Table 11

Three Top Ranked Persons Most Influential towards Music During College Years

Influence toward Majoring in Music During College Years

Male Subjects	Frequency	%	Female Subjects	Frequency	%
Sch.music or ens.dir.	92	69	Self	86	49
Self	74	56	Sch.mu.or ens.dir.	80	45
Mother	51	38	Mother	78	44

Most Helped Subjects' View of Themselves as Musicians

Sch.music or ens.dir.	75	56	App. mus.inst.	77	44
App.mus. inst.	58	44	Sch.mus.or ens.dir.	67	39
Self	52	39	Mother & self	58	33

Served as a Role Model for Musician

Sch.mus.or ens.dir.	87	65	Sch.mus.or ens.dir.	102	58
App.mus.inst..	55	41	App.mus.inst.	95	54
Mus.ed.inst.	23	17	Mus.ed.inst.	40	23

Note: N=310

School music or ensemble director remained the most frequently mentioned person among the men. However, applied music instructor ranked second with 44% of the male subjects listing this category, followed third by self. The women indicated that a school music or ensemble director and an applied music instructor

had influenced their views of themselves as musicians during college years. The women not only included self in the third category, but also mother.

When subjects were asked who served as a role model for them as musician during college years, they most often pointed to their school music or ensemble directors. Applied music instructors were their second most frequent choice (48%), followed by music education instructor (17% for men and 23% for women). The term music education instructor indicated a college faculty person whose specialty was classroom music methodologies and techniques.

Problem 3: Most Encouraging Persons towards Future Roles as Teachers During Pre-College and College Years

For research problem 3, the data were compiled from responses to items regarding their childhood (7, 9 and 11), adolescence (13 and 15) and college years (17, 19, 21 and 23).

Childhood Years

Table 12 illustrates the data for subjects regarding persons who most influenced their future roles as teachers (Appendices J, K, L, and M). A school music or ensemble director most encouraged subjects to develop an interest in becoming a teacher, followed by self and mother. Subjects indicated their mothers, followed by fathers and school music or ensemble director had most encouraged them to pursue teaching as a future career.

Table 12

Top Three Persons for Support of Role of Teacher, Pre-College YearsPersons Who Most Encouraged an Interest in Becoming a Teacher During Childhood

Category	Male Subjects		Female Subjects		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Sch.music or ens.dir.	47	35	Mother	65	37
Self	29	22	Sch.music or ens.dir.	49	28
Mother	80	26	Self	53	30

Persons Who Most Encouraged Pursuit of Teaching as a Future Career During Childhood

Sch.music or ens.dir.	31	23	Mother	79	45
Mother	33	25	Father	54	31
Father	24	18	Sch.music or ens.dir.	38	21

Persons Who Most Encouraged an Interest in Teaching During Adolescence

Sch.music or ens.dir.	65	49	Mother	76	43
Mother	36	27	Sch.music or ens.dir.	66	37
Self	32	24	Self	50	28

Note: N=310

The categories listed by all subjects for the role of future teacher during childhood were similar to those listed in response to questions regarding music and the role of musician (Table 12). Church ensemble director was listed more frequently among male vocal specialists than any other group (22%) during childhood years.

During adolescence, private music teachers were listed by women more frequently (27%) than by men (13%).

College Years

Table 13 shows the most often listed responses among the subjects to three items on the questionnaire that dealt with the role of future educator (Appendices J, K, L, and M). There are three sections in Table 13. Forty-nine percent of the subjects reported that they viewed themselves as the best source of encouragement for pursuing teacher certification during their college years.

The men listed self more frequently than did the women when asked who encouraged pursuit of teacher certification. The women listed mother and father more frequently than did the men. School music or ensemble director was given credit more often by men than by women. The most often reported persons from the college community were applied music instructor and music education instructor. As a role model, subjects reportedly chose school music or ensemble director. Applied music instructor ranked second in frequency.

Problem 4: Persons Influential toward Roles of Musicians and Educators During Post-College Years

Six items (24-29) on the questionnaire were used to obtain information about subjects' role development as musicians and educators during post-college years.

Table 13

Top Three Persons in Support for Role of Teacher, College YearsPersons Who Encouraged Pursuit of Certification

Category	Male Subjects		Female Subjects		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Self	72	54	Self	80	45
Sch.music or ens.dir.	63	47	Mother	69	39
Mother	42	32	Father	47	27

Persons Who Helped Subjects See Themselves as Teachers

Sch.music or ens.dir.	66	50	Music ed. inst.	63	36
Self	42	32	Self	56	32
App.mus.inst.	42	32	Sch.music or ens.dir.	40	23

Persons Who Served as a Role Model

Sch.music or ens.dir.	96	72	Sch.music or ens.dir.	102	58
App.mus.inst.	38	29	App.mus.inst.	68	38
Music ed. inst.	32	24	Music ed. inst.	65	37

Note: N=133 men, N=177 women

The Role of Musician During Post-College Years

The role of musician was specifically addressed in three items of the questionnaire (24, 26, and 28). Table 14 illustrates the results when male subjects were asked to list those persons who, from their viewpoint, supported their perception of their roles as musician or

Table 14

Top Three Persons-Male Musician Role, Post-College YearsPersons Most Influencing Subjects' Views of Self as Musicians

Category	Male Instrumentalists		Male Vocalists		
	Frequencies	%	Frequencies	%	
Mother	59	62	Mother	23	62
Father	48	50	Self	20	54
Self	44	46	Sibling	19	51

Persons Most Influencing Subjects' Roles as Musicians

Self	41	43	Other directors	13	35
Other directors	33	34	Self	10	27
Sch.music or ens.dir.	32	33	Sch.music or ens.dir.		
			spouse, administrator	6	16

Note: N=96 instrumentalists, N=37 vocalists

performer. Mother was the most frequently chosen response among the subjects. Other family members were listed, including father, grandparent and sibling. Although sibling had been listed in a few cases throughout the study, this category was included more often in response to this question (item 24) than to any of the others. Fifty-one percent of the male vocalists said that a brother or sister supported their views of themselves as musicians or performers in their work as active music educators.

Self was the source of the most influence for the male instrumentalists' roles as musician (41%). The male vocalists indicated that other directors were their influencing persons for their roles as musicians (Table 14).

Table 15 shows the most frequently given responses among the female subjects to the question of who influenced their views of themselves as musicians. Among the female vocalists, mother ranked higher than other classroom teachers or other directors. Private music teacher was more often listed than school music or ensemble director for the male subjects. Female vocalists attributed significance to classroom teachers more often than to another music educator or family member (Table 15).

The Role of Educator During Post-College Years

The role of teacher was specifically addressed in items 25, 27, and 29 of the questionnaire. The most frequently given responses by male subjects are listed in Table 16 which was compiled from information included in Appendices J and K. Instrumentalists considered their administrators as most supportive of them as teachers. Vocalists reported that their brothers or sisters were their greatest sources of support. Mother ranked second among both specialty groups. Father was third among the instrumentalists. Among the vocalists, the two categories of administrator and school music or ensemble director ranked third.

Table 15

Top Three Persons-Female Musician Role, Post-College Yrs.Persons Most Influencing Subjects' Views of Self as Musician

Category	Female Instrumentalists		Female Vocalists		
	Frequencies	%	Frequencies	%	
Mother	40	73	Mother	77	63
Self	31	56	Sibling	77	63
Sibling	31	56	Self	52	43

Persons Most Influencing Subjects' Roles as Musicians

Self	24	44	Self	38	31
Other directors	16	29	Mother	33	27
Private mus. teacher	14	25	Other classroom teachers	27	22

Note: N=55 instrumentalists, N=122 vocalists

No family members seemed to have impacted subjects in their roles as educators. Other ensemble directors ranked first, followed by administrators. Self was an important third source of influence toward instrumentalists' views of themselves as educators.

Classroom teachers ranked third among the vocalists (Table 16).

Table 17 shows the results obtained from items 25, 27, and 29 of the post-college section regarding the role of educator among the women. This information was taken from Appendices L and M. The female respondents reported their mothers as most supportive of

Table 16

Top Three Persons-Role of Educator, Post-College Yrs., Male SubjectsPersons Who Most Support Subjects' Views of Themselves as Teachers

Category	Instrumental Subjects		Vocal Subjects	
	Frequencies	%	Frequencies	%
Administrator	56	58	Sibling	24 65
Mother	52	54	Mother	21 57
Father	50	52	Administrator & Sch.music or ens.dir.16	43

Persons Who Most Influence Subjects' Present Role as Educator

Other directors	39	41	Other directors	16	43
Administrator	36	38	Administrator	14	38
Self	29	30	Other class.teachers	12	32

Note: N=96 instrumentalists, N=37 vocalists

Table 17 shows the results obtained from items 25, 27, and 29 of the post-college section regarding the role of educator among the women. This information was taken from Appendices L and M. The female respondents reported their mothers as most supportive of their views for the role of educator. Siblings ranked second in support for instrumentalists and for vocalists; administrators ranked third.

When the women were asked to recall who influenced them

Table 17

Top Three Persons-Role of Educator, Post-College Yrs., Female Subjects

Persons Who Most Support Subjects' Views of Themselves as Teachers

Category	Instrumental Subjects		Vocal Subjects		
	Frequencies	%	Frequencies	%	
Mother	40	73	Mother	71	58
Sibling	31	56	Sibling	70	57
Self	27	49	Administrator	63	52

Persons Who Influence Subjects' Roles as Educators

Self	22	40	Administrator	57	47
Administrator	21	38	Other class.teachers	53	43
Other class.teachers	20	36	Self	38	31

Note: N=55 instrumentalists, N=122 vocalists

most in their roles as educators, both instrumentalists and vocalists mentioned the same persons as having been influential albeit in different order. The instrumentalists viewed themselves as their greatest source of support followed by administrators and other classroom teachers. The vocalists reported administrators as most influential, followed by other classroom teachers and self.

Problem 5: Interrelationships between Gender,
Teaching Specializations, and the Subjects'
Responses to Problems 2-5

The data were analyzed in three ways to study the interrelationships between gender, teaching specialization and the subjects' responses to questions that related to all previous problems. Table 19 shows the results when the categories of influential persons were considered in view of how they continued from one life-cycle phase to another. Table 6 illustrates the results of calculations to determine the total number of influential persons in each life-cycle phase for the roles of musician and teacher respectively and Table 18 shows continuing influence across life-cycles. The remaining tables in Chapter 4 exhibit the results of the Wilcoxon tests for significant differences in the number of influential persons for the roles of musician and teacher.

Continuing Influence Across the Life-Cycle

The continued influence of persons who were viewed by the subjects as having impacted their lives is illustrated in Table 18. Subjects were able to recall the people who not only influenced them during pre-college years, but also had continued their influence during college and post-college years. For female subjects, their mothers had provided the most continued encouragement toward both roles of musician and teacher. For the male subjects, school music or ensemble directors most often continued their influence from one phase of their lives to another. The women reported more

Table 18

Continuing Influence over the Life-Cycle Phases

<u>Male Subjects</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Father</u>	<u>Sch.music or ens. dir.</u>
All phases, both roles	45	36	50
Pre-col. & col. both roles	11	4	38
Pre-col. & post-col., both roles	34	17	0
Pre-col., mus. only	15	16	7
Pre-col., tea. only	0	0	0
<hr/>			
<u>Female Subjects</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Father</u>	<u>Pri. music teacher</u>
All phases, both roles	86	56	36
Pre-col. & col., both roles	16	11	40
Pre-col. & post-col., both roles	27	15	0
Pre-col., mus. only	20	27	6
Pre-col., tea. only	0	0	0

Note: N=133 men, N=177 women

instances of their fathers' continued encouragement than that of their school music or ensemble directors. It should be noted that there were subjects who could not recall continued influence from one person throughout their life-cycles. Thirty-six of the subjects indicated that their mothers' influence was begun in pre-college years and continued again during post-college years. School music or

ensemble director was shown as being influential during pre-college and college years toward both roles, but less during post-college years. During pre-college years, 78 subjects indicated that their parents were encouraging to them as musicians, but not as future teachers.

Wilcoxon Tests According to Gender

The data illustrated in Table 6 were used to test for significant differences in the number of persons reported by subjects as encouraging them toward the roles of musician and teacher. Using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs procedure, subjects were grouped by gender and music specialty. Tests were done to compare the roles of musician and teacher during pre-college years.

Pre-College Years

The number of persons recalled by the male subjects as influencing them to become involved with music as children was compared with the number who encouraged them to consider teaching as a future career. The results showed significant differences (Table 19). Likewise, significant differences were observed among the male subjects in comparing the number of influential persons toward the role of musician during adolescence with the number of influential persons toward the role of teacher during adolescence.

When comparing the number of persons who encouraged the

Table 19

Comparison of Influential Persons for the Roles of Musician and Teacher During Childhood and Adolescence

<u>Male Subjects</u>	<u>No. of Influential Persons,</u>	<u>No. of Influential Persons,</u>
<u>Compared with:...</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Childhood</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Adol.</u>
No. of Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher	.005*	.003*

<u>Female Subjects</u>	<u>No. of Influential Persons,</u>	<u>No. of Influential Persons,</u>
<u>Compared with:</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Childhood</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Adol.</u>
No. of Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher	.043*	.303

*Significant at the .05 level

women toward music during adolescence, the results of the Wilcoxon tests were not statistically significant.

College and Post-College Years

Table 20 shows the Wilcoxon test results for the comparison of the number of persons who influenced subjects in their roles as musicians and the number of persons who influenced subjects toward their role as teacher during college and post-college years. Results showed no significant differences. This means that the numbers of persons who were reported in answer to items on the questionnaire that dealt with the role of musician were similar to

Table 20

Comparison of Influential Persons for the Roles of Musician and Teacher During College and Post-College Years

	No. of Influential Persons,	No. of Influential Persons,
Compared with:	Role of musician-college	Role of Musician-Post-College
No. of Influential Persons,		
Teacher-Male Subjects	.463	.439
No. of Influential Persons,		
Teacher-Female Subjects	.155	.203

the number that subjects reported in answer to items that dealt with teaching and the role of educator during college and post-college years. Music teachers reported similar sources for both roles of teacher and musician during college and post-college years.

Across the Life-Cycle

Table 21 shows the results of the Wilcoxon tests for the role of future teacher and educator across the life-cycle phases. The number of persons who encouraged subjects towards teaching during childhood was compared with the number of persons who encouraged subjects towards teaching during college years. The results were significantly different. Among the men, the number of persons who influenced them towards teaching as adolescents was compared with the number that subjects reported influential for

thinking of themselves as teachers when they were in college years. The results were also significantly different. This confirmed what had already been observed in frequency tables; that the men were able to recall more persons who encouraged them to become a teacher during college years than they were able to recall for their

Table 21

Comparison of Influential Persons Among Subjects for the Roles of Teacher During Pre-College, College and Post-College Years

	No. of Influential Persons,	No. of Influential Persons
Male Subjects	Role of Teacher-Childhood	Role of Teacher-Adolescence
College Yrs., Number of Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher	.049*	.001*
Post-College Yrs., Number of Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher	.004*	.0002*
Female Subjects		
College Yrs., Influential Persons,		
Role of teacher	.020*	.054
Post-College Yrs., Influential Persons,		
Role of teacher	.006*	.008*

*Significant at the .05 level

pre-college years. The same results for both men and women were observed when comparing pre-college years with post-college years. The women showed no significant differences in the number of persons who influenced them towards teaching during adolescent years compared with the number during college years. Both men and women had increasing sources of encouragement for teaching during college years, but the percentages during college years were higher for men than for women in response to items regarding influences on teaching.

The role of musician and the number of influential persons across the life-cycle phases was also compared by means of the Wilcoxon tests (Table 22). Among the female subjects the results, shown in Table 22, were not the same as for the male subjects. There were significant differences in the number of influential persons for the role of musician across the entire life-cycle. From childhood to post-college years, there were significant differences in the numbers of influential persons for the role of musician. The information supplied on the frequency tables indicates that more persons encouraged the women toward music during pre-college years than they did during college years. The percentage rates during post-college years increased over the ones for college years in response to the question of who influenced subjects' views of themselves as musicians (Tables 11 and 17).

Table 22

Comparison of Influential Persons Among Subjects for the Roles of Musician During Pre-College, College and Post-College Years

	<u>Influential Persons,</u>	<u>Influential Persons,</u>
<u>Male Subjects</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Childhood</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Adolescence</u>
Influential Persons,		
Role of musician-college	.339	.353
Influential Persons,		
Role of musician-post-college	.294	.025*
<u>Female Subjects</u>		
Influential Persons,		
Role of musician-college	.038*	.044*
Influential Persons,		
Role of musician-post-college	.008*	.001*

*Significant at the .05 level

Teaching Specialty Groups

The relationship between music specialty (instrumental and vocal) and the number of persons reported by subjects as influential for the roles of future teacher, teacher and musician were analyzed by means of the Wilcoxon tests.

Pre-College Years

Among the instrumentalists, comparisons between the number of persons who influenced subjects towards their involvement with music during childhood years and the number who influenced them towards a teaching career showed significant differences (Table 23). This meant that instrumentalists could remember more people who encouraged them to become involved with music during childhood than they could recall people who encouraged them to consider teaching as a future career. There were no significant differences for the phase of adolescence.

The analysis of the influential persons among vocal specialists yielded no significant differences. As a group, the vocalists reported

Table 23

Comparison of Influential Persons Among Teaching Specialty Groups for the Roles of Musician and Teacher During Pre-College Years

	<u>Influential Persons,</u>	<u>Influential Persons,</u>
<u>Compared with:</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Childhood</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Adolescence</u>
Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher-Instrumental	.002*	.072
Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher-Vocal	.088	.259

*Significant at the .05 level

about the same number of increases and decreases in their sources of influence toward both roles.

College and Post-College Years

The number of persons who had encouraged subjects towards their involvement with music and teaching were analyzed from within the life-cycle phases of college and post-college for both instrumentalists and vocalists. The results yielded no significant differences as they were the same for all tests (Tables 24).

Table 24

Comparison of Influential Persons Among Music Specialty Groups for the Roles of Musician and Teacher During College, Post-College Years

	Influential Persons,	Influential Persons,
Compared with:	Role of Musician-college	Role of Musician-Post-College
Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher-Instrumental	.169	.196
Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher-Vocal	.091	.414

Table 25 shows test results for comparisons of influential persons that were reported for the role of teacher across the life-cycle phases by instrumentalists. Two of the tests showed significant differences. Subjects reported more influencing persons during college and post-college than they did during pre-college years.

Table 25

Comparison of Influential Persons Among Instrumental Subjects for the Roles of Teacher During Pre-College, College, Post-College Years

	Influential Persons,	Influential Persons,
Compared with:	Role of Teacher-Childhood	Role of Teacher-Adolescence
Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher-college	.399	.032*
Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher,post-college	.096	.002*

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 26 illustrates the results of tests between the number of influential persons for the role of future teacher during childhood, adolescence and future teacher during college years. There were no significant differences. The test between childhood and post-college years showed significant differences as did the test between adolescence and post-college years. These test results confirm the frequency tables in that subjects from both specialty groups reported more sources for their encouragement towards teaching in post-college years than they did during pre-college years.

Tables 27 and 28 show the results of the Wilcoxon tests for instrumental and vocal specialty groups for the role of musician across the life-cycle. There were significant differences in the number of influential persons observed between the role of musician

Table 26

Comparison of Influential Persons Among Vocal Specialists, Role of Teacher During Pre-College, College and Post-College Years

	Influential Persons,	Influential Persons,
Compared with:	Role of Teacher-Childhood	Role of Teacher-Adol.
Influential Persons,		
role of teacher-college	.169	.156
Influential Persons,		
Role of Teacher-post-college	.037*	.045*

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 27

Comparison of Influential Persons Among Instrumental Subjects for the Roles of Musician During Pre-College, College, Post-College Years

	Influential Persons,	Influential Persons,
Compared with:	Role of Musician-Childhood	Role of Musician-Adolescence
Influential Persons,		
Role of Musician-college	.032*	.427
Influential Persons,		
Role of Musician-post-college	.089	.002*

*Significant at the .05 level

during college years and post-college years and those observed for musician during childhood. Among the vocal specialists, there were no significant differences in the numbers of important persons except between those who influenced subjects towards music during adolescence and during post-college years. The frequency tables indicate more categories of important persons during post-college years than they do for adolescence.

Figure 4 is a summary of the results of all Wilcoxon test results that were performed during this investigation. The column on the left is a list of comparisons where statistically significant

Table 28

Wilcoxon Test Values-Comparison of Influential Persons Among Vocal Subjects for the Roles of Musician During Pre-College, College and Post-College Years

	<u>Influential Persons,</u>	<u>Influential Persons,</u>
<u>Compared with:</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Childhood</u>	<u>Role of Musician-Adolescence</u>
Influential Persons,		
Role of Musician-College	.298	.030*
Influential Persons,		
Role of Musician-Post-college	.414	.351

*Significant at the .05 level

differences were observed. The column on the right shows the comparisons where no significant differences in the number of influential persons were found.

Interviews

The subjects who agreed to be interviewed mentioned family members who influenced them to become involved with music as a child (item 1). Mother was the most frequently mentioned person by the men and by the women, followed by father. Grandparent was mentioned by both men and women. Other relative was included in the responses of a male subject and a female subject. This information confirms what had already been reported from the questionnaires.

The interviewees reported that they had made their own choice as children to become involved with music. Music educators were also indicated by subjects. Five of the women and 1 of the men reported a school music or ensemble director. Several of the women reported a private music teacher. Among the men, however, private music teacher was not mentioned. Church ensemble director was confirmed by the interviewees as an influential person during childhood.

Besides categories of family, teachers and church musicians which were confirmed by the interviewees as influential persons toward the role of musician during childhood, other responses included grade school teacher, musician, and friends. The

Figure 4

Summary of Wilcoxon Test Comparisons

<u>Significant Differences</u>	<u>No Significant Differences</u>
<u>Male Subjects</u>	
Role of musician during childhood with role of teacher during childhood	
Role of musician during adolescence with role of teacher during adolescence	
<u>Female Subjects</u>	
Role of musician during childhood with role of teacher during childhood	Role of musician during adolescenc with role of teacher during adol.
<u>Male and Female Subjects</u>	
	Role of musician during college yrs. with role of teacher during college. Role of musician during post-coll. yrs. with role of teacher-post-coll.
<u>Male Subjects</u>	
Role of teacher during childhood with role of teacher during college yrs.	
Role of teacher during adol. with role of teacher during college yrs.	
Role of teacher during childhood with role of teacher during post-coll. yrs.	
Role of teacher during adol. yrs. with role of teacher during post-coll. yrs.	
<u>Female Subjects</u>	
Role of teacher during childhood with role of teacher during coll. yrs.	Role of teacher during adol. yrs. with role of teacher during coll. yrs.
Role of teacher during childhood with role of teacher during post-college yrs.	
Role of teacher during adol. yrs. with role of teacher during post-coll. yrs.	
<u>Male Subjects</u>	
	Role of musician during childhood with role of mus. during coll. yrs. Role of musician during adol. with role of musician during coll. yrs.
Role of musician during post-coll. with role of musician during adol.	

Figure 4 continued

Female Subjects

Role of musician during childhood with
role of musician during coll. yrs.

Role of musician during adol. yrs. with
role of musician during coll. yrs.

Role of musician during childhood with
role of musician during post-coll. yrs.

Role of musician during adol. yrs. with
role of musician during post-coll. yrs.

Instrumentalists

Role of musician during childhood with
role of teacher during childhood

Role of musician during adol. yrs.
with role of teacher during adol. yrs.

Vocalists

Role of musician during childhood
with role of teacher during child.
Role of musician during adol. yrs.
with role of teacher during adol.

Instrumentalists

Role of musician during coll. yrs.
with role of teacher during coll.
Role of musician during post-coll.
with role of teacher during post-coll.

Vocalists

Role of musician during coll. yrs.
with role of teacher during coll.
Role of musician during post-coll.
with role of teacher during post-coll.

Instrumentalists

Role of teacher during adol. yrs. with
role of teacher during coll. yrs.

Role of teacher during adol. yrs. with
role of teacher during post-coll. yrs.

Role of teacher during childhood with
role of teacher during coll. yrs.

Role of teacher during childhood with
role of teacher during post-coll. yrs.

Vocalists

Role of teacher during childhood with
role of teacher during post-coll. yrs.
Role of teacher during adol. yrs. with
role of teacher during post-coll. yrs.

Role of teacher during childhood with
role of teacher during coll. yrs.
Role of teacher during adol. with
role of teacher during coll. yrs.

Figure 4 continued

Instrumentalists

Role of musician during childhood with
role of musician during coll. yrs.

Role of musician during adol. yrs. with
role of musician during post-coll. yrs.

Role of musician during adol. yrs.
with role of musician during adol.

Role of musician during childhood
with role of mus. during post-coll.

Vocalists

Role of musician during adol. with
role of musician during coll. yrs.

Role of musician during childhood
with role of musician during coll.

Role of musician during childhood
with role of mus. during post-coll.

Role of musician during adol. yrs.
with role of mus. during post-coll.

questionnaires indicated the same information.

In regard to the role of future teacher, fewer responses were elicited. Most of the interviewees said that they could not recall an influential person for this role during childhood years. This confirmed the results of the mailed questionnaire.

Of the men who were interviewed, none of them recalled a family member who significantly influenced them to think of themselves as a future teacher. Some of the women recalled that their parents had influenced them toward the role of teacher during their childhood. The men and the women mentioned school music or ensemble director. Four of the women and 1 of the men reported a private music teacher. A grade school teacher was included by female subjects. Other categories reported were self, Bible school teacher, and other relatives.

In regard to subjects' adolescent years, both men and women mentioned family members, but less frequently than they had for childhood. Both men and women referred to their parents as sources

of encouragement. Grandparent and sibling were mentioned by male subjects. There were fewer persons indicated as influential towards the role of future teacher during adolescence, confirming the results of the mailed questionnaire. Several of the men and women responded with school music or ensemble director. Private music teacher was mentioned by women more often than by men. One of the men responded with festival director.

In regard to college years and the role of musician, the men said that a college ensemble director had been important to them. Others reported an applied music instructor. School music or ensemble directors and administrators were mentioned. The women's responses were similar to the men's. Applied music instructor was most often included. Music instructors, and college ensemble directors were also recalled as sources of encouragement towards their roles as musicians during college years. Other categories were administrator, instructor, school music or ensemble director, private music teacher, mother, father, and spouse.

While interviewees reported applied music instructors and college ensemble directors as their greatest sources of encouragement as college musicians, questionnaire respondents made these references infrequently. The other information was, however, similar. The wording of the questions and the modes by which the information was obtained could account for differences between the results of the interviews and the questionnaire regarding these two categories.

For the role of future teacher during college years, the men said that a college ensemble director was their main source of influence. Other men were able to recall applied music instructors, and other music instructors. An instructor outside of the academic area of music, and an administrator were mentioned. Some of the men made reference to themselves as sources of encouragement toward becoming a teacher. School music or ensemble directors, mother, and father were also indicated. The responses for the women were applied music instructor, instructors other from other areas besides music, music instructor, music education instructor, administrator, school music or ensemble director, and private music teacher. Self, mother, and spouse were also included. The information given by the female subjects who were interviewed was similar to that given by the men. All of the categories that were mentioned in the interviews had been indicated on the questionnaires.

In regard to the post-college years and the role of musician, the responses from male subjects confirmed what had already been reported on the questionnaires. Spouse, other directors, and self were the most often mentioned categories. Interviewees also said that administrators, students, peers, and friends were sources of encouragement during post-college years. One subject mentioned a church, and another said that musicians encouraged him. Another classroom teacher was also included.. The women responded similarly with administrators, students, and other classroom teachers

as their greatest sources of encouragement as musicians. The women confirmed what had already been observed from the questionnaires. Other directors and music teachers were included as was spouse, colleagues, family, and church. Former instructors, children, community, self, and minister were all mentioned by subjects.

For educator the men reported that self, administrator, spouse, and other directors were important means of encouragement as teachers. Students, other classroom teachers, parents of students, community, and church musician were among the other responses. One man said that his graduate school faculty had influenced his role as an educator. The women responded with administrator, other classroom teachers, and students. Also included were peers, other directors, a former instructor, family, spouse, self, children, community, and minister. The interviews confirmed what had been indicated on the questionnaires.

Subjects responded with information concerning sources of discouragement to them for their roles as musicians during post-college years. One male subject mentioned his students, 3 mentioned self and 1 mentioned other directors as sources of discouragement. Students, parents of students, other classroom teachers and administrators were each mentioned once by female subjects. Self was reported as a source of discouragement for the role of musician.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived role of influential persons in music educators' professional socialization toward viewing themselves as musicians and teachers. The research problems were to determine:

1. who contributed most to subjects' involvement with music during pre-college years;
2. who encouraged subjects most as musicians during their college years;
3. who encouraged subjects most during their pre-college and college years to think of themselves as future teachers;
4. who influenced subjects most during their post-college years in their role as musicians and educators; and
5. the interrelationships between gender and teaching specializations and the influences reported by the subjects.

Methodology

As a result of several pilot studies, a questionnaire containing 29 items was mailed to a stratified, random sample of 500 Arkansas music educators. Of the 500 questionnaires mailed in January of 1994, 310 were returned and considered usable. Of the 310

respondants, 133 were male, 96 instrumentalists and 37 vocalists; 177 were female, 55 instrumentalists and 122 vocalists. Subjects were asked to list influential persons who had encouraged them as either musician, future teachers, or teachers during the four life-cycle phases of childhood and adolescence (pre-college years), college years and post-college years. Questions were paired, one addressing the role of musician followed by one addressing the role of teacher so that subjects would have an equal number of opportunities to respond concerning both roles.

The questionnaires were scored by two raters who worked independently and without knowledge of each others' tabulations. The information from the questionnaires was placed on two separate tally sheets by the raters who obtained 100% consistency in tabulating the responses. The frequencies for the subjects' responses were listed according to specific guidelines. A catalog of terms was compiled in which subjects' responses were tallied into broader categories from which frequencies were determined. Each life-cycle segment was analyzed separately.

Research problem 6 was addressed by totaling the number of influential persons listed by each subject for the roles of musician and teacher from within each life-cycle phase. These scores, two for each phase, were then analyzed by means of Wilcoxon matched-pairs, signed-rank tests for significance using Harding University's academic Microvax 3600 computer and SPSS-X. Interviews with 50

subjects were conducted by telephone for the purpose of confirming the results of the questionnaire.

Results

The results of the study are summarized according to each research problem. Because the subjects were a part of a sample of music educators in Arkansas, the results can be generalized only to the population from which the sample was drawn.

Music Teachers' Profiles According to Gender, Degrees Held, Years of Teaching Experience, Teaching Specialization and Levels

Of the 177 women who returned their questionnaires, 35% had graduate degrees, compared to 58% of the 133 men. Both the men and women were experienced music educators. Thirty-one percent of the women and 32% of the men said that they had been teaching for 16 years or more. Ninety-six of the men were instrumental specialists and 37 were vocal specialists. Fifty-five of the women were instrumental specialists and 122 of them were vocal specialists. While 76% of the men said that they taught more than one educational level, 73% of the women only taught the elementary level.

Influential Persons toward Thinking of Oneself as a Musician During Pre-College Years

Mother was stated to be an influencing factor in the childhood involvement with music by more than half of the subjects. Father was less frequently mentioned. Other family members included

grandparents, siblings and other relatives (aunts and uncles). Half of the subjects reportedly had one parent who also was a musician.

Other than family members, school music or ensemble director, private music teacher and self were most frequently mentioned as sources of influence toward the role of musician during childhood. As might be expected, the vocalists were able to recall a church ensemble director more frequently than the instrumentalists.

Influential Persons for the Role of Musician During College Years

The male subjects' most frequent answers to the question of who influenced them to major in music during college years were school music or ensemble director and self. Among the women, school music or ensemble director was mentioned along with self, but private music teacher was more often indicated than by the men. The female vocalists were somewhat different from the other groups in that they listed mother more frequently than school music or ensemble director as an influential person for the role of musician during college years. In response to the question of who helped subjects to think of themselves as musicians during college years, private music teachers were more frequently listed by all four groups. The interviews confirmed the information that was reported on the questionnaires.

Influential Persons for the Role of Future Teacher During Pre-College and College Years

The items on the questionnaire pertaining to the role of future teacher received fewer responses from subjects than did the items

that pertained to the role of musician. The results of the Wilcoxon tests substantiated this observation. Subjects were able to recall more persons who had influenced them as musicians than they could recall persons who had influenced them as future teachers and educators.

Family members, such as mother, father, grandparents, and other relatives encouraged subjects to become teachers. Besides family members, the respondents listed other music educators, school music or ensemble director, and private music teacher. Categories like grade school or other teachers from childhood and adolescence were infrequently mentioned among all the gender and specialty groups. Twenty percent of the subjects reported that they had a parent who also was a teacher or educator.

During college years, subjects continued to list family members as influential persons toward their roles as future teachers, but with less frequency. School music or ensemble director, private music teacher and self were indicated as having been sources of encouragement toward teaching. Music education instructor was listed as an influential person for the role of future teacher during college years as it had been for the role of educator.

The interviews confirmed the information that was reported on the questionnaire. Interviewees reported the same important persons for both roles of musician and educator.

The Wilcoxon test results showed significant differences in the number of influential persons for the role of teacher across the life-

cycle phases. Subjects were more often able to recall persons who had influenced them toward teaching during their college and post-college years than they were able to recall for pre-college years. For the role of musician, there were significantly more influential persons indicated by subjects during childhood than there were for future teacher. This was observed with both gender groups. There were no significant differences among the subjects for influential persons for the role of musician across the life-cycle phases.

Influential Persons for the Roles of Musician and Teacher During Post-College Years

Although mother and father continued to be mentioned frequently during post-college years along with school music and ensemble director, other categories were added by subjects as influential persons for the roles of musician and teacher. Siblings were occasionally listed in pre-college and college sections. In the post-college section, however, a brother or sister was often indicated in answer to the questions. Other directors or music teachers, other classroom teachers and, administrators, especially for the role of teacher, were listed with greater frequency than family members.

Interrelations Between Gender and Teaching Specializations and Subjects' Responses to Influences on Their Roles as Teachers and Musicians

The Wilcoxon tests for significance was used to analyze the differences in the numbers of influential persons reported by subjects for the roles of musician and teacher during the life-cycle phases of pre-college, college and college years. Among the male

subjects there were significant differences in the number of influential persons for the role of musician compared with the number for the role of teacher during pre-college years. Male subjects reported significantly more influential persons for the role of musician during childhood and adolescence than they did for the role of teacher. The same was true for the female subjects during childhood. However, there were no significant differences found between the number of influential persons for the role of musician and the number for the role of teacher among the women during adolescence. This meant that female subjects indicated more support for their roles as future teacher during adolescent years than did the male subjects.

There were no significant differences in the number of influential persons for the role of musician when comparisons were made across the life-cycle phases among male subjects except between the phases of adolescence and post-college. Subjects listed more influential persons as the life-cycle progressed from childhood to post-college and the Wilcoxon tests confirmed the number as significantly different during post-college years and adolescence.

For the women, the Wilcoxon tests showed significantly different numbers of influential persons as listed by subjects for the role of musician across the life-cycle phases. These results confirmed what had been observed previously; subjects indicated a greater variety of influential persons as the life-cycle continued.

The same results were confirmed for the role of teacher, but with greater differences among the men. The tests showed significantly different numbers of influential persons when life-cycle phases were compared for the role of educator.

Conclusions

According to Berger and Luckman (1966), Brim (1966), and Sullivan (1953), the most impressionable years of life are the early ones. It is during childhood that primary socialization occurs and family members help children to define their social world (Denzin, 1977; Elkin, 1960). Because this framework of identity develops early in life, it is the most important phase and basic to later processes of identification within groups of people.

The results of this investigation provide considerable evidence that Arkansas music teachers had many persons in their lives who influenced them to become involved with music early in their childhood. They were able to recall family members, especially their mothers, who were pleased when they performed as children. There were significantly fewer subjects who could make similar recollections about important persons in their pre-college years who had encouraged them to become teachers.

The same encouragement toward the role of future teacher was not observed among the subjects. During their childhood, far fewer persons expressed support for pursuing teaching as a career. Because these early years are considered to be the most important,

this finding merits careful consideration. The music educators who responded to the questionnaire indicated that they had significantly more influence toward their involvement with music during childhood than they had toward the pursuit of teaching as a career. Therefore, the most significant impact on subjects' early occupational identity was toward the role of musician.

According to the results of the study, early influences continued into adolescence. The music teachers were able to recall family members and teachers who not only influenced them toward music during their childhood but continued to do so into adolescence. Most of those influential persons were music teachers, ensemble directors, and elementary music teachers. The women more than the men had received encouragement from their private music teachers.

Although the persons who most influenced subjects often were music educators themselves, it was the musical skill for which subjects received praise, not for verbal skills or evidence of talent toward teaching. Because subjects received praise for musical performance, they continued to perform and persons who praised them influenced them toward their roles as musicians.

Roberts et al. (1993b) found in his sample of college students that private music teachers, family (especially mother), and school music teachers most often influenced students to major in music and that performance ability was the most important criterion for entrance into college music programs. The evidence from the present investigation suggests that identity as a musician was already

substantiated by influential persons in the subjects' social environment before the time came to choose a major field in college. In some cases, primarily among the women, teaching as a career had been encouraged during pre-college years, but not to the same extent that musical involvement had been encouraged.

L'Roy (1983) and Roberts (1990, 1991, 1993a) concluded that music education majors saw themselves as musicians first and foremost. L'Roy and Roberts found evidence that music education majors sought the approval of applied music instructors and their friends during college years rather than members of the music education faculty. L'Roy observed that music education majors had not assumed the identity of educator because they did not replace their school music teachers with members of the music education faculty as significant others. L'Roy based her conclusion on evidence from her study and on Simpson's (1972) theory that nursing majors chose significant others from their work as they interacted with members of the profession and learned to function as nurses. However, subjects in the present study recalled music education instructors who were as influential as applied music instructors or college ensemble directors.

These findings differ from the L'Roy and Roberts studies. A music education instructor was listed as an influential person for both the roles of musician and teacher during college years more often than were other music faculty members. Because none of the college faculty members were mentioned as frequently as were

persons from pre-college years, this finding provides further evidence suggesting that the most significant processes of professional role development had already occurred among the music educators who were studied.

Although evidence from the present study indicates that experiences prior to and following college years had a greater impact on subject, it does not imply that a college education was unimportant to subjects or that music faculty members had little influence on their lives. Music education majors are an important part of the social environment of a university school of music and they assume the expected behavior of the role of music student (Becker et al., 1961). They only can respond from the viewpoint of an involved music student, not an experienced music educator. In hindsight, however, the college experiences pale compared to experiences prior to and following the college education years.

Denzin (1966) found evidence that college students were specific about choices of significant others from within the social environment of the college campus. His subjects could list important people such as faculty members and friends. While students were able to name significant others for their roles as college students, they also were able to recall important people from pre-college years who had a broader influence during their lives. The present study offered similar evidence. While subjects mentioned college faculty as sources of encouragement, the greater influence came from family members and teachers from pre-college and post-college years.

During the life-cycle phases of childhood, adolescence, college years and post-college years, there was evidence that the same persons who were influential during childhood continued to be influential in later life-cycles. Mother was mentioned throughout the life-cycle by most of the subjects. This influence of mothers among music educators toward their occupational goals is unique when compared with other research (Saltiel, 1986; Woelfel, 1972) where fathers were found to be more influential than mothers toward occupational goals. The earlier investigation of Nash (1954) supplied similar evidence regarding the important contributions of mothers toward the choice of becoming a composer. He said that composers whom he studied were closely bonded to their mothers.

The evidence from this investigation supports the earlier findings of L'Roy (1983) and Roberts (1990, 1991) that music educators viewed themselves more as musicians than as teachers. Because socialization is a life-long process and individuals do not take on the professional perspective until the actual role or job is assumed, the experienced music educator has a different viewpoint from the music education student (Becker et al., 1961; Simpson, 1972). Although subjects valued their college experiences, they were influenced more by persons with whom they interacted earlier in pre-college years.

Gender accounted for difference in points of view. The men were more likely to include other directors as supporters while the women were more closely associated with other classroom teachers.

White (1964) made similar observations. He also observed that the men, especially the band directors, were more oriented toward professional positions and that their closest friends were other directors.

Gender differences were further evidenced in that more of the women were teaching on the elementary level than the secondary level. White (1964) observed the same patterns and concluded that the values of society were related to choices of teaching levels. The decision to teach elementary general music is usually not made during college years. L'Roy (1983) found that after four years of college training, music education majors were not identifying with the role of teacher. Important matters such as instructional levels are decided during post-college years. Thus, the experiences and efficiency of the college years are jeopardized because students are unable to make the connection between courses of instruction and their future roles as educator.

In summary, this study provides evidence that both men and women who participated in the study were influenced by parents, especially their mothers. Fathers were often pleased by their developing performance skills. This beginning influence was reinforced during adolescence not only by parents, but also by subjects' school music or ensemble directors. The male vocalists were likely to have been encouraged to become involved with music by their church choir directors. The decision to major in music education was influenced by parents, school ensemble directors, and

the subjects' own desires. Although the men formed relationships with important persons in the college community who influenced their role concepts, these newer sources had less impact during the post-college perspective when the actual role of music educator had been assumed. Male subjects found that during post-college years, other directors and administrators were supportive of subjects' self concepts as musicians and teachers. The subjects' parents, spouses, siblings and former ensemble directors from pre-college years continued to influence and encourage the men in their post-college roles as music educators.

The female subjects were influenced by their parents, especially their mothers, to become involved with music during childhood. Private music teachers encouraged female subjects to play or sing during childhood and continued the encouragement into adolescence and college years. As children, the womens' interest in music was reinforced by their school music or ensemble directors. All of these influential persons contributed to the female subjects' choice of music education as a major. Like the men, female subjects found their applied music instructors, college ensemble directors and music education instructors to be supportive of both roles as musicians and future teachers during college years, but the encouragement of college faculty did not continue into post-college years as the actual role of music educator was assumed. From the post-college perspective, family members, especially mothers, were listed as sources of influence toward the roles of musician and

educator. Spouses, brothers and sisters were often encouraging. The womens' role as teacher was reinforced by other classroom teachers and administrators. Their roles as musicians was supported by other directors and classroom teachers.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, several matters emerged that should be investigated. The finding of fewer significant others or influential persons for the role of teacher during early childhood years implies a need to do an investigation focused on the childhood years. Because the pre-college years are the most basic in that they create a framework from which other experiences in society are built, a more concentrated study in this area with fewer subjects and a qualitative approach based on grounded theory could provide new knowledge into the issues surrounding the phenomenon of childhood interaction patterns with important persons. A listing of influential persons in the present study is only a beginning. More specific information about how these important persons encouraged subjects could be addressed. The differences in the subjects' experiences who said they received encouragement during childhood to become a teacher and those who could recall no such influence should be investigated.

Further study is recommended in the area of drop-outs from the profession and how their socialization processes differed from the music educators who remained in the profession. A sample could be studied by asking willing subjects who began in music education,

but changed professions, to supply knowledge of other drop-outs from the profession who then could be approached. Studying the differences in the perceived socialization processes of these two groups could provide helpful knowledge in the area of career guidance and academic advising. Perhaps the early experiences of the drop-outs would suggest fewer sources of influence from persons considered by subjects to be important.

The fact that subjects in the present study reported mostly influential persons within their immediate social environment is an area that would merit further study. Questions such as how this observation could be different among music majors who do not choose music education as a major, especially those who maintain that they want to become professional performers? Would professional socialization be different for music educators and professional performers? For example, would a performance major perceive more examples of recording artists as influential persons than did the music educators in this study? Knowledge related to these matters could also be very helpful to academic advisors.

Since gender accounted for most of the differences in subjects' perceptions of influential persons, more study is recommended that would focus primarily on gender issues within the area of music education. Why, for example, did men primarily choose instrumental music and the secondary levels? Why were administrators more often perceived to be influential persons among the men during post-college years than among the women? What part does gender

play when administrators assign teaching positions to music educators? All of these gender-related issues merit further study and would be helpful to those of us who work in the area of music teacher education.

Most of the previous research on occupational socialization in the field of music education has involved college students as subjects. There is evidence from this study to suggest that the role of music educator is not assumed during college years, but develops during post-college years when the actual role has been assumed. In order for those of us who fill faculty positions on the college level to make the most of students' years, a better understanding of the processes that preceded and will follow in the life-cycles of music education majors is necessary. More study of the post-college years involving active music educators is recommended.

APPENDIX A: INFORMAL INTERVIEWS

PILOT STUDY

APPENDIX A: INFORMAL INTERVIEWS

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOCIALIZATION

1. As a child, who first influenced you to get involved with music?
2. As a child, who influenced you to become a teacher?
3. During your adolescent years, who influenced you to keep playing or singing?
4. During your adolescent years, who influenced you to become a teacher?

COLLEGE YEARS

5. During your college years, who served you best as a role model for musician?
6. During college years, who served you best as a role model for teacher?
7. Who influenced you most as a musician or performer during your college years?
8. Who influenced you most as a future teacher or educator during your college years?

POST-COLLEGE YEARS

9. Who influences you the most as a musician or performer?
10. Who influences you the most as a teacher or educator?
11. To whom do you go for help with musical problems?
12. To whom do you go for help with instructional problems?
13. Who makes you feel good about yourself as a musician?

14. Who makes you feel good about yourself as a teacher?

APPENDIX B
PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

**APPENDIX B: MUSIC TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE
ABOUT
ROLES AND SOCIAL IDENTIFICATION**

PERSONAL INFORMATION: The information that you provide on this questionnaire will be kept confidential. Information from the survey will be reported so that individuals will not be identified; only group data will appear.

1. What degrees do you hold? Check all that apply. B.M.E.____, B.A.____, B.S.____, M.M.ED.____, M.ED.____, M.A.____, M.A.T.____, M.S.____, ED.D.____, D.M.A.____, PH.D.____, OTHER____.

2. How many years have you been teaching?
___0-1, ___2-5, ___6-10, ___11-15, ___16 or more.

3. What is your area of specialty? Check all that apply.
___vocal/choral,
___instrumental/brass, _____instrumental/woodwind,
___instrumental/percussion _____instrumental/string

4. What is your gender? ___Male, ___Female.

5. On what educational level/s do you teach? Check all that apply.
___elementary, ___middle school, ___junior high school, ___high school,
___K-12, ___college level.

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the questions below that relate to your childhood and adolescence. You may need to use more than one response to an item. No personal names are indicated as a response, rather the title of influential person's family or work role. The persons that you list for childhood may also be used throughout the questionnaire or you may choose to different influential persons.

CHILDHOOD INFLUENCES

Below are lists of persons who may have influenced you during childhood and adolescence toward your present occupational role as teacher and musician. Please select your responses to the questions from these lists..

Relatives	Directors	Teachers	Others
Mother	Band	Grade School	Best Friend
Father	School Choir	Elementary Music	Peers
Sister/Brother	Church Choir	Private Music	Minister
Grandparent	Orchestra	Music Camp	
Yourself	Music Camp	Sunday/Church	School
Aunt/uncle	Festival		

1. Did you have a family member who worked as one or more of the following?
 Yes, No.

Check all that apply. Musician/performer., Music teacher/educator.,
 Teacher/educator.

2. Who most encouraged you to sing or play an instrument during childhood?

3. As a child, did someone encourage you to become a teacher?

4. Did your ability to perform (play/sing) as a child seem to please someone close to you?

Yes, No. Who? Parents, Relative

5. Was your getting a college education encouraged or valued by someone close to you as a child? Yes, No.

Who? Father, Mother, Relative, Teacher, Other (specify)

6. Did you experienced discouragement from any of the above people for your interest in music? Yes , No .

Which one/s? Father, Mother, Relative, Teacher, Ensemble Director, Other (specify)

7. Did you experience discouragement from any of the above people for your interest in education? Yes , No .

Which one/s? Father, Mother, Relative, Teacher, Ensemble Director, Other (specify)

ADOLESCENT INFLUENCES

8. During adolescent years, who influenced you most to continue playing your instrument or singing?

9. During adolescent years, who influenced you most to think about becoming a teacher?

10. Who encouraged you as a young musician?

11. Who encouraged you to think of yourself as a future teacher?

12. Did anyone help you to see yourself in the role of a musician during adolescence? Yes, N. Who?

13. Did anyone help you to see yourself in the role of a teacher during adolescence? ___Yes, ___No. Who?
14. Did you feel that an influential person discouraged your interest in music as an adolescent? ___Yes, ___No.
Which one/s?
15. Did you feel that any influential person discouraged your interest in education as an adolescent? ___Yes, ___No. Which one/s?

COLLEGE YEARS

Directions: Please answer the questions that follow concerning college or training years. You may use the suggested roles from the list or use answers that describe persons most influential from your own experiences. More than one response may be needed. If the same persons continued to be most influential from your pre-college years, please use those responses.

Directors	Instructors	Administrators	Others
Ensemble	Music education	Department Chair	Office personnel
Band	Theory	Dean	Best friend
Orchestra	Ear-training	Admissions Officer	Peers
Choir	History/Literature	Financial Aid	Yourself
Conducting	Applied music		Other students
	Education class		Other music ed. majors
			Cooperating teacher

16. Who most influenced you to major in music?
17. Who most influenced you to certify to become a teacher?
18. Did anyone affirm your claim to the title of musician/performer during your college years?
19. Did anyone affirm your claim to the title of teacher/educator during your college years?
20. Did anyone serve as a role model for you as a musician/performer?
21. Did anyone serve as a role model for you as a teacher/educator?

22. Specifically, did anyone discourag you the as a music major during your college years?

23. Did anyone discourag you as a future teacher/educator during your college years?

POST-COLLEGE YEARS

Directions: Please answer the questions below that relate to your post-college or work years as a music educator.

You may need to use more than one response per item. Answers may come from the list or from your own experiences.

Administrators	Former Instructors	Colleagues	Organizations
Principal	Applied Music	Other Classroom Teachers	ASBOA Mem.
Superintendent	Ensemble Directors	Other Band Directors	ACDA Mem.
Music Supervisor	Theory Instructor	Other Orchestra Directors	ASTA Member
Dept. of Ed. Official	Music Education	Other Choir Directors	MENC Member
	Education class	Contest Judge	Publishers
	History/Literature	Other Arts Teachers	Phi Delta
			Kappa Mem.
Students			
Parent			
Musicians			
Yourself			
Friend			

24. Does anyone affirm your claim now to the title of musician/performer?

25. Does anyone affirm your claim now to the title of teacher/educator?

26. Who has served as role model to you as a musician/performer?

27. Who has served as role model to you as teacher/educator?

28. During faculty meeting or in-service training sessions who affirms you as a musician?

29. During faculty meetings or in-service training sessions who affirms you as a teacher?

30. Who causes you to doubt yourself as a musician/performer?

31. Who causes you to doubt yourself as a teacher/educator ?

APPENDIX C
CATELOG OF TERMS

APPENDIX C: CATELOG OF TERMS

Childhood-Adolescence or Pre-college Years

<u>Parents</u>	<u>Siblings</u>	<u>Grandparents</u>	<u>Other relative</u>	<u>Self</u>
mother	sister	grandmother	aunt	myself
father	brother	grandfather	uncle	I
			cousin	me

<u>School music/ ensemble director</u>	<u>Private music teacher</u>	<u>Other teachers</u>
band	violin teacher	history teacher
orchestra	piano teacher	English teacher *
chorus	trumpet teacher	math teacher
music camp	clarinet teacher	coach
school music teacher	voice teacher	language teacher
festival (all state, etc.) music ed. instructor	flute teacher	

<u>Grade school teacher</u>	<u>Church ens.dir.</u>	<u>Minister</u>	<u>Musician</u>
first grade teacher	choir director	pastor	Capt. Kangaroo
second grade teacher	song leader	preacher	Sym. conductor
third grade teacher, etc.			Recording artist

College Years

<u>Ensemble director</u>	<u>Applied music inst.</u>	<u>Other music inst.</u>
band	voice	theory
orchestra	violin	history/literature
chorus	trumpet	ear training
	piano	conducting

<u>Music ed. instructor</u>	<u>Administrator</u>	<u>Education instructor</u>
elementary	dept. chair	ed. psychology
secondary	dean	human development
instrumental	admissions	audio-visual
choral	advisor	history/philosophy
student teaching		

<u>Friends</u>	<u>Spouse</u>	<u>Musician</u>
peers	wife	recording artist
other students	husband	sym. conductor
		specific ensemble

Post College YearsOther classroom teachers

other teachers, non-music

Other directors

other music teachers

ASBOA member

MENC member

Contest judge

Administrators

superintendent

principal

music supervisor

APPENDIX D
PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE RAW FREQUENCIES

APPENDIX D: PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE RAW FREQUENCIES

Table 29

Influential Persons

	Childhood			Adolescence	
	Music	Teaching		Music	Teaching
mother	5	1	mother	5	1
father	4	2	father	2	1
private music teacher	3	-*	peers	3	-
grandparent	1	-	private music teacher	3	1
self	1	2	band director	2	3
brother	1	-	school choir director	2	-
grade school teacher	1	-	music camp director	1	-
			contest judge	1	-
			other teachers	1	-
			self	1	2
College Years			Post-College Years		
	Musician	Teacher		Musician	Teacher
applied music inst.	5	-	former applied inst.	2	-*
peers	3	2	former ensemble dir.	1	1
other music students	3	-	former music ed. inst.-	-	1
best friend	1	1	ACDA member	1	-
choir director	1	1	ASBOA member	2	1
ensemble director	2	-	peers	1	1

self	2	2	other music teachers	1	4
orchestra director	1	1	other classroom tea.	-	3
other music ed. students	1	-	other arts teachers	-	1
cooperating teacher	1	2	parents of students	-	3
music ed. instructor	-	5	students	-	2
theory instructor	-	1	principal	-	3
band director	-	3	superintendent	-	1
conducting instructor	-	1	self	1	7
history/lit. instructor	-	1	spouse	5	5
first students	-	1	friends	-	2
department chair	-	1			
education instructor	-	1			

Note: N=7

* indicates no response

Table 30

Support for Female Subjects-Childhood

	Music	Teaching
Parents	2	1
Sibling	1	.*
Private music teacher	-	3
Self	2	1

Note: N=3 * indicates no response

Table 31

Support for Female Subjects-Adolescent Year

	Music	Teaching
parents	2	.*
private music teacher	3	-
ensemble director	2	-
self	2	1

Note: N=3 * indicates no response

Table 32

Support for Female Subjects-College Years

	Musician	Educator
applied music inst.	2	.*
ensemble director	1	1
other music inst.	1	2
other music students	-	3
music ed. inst.	-	3
best friend	1	1
other music ed.maj.	1	-
administrator	-	1

Note: N=3

Table 33

Support for Female Subjects-Post-College Years

	Musician	Educator
former applied instructor	1	.*
former ensemble director	1	-
students	2	2
students' parents	2	2
friends	1	1
spouse	3	3
self	1	3
other classroom teachers	-	1
other music teachers	1	2
parents	2	2

Note: N=3

* indicates no response

Table 34

Support for Male Subjects-Childhood Years

	Music	Teaching
parents	4	1
private music	1	.*
self	1	1

Note: N=4

* Indicates no response

Table 35

Support for Male Subject-Adolescent Years

	Music	Teaching
parents	4	1
ensemble director	3	4
self	2	.*
other teachers	-	1
peers	2	-

Note: N=4

* Indicates no response

Table 36

Support for Male Subjects-College Years

	Musician	Educator
applied music inst.	3	.*
ensemble director	1	3
other instructors	1	1
other music students	1	1
other mu. ed. majors	1	1
music ed. inst.	-	2

Note: N=4

* Indicates no response

Table 37

Support for Male Subjects-Post-College Years

	Musician	Educator
administrator	2	2
former applied instructor	1	.*
former ensemble director	1	2
students' parents	2	2
friends	2	3
spouse	3	3
self	3	3
other classroom teachers	2	2
other music teachers	2	2
parents	2	2

Note: N=4

* Indicates no response

Table 38

Influential Persons-Vocalists

<u>Pre-College Yrs.</u>	<u>Music</u>	<u>Teaching</u>
self	1	1
parent	2	2
ensemble director	3	.*
contest judge	1	-

<u>College Yrs.</u>	<u>Music</u>	<u>Educator</u>
self	1	-
ensemble director	3	1
other students	1	1
other music students	3	1
history/literature instructor	-	1
applied music instructor	2	-
music education instructor	1	2
administrator	-	1

<u>Post-College Yrs.</u>	<u>Music</u>	<u>Educator</u>
other music teachers	2	-
other classroom teachers	1	1
administrators	1	1
students' parents	2	2
former ensemble director	3	-
former music education instructor	-	1

spouse	3	3
friends	3	3
self	2	2

Note: N=3

* Indicates no response

Table 39

Influential Persons-Instrumentalists

<u>Pre-College Yrs.</u>	<u>Music</u>	<u>Teaching</u>
parent	4	1
sibling	1	.*
private music teacher	2	-
self	-	1
ensemble director	2	3
friends	1	-
<hr/>		
<u>College Yrs.</u>	<u>Musician</u>	<u>Educator</u>
applied music instructor	3	-
ensemble director	1	3
conducting instructor	1	1
other music students	3	2
music education instructor	-	3
best friend	-	1
cooperating teacher	1	1
<hr/>		
<u>Post-College Yrs.</u>	<u>Musician</u>	<u>Educator</u>
former applied music instructor	2	.*
former ensemble director	-	1
other music teachers	2	1
other classroom teachers	2	1
administrator	1	2

APPENDIX E
COVER LETTER

Harding University

Educating for Eternity

January, 1994

Dear Music Teacher,

The Harding University Department of Music is asking for your help in a study of occupational role identification among music teachers. The purpose of this study is to obtain information on the socialization process and the identity of music teachers. This information will be used to help us and other music departments as we plan teacher education courses. You were randomly selected from a statewide list of Arkansas music educators.

Enclosed with this letter is a questionnaire about persons who influenced you most to become a music teacher. We are asking that you complete and return it to us. If you choose to participate by completing the questionnaire, you may also be telephoned for a follow-up interview. Interviewees will be selected at random from the returned questionnaires. If selected, your participation in the telephone interview will also be voluntary and all of the information that you give to us will be kept confidential. When the data is reported, no names of teachers will be used.

Please take a moment, complete the form and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. This research would not be possible without the help of people like yourself. If you would like to receive a summary of the results of the study, please let us know in a separate letter with your name and address included.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation with this research.

Patricia J. Cox,
Project Director

APPENDIX F
TALLY SHEET FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX F: TALLY SHEET FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Identification Code _____

PERSONAL INFORMATION: ___Male, ___Female
 Musical specialty: ___Elementary, ___Choral, ___Band,
 ___Orchestra, Other _____
 Years of Experience: _____
 Degrees: _____
 Levels of Instruction: _____

Items: Childhood Influences (ages 6-12)

6. _____

6b _____

7 _____

Totals:
 Musician _____
 Teacher _____

7b _____

8 _____

9 _____

10 _____

11 _____

Adolescent Influences (ages 13-17)

12 _____

13 _____

14 _____

15 _____

Totals:
 Musician _____
 Teacher _____

College Years

16 _____

17 _____

18 _____

19 _____

20 _____

21 _____

22 _____
23 _____

ID Code _____
Totals:
Musician _____
Teacher _____

Post College Years

24 _____

25 _____

26 _____
27 _____
28 _____

29 _____

Totals: # 1 #2 _____
Musician: _____
Teacher: _____

APPENDIX G
MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX G: MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

The main study questionnaire is presented in Appendix G as a photocopy of the original version in sections. The actual questionnaire was printed on front and back sides of paper that measured 9 by 14.25 inches and folded in fourths. Each page presented here shows 1 of those 8 sections.

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT YOUR IDENTIFICATION AS MUSICIAN AND TEACHER
--

Please return by
February 5, 1994 to

Patricia Cox
Box 767
Searcy, AR 72149

INTRODUCTION: *This questionnaire will be used in a study of the background of music teachers. We want you to tell us about the people that you consider to be most important in your decision to become a music teacher. In all cases, we would like for you to be as specific as possible about these people.*

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 1.) What degrees do you hold? Check all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> B.M.E.	<input type="checkbox"/> M.S.
<input type="checkbox"/> B.A.	<input type="checkbox"/> ED.D
<input type="checkbox"/> B.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> D.M.A.
<input type="checkbox"/> M.M.E.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> PH.D.
<input type="checkbox"/> M.ED.	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> M.A.	
<input type="checkbox"/> M.A.T.	

- 2.) How many years have you been teaching?

<input type="checkbox"/> 0 - 1 yrs	<input type="checkbox"/> 11 - 15 yrs
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 - 5 yrs	<input type="checkbox"/> 16 or more
<input type="checkbox"/> 6 - 10 yrs	

- 3.) What is your area of specialty? Check all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> elementary	
<input type="checkbox"/> choral	
<input type="checkbox"/> band	
<input type="checkbox"/> orchestra	
<input type="checkbox"/> other _____	(specify)

- 4.) What is your gender? M F

- 5.) On what educational level(s) do you teach?

<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> Middle School
<input type="checkbox"/> Jr. High	<input type="checkbox"/> High School
<input type="checkbox"/> K-12	<input type="checkbox"/> College

DIRECTIONS: *Please answer the following questions that relate to your early influences. You may need to use more than one response to some item.*

The following are suggestions of persons who may have influenced you during your childhood and adolescence toward your present work as a teacher and musician. You may choose one of these or specify your own.

Relatives: Mother, Father, Sister/Brother, Grandparent, Yourself, Aunt, Uncle, Cousin

Directors: Band, School Choir, Church Choir, Orchestra, Music Camp, Festival

Teachers: Grade School, Elementary School, Private Music, Music Camp, Sunday/Church School

YOUR CHILDHOOD INFLUENCES (age 6-12)

6.) Who most encouraged you to become involved with music during your childhood? (List in rank order: 1,2,3,etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

6b.) If any of these persons were involved with music, who were they? Check all that apply.

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

7.) Who most encouraged you to develop an interest in becoming a teacher during your childhood? (List in rank order: 1,2,3,etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

7b.) If any of these persons were teachers, who were they? Check all that apply.

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

8.) If your ability to perform (play/sing) as a child seemed to please someone close to you, who was it? Check all that apply.

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

9.) If pursuing teaching as a future career was encouraged by someone close to you, who expressed it most? Check all that apply.

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

10.) If you experienced discouragement from anybody for your interest in music, who was it?

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

11.) If you experienced discouragement from anybody for your interest in teacher education, who was it?

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

YOUR ADOLESCENT INFLUENCES

(AGE 13-17)

12.) If anyone encouraged your interest in music during adolescence, who was it? (List in rank order: 1,2,3, etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

13.) If anyone encouraged your interest in becoming a teacher during adolescence who was it? (List in rank order: 1,2,3, etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

14.) If you felt that someone discouraged your interest in music during adolescence, who was it?

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

15.) If you felt that someone discouraged your interest in becoming a teacher during adolescence, who was it?

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

Your College Years

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the questions that follow concerning college or training years. You may use answers from the suggestions below or specify your own. More than one response may be needed.

Directors: Ensemble, Band, Orchestra, Choir

Instructors: Music Education, Theory, Ear-training, History/Literature, Conducting, Applied Music, Cooperating Teacher, Education class

Administrators: Department Chair, Dean, Admissions Officer, Financial Aid

16.) Who influenced you most to major in music? (List in rank order: 1,2,3, etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

17.) Who influenced you to pursue teacher certification? (List in rank order: 1,2,3,etc.)

Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

18.) If anyone helped you to think of yourself as a musician/performer during your college years, who was it? (List in rank order: 1,2,3, etc.)

Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

19.) If anyone helped you to think of yourself as a teacher/educator during your college years, who was it? (List in rank order: 1,2,3, etc.)

Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

20.) Who served as a role model for you as a musician/performer? Check all that apply.

Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

21.) Who served as a role model for you as a future teacher/educator? Check all that apply.

Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

22.) If anyone discouraged you as a music major during your college years, who was it? Check all that apply.

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

23.) If anyone discouraged you as a future teacher/ educator during your college years, who was it? Check all that apply.

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

YOUR POST COLLEGE YEARS

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions that relate to your post-college or work years as a music educator. Answers may come from the suggestions below or from your own experiences. You may need to use more than one response per item.

ADMINISTRATORS: Principal, Superintendent, Music Supervisor, Dept. of Ed. Official

FORMER INSTRUCTORS: Applied Music, Ensemble Directors, Theory Instructor, Music Education, Education Class, History/Literature

COLLEAGUES: Other classroom teachers, Other Ensemble Directors, Contest Judge, Other Arts Teachers

ORGANIZATIONS: ASBOA Member, ACDA Member, ASTA

24.) If anyone supports your view of yourself as a musician/ performer, who is it? Check all that apply.

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

25.) If anyone supports your view of yourself as a teacher/educator, who is it? Check all that apply.

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

26.) Who causes you to doubt yourself as a musician/performer?(list in rank order: 1,2,3,etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

27.) Who causes you to doubt yourself as a teacher? (List in rank order: 1,2,3, etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

28.) Please list in rank order those persons who influence you most in your present role as a musician. (List in rank order: 1,2,3,etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

29.) Please list in rank order those persons who influence you most in your present role as an educator. (List in rank order: 1,2,3,etc.)

- Mother Father Sister Brother
 Grandparent Yourself No one
 Grade School Teacher School Music Teacher
 Private Music Teacher School Ensemble Director
 Church Ensemble Director
 Music Education Instructor
 Instructor _____ (specify)
 Administrator _____ (specify)
 Other Classroom Teacher Other Directors
 Other? _____ (specify)

APPENDIX H
MAIN STUDY INTERVIEW FORM

APPENDIX H: MAIN STUDY INTERVIEW FORM

Research Problems 1 and 3-Influential persons during pre-college years.

1. As a child, who first comes to mind as having influenced you to become involved with music?
2. As a child, who first influenced you to begin to see yourself as a teacher?
3. Can you think who most influenced you to continue to play an instrument or sing during your adolescence?
4. Can you think who most influenced you to think of yourself as a future teacher during your adolescent years?
5. Did any influential person discourage you in music during childhood or adolescence?
6. Did any influential person discourage you about education during childhood or adolescence?

Research Problems 2 and 3-Influential persons during college years.

7. Who encouraged you as a college musician?
8. Who encouraged you toward the role teacher during college years?
9. Who not only influenced you towards music, but also discouraged you in music during your college years?
10. Which of the influential persons also discouraged you as a future teacher during college years?

Research Problem 4-Influential persons during post-college years.

11. Who affirms you the most now as a musician or performer?
12. Who affirms you the most now as a teacher or educator?
13. Do you ever feel discouraged now as a musician? Who is the source of that discouragement?
14. Do you ever feel discouraged now as a teacher? Who is the source of that discouragement?

APPENDIX I
TALLY SHEET, MAIN STUDY INTERVIEWS

**APPENDIX I: TALLY SHEET
INTERVIEWS, MAIN STUDY**

Pre-College Years (Childhood and Adolescence)

Items:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Totals:

Musician _____

Teacher _____

College Years

Items:

7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

Totals:

Musician _____

Teacher _____

Post-College Years

Items:

11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____

Totals:

Musician _____

Teacher _____

APPENDIX J
RAW DATA FROM MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
MALE INSTRUMENTALISTS

APPENDIX J

FREQUENCIES FROM MAIN STUDY
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MALE SUBJECTS

Table 40

Persons Influencing Male Subjects' Involvement with Music During
Childhood (item 6)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	67	70%
Father	45	47
School music/ensemble director	46	48
Self	37	39
Grandparent	20	21
Private music teacher	20	21
Sibling	14	15
Church ensemble director	13	14
Grade school teacher	7	7
Friend	6	6
Other relative	2	2
Festival/other directors	2	2
Musician	2	2

Note: N=96

Table 41

Persons Influencing Male Subjects' Involvement with Music During
Childhood (item 6,ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choices</u>
Mother	45	17	4
Father	11	20	11
Self	16	11	7
School music/ensemble director	9	8	9
Church ensemble director	2	2	6
Grandparent	4	6	5
Private music teacher	2	4	6
Grade school teacher	3	2	1
Friend	2	2	11
Sibling	3	4	4
Other relative	1	0	0
Musician	0	1	0

Note: N=96

Table 42

Persons Encouraging Subjects' Interest in Teaching During Childhood
(item 7)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music/ensemble director	35	36.4%
Self	20	20.8
Mother	15	15.6
Father	15	15.6
Grandparent	6	6.3
Grade school teacher	5	5.2
Private music teacher	5	5.2
Church ensemble director	3	3.1
Sibling	2	2.0
Other relative	2	2.0

Note: N=96

Table 43

Persons Encouraging Subjects' Interest in Teaching During Childhood
(item 7-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choices</u>		
Self	13	5	3
School music/ensemble director	17	13	1
Mother	8	2	3
Father	6	7	2
Private music teacher	4	1	0
Grade school teacher	3	1	0
Church ensemble director	1	0	2
Grandparent	1	3	1
Other relative	1	0	0

Note: N=96

Table 44

Persons Who Were Pleased with Subjects' Musical Performance
During Childhood (item 8)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	80	83
Father	60	63
Grandparent	43	45
School music/ensemble director	46	48
Self	38	40
Sibling	25	26
Private music teacher	18	19
Church ensemble director	20	21
Grade school teacher	11	11
Friend	2	2
Other relative	2	2

Note: N=96

Table 45

Persons Who Encouraged Subjects to Pursue Teaching as a Career
(item 9)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music/ensemble director	27	28
Mother	22	23
Father	19	20
Grandparent	8	8
Private music teacher	8	8
Self	7	7
Sibling	5	5
Grade school teacher	4	4
Church ensemble director	2	2
Other relative	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 46

Persons Who Encouraged Adolescent Interest in Music (item 12)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music/ensemble director	76	79
Mother	66	69
Father	50	52
Self	35	36
Grandparent	23	24
Private music teacher	22	23
Church ensemble director	17	18
Sibling	12	13
Grade school/other teacher	8	8
Friends	5	5
Minister	1	1
Musicians	1	1
Festival/other director	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 47

Persons Who Encouraged Adolescent Interest in Music (item 12-
Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choice</u>
Mother	35	18	10
School music/ensemble director	29	14	18
Father	10	27	8
Self	13	6	11
Grandparent	3	5	8
Church ensemble director	1	4	2
Private music teacher	2	5	3
Friend	2	2	0
Grade school/other teacher	0	2	3
Sibling	1	3	3
Musician	1	0	0

Note: N=96

Table 48

Persons Who Encouraged Adolescent Pursuit of Teaching Career (item 13)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music/ensemble director	47	49
Mother	21	22
Self	21	22
Father	17	18
Private music teacher	12	13
Grandparent	7	7
Grade school/other teacher	7	7
Church ensemble director	3	3
Grandparent	2	2
Other relative	1	1
Minister	1	1
Festival/other director	1	1
Counselor	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 49

Persons Who Encouraged Adolescent Pursuit of Teaching Career (item 13-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
School music/ensemble director	27	11	9
Mother	12	7	2
Self	12	4	3
Grandparent	4	1	2
Private music teacher	4	3	1
Father	2	11	2
Grade school/other teacher	3	0	2
Church ensemble director	0	1	2
Sibling	0	1	0
Other relative	1	0	0
Counselor	0	1	0
Minister	0	1	0

Note: N=96

Table 50

Persons Supporting a Major in Music During College Yrs. (item 16)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	64	67
Self	52	54
Mother	36	38
Father	34	35
Private music teacher	20	21
Music education instructor	8	8
Grandparent	8	8
Church ensemble director	7	7
Administrator	7	7
Sibling	6	6
Applied music instructor	5	5
College ensemble director	4	4
Friends	4	4
Grade school or other teacher	3	3
Music instructor	2	2
Instructor	1	1
Spouse	1	1
Musicians	1	1
God or minister	2	2
Other directors	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 51

Persons Supporting a Major in Music, College Yrs. (item 16-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	39	7	5
School music/ensemble director	28	22	7
Mother	5	16	5
Father	3	7	10
Private music teacher	4	9	4
Music education instructor	1	1	1
Spouse	1	0	0
God	1	0	0
Music instructor	2	0	0
College ensemble director	2	0	2
Church ensemble director	0	1	4
Friend	1	1	0
Musicians	1	0	1
Grade school/other teacher	0	1	2
Sibling	0	1	0
Grandparent	0	3	2
Applied music instructor	0	1	2
Administrator	0	1	2

Note: N=96

Table 52

Encouraging for Pursuit of Teacher Certification (item 17)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	50	52
School music or ensemble director	47	49
Mother	30	31
Father	2	23
Private music teacher	19	20
Music education instructor	14	15
Administrator	10	10
Grandparent	8	8
College ensemble director	6	6
Sibling	5	5
Applied music instructor	4	4
Other directors	3	3
Spouse	3	3
Instructor	3	3
Church ensemble director	1	1
Music instructor	1	1
Grade school/other teacher	1	1
Musicians	1	1
University	1	1
Other relative	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 53

Encouragement toward Pursuit of Teacher Certification (item 17-
Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choice</u>
Self	37	6	3
School music or ensemble director	21	20	6
Mother	8	15	5
Father	4	8	7
Private music teacher	4	4	3
Music education instructor	3	5	1
Spouse	3	0	0
Music instructor	2	0	0
College ensemble director	2	1	0
Grandparent	2	1	5
Administrator	2	3	3
Applied music instructor	1	3	1
Church ensemble director	0	0	1
Sibling	0	1	0
University	1	0	0
Other relative	0	0	1
Musicians	0	0	1

Note: N=96

Table 54

Support for Musician-College Yrs. (item 18)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	53	55
Private music teacher	43	45
Self	38	40
Mother	35	36
Father	28	29
Grandparent	13	14
Applied music instructor	12	13
Music education instructor	11	11
Music instructor	8	8
Friends	6	6
College ensemble director	6	6
Church ensemble director	5	5
Instructor	5	5
Sibling	4	4
Administrator	3	3
Spouse	3	3
Other director	3	3
Musicians	2	2

Note: N=96

Table 55

Support for Musician During College Yrs. (item 18-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	20	5	5
School music/ensemble director	20	23	10
Mother	7	8	7
Father	3	8	8
Private music teacher	24	14	4
Music education instructor	2	6	2
College ensemble director	1	2	0
Church ensemble director	1	1	0
Friend	1	2	2
Spouse	1	1	1
Sibling	0	0	1
Grandparent	0	0	5
Applied music instructor	9	3	2
Musicians	0	0	2
Instructor	0	2	4
Music instructor	5	0	1
Administrator	1	2	0

Note: N=96

Table 56

Support for Role of Future Teacher-College Yrs. (item 19)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	45	47
Self	31	32
Private music teacher	30	31
Mother	25	26
Music education instructor	20	21
Father	18	19
Administrator	8	8
Applied music instructor	7	7
Grandparent	6	6
Grade school or other teacher	6	6
Instructor	6	6
Other director	6	6
Spouse	4	4
Sibling	4	4
College ensemble director	4	4
Music instructor	2	2
Friends	2	2
Church ensemble director	1	1
Cooperating teacher	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 57

Support for Role of Musician-College Yrs., (item 19-ranked responses)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
School music or ensemble director	21	17	8
Private music teacher	16	10	2
Self	15	6	7
Music education instructor	11	3	3
Mother	5	7	3
Applied music instructor	3	3	1
Administrator	2	2	3
Father	1	8	4
College ensemble director	2	1	0
Spouse	2	0	0
Grandparent	1	0	2
Grade school or other teacher	0	3	2
Instructor	1	3	2
Music instructor	1	1	0
Church ensemble director	1	0	0
Sibling	0	1	0
Friend	0	0	1

Note: N=96

Table 58

Support for Musician During College Yrs. (item 20)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	54	56
Private music teacher	40	43
Music education instructor	19	20
Mother	12	13
Father	12	13
Musicians	11	12
Church ensemble director	10	10
Applied music instructor	9	9
Other directors	8	8
Grandparent	7	7
Instructor	7	7
College ensemble director	6	6
Friends	6	6
Music instructor	6	6
Administrator	5	5
Grade school or other teacher	4	4
Self	3	3
Sibling	1	1
Other relative	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 59

Role Models for Teacher During College Yrs. (item 21)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequencies</u>	<u>%</u>
School music/ensemble director	66	69
Private music teacher	24	25
Music education instructor	24	25
Other director	14	15
College ensemble director	12	13
Mother	9	9
Grade school/other teacher	7	7
Father	6	6
Music instructor	6	6
Instructor	6	6
Applied music instructor	6	6
Administrator	5	5
Grandparent	3	3
Church ensemble director	3	3
Sibling	1	1
Self	1	1
Spouse	1	1
Other relative	1	1
Cooperating teacher	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 60

Support for Role of Musician-Post-College Years (item 24)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequencies</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	59	62
Father	48	50
Self	44	46
Administrator	41	43
School music or ensemble director	40	42
Other directors	36	38
Sibling	34	35
Other classroom teachers	23	24
Spouse	21	22
Private music teacher	19	20
Grandparent	16	17
Church ensemble director	16	17
Music education instructor	13	14
College ensemble director	4	4
Applied music instructor	4	4
Instructor	3	3
Everyone-community	2	2
Students or their parents	2	2
Children	1	1
Friends or musicians	2	2

Note: N=96

Table 61

Support for Role of Educator, Post-College Yrs. (item 25)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Administrator	56	58
Mother	52	54
Father	50	52
Self	39	41
Sibling	37	39
Other directors	36	36
School music/ensemble director	36	38
Other classroom teachers	32	33
Spouse	19	20
Church ensemble director	18	19
Music education instructor	16	17
Private music teacher	16	17
Grandparent	14	15
Grade school/other teacher	6	6
Instructor	5	5
College ensemble director	3	3
Students or their parents	3	3
Friends or community	3	3
Applied music instructor	1	1
Children	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 62

Support for Role of Musician, Post-College Yrs. (item 28)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequencies</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	41	43
Other directors	33	34
School music or ensemble director	32	33
Mother	25	26
Father	22	21
Private music teacher	19	20
Spouse	17	18
Other classroom teachers	16	17
Administrator	15	16
Music education instructor	12	13
Church ensemble director	12	13
Sibling	10	10
Grandparent	7	7
Musicians	7	7
Students	5	5
Friends	4	4
Instructor	3	3
Applied music instructor	3	3
College ensemble director	3	3
Parents of students	2	2
Children	2	2
Grade school or other teacher	2	2

Community	1	1
Music instructor	1	1
Counselor	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 63

Support for Role of Musician, Post-College Yrs. (item 28-ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choices</u>
Self	26	5	3
Other directors	17	5	6
Mother	10	8	3
School music or ensemble dir.	7	14	1
Spouse	6	7	2
Administrator	4	7	1
Father	2	6	9
Private music teacher	3	3	6
Church ensemble director	3	3	3
Musicians	4	1	0
Children	2	0	0
Applied music instructor	2	0	1
Friends	2	1	0
Grandparent	1	1	2
College ensemble director	1	0	2
Students	0	2	3
Sibling	0	1	2
Music instructor	0	1	0

Note: N=96 instrumentalists, N=37 vocalists

Table 64

Support for Role of Educator, Post-College Yrs. (item 29)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Other directors	39	41
Administator	36	38
School music or ensemble director	31	32
Self	29	30
Other classroom teachers	23	24
Mother	22	23
Father	16	17
Spouse	13	14
Music education instructor	11	12
Students or their parents	9	9
Sibling	8	8
Private music teacher	8	8
Instructor	6	6
Church ensemble director	6	6
Grandparent	4	4
Friends-community	4	4
College ensemble director	3	3
Applied music instructor	2	2
Music instructor	1	1
Grade school or other teacher	1	1

Note: N=96

Table 65

Support for Role of Educator, Post-College Yrs. (item 29-ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choices</u>
Self	18	3	5
Other director	18	14	4
Administrator	13	11	8
School music or ensemble dir.	9	11	2
Other classroom teachers	8	11	3
Mother	7	1	6
Spouse	6	4	2
Father	4	5	2
Music education instructor	3	0	4
Students	3	0	2
Instructor	2	4	0
college ensemble director	1	0	2
Applied music instructor	1	0	0
Private music teacher	0	2	2
Sibling	0	2	1
Grandparent	0	2	1
Friend	0	0	1

Note: N=96 instrumentalists, N=37 vocalists

APPENDIX K
RAW FREQUENCIES FOR MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
MALE VOCALISTS

APPENDIX K

RAW FREQUENCIES FROM MAIN STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MALE VOCALISTS

Table 66

Persons Who Encouraged Childhood Musical Involvement (item 6)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	22	60
Church ensemble director	20	54
School music or ensemble director	16	43
Self	11	29
Father	11	29
Private music teacher	10	27
Sibling	8	21
Grandparent	6	16
Other relative	2	5
Grade school teacher	2	5
Festival or other director	2	5
Church	1	2

Note: N=37

Table 67

Encouragment for Music During Childhood (item 6-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st. 2nd. 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	13	7	1
Self	7	2	1
Father	6	5	1
Grandparent	5	1	0
Church ensemble director	3	4	5
School music/ensemble director	1	5	7
Grade school teacher	1	1	0
Sibling	0	4	4
Private music teacher	0	3	3
Other relative	0	1	1
Church	0	0	1

Note: N=37

Table 68

Encouragement toward Future Teacher During Childhood (item 7)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	12	32
Self	9	24
Mother	8	22
Church ensemble director	8	22
Grandparent	6	16
Private music teacher	5	14
Sibling	4	11
Father	3	8
Other relative	1	3
Grade school teacher	1	3
Scout master	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 69

Encouragment for Childhood Interest in Teaching (item 7-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st. 2nd. 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	5	3	0
Self	5	2	1
School music/ensemble director	4	4	4
Grandparent	4	1	1
Church ensemble director	2	1	1
Father	0	3	0
Private music teacher	1	0	2
Sibling	0	2	1
Scout master	0	0	1

Note: N=37

Table 70

Encouragement for Music During Childhood (item 8)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	32	87
Church ensemble director	22	60
Father	21	57
Grandparent	20	54
School music or ensemble director	17	46
Self	14	38
Private music teacher	14	38
Sibling	11	30
Grade school teacher	9	24
Other relative	4	11
Church	2	5

Note: N=37

Table 71

Encouragment for Teaching as a Future Career (item 9)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mohter	11	30
Self	7	19
Church ensemble director	6	16
Father	5	14
Grandparent	5	14
School music or ensemble director	4	11
Private music teacher	4	11
Sibling	3	8
Grade school teacher	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 72

Encouragement for Music During Adolescence (item 12)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	27	73
Mother	26	70
Church ensemble director	18	49
Father	15	41
Self	15	41
Private music teacher	10	27
Grandparent	8	22
Sibling	6	16
Grade school or other teacher	3	8
Other relative	2	5
Church	2	5

Note: N=37

Table 73

Encouragement for Adolescent Interest in Music (item 12-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	12	6	3
Self	9	2	1
School music or ensemble director	5	10	7
Father	3	7	3
Church ensemble director	2	4	7
Grandparent	2	3	1
Private music teacher	3	1	1
Sibling	0	3	4
Grade school or other teacher	0	1	1

Note: N=37

Table 74

Encouragment toward Future Teaching During Adolescence (item 13)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	18	49
Mother	15	41
Self	11	30
Father	8	22
Church ensemble director	8	22
Grandparent	7	19
Private music teacher	5	14
Sibling	3	8
Grade school or other teacher	2	5
Other relative	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 75

Support for Future Teaching, Adolescence (item 13-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	8	0	3
School music or ensemble director	8	6	4
Mother	5	6	1
Father	2	5	0
Church ensemble director	0	0	4
Grandparent	0	3	2
Private music teacher	2	0	0
Sibling	0	2	0
Grade school or other teacher	0	1	0

Note: N=37

Table 76

Influence toward a Major in Music During College Years (item 16)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	28	76
Self	22	60
Mother	15	41
Private music teacher	11	30
Father	7	19
Church ensemble director	7	19
Sibling	5	14
Grandparent	4	11
Music education instructor	4	11
Administrator	4	11
Other relative	1	3
Grade school or other teacher	1	3
Festival or other director	1	3
Cooperating teacher	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 77

Influence toward a Major in Music During College (item 16-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choice</u>
Self	17	4	2
School music or ensemble director	6	10	4
Mother	2	6	3
Father	0	4	1
Private music teacher	2	2	4
Church ensemble director	2	1	0
Festival or other director	1	0	0
Sibling	2	2	1
Grandparent	1	0	1
Music education instructor	1	1	0
Grade school or other teacher	0	0	1
Cooperating teacher	0	0	1
Administrator	0	0	1

Note: N=37

Table 78

Encouraged Subjects to Pursue Teacher Certification (item 17)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	22	60
School music or ensemble director	16	43
Mother	12	32
Private music teacher	10	27
Father	7	19
Sibling	4	11
Music education instructor	3	8
Festival or other director	3	8
Grandparent	2	5
Spouse	2	5
Church ensemble director	2	5
Instructor	1	3
Other relative	1	3
Grade school or other teacher	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 79

Support for Pursuit of Teacher Certification (item 17-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	17	2	1
School music or ensemble director	8	0	7
Mother	2	6	3
Father	0	4	1
Private music teacher	1	3	3
Church ensemble director	0	1	0
Festival or other director	0	1	0
Sibling	0	2	1
Grandparent	2	0	0
Music education instructor	1	1	0
Grade school or other teacher	0	1	0
Other relative	1	0	0
Spouse	0	2	0
Instructor	1	0	0

Note: N=37

Table 80

Support for Role of Musician-College Yrs. (item 18)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	22	60
Private music teacher	15	41
Self	14	38
Mother	9	24
Father	5	14
Church ensemble director	4	11
Music education instructor	4	11
Applied music instructor	4	11
Sibling	3	8
College ensemble director	3	8
Administrator	3	8
Festival or other directors	3	8
Grandparent	2	5
Other relative	2	5
Grade school or other teacher	2	5
Other students	1	3
Friends	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 81`

Support for Role of Musician-College Yrs.(item 18-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
School music or ensemble director	15	5	2
Private music teacher	7	8	0
Mother	3	3	2
Self	2	6	3
Applied music instructor	2	1	1
College ensemble director	2	1	0
Music education instructor	1	1	2
Church ensemble director	0	0	4
Sibling	1	0	2
Friend	1	1	0
Grandparent	1	1	0
Administrator	0	1	1

Note: N=37

Table 82

Support for Future Teacher During College Years (item 19)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	21	57
Private music teacher	12	32
Self	11	30
Music education instructor	8	22
Mother	6	16
College ensemble director	5	14
Sibling	3	8
Church ensemble director	3	8
Father	2	5
Grandparent	2	5
Festival or other director	2	5
Instructor	1	3
Music instructor	1	3
Administrator	1	3
Other relative	1	3
Grade school or other teacher	1	3
Other students	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 83

Support for Role of Future Teacher-College Yrs. (item 19-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
School music or ensemble director	9	6	3
Self	5	5	1
Private music teacher	4	5	2
College ensemble director	4	1	0
Mother	3	3	0
Music education instructor	3	2	1
Father	1	1	1
Church ensemble director	0	0	1
Sibling	0	1	2
Friend	1	1	0
Grandparent	2	0	0
Administrator	1	1	1
Festival or other director	1	0	0

Note: N=37

Table 84

Role Models for Musician During College Yrs. (item 20)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	33	89
Private music teacher	15	41
Church ensemble director	8	22
Grandparent	6	16
Music education instructor	4	11
Self	3	8
Administrator	3	8
Father	2	5
Applied music instructor	2	5
Festival or other director	2	5
College ensemble director	2	5
Instructor	1	3
Music instructor	1	3
Musicians	1	3
Grade school or other teacher	1	3
Other students	1	3
Friends	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 85

Role Models for Teacher During College Years (item 21)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	30	81
Private music teacher	14	38
Music education instructor	8	22
Church ensemble director	5	14
Grandparent	4	11
Mother	3	8
Self	3	8
Administrator	3	8
College ensemble director	3	8
Grade school or other teacher	3	8
Father	2	5
Sibling	2	5
Festival or other director	2	5
Other relative	2	5
Instructor	1	3
Music instructor	1	3
Applied music instructor	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 86

Support for Musician During Post-College Yrs.(item 24)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	23	62
Self	20	54
Sibling	19	51
Administrator	17	46
Father	15	41
Spouse	13	35
School music or ensemble director	13	35
Other directors or music teachers	12	32
Other classroom teachers	11	30
Church ensemble director	11	30
Private music teacher	8	22
Grandparent	6	16
Music education instructor	6	16
Instructor	2	5
Grade school or other teacher	2	5
Students	2	5
Audiences or theatre	2	5
Other relative	1	3
Children	1	3
Friends	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 87

Support for Role of Educator During Post-College Yrs.(item 25)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Sibling	24	65
Mother	21	57
School music or ensemble director	16	43
Administrator	16	43
Self	15	41
Father	12	32
Other classroom teachers	12	32
Other directors or music teachers	11	30
Church ensemble director	11	30
Spouse	8	22
Private music teacher	6	16
Music education instructor	6	16
Grandparent	5	14
College ensemble director	2	5
Instructor	2	5
Grade school or other teacher	2	5
Other relative	1	3
Friends	1	3
Students	1	3
Parents of students	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 88

Support for Role of Musician During Post-College Yrs. (item 28)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Other directors or music teachers	13	35
Self	10	27
Administrator	6	16
Spouse	6	16
School music or ensemble director	6	16
Mother	5	14
Sibling	4	11
Other classroom teachers	4	11
Church ensemble director	3	8
Father	3	8
College ensemble director	3	8
Music education instructor	3	8
Friends	2	5
Grandparent or other relative	2	5
Private music teacher	1	3
Grade school or other teacher	1	3
Church	1	3
Children	1	3
Students	1	3
Instructor	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 89

Support for Role of Musician-Post-College Years (item 28-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	5	4	1
Other directors	9	3	1
Mother	2	0	0
School music or ensemble dir.	2	2	1
Spouse	4	1	1
Administrator	4	1	0
Father	1	1	0
Private music teacher	0	1	0
Church ensemble director	2	0	1
Musicians	1	0	0
Children	1	0	0
Friends	0	1	0
Grandparent	0	1	0
College ensemble director	2	1	0
Sibling	0	0	2
Grade school or other teacher	0	1	0

Note: N=96 instrumentalists, N=37 vocalists

Table 90

Support for Role of Educator During Post-College Years (item 29)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Other director or music teachers	16	43
Administrator	14	38
Other classroom teachers	12	32
Self	9	24
Spouse	6	16
School music or ensemble director	5	14
Mother	3	8
College ensemble director	3	5
Sibling	2	5
Church ensemble director	2	5
Private music teacher	2	5
Music education instructor	2	5
Students	2	5
Father	1	3
Grandparent	1	3
Instructor	1	3
Other relative	1	3
Family	1	3
Friends	1	3

Note: N=37

Table 91

Support for Role of Educator-Post-College Years (item 29-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	4	2	2
Other director	8	3	4
Administrator	10	2	0
School music or ensemble dir.	1	0	2
Other classroom teachers	2	6	2
Mother	1	0	0
Spouse	3	1	1
Father	0	1	0
Music education instructor	1	0	1
Students	0	1	0
college ensemble director	0	3	0
Private music teacher	1	0	1
Sibling	0	0	2
Grandparent	0	1	0
Grade school or other teacher	0	1	0
Family	0	0	1

Note: N=96 instrumentalists, N=37 vocalists

APPENDIX L
RAW FREQUENCIES FROM MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
FEMALE INSTRUMENTALISTS

APPENDIX L

RAW FREQUENCIES FROM MAIN STUDY
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FEMALE INSTRUMENTALISTS

Table 92

Support for Music During Childhood (item 6)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	40	72
School music or ens. dir.	37	67
Self	26	47
Father	22	40
Private music teacher	20	36
Grandparent	12	22
Church ensemble director	11	20
Sibling	7	13
Grade school or other teacher	4	7
Other relative	4	7
Friends	3	6
Musicians	1	2
Administrator	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 93

Support for Music During Childhood (item 6-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	30	6	1
Father	8	11	2
Self	9	5	10
School music or ensemble director	3	8	11
Grandparent	2	4	4
Private music teacher	1	6	3
Church ensemble director	1	2	1
Sibling	1	3	1
Musician	1	0	0
Grade school teacher	0	1	1
Other relative	0	1	1
Friend	0	1	0

Note: N=55

Table 94

Encouragement for Future Teaching During Childhood (item 7)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	25	45
School music or ensemble director	21	38
Self	19	35
Father	15	27
Private music teacher	15	27
Grade school or other teacher	11	20
Church ensemble director	4	7
Grandparent	3	6
Festival or other director	1	2
Sibling	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 95

Encouragement for Future Teaching-Childhood (item 7-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choice</u>
Mother	12	10	4
Self	12	2	3
School music or ensemble director	7	7	3
Father	7	7	2
Grandparent	1	1	0
Private music teacher	3	3	5
Grade school teacher	3	4	1
Church ensemble director	0	1	2
Sibling	1	0	0

Note: N=55

Table 96

Support for Music During Childhood (item 8)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	47	85
School music or ensemble director	41	75
Father	34	62
Grandparent	31	56
Self	26	47
Private music teacher	26	47
Church ensemble director	18	33
Sibling	17	31
Grade school or other teacher	13	24
Other relative	4	7
Friends	3	6
Festival or other director	1	2
Administrator	1	2
Church	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 97

Support for Teaching as Future Career-Childhood (item 9)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	25	45
Father	17	31
School music or ensemble director	16	29
Self	10	18
Private music teacher	8	15
Grandparent	4	7
Church ensemble director	4	7
Grade school or other teacherq	3	6
Sibling	2	4
Other relative	1	2
Festival or other director	1	2
Counselor	1	2
Minister	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 98

Support for Music During Adolescence (item 12)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	43	78
Mother	41	75
Private music teacher	27	49
Father	25	45
Self	24	44
Church ensemble director	16	29
Grandparent	11	20
Sibling	3	5
Other relative	3	5
Grade school or other teacher	2	4
Friends	1	2
Administrator	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 99

Support for Music During Adolescence (item 12-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	26	5	7
School music or ensemble director	11	16	9
Father	5	15	2
Self	9	5	6
Private music teacher	2	4	9
Church ensemble director	1	5	3
Sibling	1	0	2
Grandparent	1	2	3
Other relative	1	0	1

Note: N=55

Table 100

Support for Adolescent' Interest in Teaching (item 13)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	23	42
School music or ensemble director	22	40
Private music teacher	16	29
Self	15	27
Father	13	24
Grade school or other teacher	6	11
Church ensmeble director	4	7
Grandparent	3	5
Sibling	2	4
Administrator	1	2
Counselor	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 101

Support for Adolescents' Interests in Teaching (item 13-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	13	7	2
School music or ensemble director	6	9	4
Self	9	2	2
Father	4	5	2
Private music teacher	3	2	6
Sibling	1	0	1
Grade school teacher	2	1	1
Church ensemble director	0	1	2
Grandparent	0	2	0
Counselor	1	0	0

Note: N=55

Table 102

Influence toward a Major in Music During College Years (item 16)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	33	60
Self	26	47
Mother	21	38
Private music teacher	18	33
Father	17	31
Music education instructor	9	16
Church ensemble director	5	9
Friends	5	9
Grandparent	4	7
Music instructor	3	6
Administrator	3	6
Festival/other director	3	6
Applied music instructor	2	4
Instructor	2	4
Sibling	1	2
College ensemble director	1	2
Grade school or other teacher	1	2
Counselor	1	2
Spouse	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 103

Influence toward Major in Music-College Yrs. (item 16-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st. 2nd. 3rd choice</u>		
Self	22	2	1
School music or ensemble director	8	16	8
Mother	5	7	6
Father	5	3	4
Private music teacher	5	3	6
Music education instructor	4	2	3
College ensemble director	0	0	1
Church ensemble director	0	2	1
Friend	1	2	0
Spouse	0	0	1
Grandparent	0	1	1
Applied music instructor	1	1	0
Counselor	0	1	0
Instructor	1	0	0
Administrator	2	0	0

Note: N=55

Table 104

Encouraged Pursuit of Teacher Certification (item 17)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	26	47
Mother	22	40
Father	17	31
School music or ensemble director	17	31
Music education instructor	14	25
Private music instructor	9	16
Instructor	5	9
College ensemble director	5	9
Administrator	5	9
Grandparent	3	6
Sibling	3	6
Grade school or other teacher	2	4
Church ensemble director	1	2
Music instructor	1	2
Applied music instructor	1	2
Festival or other director	1	2
Spouse	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 105

Encouraged Pursuit of Teacher Certification (item 17-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	20	6	1
School music or ensemble director	6	5	4
Mother	9	9	3
Father	5	4	4
Private music teacher	3	2	3
Music education instructor	5	4	4
College ensemble director	0	0	1
Spouse	0	0	1
Grandparent	0	2	0
Sibling	1	0	1
Applied music instructor	0	1	0
Instructor	1	0	0
Administrator	1	1	1

Note: N=55

Table 106

Support for Role of Musician During College Yrs. (item 18)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Private music teacher	27	49
School music or ensemble director	25	45
Self	21	38
Mother	12	22
Music education instructor	11	20
Applied music instructor	10	18
Father	9	16
College ensemble director	6	11
Sibling	5	9
Music instructor	3	6
Festival or other director	3	6
Spouse	3	6
Grandparent	2	4
Instructor	2	4
Administrator	2	4
Friends	2	4
Church ensemble director	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 107

Support for Role of Musician During College Yrs. (item 18-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Private music teacher	14	8	3
Self	11	3	3
School music or ensemble director	9	9	5
Father	4	2	0
Music education instructor	4	5	2
Applied music instructor	4	3	1
Mother	3	5	3
College ensemble director	2	2	0
Spouse	2	1	0
Church ensemble director	0	0	1
Sibling	0	1	2
Friend	0	0	2
Grandparent	0	1	1
Administrator	0	1	0

Note: N=55

Table 108

Support for Role of Future Teacher During College Yrs. (item 19)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Music education instructor	20	36
Self	17	31
School music or ensemble director	13	24
Mother	12	22
Private music teacher	11	20
Father	10	18
Sibling	6	11
Instructor	6	11
Administrator	6	11
Spouse	5	9
Applied music instructor	4	7
Church ensemble director	2	4
College ensemble director	2	4
Grandparent	1	2
Grade school or other teacher	1	2
Cooperating teacher	1	2
Festival or other director	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 109

Support for Role of Future Teacher During College Yrs. (item 19-
Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	13	2	3
Music education instructor	10	8	0
School music or ensemble director	8	3	4
Mother	3	5	4
Father	3	3	1
Private music teacher	3	6	0
Applied music instructor	3	0	0
Instructor	2	0	0
Spouse	1	3	1
Administrator	1	2	2
Sibling	1	0	2
Cooperating teacher	0	1	0
College ensemble director	0	1	0
Church ensemble director	0	0	2

Note: N=55

Table 110

Role Models for Musician During College Years (item 20)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	36	65
Private music teacher	31	56
Music education instructor	11	20
Church ensemble director	9	16
Applied music instructor	9	16
Father	6	11
College ensemble director	5	9
Self	4	7
Other students	4	7
Mother	3	6
Sibling	3	6
Instructor	3	6
Administrator	3	6
Grade school or other teacher	3	6
Festival or other director	3	6
Musicians	3	6
Grandparent	2	4
Music instructor	2	4
Spouse	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 111

Role Models for Teacher During College Years (item 21)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	37	67
Private music teacher	23	42
Music education instructor	19	35
Grade school or other teacher	13	24
Mother	9	16
Father	9	16
College ensemble director	9	16
Festival or other director	7	13
Applied music instructor	6	11
Grandparent	6	11
Administrator	5	9
Instructor	4	7
Music instructor	4	7
Sibling	2	4
Church ensemble director	2	4
Self	2	4
Friends	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 112

Support for Role of Musician for Post-College Yrs. (item 24)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	40	73
Self	31	56
Sibling	31	56
Father	25	45
Other classroom teachers	23	42
Other directors or music teachers	22	40
Administrator	19	35
Spouse	16	29
Private music teacher	15	27
School music or ensemble director	13	24
Church ensemble director	13	24
Grandparent	11	20
Music education instructor	8	15
Music instructor	3	6
Grade school or other teacher	3	6
Instructor	3	6
College ensemble director	3	6
Students	2	4
Other relatives	2	4
Musicians	2	4
Friends	2	4
Family	1	2

Applied music instructor	1	2
Children	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 113

Support for Role of Educator During Post-College Yrs. (item 25)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	40	73
Sibling	31	56
Self	27	49
Father	22	40
Administrator	22	40
Other classroom teachers	20	36
Other directors	17	31
Grandparent or other relative	13	24
Spouse	12	22
School music or ensemble director	10	18
Church ensemble director	9	16
Private music teacher	8	15
Music education instructor	6	11
Grade school or other teacher	3	6
Students	3	6
Musicians or friends	3	6
Instructor	2	4
Family-children	2	4
Applied music instructor	1	2
College ensemble director	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 114

Support for Role of Musician During Post-College Yrs. (item 28)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	24	44
Other directors or music teachers	16	29
Private music teacher	14	25
Spouse	13	24
Mother	13	24
Father	12	22
Church ensemble director	11	20
School music or ensemble director	9	16
Other classroom teachers	8	15
Administrator	8	15
Sibling	7	13
Grandparent or other relatives	6	11
Music education instructor	5	9
Musicians	5	9
Students	3	6
College ensemble director	2	4
Grade school or other teacher	2	4
Instructor	1	2
Applied music instructor	1	2
Church	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 115

Support for Role of Musician-Post-College Yrs. (item 28-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choices</u>		
Self	16	4	1
Other directors	6	4	3
Spouse	6	4	3
Mother	3	2	3
Other classroom teachers	1	2	3
School music or ensemble dir.	3	4	2
Church ensemble director	2	4	2
Private music teacher	7	2	1
Administrator	3	3	1
Father	5	2	2
Instructor	1	0	0
Musicians	1	3	1
Church	1	0	0
Music education instructor	0	1	1
Students	0	1	0
Applied music instructor	0	1	0
Other relative	0	1	0
College ensemble director	0	0	1
Sibling	0	3	1
Grandparent	0	1	1

Note: N=55 instrumentalists, N=122 vocalists

Table 116

Support for Role of Educator During Post-College Yrs. (item 29)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	22	40
Administrator	21	38
Other classroom teachers	20	36
Other directors/music teachers	18	33
Mother	16	29
Spouse	12	22
Father	11	20
Music education instructor	10	18
Sibling	8	15
School music or ensemble director	8	15
Private music teacher	7	13
Grandparent	5	9
Church ensemble director	5	9
Instructor	2	4
Students	2	4
Parents of students	1	2
College ensemble director	1	2
Other relative	1	2
Musicians	1	2

Note: N=55

Table 117

Support for Role of Educator-Post-College Yrs. (item 29-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choices</u>		
Self	13	4	3
Administrator	7	7	1
Other classroom teachers	0	8	8
Other directors	8	3	4
Mother	7	3	3
Spouse	4	4	1
Father	4	2	2
School music or ensemble dir.	1	2	1
Father	4	2	2
Sibling	1	2	1
College ensemble director	1	0	0
Instructor	1	1	0
Musicians	1	0	0
Music education instructor	1	0	2
Church ensemble director	0	1	3
Parents of students	0	1	0
Students	0	0	1

Note: N=55 instrumentalists, N=122 vocalists

APPENDIX M
RAW FREQUENCIES FROM MAIN STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
FEMALE VOCALISTS

APPENDIX M

RAW FREQUENCIES FROM MAIN STUDY
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FEMALE VOCALISTS

Table 118

Support for Music During Childhood (item 6)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	101	83
Father	67	55
Private music teacher	65	53
School music or ensemble director	52	43
Self	39	32
Church ensemble director	30	25
Grandparent	21	17
Grade school or other teacher	12	10
Sibling	10	8
Friends	4	3
Other relative	3	2
Musician	1	1
Minister	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 119

Support for Music During Childhood (item 6-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choices</u>
Mother	75	22	3
Father	15	40	11
Self	15	6	11
School music or ensemble director	6	8	14
Church ensemble director	4	2	8
Grandparent	1	7	7
Sibling	3	1	5
Other relative	0	1	5
Friend	1	2	0
Minister	0	1	0

Note: N=122

Table 120

Encouraged Childhood Interest in Teaching (item 7)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	40	33
Self	34	28
Father	29	24
Private music teacher	29	24
School music or ensemble director	28	23
Grade school or other teacher	26	21
Grandparent	7	6
Church ensemble director	7	6
Other relative	3	2
Sibling	2	2
Administrator	1	1
Counselor	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 121

Encouraged Childhood Interest in Teaching (item 7-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	27	8	2
Self	21	6	4
School music or ens. dir.	10	7	6
Father	6	17	2
Grandparent	1	1	4
Church ensemble dir.	0	5	1
Sibling	0	0	2
Other relative	0	1	0

Note: N=122

Table 122

Support for Childhood Musical Performance (item 8)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	112	92
Father	96	79
Grandparent	69	57
Private music teacher	69	57
School music or ensemble director	68	56
Self	57	47
Sibling	50	41
Church ensemble director	49	40
Grade school or other teacher	37	30
Other relative	9	7
Administrator	4	3
Minister	3	2
Friends	3	2
Church	1	1
Festival or other directors	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 123

Encouraged Childhood Pursuit of Teaching as Career (item 9)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	54	44
Father	37	30
Private music teacher	31	25
Self	23	19
School music or ensemble director	22	18
Grade school or other teacher	13	11
Grandparent	9	7
Church ensemble director	6	5
Other relative	5	4
Sibling	4	3
Administrator	2	2
Friends	2	2
Minister	2	2

Note: N=122

Table 124

Encouraged Subjects' Adolescent Interest in Music (item 12)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	94	77
School music or ensemble director	79	65
Father	74	61
Private music teacher	73	60
Self	37	30
Church ensemble director	36	29
Grandparent	22	18
Sibling	12	10
Grade school or other teacher	9	7
Friends	7	6
Minister	6	5
Other relative	5	4
Church	2	2
Administrator	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 125

Encouraged Adolescent Interest in Music (item 12-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	62	16	9
Father	12	44	11
School music or ensemble director	16	18	22
Private music teacher	13	15	22
Self	13	7	7
Church ensemble director	6	6	9
Grandparent	4	3	7
Sibling	0	0	8
Friend	0	0	2
Grade school or other teacher	1	0	0
Minister	0	1	0
Other relative	0	1	0
Administrator	0	0	1

Note: N=122

Table 126

Encouraged Adolescent Interest in Teaching (item 13)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	53	43
School music or ensemble director	44	36
Father	36	29
Self	35	29
Private music teacher	32	26
Grade school or other teacher	17	14
Church ensemble director	10	8
Sibling	5	4
Grandparent	5	4
Minister	3	2
Other relative	3	2
Friends	2	2
Church	2	2
Administrator	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 127

Encouraged Adolescent Interest in Teaching (item 13-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Mother	34	10	5
School music or ensemble director	16	11	9
Father	10	22	1
Self	12	3	8
Private music teacher	8	7	9
Grade school or other teacher	5	3	1
Church ensemble director	0	4	4
Grandparent	0	1	4
Sibling	1	0	3
Friend	0	0	1
Minister	0	1	0
Other relative	1	1	0
Administrator	1	0	0

Note: N=122

Table 128

Influenced Subjects to Major in Music During College Yrs. (item 16)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	60	49
Mother	57	47
Private music teacher	55	45
School music or ensemble director	47	39
Father	41	34
Music education instructor	21	17
Church ensemble director	18	15
Administrator	10	8
Sibling	8	7
Instructor	6	5
College ensemble director	6	5
Applied music instructor	6	5
Friends	5	4
Grandparent	4	3
Grade school or other teacher	3	2
Minister	2	2
Other relative or spouse	2	2
Music instructor	1	1
Festival or other director	1	1
God	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 129

Influenced a Major in Music During College Yrs. (item 16-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st. 2nd. 3rd choice</u>		
Self	45	6	7
Mother	21	20	12
School music or ensemble director	14	13	6
Private music teacher	14	18	10
Father	10	9	10
Music education instructor	7	3	6
College ensemble director	5	0	0
Church ensemble director	2	2	7
Friend	2	1	0
Applied music instructor	2	2	1
Sibling	0	3	2
Grandparent	0	0	2
God	1	0	0
Instructor	1	1	2
Music instructor	0	1	0
Minister	0	1	0
Administrator	0	1	3

Note: N=122

Table 130

Influenced Pursuit of Teacher Certification-College Yrs. (item 17)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	54	44
Mother	47	38
Father	30	25
Private music teacher	30	25
Music education instructor	27	22
School music or ensemble director	24	20
Administrator	10	8
Applied music instructor	9	7
Spouse	8	7
Instructor	7	6
Sibling	4	3
Church ensemble director	4	3
College ensemble director	3	2
Friends	3	2
Grandparents	2	2
Grade school or other teacher	2	2
Music instructor	1	1
Minister	1	1
God	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 131

Influenced Pursuit Teacher of Certification-College Yrs.(item 17-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st.</u>	<u>2nd.</u>	<u>3rd choice</u>
Self	41	8	3
Mother	19	13	6
Private music teacher	11	12	3
Music education instructor	12	7	5
Father	3	12	9
School music or ensemble director	6	9	7
Applied music instructor	3	4	1
Administrator	7	0	2
College ensemble director	1	1	1
Friend	1	1	1
Sibling	1	1	2
Grade school or other teacher	1	0	0
God	1	0	0
Instructor	0	5	1
Grandparent	0	0	1
Church ensemble director	0	0	3
Minister	0	0	1
Music instructor	1	0	0

Note: N=122

Table 132

Support for Role of Musician During College Yrs. (item 18)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Private music teacher	50	41
Mother	46	38
School music or ensemble director	42	34
Self	37	30
Father	32	26
Music education instructor	32	26
Applied music instructor	19	16
Church ensemble director	13	11
College ensemble director	10	8
Spouse	9	7
Sibling	8	7
Music instructor	8	7
Administrator	7	6
Friends	6	5
Grandparent	4	3
Grade school or other teacher	1	1
Other students	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 133

Support for Role of Musician During College Yrs. (item 18-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	24	5	6
School music or ensemble director	14	17	8
Mother	15	15	13
Private music teacher	29	11	7
Music education instructor	7	9	8
Applied music instructor	7	1	1
Father	4	9	7
Spouse	5	0	0
Administrator	3	0	0
Friend	2	1	2
Grade school or other teacher	1	1	0
Church ensemble director	0	7	1
College ensemble director	0	2	3
Instructor	0	2	1
Sibling	0	0	3

Note: N=122

Table 134

Support for Role of Future Teachers During College Yrs. (item 19)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Music education instructor	43	35
Mother	39	32
Self	39	32
Private music teacher	34	28
School music or ensemble director	27	22
Father	25	20
Instructor	14	11
Applied music instructor	8	7
Spouse	7	6
College ensemble director	6	5
Church ensemble director	6	5
Grandparent	5	4
Administrator	5	4
Sibling	4	3
Grade school or other teacher	3	2
Music instructor	2	2
Friends	2	2
Minister	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 135

Support for Role of Future Teacher-College Yrs. (item 19-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st. 2nd. 3rd choice</u>		
Self	28	7	6
Music education instructor	18	13	7
Mother	15	11	8
Private music teacher	15	12	5
School music or ensemble director	13	6	6
Instructor	7	3	0
Father	3	9	5
Applied music instructor	3	4	1
College ensemble director	3	0	1
Spouse	3	2	1
Administrator	2	2	3
Music instructor	1	1	0
Church ensemble director	1	1	0
Grade school or other teacher	1	0	1
Sibling	0	1	1
Friend	0	0	1

Note: N=122

Table 136

Role Models for Musician During College Yrs. (item 20)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	66	54
Private music teacher	64	52
Church ensemble director	29	24
Music education instructor	29	24
Mother	21	17
Father	20	16
Applied music instructor	12	10
College ensemble director	11	9
Sibling	10	8
Friends	6	5
Other students	5	4
Instructor	7	6
Grade school or other teacher	5	4
Grandparent	4	3
Music instructor	4	3
Administrator	4	3
Festival or other director	4	3
Other relative	4	3
Cooperating teacher	2	2
Musicians	2	2
Spouse	2	2
Self	1	1

Minister

1

1

Note: N=122

Table 137

Role Models for Teacher During College Yrs. (item 21)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
School music or ensemble director	65	53
Music education instructor	46	38
Private music teacher	45	37
Grade school or other teacher	25	20
Mother	20	16
Church ensemble director	17	14
Father	10	8
Instructor	9	7
Sibling	7	6
Administrator	5	4
Other relative	5	4
Grandparent	4	3
College ensemble director	4	3
Cooperating teacher	4	3
Festival or other director	4	3
Self	3	2
Friends	3	2
Applied music instructor	2	2
Spouse	2	2
Music instructor	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 138

Support for Role of Musician During Post-College Yrs. (item 24)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	77	63
Sibling	77	63
Father	60	49
Administrator	53	43
Self	52	43
Other classroom teachers	50	41
Church ensemble director	36	29
Spouse	34	28
Other directors or music teachers	34	28
School music or ensemble director	26	21
Music education instructor	21	17
Private music instructor	20	16
Grandparent	16	13
Grade school or other teacher	11	9
Friends	11	9
Students	8	7
Instructor	6	5
Children	4	3
Other relatives	3	2
Parents of students	3	2
Applied music instructor	2	2
Musicians	2	2

Community	2	2
Minister	2	2
Music instructor	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 139

Support for Role of Educator During Post-College Yrs. (item 25)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Mother	71	58
Sibling	70	57
Administrator	63	52
Father	58	48
Other classroom teachers	49	40
Self	48	39
Spouse	29	24
Church ensemble director	26	21
School music or ensemble director	24	20
Music education instructor	23	19
Other directors or music teachers	20	16
Grandparent	15	12
Private music teacher	15	12
Grade school or other teacher	9	7
Instructor	7	6
Students	7	6
Children	6	5
Friends	6	5
Parents of students	3	2
Community	3	2
Applied music instructor	2	2
Family	2	2

Musicians	1	1
Other relative	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 140

Support for Role of Musician During Post-College Yrs. (item 28)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Self	38	31
Mother	33	27
Other classroom teachers	27	22
Church ensemble director	26	21
Other directors or music teachers	24	20
Administrator	23	19
Father	23	19
Spouse	22	18
Sibling	20	16
Private music teacher	16	13
School music or ensemble director	13	11
Music education instructor	12	10
Students	9	7
Children	6	5
Instructor	4	3
Musicians	4	3
Grade school or other teacher	4	3
College ensemble director	2	2
Family	2	2
Other relative	2	2
Minister	2	2
Applied music instructor	1	1

Church	1	1
Community	1	1
God	1	1

Note: N=122

Table 141

Support for Role as Musician-Post-College Yrs. (item 28-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	26	5	3
Other directors	11	8	4
Spouse	11	8	3
Mother	13	8	7
Other classroom teachers	8	10	8
School music or ensemble dir.	6	2	2
Church ensemble director	3	9	3
Administrator	8	7	4
Father	2	6	4
Instructor	2	1	0
Musicians	0	0	1
Music education instructor	5	3	1
Students	5	0	2
Applied music instructor	1	0	0
Other relative	0	0	2
College ensemble director	1	0	1
Sibling	0	4	2
Grandparent	1	1	0
Children	0	4	2
Minister	1	0	0
God	1	0	0
Community	1	0	0

Grade school or other teacher	0	0	1
-------------------------------	---	---	---

Note: N=55 instrumentalists, N=122 vocalists

Table 142

Support for Role of Educator During Post-College Yrs. (item 29)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>%</u>
Administrator	57	47
Other classroom teachers	53	43
Self	38	31
Other directors or music teachers	29	24
Mother	27	22
Father	23	19
Spouse	19	16
Sibling	17	14
School music/ensemble director	17	14
Music education instructor	13	11
Students	10	8
Instructor	6	5
Friends or family	5	4
Children	4	3
Grandparent or other relative	4	3
Church or minister	2	2
Applied music instructor	1	1
Parents of students	1	1
Community	1	1
God	1	1

Note: N-122

Table 143

Support for Role of Educator-Post-College Yrs. (item 29-Ranked)

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st, 2nd, 3rd choice</u>		
Self	22	7	4
Administrator	21	19	13
Other classroom teachers	14	22	11
Other directors	8	8	7
Mother	8	6	4
Spouse	9	6	2
Father	2	5	3
School music or ensemble dir.	8	4	2
Father	2	5	3
Sibling	1	3	2
College ensemble director	1	0	0
Instructor	2	0	0
Music education instructor	3	3	2
Church ensemble director	1	1	1
Community	1	0	0
Friend	1	0	0
God	1	0	0
Grandparent	1	0	0
Children	0	0	2
Grade school or other teacher	0	3	0
other relative	0	0	1
Applied music instructor	0	1	0

Students

7 0 2

Note: N=55 instrumentalists, N=122 vocalists

APPENDIX N
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS REGARDING DISCOURAGEMENT

APPENDIX N

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS REGARDING DISCOURAGEMENT

Table 144

Discouraged toward Music-Childhood

<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Category</u>
1	1	school music or ensemble director
2	1	self
1	0	private music teacher
2	1	relative
8	5	parent

Note: N=177 women, N=133 men

Table 145

Discouragment toward Future Teaching-Childhood

<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Category</u>
4	2	school music or ensemble director
4	0	self
1	0	relative
13	6	parent

Note: N=133 men, N=177 women

Table 146

Discouragement toward Career of Teaching-Adolescence (item 15)

Men	Women	Category
1	0	Other teachers (non-music)
4	3	school music/ensemble director
2	1	self
2	1	other relative
15	5	parent

Note: N=133 men, N=177 women

Table 147

Discouragement for Role of Future Teacher-College Yrs. (item 23)

Men	Women	Category
1	0	Friend
4	4	Instructor (college)
0	4	school music/ensemble director
0	1	private music teacher
3	4	self
3	3	parent

Note: N=133 men, N=177 women]

Table 148

Sources of Doubt for Musician-Post-College Years (item 26)

<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Category</u>
36	43	self
6	6	colleagues
1	4	administrators
1	2	college instructor
0	1	school music/ensemble director
0	1	private music teacher
1	2	relative
1	2	parent

Note: N=133 men, N=177 women

Table 149

Sources of Doubt for Role as Educator-Post-College Years (item 27)

<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Category</u>
0	1	school music/ensemble director
0	2	college instructor
4	4	administrator
5	10	colleagues
36	42	self

Note: N= 133 men, N=177 women

APPENDIX O
COMPARISON OF FREQUENCIES
AND RANK-ORDERED ITEMS

Appendix O: Agreement of Frequencies and Ranked Responses

Table 150

Comparison of Frequencies and Ranked Responses-Male Subjects

Encouraged Subjects to Become Involved with Music During Childhood

<u>Instrumentalists' Responses</u>			<u>Vocalists' Responses</u>						
<u>Ranked Response (1, 2, & 3)</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Ranked Responses (1, 2, & 3)</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>				
Mother	45	17	Mother	13	7	1	Mother	22	60
Father	11	20	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	46	48	1	Chens.dir.	20	54
Self	16	11	Father	45	47	5	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	16	43

Encouraged Subjects' Developing Interest in Teaching During Childhood

Sch.mu.ens.dir.	17	13	1	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	35	36	Mother	5	3	0	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	12	32
Self	13	5	3	Self	20	21	Self	5	2	1	Self	9	24
Mother	8	2	3	Parents	15	16	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	4	4	4	Mother & Ch.		
Father	6	7	2				ens.dir.				8	22	

Encouraged Subjects' Interest in Music During Adolescence

Mother	35	18	10	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	76	79	Mother	12	6	3	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	27	73
--------	----	----	----	-----------------	----	----	--------	----	---	---	-----------------	----	----

Sch.mu.ens.dir.29	14	18	Mother	66	69	Self	9	2	1	Mother	26	70	
Father	10	27	8	Father	50	52	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	5	10	7	Self & Father	15	41

Encouraged Subjects' Interest in Becoming a Teacher During Adolescence

Sch.mu.ens.dir.27	1	9	Sch.mu.ens.dir.47	49	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	8	6	4	Sch.mu.ens.dir.18	49			
Mother	12	7	2	Mother & Self	21	22	Self	8	0	3	Mother	15	41
Self	12	4	3	Father	17	18	Mother	5	6	1	Self	11	30

Influenced Subjects to Major in Music During College Years

Self	39	7	5	Sch.mu.ens.dir.64	67	Self	17	4	2	Sch.mu.ens.dir.28	76		
Sch.mu.ens.dir.28	22	7	7	Self	52	54	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	6	10	4	Self	22	60
Mother	5	16	5	Mother	36	38	Mother	2	6	3	Mother	15	41

Influenced Subjects to Pursue Teacher Certification During College Years

Self	37	6	3	Self	50	52	Self	17	2	1	Self	22	60
Sch.mu.ens.dir.21	20	6	6	Sch.mu.ens.dir.47	49	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	8	0	7	Sch.mu.ens.dir.16	43		
Mother	8	15	5	Mother	30	31	Mother	2	6	3	Mother	12	32

Helped Subjects to Think of Themselves as Musicians During College Years

App.mu.inst.	24	14	4	Sch.mu.ens.dir.53	55	Sch.mu.ens.dir.15	5	2	Sch.mu.ens.dir.22	60			
Sch.mu.ens.dir.20	23	10	App.mu.inst.	43	45	App.mu.inst.	7	9	0	App.mu.inst.	15	41	
Self	20	5	5	Self	38	40	Self	2	6	3	Self	14	38

Helped Subjects to Think of Themselves as Teachers or Educators During College Years

Sch.mu.ens.dir.21	14	8	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	45	47	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	9	6	3	Sch.mu.ens.dir.21	57		
App.mu.inst.	16	10	2	Self	31	32	Self	5	5	1	App.mu.inst.	12	31
Self	15	6	7	App.mu.inst.	30	31	App.mu.inst.	4	5	2	Self	11	30

Influenced Subjects as Musicians During Post-College Years

Self	26	5	3	Self	41	43	Self	5	4	1	Other dirs.	13	35
Other dirs.	17	5	6	Other dirs.	33	34	Other dirs.	9	3	1	Self	10	27
Spouse	4	1	1	Sch.mu.ens.dir.32	33	33	Spouse	4	1	1	Administrator	6	16

Influenced Subjects as Educators During Post-College Years

Other dirs.	18	14	4	Other dirs.	39	41	Administrator	10	2	0	Other dirs.	16	43
-------------	----	----	---	-------------	----	----	---------------	----	---	---	-------------	----	----

Self	18	3	5	Administrator	36	38	Other dirs.	8	3	4	Administrator	14	38
Administrator	13	11	8	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	31	32	Other classrm.				Other classrm.		
							teachers	2	6	2	teachers	12	32

Note: N=133

Table 151

Comparison of Frequencies and Ranked Responses-Female Subjects

		<u>Instrumentalists</u>			<u>Vocalists</u>								
<u>Ranked Response (1, 2, & 3)</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>30</u>						
	<u>Self</u>	<u>Sch.mu.ens.dir.</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>						
	<u>2.6</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>22.3</u>	<u>22.3</u>	<u>75.3</u>						
	<u>47</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>75</u>						
	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>40</u>						
	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>						
	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>						
	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>65</u>						
	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5.3</u>						
Mother	30	6	1	Mother	40	72	Mother	75	22	3	Mother	101	83
Father	8	11	2	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	37	67	Father	15	40	11	Father	67	55
Sch.mu.ens.dir.	3	8	11	Self	26	47	Self	15	6	11	Pvt.mu.tea.	65	53

		<u>Instrumentalists</u>			<u>Vocalists</u>								
<u>Ranked Response (1, 2, & 3)</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>30</u>						
	<u>Self</u>	<u>Sch.mu.ens.dir.</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>						
	<u>2.6</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>22.3</u>	<u>22.3</u>	<u>75.3</u>						
	<u>47</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>75</u>						
	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>40</u>						
	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>						
	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>						
	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>65</u>						
	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5.3</u>						
Mother	12	10	4	Mother	25	45	Mother	27	8	2	Mother	40	33
Self	12	2	3	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	21	38	Self	21	6	4	Self	34	28
Sch.mu.ens.dir.	7	7	3	Self	19	35	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	10	7	6	Father & app.		
											mus.inst.	29	24

		<u>Instrumentalists</u>			<u>Vocalists</u>								
<u>Ranked Response (1, 2, & 3)</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>30</u>						
	<u>Self</u>	<u>Sch.mu.ens.dir.</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>	<u>Mother</u>						
	<u>2.6</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>22.3</u>	<u>22.3</u>	<u>75.3</u>						
	<u>47</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>75</u>						
	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>40</u>						
	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>						
	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>						
	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>65</u>						
	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5.3</u>						
Mother	26	5	7	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	43	78	Mother	62	16	9	Mother	94	77
Sch.mu.ens.dir.	11	16	9	Mother	41	75	Father	12	44	11	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	79	65

Father	5	15	2	Father	74	61	Self	12	4	3	Father	74	61
--------	---	----	---	--------	----	----	------	----	---	---	--------	----	----

Encouraged Subjects' Interest in Becoming a Teacher During Adolescence

Mother	13	7	2	Mother	23	42	Mother	34	10	5	Mother	53	43
Sch.mu.ens.dir.	6	9	4	Sch.mu.ens.dir.22	40	40	Self	9	2	2	Pvt.mu.tea.	16	29
Self	9	2	2	Pvt.mu.tea.	16	29	Father	10	22	1	Father	36	29

Influenced Subjects to Major in Music During College Years

Self	22	2	1	Sch.mu.ens.dir.33	60	60	Self	45	6	7	Self	60	49
Sch.mu.ens.dir.	8	16	8	Self	26	47	Mother	21	20	12	Mother	57	47
Mother	5	7	6	Mother	21	38	Pvt.mu.tea	14	18	10	Pvt.mu.tea.	55	45

Influenced Subjects to Pursue Teacher Certification During College Years

Self	20	6	1	Self	26	47	Self	41	8	3	Self	54	44
Mother	9	9	3	Mother	22	40	Mother	19	13	6	Mother	47	38
Sch.ens.dir.	6	5	4	Father &			Pvt.mu.tea.	11	12	3	Father &		
				sch.mu.ens.dir.17	31	31					pvt.mu.tea.	30	25

Helped Subjects to Think of Themselves as Musicians During College Years

App.mu.inst.	14	8	3	App.mu.inst.	27	49	App.mu.inst.	29	11	7	App.mu.inst.	50	41
Self	11	3	3	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	25	45	Self	24	5	6	Mother	46	38
Sch.mu.ens.dir.	9	9	5	Self	21	38	Mother	15	15	30	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	42	34

Helped Subjects to Think of Themselves as Teachers or Educators During College Years

Self	13	2	3	Mus.ed.inst.	20	36	Self	28	7	6	Mus.ed.inst.	43	35
Mus.ed.inst.	10	8	0	Self	17	31	Mus.ed.inst.	18	13	7	Mother & self	39	32
Sch.mu.ens.dir.	8	3	4	Sch.mu.ens.dir.	13	24	Mother	15	11	8	App.mu.inst.	34	28

Influenced Subjects as Musicians During Post-College Years

Self	16	4	1	Self	24	44	Self	26	5	3	Self	38	31
Other dirs. & spouse	6	4	3	Other dirs.	16	29	Mother	13	8	7	Mother	33	27
Pvt.mu.tea.	7	2	1	Pvt.mu.tea.	14	25	Other dirs.	11	8	4	Other classrm. teachers	27	22

Influenced Subjects as Educators During Post-College Years

Self	13	4	3	Self	22	40	Self	22	7	4	Administrator	57	47
------	----	---	---	------	----	----	------	----	---	---	---------------	----	----

Other dirs. &	8	3	4	Administrator	21	38	Administrator	21	19	13	Other classrm.	
administrator	7	7	1	Other classrm.			Other classrm.				Self	38
Mother	7	3	3	teachers	20	36	teachers	14	22	11		31

Note: N=177

APPENDIX P
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
LETTER OF APPROVAL



University of North Texas

Office of Research Administration

January 31, 1994

Patricia Cox
509 Live Oak
Searcy, AR 72143

Dear Ms. Cox:

Your proposal entitled "The Perceived Role of Significant Others in the Socialization Process of Music Educators as Musicians and Teachers," has been approved by the IRB and is exempt from further review under 45 CFR 46.101.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (817) 565-3946.

Good luck on your project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sandra Terrell".

Sandra Terrell, Chair
Institutional Review Board

ST/tl

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. (1981). The identity crisis of the art educator: Artist? Educator? Both?. Art Education, 34 (4), 45-46.
- Arian, E. (1971). Bach, beethoven and bureaucracy: The case of the Philadelphia orchestra, University, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1952). The career of the Chicago public schoolteacher. American Journal of Sociology, 57, 352-369.
- Becker, H. S. (1970) Sociological work. Chicago: Aldine.
- Becker, H. S. (1976). Art worlds and social types. American Behavioral Scientist, 19, (6), 703-718.
- Becker, H. S., Geer, B., & Hughes, E. C. (1968), Making the grade: The academic side of college life. New York: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. S. (1961), Boys in white: Student culture in medical school. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berdie, D., & Anderson, J. (1974), Questionnaires: Design and use. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Berger, P., & Berger, B. (1975). Sociology: A biographical approach. (2nd ed.) New York: Basic Books.
- Berger, P., & Luckman, T. (1966). The social construction of reality. New York: Free Press.
- Biddle, B., Twyman, J., & Rankin, E., Jr. (1962), The role of the teacher and occupational choice. The School Review, 18, 191-206.
- Binder, D. (1989), Music: A frequently missing component in

American studies (American Studies Association, Canadian Association for American Studies International Convention), "Americas '89: Five Centuries of Endings and Beginnings", Toronto Sheraton, November 2-5.

- Braga, J. (1972). Teacher role perception. Journal of Teacher Education, 23(1), 53-57.
- Brand, M. (1984). Music teacher effectiveness research, University of Houston, (ERIC Document Publication Service No. ED 253 443).
- Brim, O. G., Jr. (1966). Socialization through the life cycle. In O. G. Brim, Jr. & S. Wheeler (Eds.), Socialization after Childhood: Two essays. (pp. 1-50) New York: Wiley.
- Brown, B., B. Frankel & M. Fennell (1989). Hugs or shrugs: Parental and peer influence on continuity of involvement in sport by female adolescents. Sex Roles, 20(7/8), 397-409.
- Bullough, R., Jr. (1992, January-February). Exploring personal teaching metaphors in preservice, teacher education, Journal of Teacher Education, 42(1), 43-51.
- Burchard, W. (1954). Role conflicts of military chaplains, American Sociological Review, 19, 528-535.
- Burke, P. (1991). Identity processes and social stress, American Sociological Review, 56(6), 836-849.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1990). The condition of teaching, a state-by-state analysis. Princeton, NJ.: Fonder, M., ed.
- Carper, J. (1970a). Adjustment of conflicting expectations in the development of identification with an occupation. In H. Becker (Ed.) Sociological work, (203-211). Chicago: Aldine.
- Carper, J. (1970b). The development of identification with an occupation. In H. Becker (Ed.) Sociological work, (189-201). Chicago: Aldine.

- Carper, J. (1970c). The elements of identification with an occupation. In H. Becker (Ed.) Sociological work (177-188). Chicago: Aldine.
- Caimi, F. (1981). Relationships between motivation variables and selected criterion measures of high school band directing success. Journal of Research in Music Education, 29(3), 183-98.
- Clark, V., & Reagan, S. (1988). A method for considering the values of teachers in curriculum guide education. Action in Teacher Education, 10(2), 65-71.
- Clark-Lempers, D., Lempers, J. & Ho, C.. (1991). Early, middle, and late adolescents' perceptions of their relationships with significant others. Journal of Adolescent Research, 6(3), 296-315.
- Clinton, J. (1991). An investigation of the self-perceptions certified fine arts teachers have toward their roles as artists and instructional staff members in selected schools of Oklahoma. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton, TX.
- Colwell, R. (1988). Second thoughts. In C. Fowler (Ed) The crane symposium (pp. 181-186). Potsdam: Potsdam College of the State University of New York.
- Cooley, C. H. (1922). Human nature and the social order. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Corwin, R. (1961). The professional employee: A study of conflict in nursing roles. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 604.
- Cotterell, J. (1992). The relation of attachments and supports to adolescent well-being and school adjustment. Journal of Adolescent Research, 7(1), 28-42.
- Cowden, R. (1988). D. J. Nimmo: Factors of attrition among high school band directors: A review. Bulletin: Council for Research in Music Education, 98, 40-44.
- Denzin, N. (1966). The significant others of a college population. The

Sociological Quarterly, 7, 298-310.

Denzin, N. (1977). Childhood socialization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. (1922). Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology. New York: Holt.

Dickstein, S., & Parke, R. (1988). Social referencing in infancy: A glance at fathers and marriage. Child Development, 59, 506-11.

Ekman, R. (1985). A brief history of the effects of social institutions on the civic values of american youth, German-American conference. The development of civic competence and civic responsibility among youth, (ERIC Document Publication Service No. ED 299 176).

Elkin, F. (1960). The child and society: The process of socialization. New York: Random House.

Faulkner, R. (1971). The Hollywood studio musician. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton Press.

Faulkner, R. (1973). Career concerns and mobility motivations of orchestra musicians. The Sociological Quarterly, 14, 334-349.

Feldens, M. & Duncan, J. (1988). Brazilians speak out about their schools: Implications for teacher education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 14(2), 105-123.

Fishburn, C. (1962). Teacher role perception in the secondary school. The Journal of Teacher Education, 13(1), 55-59.

Foley, R., & Templeton, D. (1969). Conflict, craftsmen and professionals: A sociological view of the art teacher. Art Education, 23(2), 47-59.

Fowler, C. (1988), (ed), The Crane symposium: Toward an understanding of the teaching and learning of music performance. Potsdam: Potsdam College of the State University of New York.

- Frederickson, J. & Rooney, J. F. (1988). The free-lance musician as a type of non-person: An extension of the concept of non-personhood. The Sociological Quarterly, 29(2), 221-239.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. Developmental Psychology, 21, 1016-1024.
- Gaines, J. (1972). Building community support for the music education program. Music Educators Journal, 58(5) 25-56.
- Galbo, J. (1986). The teacher of adolescents as significant adult. (Paper presented at First Biannual Conference of the Society for Research on Adolescence), Madison, Wisconsin (ERIC Document Publication Service No. ED 288 869).
- Galbo, J. (1989). The teacher as significant adult: A review of the literature, Adolescence, 24(95), 549-565.
- Geer, B. (1966). Occupational commitment and the teaching profession. The School Review, 74, 31-47.
- Getzels, J., & Guba, E. (1954). Role, role conflict, and effectiveness: an empirical study, American Sociological Review, 19, 164-175.
- Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Basic Books.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J. (1991). A study of the education of educators: One year later. Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 72, 311-316.
- Gordon, C. (1955). The role of the teacher in the social structure of high school. The Journal of Educational Sociology, 29, 21-29.

- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.
- Haller, A., & Woelfel, J. (1969). The Wisconsin significant other battery. (Final report, project 5-1170) Washington, DC: U. S. Office of Education.
- Harris, R. (1991). Musician and teacher: The relationship between role identification and intrinsic career satisfaction of the music faculty at doctoral degree granting institutions Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton, TX.).
- Heard, D. (1990). How do teachers identify multicultural and cross-cultural pedagogical phenomena in and out of arts classrooms? Educational Review, 42(3), 303-18.
- Hendry, L., Roberts, W., Glendinning, A., & Coleman, J. (1992). Adolescents' perceptions of significant individuals in their lives, Journal of Adolescence, 15, 255-270.
- Herzberg, L. E. (1976). One more time: How do you motivate employees? In M. M. Gruneberg (Ed.). Job satisfaction: A reader (pp. 17-32). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hinkle, D., Wiersma, W., and Jurs, S. (1988). Applied statistice for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Holsti, O. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hughes, E. C. (1958). Men and their work. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Hughes, J. N.(1983). The application of cognitive dissonance theory to consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 21, 349-357.
- Hyman, H. H. (1942). The psychology of status. Archives of Psychology, 38(267), 6.
- Hyman, H. H., & Singer, E. (Eds.). (1968). Readings in reference group theory and research. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

- Kadushin, C. (1969). The professional self-concept of music students. American Journal of Sociology, 75, 389-404.
- Kaplan, M. (1990). The arts: A social perspective. London: Associated University Press.
- Kealy, E. (1974). The musician in America: A study of his social roles (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois). Dissertation Abstracts, 12,110. (University Microfilms No. 11-03142)
- Kealy, E. (1979). From craft to art: The case of sound mixers and popular music. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 6, 3-29.
- Krueger, R. J. (1976). Investigation of personality and music teaching success. Bulletin: Council of Research in Music Education, 47, 16-25.
- Kuhlen, R. G. (1976). Needs, perceived need satisfaction opportunities, and satisfaction with occupation. In M. M. Gruneberg (Ed.). Job satisfaction: A reader (pp. 3-17). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kuhn, M. H. (1964). The reference group reconsidered. The Sociological Quarterly, 5, 6-21.
- Kushner, S. (1991). Musicians go to school: A case of knowledge, control, and cross-professional action, American educational research journal, 28(2), 275-296.
- Lackovic-Grgin, K., & Dekovic, M. (1990). The contribution of significant others to adolescents' self-esteem. Adolescence, 25(100), 839-846.
- Lawler, E. E. III, (1976). Job design and employee motivation. In M. M. Gruneberg (Ed.). Job satisfaction: A reader (pp. 90-98). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Leatherby, L. (1970). Conflicts in commitment to art education. Art Education, 24(2), 6-7.

- Lipham, J., Rankin, R., & Hoeh, J. (1985). The principalship: Concepts, competencies, and cases. New York: Longman.
- Lortie, D. (1959). Laymen to lawmen. Harvard Educational Review, 29, 470-477.
- Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- L'Roy, D. (1983). The development of occupational identity in undergraduate music majors. (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University 1984), Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 4502-A.
- Madsen, C. H. & Madsen, C. K. (1981). Teaching/discipline: A positive approach for educational development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Manis, J. G., & Meltzer, B. N. (1972). Symbolic interaction: A reader in social psychology. (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Margolin, L., Blyth, D., & Carbone, D. (1988). The family as a looking glass: Interpreting family influences on adolescent self-esteem from a symbolic interaction perspective. Journal of Early Adolescence, 8(3), 211-224.
- McCormick, K. (1988). Make big music with a small staff, The executive educator, 10(12), 24-26.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, G. H. (1977). On social psychology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meltzer, B. N., Petras, J. W., & Reynolds, L. T. (1975). Symbolic interactionism. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Meltzer, B. N. (1964). Mead's social psychology. In The social

- psychology of George Herbert Mead (pp. 10-31). Western Michigan University: Center for Sociological Research.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). Social theory and social structure (rev. ed.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Mortimer, J. T., & Lorence, J. (1979). Occupational experience and the self-concept: a longitudinal study. Social Psychology Quarterly, 42, (4), 307-323.
- Nash, D. (1954). The American composer: A study in social-psychology (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan). Publication No. 7807. (University Microfilms No. 58-6726).
- Oleson, V., & Whittaker, E. (1968). The silent dialogue. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parker, J. H. (1970). The alienation of public school teachers: A reference group theory approach. Contemporary Education, 41 (6), 276-279.
- Parsons, T. (1951). The social system. New York: Free Press.
- Pavalko, R. (1971). Sociology of occupations and professions. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.
- Pavalko, R. (1972). (Ed.). Sociological perspectives on occupations. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Rainbow, E. L., & Froehlich, H. C. (1987). Research in music education: An introduction to systematic inquiry. New York: Schirmer.
- Roberts, B. (1990). Teacher education as identity construction. Music: a case study. (ERIC Document Publication Service No. ED 328 531).
- Roberts, B. (1991). Musician: a process of labelling. St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada: Memorial University.
- Roberts, B. (1993a). I, musician: Towards a model of identity construction and maintenance by music education students as

musicians. St John's, Newfoundland, Canada: Memorial University.

- Roberts, B., Brennan, M., Dundas, K., Walso, K., Warren, R. (1993b). Why music? Towards a sociological theory to explain the selection of music for study at university. Presented at the Canadian Music Educators Conference, Research Council, Wilfred Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario.
- Rosenberg, M. (1973). Which significant others? American Behavioral Scientist, 16, 829-60.
- Rowell, J. (1989). From implicit to explicit: Religiously informed values in public schools. Religion and Public Education, 16(3), 335-37.
- Regelski, T. (1988). Inferences for teacher education. In C. Fowler (Ed.) The Crain symposium (pp.187-196). Potsdam: Potsdam College of the State University of New York.
- Rumbelow, A. S. (1969). Music and social groups: An interactionist approach to the sociology of music (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota). Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 1389A. (University Microfilms No. 70-15802)
- Saltiel, J. (1986). Segmental influence: The case of educational and occupational significant others. Adolescence, 21(83), 615-22.
- Seashore, S., & Taber, T. (1975). Job satisfaction indicators and their correlates, American Behavioral Scientist, 18, 333-368.
- Shibutani, T. (1955). Reference groups as perspectives. American Journal of Sociology, 60, 562-569.
- Shrauger, J. S., & Shoeneman, T. J. (1979). Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 549.
- Simpson, I. H. (1967). Patterns of socialization into professions: The

- case of Student Nurses. Sociological Inquiry, 37, 47-54.
- Simmel, G. (1950). The society of Georg Simmel. L. Wolf (Ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Stryker, S. (1964). The interactional and situational approaches. In H. Christensen (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family (125-170), Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Stryker, S. (1967). Symbolic interaction as an approach to family research. In J. G. Mannis & B. N. Meltzer (Eds.). Symbolic interactions: A reader in social psychology. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 371-383.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1940). Conceptions of modern psychiatry. Washington, DC: W. A. White Psychiatric Foundation.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). An interpersonal theory of psychology. New York: Norton.
- Szekely, G. (1977). Uniting the roles of artist and teacher. Art Education, 31(1), 17-20.
- Wesleyan Symposium on the Perspectives of Social Anthropology in the Teaching and Learning of Music. (1984). Reston, Va.: Music Educators National Conference.
- White, H. (1964). The professional role and status of the school music teacher (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas). Dissertation Abstracts, 25, 7415. (University Microfilms No. 65-04968).
- White, H. G. (1967). The professional role and the status of music educators in the United States, Journal of research in music education, Vol. 15, 3-10.
- Williams, R. H., & Williams, S. A. (1987). Level of identification as a predictor of attitude change. Simulations and Games, 18 (4), 471-87.

- Woelfel, J. (1972). Significant others and their role relationships to students in a high school population, Rural sociology, 37(1), 86-97.
- Zurcher, L., Jr., Meadow, A., & Zurcher, S. (1965). Value orientation, role conflict, and alienation from work: A cross-cultural study, American Sociological Review, 30, 339-548.