INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Finkelstein, Mark Stephen

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILES OF MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE MUSIC FACULTY

Michigan State University PH.D. 1983

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Other _____

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILES OF MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE MUSIC FACULTY

By

Mark Stephen Finkelstein

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Music

1983

ABSTRACT

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILES OF MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE MUSIC FACULTY

By

Mark Stephen Finkelstein

Music teachers from 23 Michigan community colleges served as subjects for this descriptive study. Demographic, situational, and attitudinal data were collected by mail questionnaire from 123 respondents (65% of estimated population). Profiles were constructed for three types of faculty: full-time instructors, part-time faculty solely teaching private music lessons, and general part-time faculty.

Findings included: (a) Differences between full- and part-time faculty were widespread: full-time faculty were more likely than part-time faculty to be male (90% to 49%) and to have taught in the public schools (80% to 34%). They were virtually the only faculty to have been granted tenure (90%), academic rank (30%), and to become music administrators (40%); (2) Differences between part-time general and part-time applied faculty were not so pronounced. The applied faculty, 52% of whom taught off-campus exclusively, displayed wider age and on-the-job experience distributions than did part-time general faculty. General faculty were most likely to have resided in their community before they accepted their positions and exhibited

heterogeneity of academic background, range of professional experience, and musical taste; (3) full-time instructors derived significantly greater satisfaction than did part-time instructors from personal and professional benefits and from use of campus facilities. Part-time applied faculty reported less satisfaction with prestige than did other subgroups; (4) Subgroups generally found the encouragement of student musical involvement a primary professional concern and found little or no difficulties performing instructional-related organizational tasks. Part-time general faculty experienced greater difficulty than others in utilizing their school's resources. Part-time applied instructors encountered fewer difficulties than full-time instructors in helping students meet course requirements.

The data suggests that many instructors, mostly part-time faculty, expressed attitudes contrary to the institution's student-centered position. Recommendations were made to influence the work-group culture through pre- and in-service training, and through increased faculty participation in the national music educators' association.

To My Parents

and

Grandparents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Robert Erbes, chairperson of my committee, for his limitless patience and unfailing support during production of this study. Particular thanks are expressed to Dr. Charles McDermid for the time and effort expended on my behalf. His comments and criticisms are most highly appreciated. Thanks are also expressed to Drs. Russell Friedewald and Rosalie Schellhaus, members of the guidance committee, for their interest and counsel. To Dr. Daniel Russell (now at Northwestern University) and Dr. Dale Bonge, I owe a debt of gratitude for their assistance in the early stages of the project.

I would like to acknowledge and thank the faculty members from the Michigan community colleges who gave of their time and advice. In addition, thanks are extended to Mary Dassance, technical specialist at Lansing Community College's Professional Resource Center, for providing ready access to the Center's excellent collection of materials. I am also grateful for the assistance in the preparation of this dissertation provided by Janet Abramson, Sandra Gross, and Nancy Heath.

Deepest appreciation goes to my loving wife, Jody, who helped see this project through to completion, and to my parents and sibling who had confidence in me over these many years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii
BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Need for the Study	2
Statement of Purpose	4
Statement of the Basic Questions	5
Significance of the Study	6
Scope and Limitations of the Study	8
Assumptions	8
Definitions	9
Overview of the Report	11
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Introduction	12
Issues and Problems Concerning the Two-Year College Faculty	12
Two-Year College Faculty and Their Professional Identity	12
Issues Concerning Part-Time Faculty	18
Job Satisfaction	26
Defining the Model Two-Year College Faculty Member	41
Descriptors of Two-Year College Faculty	44
Summary of General Literature About Two-Year College Faculty	48
The Two-Year College Music Instructor	50
Music in the Two-Year Colleges	50
Staffing Patterns for Two-Year College Music Programs	53
Duties and Responsibilities of Two-Year College Music Faculty	57
Descriptors of Two-Year College Music Faculty	63
Job Appraisals	68
Summary of Literature Pertaining to Two-Year College Music Faculty	74

Page

SAMPLE, INSTRUMENT, AND PROCEDURES 76

Introduction 76
Methodology 76
Construction of the Community College Music Faculty Questionnaire 78
Summary of the Questionnaire's Content 78
Procedural Review 81
Construction of the Position Satisfaction Scale . . 84
Construction of the Instructional Difficulties Scale . 86
The Sample 88
Results of the Initial Inquiry 88
Dissemination and Retrieval of the Questionnaire . . 90
Response to the Questionnaire 90
Treatment of the Data 92
Editorial Decisions 92
Factor Analysis of the Attitudinal Measures . . . 93
Factor Analysis of the Position Satisfaction Scale . 95
Factor Analysis of the Instructional Difficulties Scale 97
Analytical Procedures 99

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 102

Descriptors of Respondents 103
Breakdown by Employment Status 103
Demographic Descriptors 105
Experiential Descriptors 109
Professional Descriptors 121
Functional Descriptors 122
Attitudinal Descriptors 134
Categorization of Environmental Variables 149
Classification of Position Satisfaction Variables . 150
Classification of Instructional Difficulties Variables 153
Attitudinal Measure Subscale Analysis 157
Analysis of the Position Satisfaction Subscale Means . 157
Analysis of the Instructional Difficulties Subscale Means 164
Content Analysis of Faculty Response to Open-Ended Questions 172
Content Analysis of Question 1 174
Content Analysis of Question 2 175
Content Analysis of Question 3 177

Page

SUMMARY, PROFILES, AND DISCUSSION 179

Summary 179
Correlates of Subgroup Status 180
Findings Relating to Use of the Position Satisfaction Scale 181
Findings Relating to Use of the Instructional Difficulties Scale 183
Advice Given by the Music Faculty to Prospective Teachers 184
Profile of Full-time Community College Music Instructors 185
Profile of Part-time General Instructors of Music . . 188
Profile of Private Music Instructors 191
Conclusions 193
Discussion 196
Recommendations 199
Recommendations for Further Research 206

APPENDICES 209

LIST OF REFERENCES 257

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Advantages of Hiring Part-Time Faculty	20
2.2	Sources of Part-Time Faculty Dissatisfaction . . .	33
2.3	Herzberg's Classification of Factors Influencing Motivation	35
2.4	Course Offerings in Music on the Public and Private Two-Year College Campuses in Michigan (1977) . . .	59
3.1	Summary of the Questionnaire's Content	79
3.2	Subscale of the Satisfaction Measure	96
3.3	Subscale of the Difficulty Measure	98
4.1	Identification of Full-time and Part-time Employment Status	103
4.2	Identification of Part-time Subgroup Status . . .	104
4.3	Identification of Full-time Subgroup Status . . .	104
4.4	Breakdown of Sample by Faculty Subgroup	105
4.5	Distribution of Gender by Status	105
4.6	Distribution of Gender Across Subgroups	106
4.7	Age: Central Tendencies for the Sample	106
4.8	Age: Breakdown by Subgroup	107
4.9	Staffing Patterns: Breakdown by Locale	108
4.10	Staffing Patterns: Breakdown by Subgroup	108
4.11	Years in Current Position: Central Tendencies of the Sample	109

Table		Page
4.12	Years in Current Position: Breakdown by Subgroups	109
4.13	Total Teaching Experience: Central Tendencies of the Sample	110
4.14	Total Teaching Experience: Breakdown by Subgroup	110
4.15	Academic Degrees	111
4.16	Current Enrollment Toward a Degree	112
4.17	Community College Attendance	113
4.18	Formal Study of the Institution	113
4.19	Performing Abilities	114
4.20	Private Teaching Experience	115
4.21	Public School Teaching Experience	115
4.22	Music Industry Experience	116
4.23	Experience as a Commercial/Studio Musician	116
4.24	Experience as a Graduate Teaching Assistant	117
4.25	Other Musical Experience	117
4.26	Summary of Professional Experience Patterns for the Sample	118
4.27	Summary of Professional Experience Patterns by Subgroup	119
4.28	Concurrent Employment	120
4.29	Source of Regional Recruitment	120
4.30	Academic Rank	121
4.31	Tenure	122
4.32	Number of Hours Taught	123
4.33	Music Administrators	123

Table		Page
4.34	Place of Instruction	124
4.35	Times of Instruction	125
4.36	Kinds of Students Taught	126
4.37	Applied Instrumental Lessons	126
4.38	Applied Vocal Lessons	127
4.39	Class Applied Instruction	127
4.40	Music Theory and Ear Training	128
4.41	Music Appreciation	129
4.42	Music History	129
4.43	Music for Education Majors	129
4.44	Music Business/Industry Courses	130
4.45	Conduct Vocal Ensemble	131
4.46	Conduct Instrumental Ensemble	131
4.47	Other Course Assignment	131
4.48	Rank Ordering of the Frequency with which Courses Are Assigned	133
4.49	Apportionment of Course Assignments	134
4.50	Reason for Entry: Professional Preparation	135
4.51	Reason for Entry: Relative was Employed in the Vicinity	136
4.52	Reason for Entry: Needed a Second Job	136
4.53	Reason for Entry: To Avoid Public School Teaching	137
4.54	Reason for Entry: To Fill Leisure Time	137
4.55	Reason for Entry: For the Prestige	138
4.56	Reason for Entry: Unavailability of Public School Position	138

Table		Page
4.57	Reason for Entry: Unavailability of Senior College Position	139
4.58	Reason for Entry: To Gain Teaching Experience	140
4.59	Reason for Entry: Employment while Completing Graduate Degree	140
4.60	Reason for Entry: Other Factors	141
4.61	Rank-Ordering of Reasons for Entry into Position	142
4.62	Ordering by Subgroup of Reasons for Entry into Position	143
4.63	Job Preference	144
4.64	Professional Allegiance	145
4.65	Preferred Program Orientation	146
4.66	Motivational State	147
4.67	Perception of Teaching Load	148
4.68	Musical Preference	148
4.69	Professional Plans	149
4.70	Summary Table: Faculty Perception of Position Variables	151
4.71	Instructional Difficulties Scale Summary	154
4.72	Survival Subscale: Subgroup Means	158
4.73	Survival Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-A Differences	158
4.74	Survival Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-G Differences	158
4.75	Survival Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and PT-A Similarities	159
4.76	Facilities Subscale: Subscale Means	159

Table		Page
4.77	Facilities Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-G Differences	160
4.78	Facilities Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-A Differences	160
4.79	Facilities Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and PT-A Similarities	160
4.80	Social Relations Subscale: Subscale Means	161
4.81	Social Subscale: ANOVA Indicating Lack of Significant Differences	161
4.82	Prestige Subscale: Subgroup Means	162
4.83	Prestige Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-A and FT Differences	162
4.84	Prestige Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-A and PT-G Differences	163
4.85	Prestige Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-G Similarities	163
4.86	Summary Table: Position Satisfaction Subscale Means by Subgroup	165
4.87	Student Musical-Involvement Subscale: Subgroup Means	166
4.88	SMI Subscale: ANOVA Indicating Lack of Significant Differences	166
4.89	Student Requirements Subscale: Subgroup Means	167
4.90	SR Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-A Differences	167
4.91	SR Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-G Similarities	168
4.92	SR Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and PT-A Similarities	168
4.93	Organization Subscale: Subgroup Means	169
4.94	Organization Subscale: ANOVA Indicating Lack of Significant Differences	169

Table		Page
4.95	Materials Subscale: Subgroup Means	170
4.96	Materials Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and FT Differences	170
4.97	Materials Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and PT-A Differences	170
4.98	Materials Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-A Similarities	171
4.99	Summary Table: Instructional Difficulties Subscale Means by Subgroup	173
A-3.1	Inventory of Questionnaire Items and Their Sources	218
A-4.1	Potential Sources of Position Satisfaction	220
A-5.1	Potential Sources of Instructional-Related Difficulties	223
A-6.1	Rank-Ordering of Most Satisfying Position Variables by Subgroup	226
A-7.1	Rank-Ordering of Least Satisfying Position Variables by Subgroup	229
A-8.1	Frequency Distribution for the 40 Position Satisfaction Items	232
A-9.1	Position Variables Rated Inapplicable by More than 20% of Cases	235
A-10.1	Rank-Ordering of Most Troublesome Instructional Variables by Subgroup	237
A-11.1	Instructional Variables Rated Moderately Problematic	240
A-12.1	Rank-Ordering of Least Troublesome Instructional Variables by Subgroup	243
A-13.1	Frequency Distribution for the 56 Instructional Difficulties Items	246
A-14.1	Correlates of Selected Variables	240

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
1	Cover Letter for Questionnaire	210
2	Questionnaire	212
3	Inventory of Questionnaire Items and Their Sources Table	217
4	Potential Sources of Position Satisfaction Table	219
5	Potential Sources of Instructional-Related Difficulties Table	222
6	Rank-Ordering of Most Satisfying Position Variables by Subgroup Table	225
7	Rank-Ordering of Least Satisfying Position Variables by Subgroup Table	228
8	Frequency Distribution for the 40 Position Satisfaction Items Table	231
9	Position Variables Rated Inapplicable by More Than 20% of Cases Table	234
10	Rank-Ordering of Most Troublesome Instructional Variables by Subgroup Table	236
11	Instructional Variables Rated Moderately Problematic Table	239
12	Rank-Ordering of Least Troublesome Instructional Variables by Subgroup Table	242
13	Frequency Distribution for the 56 Instructional Difficulties Items Table	245
14	Correlates of Selected Variables Table	248
15	Comparison of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Characteristics	250

Appendix | Page

16 Comparison of Part-Time General Faculty and Part-Time Applied Faculty Characteristics 253

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

Introduction

Over the past two decades, the two-year community colleges have grown in such numbers and popularity as to command statewide, national, and even international attention. In Michigan, for example, as one prominent spokesman for the community colleges stated, "The community colleges were [by 1976] no longer small potatoes. They had grown in just a short time from using about $50 million to $100 million of state money" (Gleazer, 1980, p. 118), and Michigan is no anomaly. While in some states the community college system has expanded more than in others, there is little doubt that its impact on education has been phenomenal. The community college is now widely acclaimed as "probably the most significant development in American higher education thus far in the twentieth century" (Burnett, c. 1977, p. 1), and its patterns and principles are studied and emulated as far away as Japan.

The uniqueness of the institution itself has made the community college, the people's college, so popular. Students of all kinds are attracted by the community college's informal atmosphere, close proximity to home, and inexpensive tuition. Through the community college, students can train for careers, pursue a traditional liberal arts education, or take courses for personal enjoyment. Because the community college offers its comprehensive services to all who apply,

it is considered to have revolutionized post-secondary education in America.

Music has long held its place within the two-year college curriculum. When an ad hoc Music Educators National Conference (MENC) Committee on Music in the Junior Colleges acknowledged in 1970 that the "junior colleges [were] playing an increasingly important role in higher education" (Stover et al., 1970, p. 36), the study of music had been part of the junior college curriculum for at least thirty years. As early as 1939, such individuals as S. Earle Blakeslee and Esther Goetz, chairpersons of the first MENC Committees on Music in the Junior Colleges from 1936-1940 and 1940-1942, respectively, debated in public the merits of the junior college in fostering musical growth within a nontraditional student body (MENC Yearbook, 1939-1940).

Need for the Study

Although music has been a part of junior college education for several decades, relatively little is known about the circumstances under which it has been taught. As Gagermeier stated in 1967: "To date there exists no authoritative and comprehensive study of the role of music in the junior college. Moreover, concern of any kind with the area of music in the junior college has been conspicuously and sadly lacking" (1967, p. 4). In 1983 Gagermeier's observation can still be accepted as valid. Certainly little attention has been paid to the music faculty members employed at the community college level.

Of the few studies pertaining to music instructors employed within the two-year colleges, perhaps the most relevant was conducted by Merkel (1977). Merkel surveyed the responsibilities of Michigan's two-year college music faculty and concluded that more descriptive research of two-year college music faculty was needed:

> Although much research has been written about the faculty in community colleges, it yet remains for someone to do a definitive study which will more thoroughly answer . . . [questions in regard to the music faculty in the two-year colleges] (pp. 114-115).

He specifically cited the need to ascertain who the two-year college music instructors were, why they were there, and how they felt about themselves and their work (1977, p. 114).

Additional support for conducting descriptive research on community college music faculty may be gleaned from the writings of the music education researchers Schneider and Cady (1965) who stated that:

> The various attitudes of teachers, such as the attitudes toward non-musical endeavors in and out of school, professional responsibilities of differing kinds, varieties of students and other school personnel, needs clarification (p. 322).

A third reason to support additional research on community college music faculty relates to the lack of information about part-time music teachers. Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982) reported that "part-timers are essential to the operation of programs in music" (p. 22). In fact, according to Merkel (1977, p. 97), part-time music faculty outnumber full-time music faculty in Michigan two-year colleges. Despite their prominence, however, part-time

music faculty have almost always been selectively excluded from research studies. Even within the realm of general community college instructor-oriented research, comparisons between part-time and full-time faculty have been notably lacking (Cohen & Brawer, 1977, p. xi).

The questions Merkel and others recommend be addressed are those that require research into the demographic, experiential, functional, professional, and attitudinal identity of community college music faculty. While inquiry into all these areas shall be undertaken in this study, special attention shall be paid to investigating the faculty's professional self-perception. This area merits special consideration in light of the widespread complaint voiced by researchers that the professional identity of the community college instructor is still in the process of formation (Cohen & Brawer, 1977; London, 1980; Jamerson, 1979).

Statement of Purpose

This study is devoted to the descriptive characterization of music faculty employed within Michigan public community colleges based on data to be collected by mail questionnaire. The primary purpose of the study is to construct profiles for three types of music faculty defined herein: full-time faculty, part-time general faculty, and part-time applied faculty. Secondary purposes include an examination of self-reported job satisfaction of music faculty regarding the three faculty subgroupings, and a determination of what full-time, part-time general, and part-time applied music faculty perceive to be their major instructional-related difficulties. Additional purposes

are to summarize the advice given by faculty members to prospective community college music instructors to appraise professional self-perception and to recommend practices intended to stimulate professional growth.

Statement of the Basic Questions

The representative profiles of community college music faculty to be constructed will contain information to answer the following questions:

1. How do community college music faculty describe themselves, and in what ways do the descriptors of full-time and part-time faculty differ?

   a. Do faculty subgroups differ demographically by sex or age?

   b. Do faculty subgroups differ experientially by their length of service, academic background, or range of professional experience? Do they differ in their having been community college students themselves, having studied the philosophy and functions of the community college, or being new to their community when they first accepted their positions? Do they differ in their performance skills, or in their members holding concurrent employment?

   c. Do faculty subgroups differ professionally by academic rank or tenure?

   d. Do faculty subgroups differ functionally by serving as music administrators, or by where, when, who, what, or how many hours per week they teach?

e. Do faculty subgroups differ attitudinally by their reasons for entering community college teaching, job preference, professional allegiance, preferred program orientation, motivational state, musical taste, or plans to stay in community college teaching?

2. From what environmental factors do subgroup members derive average position satisfaction or better? From what factors do subgroup members derive less than average position satisfaction?

3. What the the most difficult instructional-related problems subgroup members face?

4. What advice do faculty members have to give to prospective community college music teachers?

Significance of the Study

The potential beneficiaries of a study of community college music faculty characteristics and attitudes might include university music educators, current and prospective community college music teachers, music administrators and supervisors.

University music educators require materials which accurately reflect conditions within the various music educational environments. The more information they have about the satisfactions and problems of the community college music staff, the more help they can give to prospective teachers in making a wise career decision. Moreover, the results of this study might enable interested university music educators involved with the Music Educators National Conference to help foster professional development efforts aimed at in-service community college music teachers.

With the results of this study, prospective community college music teachers might gain a better appreciation of the problems they are likely to encounter. They should also be able to determine how entering the field as either a full-time or part-time employee will influence their perception of what is expected of them. In addition, knowledge about what current faculty think about their jobs might arm future faculty with appropriate questions for their prospective employers.

Research pertinent to the community college music instructor might also provide valuable information to the community college music administrator. In order to maintain a music program responsive to students' needs, community college music administrators must assess the relationships between faculty members and the instructional program. Only by monitoring these varied relationships can an administrator hope to make the periodic adjustments needed to re-align his faculty's strengths with a program's objectives. It is hoped that the administrator's efforts can be made more productive through knowledge of general staff characteristics and attitudes. Results of this study may also help administrators identify faculty in immediate need of professional revitalization.

Finally, it is believed that the information compiled here might prove beneficial to the music teacher in service at the community college level. As Katz (1962) suggests, information about one's own attitudes can prove enlightening:

> At the present time college teachers are not expected to have a disciplined awareness of their motivations

> and attitudes in teaching. Given the influence that college teachers have or might have on their students, some sensitiveness to human interactions may come to be regarded part of the college teacher's job (p. 368).

From the results of this study, faculty members might find that they are not alone in their responses, and that they share certain concerns with their colleagues. This may encourage more frequent discussion of their feelings about their job with colleagues. Other faculty members, when presented with the information from this study, may wish to reevaluate or clarify some of the values they hold. For these individuals, an attitudinal change may determine whether or not they stay at the community college level or choose to work elsewhere.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The limitations for this study were as follows:

1. Only currently employed music faculty from the public community colleges within the State of Michigan were surveyed.
2. Only faculty employed in community colleges participating in the study were surveyed.
3. Only faculty members whose names had been provided by their music administrators were sent questionnaires.

Assumptions

For purpose of this study, the following are accepted as valid assumptions:

1. Faculty characteristics and attitudes can validly and reliably be measured by means of a questionnaire.

2. All of the following factors contribute to the validity of the instrument:
   a. Items used in the questionnaire were drawn from the literature relating to the study of higher education faculty, and community/junior college faculty in particular
   b. The items pertain to the environment of the community college music teacher
   c. A nonrestrictive response option ("other") was added to most questions
   d. The questionnaire was submitted for criticism to an expert panel of nonmusic community college faculty and administrators

Definitions

Certain terms which are uncommon or potentially ambiguous appear in these chapters. For the purpose of this study they are defined as follows.

Community College is a term used to identify a public two-year postsecondary institution which offers a general-, transfer-, and terminal-education program.

Music faculty represents all persons engaged in teaching music at the community college level.

Instructor is used as a synonym for teacher. When the term is used to denote a particular academic rank, the phrase will invariably read "rank of instructor."

Employment status is used to differentiate between instructors employed on a full-time, or part-time basis.

Full-time faculty member is used to represent a person carrying a teaching load that contains at least the minimum number of contact hours considered by his college to be the recognized full-time load and is contractually designated to have full-time status.

Part-time faculty member is a term used to identify a person who either carries less than the minimum number of contact hours considered by his college to be the recognized full-time load or is contractually designated to have part-time status.

Employment function is used to differentiate between instructors who are assigned general classroom responsibilities and those who have been hired to teach only private music lessons.

General instructor denotes a person employed by his/her college to teach or direct one or more courses requiring preparation for more than a single student.

Applied music instructor identifies a person employed by his/her college to teach only private vocal or instrumental lessons. Because of the nature of the population surveyed, this term applies only to part-time faculty.

Employment subgroup is a term used to represent a subcategory of faculty members drawn from among the entire faculty. The subgroup is specifically defined by its classification according to both employment status and employment function. Three faculty subgroups are of interest in this study: the full-time, the part-time general, and the part-time applied.

Attitude is defined as the predisposition to view an issue in a certain manner.

Job satisfaction is defined as a general, positive feeling toward one's work, or particular aspects of one's work.

Instructional difficulties is a term which denotes the difficulties personally encountered in the preparation for or performance of one's instructional duties.

Overview of the Report

In the following section, literature related to this study was reviewed. The review dealt with general research studies of two-year college faculty, as well as with studies restricted to two-year college music faculty. In the Samples, Instrument, and Procedures section, the methodology of the study was discussed and the analytical procedures used to interpret the data were described. Results of the study were then presented in the fourth section of this dissertation. A summary of the study, the newly constructed faculty profiles, and a discussion of means for promoting faculty professionalization were contained in the last section.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This section is divided into two parts. Within the first section, literature regarding the broader topic of two-year college faculty is reviewed. Consideration is given to the perception of the two-year college instructional staff by researchers, issues concerning part-time faculty, job satisfaction, attempts that have been made to define the ideal two-year college faculty member, and a description of faculty characteristics. The first part concludes with a brief summary.

The next part of the section is devoted to the review of literature that relates specifically to two-year college music faculty. It contains an examination of the incidence and scope of music in the two-year colleges, the utilization of music faculty, music faculty characteristics, job satisfaction, and role awareness. This part also concludes with a summary.

Issues and Problems Concerning the Two-Year College Faculty

Two-Year College Faculty and Their Professional Identity

A new era for the two-year colleges was initiated during the 1960s. They experienced significant growth, stimulated by such factors as the increasing desirability of obtaining a college education, the attainment of college age by the baby boom generation, and an

increase in federal assistance for occupational education programs. "By 1970," according to Schultz (1977, p. 15), "community college teaching was widely accepted as a career in its own right." Along with recognition, however, more attention than ever before was given to questions regarding the issues associated with community college teaching.

Professionalization: the predominant issue. The predominant issue in the literature on two-year college faculty is professionalization, a term which, in practice, has come to mean the knowledge, acceptance, and fulfillment of the obligations accompanying employment at the two-year college level. This issue subsumes several other issues, such as faculty job satisfaction and the utilization of part-time instructional staff. It has become the overriding concern of faculty-oriented researchers including Garrison, O'Banion, and Cohen and Brawer, who have been affilitated with the major organizations responsible for initiating and disseminating junior college research: the Association of American Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, and the Center for the Study of Community Colleges.

The new context. In effect, the issues surrounding the professionalization of the two-year college teacher emerged when junior college teaching came to be considered a separate profession. Garrison (1967) formally identified the junior college teacher as "a new breed of instructor within higher education" (p. 15). Having

conducted 650 interviews with instructors, Garrison noted that the junior college teacher "is, in his own desire, and view, a colleague in a new collegiate effort" (p. 15).

As a collegiate effort, the two-year community college functions quite differently than does the four-year college. Gleazer (1980) stated that the "community colleges and their progenitors, public junior colleges, were established to extend educational opportunity [to a variety of learners]" (p. 78) beyond those served by four-year institutions.

New responsibilities. The primary responsibilities of the two-year college teacher focus on serving the needs of his/her institution's student body. As Gleazer, a long-time leader within the community college movement, has stated:

> The point of beginning and continuing reference [in community college teaching] is the learning needs and interests of the people, not the syllabus, the book, the course, the professor, the institution (1980, p. 88).

The two-year college instructor is clearly expected to subordinate his/her research interests, and his/her subject-matter orientation to the needs of students, as attested to by Garrison (1967, p. 78), Kelley and Wilbur (1970, p. 146), and Cohen and Brawer (1977, p. 46). This student orientation, according to Garrison (1967, p. 15), accounts for the significant differences in professional and philosophical attitudes which separate two-year and four-year college faculty.

The two-year college instructor is also expected to have been prepared academically to accommodate individual learning needs. According to Kelley and Wilbur (1970), "the typical junior college

teacher needs greater depth of subject matter than the typical high school teacher. And he requires greater breadth in a field of knowledge than does the typical college-university teacher" (p. 52).

Living up to expectations. Kelley and Wilbur (1970, p. 52) noted that individuals wishing to teach at the two-year college level must possess a body of knowledge to impart and be willing and able to teach students displaying a wide variety of learning abilities. The second requirement is generally the more difficult to fulfill.

It is all too easy for instructors to adopt a professional attitude more suitable to university students than to community college students. Community college instructors, unlike staff of senior colleges, must monitor more carefully the degree of independence they grant their students, to prevent them from losing sight of their objectives. Instructors must also seriously consider limiting the amount of abstract material they present to community college students, for as is widely reported (Gleazer, 1964, p. 3; Monroe, 1972, p. 255), many two-year college students may be unable to process the information adequately.

According to Monroe (1972) the academic limitations of the student body "is a fact of life which community college teachers will need to learn to accept gracefully" (p. 255). Those who do not, states London (1980), tend to become demoralized, since "success with students . . . can be sufficiently insubstantial" (p. 70).

A lack of professionalism cited. Placing the student and his needs at the center of the two-year college's mission helped

faculty-oriented researchers to differentiate between desired faculty behavior and observed faculty behavior. Upon making this comparison, O'Banion (1972) found that the typical faculty member was "vocationally and educationally unprepared for specific employment in the community-junior college" (p. 55). He concluded from contemporary reports that "many faculty members do not have the attitudes or graduate preparation that would aid their adjustment to the teaching college [the community college]" (p. 60):

> Many faculty members do not support basic tenets of the community-junior college philosophy, and may have great distaste for a significant proportion of students who attend the institutions.

Others critical of the two-year college faculty's adaptation to their positions include the research team of Cohen and Brawer. After analyzing the professional identity of the two-year college faculty, they concluded (1972, p. 12), that these instructors had yet to define a place for themselves as distinct from senior college and high school teachers. Their most recent appraisal of two-year college teachers was little better. In 1977, after having conducted a nationwide survey of humanities instructors, they asserted that "collectively the faculty exhibits a picture of an occupational grouping in a nascent stage of professionalization" (Cohen & Brawer, p. xi).

Cohen and Brawer (1977, pp. 100-107) claimed that the faculty display "reclusive" tendencies, such as hiding behind conservative teaching patterns which ignore important innovations in the management of learning. They also claimed that faculty have spurned the

newer methods of student evaluation, which specify objectives designed to evaluate accurately teacher effectiveness. The authors concluded (1977, p. 105) that faculty have failed as yet to develop common goals, techniques, and concerns: the hallmarks of a full-fledged profession. It was their observation that faculty "interact with each other more on questions of rights, welfare, and college level concerns than on issues relating to their doing a better job for their clients" (p. 109).

To promote the professionalization of the two-year college instructional staff, O'Banion (1972) advocated the establishment and extension of pre-service and in-service staff development programs. O'Banion (1974, p. 63) sought to create a "people-oriented" and "process-oriented" staff, knowledgeable in the techniques of curriculum development. Brawer's (1979, p. 22) definition of the mature, self-actualized instructor was one who merges his/her personal and professional roles.

Garrison, O'Banion, and Cohen and Brawer have expressed a widely felt concern with the emerging corporate identity of two-year college instructors. In summary, Cohen and Brawer (1977) stated: Community college instructors "are teachers first, members of the [two-year college] teaching profession second" (p. 7), when, in fact, a community college teachers' commitment should be just the reverse.

Missing from these authors' analyses was the consideration of a growing sgement within the instructional staff: the part-time faculty. Especially in the field of community college music education, part-time faculty have traditionally played an important role (Leslie,

Kellams, & Gunne, 1982, p. 22). Because of this, and other compelling functional roles of the group, the needs and desires of part-time faculty should be given full consideration.

Issues Concerning Part-Time Faculty

Within the past two decades, much has been written about the two-year college instructor, yet only since the mid-1970s have the needs of part-time faculty been seriously considered (Guthrie-Morse, 1979, p. 8). As Harris (1980) states: "During the 1950's, 1960's, and early 1970's, an unusual emphasis was placed upon hiring full-time faculty with a corresponding decreased emphasis on the role of part-time faculty" (p. 13). Both research and discussion about two-year college faculty produced during this period virtually ignored part-time staff members. Interest in part-time faculty increased simultaneously with the sharp increase of their numbers into the community colleges, parallelling the rapid increase of students enrolling in these institutions. In 1971 part-time faculty constituted 40% of the two-year college teaching force. By 1975 their numbers had increased two-fold over 1971 to comprise a majority, 53% of full-time faculty (AACJC, 1981, p. 61). Despite the interest recently directed to part-time faculty, the literature pertaining to part-time faculty remains limited. According to Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982): "In general, very little has been written about part-time faculty. Data are scarce and there has been little continuity in the research efforts in this field" (p. 11).

Importance of part-time faculty. Harris (1980, p. 14) noted that the existing diversified literature on part-time faculty consists largely of articles containing assessments of the importance of part-time faculty to the overall college environment. An example may be found in a frequently cited article by Kuhn (1971, p. 466) which contends that without part-time faculty, the junior collegs could never offer the diversity of courses that they do. Now that part-time faculty are the majority of all two-year college teachers, it appears that Kuhn's observation is true.

Advantages and disadvantages of hiring part-time faculty. A second topic that occurs in the literature relates to the advantages and disadvantages of hiring part-time staff. The advantages of hiring part-time faculty have been summarized by many authors. Eliason (1980, pp. 2 and 6), for example, classified the benefits derived through the use of part-time faculty into social and economic categories. A listing of such benefits from the works of Albert and Watson (1980), Eliason (1980), and Sillman (1980) appears in Table 2.1.

The disadvantages of hiring part-time staff have not been so widely treated. Cosand's study (1979) is the most cogent discussion of the replacement of full-time staff by part-time staff. Cosand (pp. 27-28) stated that by replacing full-time faculty with part-time faculty: (a) the continuity of both personnel and program is sacrificed; and (b) "the core faculty, decreased in size, becomes less representative of the total program, less comprehending, and hence,

TABLE 2.1.--Advantages of Hiring Part-time Faculty

	Albert & Watson	Eliason	Sillman
Economic			
1. Potential savings (per course rate is lower)	x	x	x
2. No fringe benefits	x	x	
3. Minimal office space requirements	x		
4. No long-term commitments	x	x	
5. Can share support services		x	
6. Response to community needs within budget			x
7. Discouragement of collective bargaining due to factionalization			x
Social			
1. Curricular flexibility	x		x
2. Scheduling flexibility			x
3. Used to meet affirmative action guidelines		x	
4. Link to community/industry		x	
5. Pool of talent		x	

SOURCES: Albert and Watson (1980, p. 74).
Eliason (1980, pp. 2, 3, 6, 7).
Sillman (1980, pp. 89-90).

less supportive of the college as a whole." Moreover, according to Cosand, the employment of part-time faculty may prove detrimental because: (a) part-time faculty do not maintain the same out-of-the-classroom contacts with students as do full-time faculty; (b) part-time faculty may feel dissatisfied with their professional compensations; and (c) part-time faculty are perceived as threatening in certain ways by full-time faculty.

Other problems associated with part-time faculty, mentioned by Grymes (1976, p. 12) are that: (a) part-time faculty tend to be less academically prepared than full-time faculty; (b) they often do not possess comparable teaching skills and experiences; and (c) they usually have other employment to which they devote a portion of their time and efforts. Another researcher, Friedlander (1979) asserted that part-time and full-time faculty differ quite markedly with regard to a variety of instructional-related practices. Friedlander found that part-time faculty, in comparison with full-time faculty

> had less input into the selection of materials to be used in their courses, assigned fewer pages to be read, used less instructional media, recommended or required students to attend fewer out-of-class activities, and placed less emphasis on written assignments in determining student grades (p. 12).

Despite the functional differences between part- and full-time faculty, it remains to be proven conclusively that part-time faculty members are inherently inferior teachers. Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1981, p. 16) concluded only that the part-time faculty's instructional quality is less predictable than that of full-time faculty.

Negative treatment of part-time faculty. It is now commonly accepted that part-time faculty are treated differently than full-time faculty. Bender and Breuder (1973) stimulated widespread interest in the plight of part-time faculty with the disclosure that many community college had not established policies or practices to govern the utilization of part-time staff. Bender and Hammons (1972) and Abel (1976) reported similar findings. Lombardi (1975) also determined that part-time faculty have been abused. In a paper published during a period in which faculty actively organized their collective bargaining units, Lombardi noted that "savings made possible by hiring low-paid part-time instructors . . . partly financed . . . the [contemporary] surge in enrollment" (p. 51). Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982, pp. 144-145) called for fair and equitable policies to address such issues as compensation and achievement of tenure. To solve some problems that have emerged between part-time faculty and administration, they recommended that contractual agreements "should reflect a meeting of the minds, and not a take-it-or-leave-it arrangement" (p. 145).

Part-time faculty development. One additional topic in the literature concerns the desire to help realize the potential of part-time faculty. As Sillman (1980) states, this desire is relatively new:

> Staff development has been a major concern in community colleges for the past decade; however, only in the last few years has there been a real interest in the development of programs for part-time faculty (p. 94).

Various authors have outlined the objectives of community college staff development programs. Hammons, Smith-Wallace, and Watts (1978, p. 4), for example, have cited the requirements to provide all faculty with information to utilize new technologies of instruction and to cope with the needs of both "high-risk" and older students. Programs designed to aid the development of part-time staff in particular, however, tend to take a broader set of objectives into consideration.

Parsons (1980, p. 48) constructed a detailed part-time faculty development model largely because he perceived the need to maintain the parity of instruction between part-time and full-time faculty. Based on a plan implemented at a Maryland community college, Parson's model is structured as follows:

1. It counsels administrators to recruit faculty according to subject matter expertise and teaching potential
2. It provides orientation programs for course organization, and facilitates social and campus-related introductions
3. It establishes channels of communication designed to maintain a sense of faculty identification with the college
4. It provides for the availability of and access to support services
5. It organizes instructional clinics to foster instructional expertise.

6. It establishes processes of student and supervisory evaluation of faculty, and encourages discussion of the results

Parsons' format is one of several developed to minimize the difficulties of part-time faculty in performing their responsibilities. It is one plan that pertains to how part-time faculty are selected, supported, and assigned--elements that are considered by Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982, p. 140) to be of primary importance in the successful use of part-time faculty.

Faculty motivations for accepting a part-time position. The reasons that part-time faculty choose to work at the community college level have been examined by Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982). After interviewing 104 part-time faculty from 14 colleges in Virginia (including both senior and community colleges), the authors identified four clusters of variables relating to the reasons faculty accepted their positions. Faculty took employment primarily for intrinsic reasons (p. 46) and secondarily for nonacademic professional reasons. Intrinsically, faculty were motivated to accept their positions because they derived personal satisfaction, a sense of accomplishment and enjoyment from teaching. Some joined the college to escape "a more routine or less stimulating environment." Still others affiliated with their college for the prestige. Secondly, individuals holding nonacademic positions were found to enter into community college teaching in order to share their specialized knowledge and skills with their communities. A third set of reasons for faculty accepting

positions pertained to what the authors termed "careerist" choices. Some faculty members had accepted their positions because they were unable to find full-time employment at the senior college level. Finally, part-time faculty accepted their jobs for economic reasons. According to Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne, however, teaching for the money was "definitely the least salient of all reasons . . . uncovered" (p. 45).

Grymes (1976, p. 18), in contrast, found the monetary factor to be of immediate importance to part-time faculty. He reported that the most frequently cited reason for teaching at his community college part-time was to secure "extra income." The factor was specified by 65% of the 254 part-time faculty included in his survey. The response, "Feel as if doing something worthwhile," an intrinsic reason, was selected almost as often (63.4%).

Characterizing the diversity of the part-time faculty. Researchers have often found that a diversity exists among the part-time faculty. Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982, p. 144) noted, for example, that part-time faculty with widely varying backgrounds are employed at most institutions. Some part-time faculty share interests with the full-time faculty; many do not. At some colleges, part-time faculty are employed on a continuing, long-term basis. Elsewhere, part-time faculty are employed more sporadically.

Lombardi (1975) differentiated between day and evening part-time faculty, indicating that evening workers may be subjected to inferior working conditions. He also differentiated between part-time staff who maintained jobs outside the college and those who

depend on their college position for the major part of their income. He indicated (pp. 2-3) that part-time faculty without other jobs were the most interested in continuous employment and fringe benefits.

Most recently, researchers have begun to hypothesize typologies to account for the diversity of the part-time staff. Quayle (1977, 1978), cited by Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982, p. 37), divided a population of part-time faculty into three categories: (a) educational professionals (teachers concurrently employed in other educational levels), (b) noneducational professionals (crafts people employed full time in a noneducationally related position), and (c) permanent part-time staff members (those hoping to obtain a full-time position at their institution). A more detailed typology, encompassing both two-year and four-year college faculty was formulated by Tuckman (1978). Research that uses an appropriate typology might prove more accurate than research that uses an undifferentiated population.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction, the state of self-reported contentedness with the whole or aspects of one's job is clearly difficult to measure. In order to estimate the job-related satisfaction of two-year college faculty, various approaches have been employed. Some researchers have asked their subjects to answer a single, direct question: "Are you satisfied with what you are doing?" Other have asked their subjects to respond to a series of job-related questions. Some

researchers have categorized their questions, and then have examined their subjects' responses to each category separately to produce more detailed analyses of faculty job satisfaction.

Differing approaches exist for both measuring and interpreting job satisfaction. While most researchers, like Eckert and Williams (1972, p. 26) perceived satisfaction to be significantly influenced by environmental causes, a few researchers such as Cohen and Brawer (1977, p. 31) believed satisfaction to be linked basically to personality: what satisfies one individual sometimes dissatisfies another. Despite theoretical disagreement, a consensus remains regarding the satisfaction of two-year college faculty. According to reviewers of the literature (Frankel,1973, p. 6; Friedlander, 1976, p. 61), most studies of two-year college faculty have indicated that the vast majority of faculty members are generally satisfied with their jobs. However, researchers who questioned faculty members in greater depth have often found that faculty specifically identified unsatisfactory aspects of their jobs.

Inferences of generalized satisfaction. Estimates of two-year college faculty job satisfaction are most often obtained by asking subjects a direct question. A dozen studies indicated that more than 85% of full-time faculty members responded positively to direct questions regarding their job satisfaction. For example, 94% of Kurth and Mills' (1968) sample of full-time faculty from Florida responded positively to the question: "Are you happy with the nature of your work?" Eckert and Williams (1972) reported that more than

80% of the full-time teachers they sampled responded affirmatively to the question: "Do you like your job?" To the query: "How much do you enjoy teaching at the junior college level?" 94% of full-time faculty surveyed by Kelley and Wilbur (1970, p. 191) replied that they enjoyed teaching either very well or extremely well. The question, "Are you satisfied with your job?" drew an affirmative response from 95% of full-time staff surveyed by Benoit (1978). In contrast, a relatively low percentage of full-time faculty indicated their satisfaction in a study conducted by the National Educational Association (1979). When asked to complete the phrase: "My morale is . . .," 73.3% of full-time faculty surveyed by the NEA (1979, p. 12) described their morale as "fairly high" or "very high."

Accounts of the degree of general satisfaction experienced by part-time faculty may be relatively scarce, but they are consistent. Part-time faculty appear to be generally content with their positions. Quanty (1976) reported that 95% of the part-time faculty who comprised his limited sample expressed general satisfaction with their jobs. Only 35% of his sample, however, expressed particular satisfaction with their salaries. Similarly, Grymes (1976) reported that the part-time faculty from the one Virginia community college he studied were generally satisfied with their job and with their school's facilities. Cohen and Brawer (1977, p. 61) indicated that to their surprise, they found no significant difference in satisfaction between part-time and full-time humanities instructors. It is commonly indicated, however, (Cohen and Brawer, 1977, p. 29; Quayle, 1977) that of the part-time faculty surveyed, those who were most likely to report

satisfaction with part-tme teaching were those who held concurrent full-time employment outside of their college.

Use of unidimensional or summative scales. Certain researchers felt that in order to estimate job satisfaction more accurately, a subject should respond to a battery of job-related questions rather than to a single question. Among the researchers ascribing to this approach are Cohen and Brawer (1977) and Wozniak (1973). Cohen and Brawer (1977, p. 16) measured job satisfaction by asking subjects to report their level of agreement or disagreement to items such as the following: (a) "If I had a chance to retrace my steps, I would not choose an academic life;" and (b) "Satisfactory opportunities for in-service training are not available at this college." A summative score for each subject was acquired by aligning the polarities of each item, calculating a value for each response (using a five-step rating scale), and then adding the results. Brawer (1976, pp. 7-8) ascertained that of the 1493 humanities faculty surveyed, 17% exhibited high job satisfaction, 59% exhibited medium job satisfaction, and 24% exhibited low job satisfaction.

A similar procedure was employed by Wozniak (1973). Wozniak employed the Brayfield-Rothe scale of items relating to job satisfaction, a scale which was among the measures of job satisfaction evaluated by Robinson, Athanasiou, and Head (1969). Wozniak's study, performed with two-year college music faculty, will be discussed in detail later in this section.

Advantages and disadvantages of teaching at the community college level. The study that most explicitly identified pleasing and displeasing job-related components was conducted in the fall of 1967 by Kelley and Wilbur. Their sample consisted of 118 full-time two-year college faculty members from 23 community/junior colleges nationwide. Faculty members specified (1970, pp. 191-193) by free response that the ten most enjoyable aspects of teaching at the two-year college level were (in order):

1. Experiencing academic and personal freedom
2. Placing an emphasis on teaching (rather than on research)
3. Encountering students of differing abilities
4. Establishing close relationships with students
5. Establishing close relationships with faculty
6. Encountering higher level of students (compared to the high school level)
7. Dealing with a responsive administration
8. Experiencing a feeling of service to students
9. Teaching within relaxing working conditions
10. Experiencing the excitement of the junior college philosophy and its characteristics

Among the problems that faculty members perceived as currently perplexing (Kelley and Wilbur, 1970, pp. 199-120) were the following:

1. Maintaining motivation and instructional standards
2. Maintaining good inter-personal relations and communications
3. Securing adequate working conditions

4. Planning curriculum with reference to students' needs and abilities
5. Interpreting the two-year college's role in education
6. Nurturing professional abilities and insights
7. Accepting the college's open-door admissions policy
8. Coping with immature and aimless students
9. Providing effective and efficient academic counseling
10. Attracting qualified staff members

Kelley and Wilbur summarized their findings by listing the services, courtesies, and rewards desired by community-junior college faculty. According to the authors (pp. 214-215), faculty wanted better or improved:

1. Salaries
2. Teaching loads
3. Free time
4. Working relations with administrators and staff
5. Lines of communication
6. Standards of teaching and learning
7. Student follow-up results
8. Counseling and student placement
9. Status and prestige
10. Faculty orientation
11. Opportunities for professional growth
12. Public relations
13. Administrative leadership
14. Quality among the staff
15. Financing
16. Cooperation among staff members
17. Articulation and coordination within and between educational levels
18. Attitudes among students and teachers
19. Methods of teacher evaluation
20. Methods of staffing
21. Agreement on philosophy, goals, purposes, and functions
22. Continuity of learning
23. Faculty voice in college government
24. Freedom from unnecessary pressures
25. Faculty fringe benefits

Kelley and Wilbur's study is particularly relevant to the present study because it serves as a primary source for many of the items included within the attitudinal measures. No other study is nearly as comprehensive in its specification of environmental variables pertinent to full-time faculty. The study is, however, deficient in its treatment of problems encountered specifically by part-time faculty.

Identification of part-time faculty needs. In 1975 Ferrett conducted a study to determine the needs of part-time faculty employed at a single Michigan community college. She formulated a list of 12 problems of great concern to part-time faculty, and asked her sample of 150 part-time staff members to identify and rank order the five most important problems they faced.

The five most important needs identified by part-time faculty were as follows (p. 131):

1. Learning the range of responsibilities that part-time faculty are expected to undertake
2. Understanding the administrative structure of the college to know whom to consult regarding a particular problem
3. Obtaining needed instructional materials
4. Obtaining help in instructional improvement
5. Adapting instruction to individual academic differences

These needs appear to relate to the functioning of part-time faculty within their instructional role. Should these needs not be met, job dissatisfaction might ensue. A completely different issue, however, appeared among part-time faculty who perceived themselves as members of an underclass. Among the most prevalent complaints

from several studies of part-time faculty are those listed in the following table.

TABLE 2.2.--Sources of Part-time Faculty Dissatisfaction

Source of Dissatisfaction	Source
1. Low salaries	1, 2, 7
2. Lack of job security	7
3. Lack of fringe benefits	1, 2, 5
4. Lack of support services	2, 4
5. Relegation to evening and outreach courses	5
6. Lack of voice in planning	2, 6
7. Ignored by full-time staff in own field	6
8. Irregular pay increments or other payment problems	5
9. Low status	1
10. Prohibited from full-time employment by economics	2, 7
11. Lack of academic rank	2

SOURCES:
1 Abel (1976)
2 Anderson (1975)
3 Cohen (1976)
4 Eliason (1980)
5 Ferris (1976)
6 Greenwood (1980)
7 Obetz (1976)

Identification of factors influencing job satisfaction. To clarify the broader dynamics at work within the environment, various researchers have sought to identify clusters of variables, or factors, that influence job satisfaction. Garrison (1968, pp. 9-11), noted that faculty expressed major concerns in six areas: (1) lack of time, (2) relating college policies to instruction, (3) participating in college governance, (4) adapting instruction to the variety of student

abilities, (5) evaluating and grading student work, and (6) lack of clerical help. His categorization parallelled quite closely that used by Siehr et al. (1963, p. 26).

Ferrett (1975, p. 106) intuitively categorized the set of needs identified by part-time faculty into three broad factors: (a) personal development and growth, (b) need to clarify organizational structure, and (c) need to insure instructional improvement. Cohen and Friedlander (1980) distilled their findings even further. They categorized the desires of instructors according to what instructors want for themselves and what they want for their work situations. According to the authors, instructors want more time, more interaction with colleagues, and better professional development opportunities for themselves; for their work situation, they want better support, better students, and better media and materials.

Use of pre-defined factors. Herzberg (1959) is often credited with having influenced an entire generation of job-satisfaction researchers. In 1957, he conducted a study of what industrial workers desired from their jobs, and concluded that positive feelings toward work tended to be associated with task-oriented, intrinsic factors, while negative work attitudes tended to be associated with environmental, or extrinsic factors.

In his original study, Herzberg classified a set of job-related variables as shown in Table 2.3.

Many researchers have sought to test Herzberg's construct. Recently, researchers such as Shank (1968) and Wittenauer (1980) have

TABLE 2.3.--Herzberg's Classification of Factors Influencing Motivation

Satisfaction Producing Factors (Intrinsic)	Dissatisfaction Producing Factors (Extrinsic)
Achievement	Policy and administration
Recognition	Supervision
Work itself	Interpersonal relations
Responsibility	Working conditions
Advancement	Salary
	Status
	Personal life
	Job security
	Possibility of growth

SOURCE: Hoy and Miskel (1982, p. 150).

replicated Herzberg's findings. They agree that satisfaction tends to be related to the presence of intrinsic rewards. Other researchers have found evidence contradicting Herzberg's theory. Moorehead (1979), for example, surveying 173 full-time community college faculty in Connecticut, found that extrinsic factors proved more highly correlated with overall satisfaction than did intrinsic factors.

In an attempt to account for some of these divergent findings, a competing theory has been formulated. Hoy and Miskel (1978) modified Herzberg's theory of satisfaction/dissatisfaction by extrapolating a third factor, composed of variables that may be associated with either satisfaction or dissatisfaction, under different conditions. Hoth (1979) replicated Hoy and Miskel's three-factor theory. In her study of 68 academic faculty members from a Michigan community

college, she found that intrinsic factors were more strongly associated with high satisfaction than with low satisfaction, extrinsic factors more strongly associated with low satisfaction than with high satisfaction, and ambient factors (the third factor) strongly associated with neither high nor with low satisfaction.

In a study similar to that of Hoy and Miskel, Friedlander (1976) stated that satisfaction is associated with both intrinsic as well as extrinsic factors. Pointing to a paradox in the Kurth and Mills study (1968), he hypothesized and concluded (p. 61) that community college faculty are indeed satisfied with their jobs; it is only that they are dissatisfied with their working conditions. Friedlander's (1979) and Hoth's (1979) work indicated that labeling factors as intrinsic or extrinsic may help to identify certain determinants of job satisfaction, but not others.

Use of the factor analytic technique. Instead of pre-categorizing variables into intrinsic, extrinsic, or ambient factors, the factor analytic technique permits areas to be identified according to the way variables empirically cluster. The most relevant research using factor analysis was conducted by Sanders (1971). In a study of 195 full-time faculty members employed within the University of Kentucky community college system, Sanders discerned four factors relating to faculty morale: (a) Factor I contained items pertaining to interpersonal relations, communication with the administration, personal security, relationship with an immediate supervisor, and growth and advancement; (b) Factor II related to physical working

conditions; (c) Factor III included variables related to adequacy of salary, and salary schedule; and finally, (d) Factor IV pertained to noninstructional workload. Sanders found (p. 50) that his first, composite factor was the most important in explaining moral differences. He observed that "where the faculty member felt more personally secure, he tended to have better communication with colleagues and administrators, and as a result was more likely to be associated with the higher morale group" (1971, p. 50).

Implied indicators of job satisfaction. Certain situational responses reveal information about how faculty view their jobs, but from which a direct inference of job satisfaction cannot be made. Among these implied indicators are expressed job preference, speculations as to future plans, and observed faculty turnover.

Historically, a large proportion of two-year college faculty have viewed with envy a senior college teaching position. According to Cohen and Brawer (1977), "Many [staff members] readily admit that they would rather teach in a four-year college or university than in the two-year college" (p. 81). Siehr (1963), for example, found that 75% of new full-time faculty entering into the community colleges of Michigan openly aspired to a senior college position. In a national study, Medsker (1960, p. 175) noted that 46% of full-time two-year college faculty preferred their current teaching position as compared to a majority (52%) who preferred four-year college teaching. Later research suggests that a majority of full-time faculty now tend to consider community college teaching their primary

choice. Kurth and Mills (1968), for instance, found that 54.2% of their Florida sample preferred two-year college teaching, while 34.8% of those surveyed preferred to teach at the senior college level, if salary, promotion, and job security were equal. Similarly, Medsker and Tillery (1971, p. 91) found a majority (53.8%) of full-time faculty preferred working within the two-year colleges.

The attitudes of part-time faculty toward this issue are less well known. Cohen and Brawer (1977, p. 60) observed that a larger proportion of part-time humanities faculty than full-time humanities faculty (51% vs. 35%) reported finding a four-year college position "very attractive." No other data are available. Among the part-time faculty, a related issue arises: aspiring to full-time community college employment. Grymes (1976) reported that a majority (68%) of part-time faculty surveyed sought community college employment with the aim of supplementing their income; only a few (2%) indicated they hoped to gain full-time employment. Similarly, Abel (1976) noted that 65% of part-time staff surveyed preferred to remain part-time employees. Nonetheless, 70% of her sample indicated that they would accept full-time employment should the opportunity arise.

Gradually, an increasing percentage of full-time faculty have indicated their intention to stay in community college teaching. In 1963, Siehr found that only one in three new full-time teachers surveyed viewed community college teaching as a career. Kurth and Mills reported during the late 1960s (1968) that 58.5% of full-time faculty from Florida planned to remain in their positions, rather

than find employment elsewhere. A significant proportion of Kurth and Mills' sample, however, (29.6%) were undecided about their future in the profession. A later report by Bushnell (1973, p. 35) indicated that 80% of the full-time faculty surveyed nationwide intended to stay in community college teaching. Extensive data regarding the future plans of part-time faculty are not available. A study by Quanty (1976) indicated that 78% of part-time faculty surveyed from one Kansas community college were willing to commit themselves to one additional year of community college teaching.

One reliable indicator of teacher satisfaction might be the rate of faculty turnover. Turnover relates to both expressed job preference and to speculation about future employment plans. Unfortunately, the limited data available on turnover makes it difficult to determine clearly the relationship between faculty turnover and job satisfaction. Moreover, with a slowing economy, faculty turnover, or mobility, may be artificially repressed. The following, however, may be cited. Kelly (c.f., Kelly and Connolly, 1968, p. 6), who reported the results of a follow-up study to his dissertation, stated that 48% of 1500 new two-year college full-time faculty employed in New York State had vacated their position within three years of their initial employment. In a report that reflects more current economic conditions, however, Abel (1976) found that between fall 1975 and fall 1976, only 4% of full-time faculty employed at one California community college had relinquished their positions, in contrast to the 35% of part-time faculty who had done so.

Correlates of satisfaction. Researchers often seek to identify the demographic variables that correlate significantly with their measure of satisfaction. To date, however, findings have been ambiguous. Kelley and Wilbur (1970) found that, "answers seemed to reflect little differences among sex, religion, and other profile characteristics" (p. 251). Eckert and Williams (1972) observed that within their sample of Minnesota community college faculty, older faculty members displayed greater satisfaction than did younger faculty, and that vocational faculty expressed greater satisfaction than did academic faculty. Cohen and Brawer (1977, pp. 25-32) indicated that among community college humanities faculty, age, future plans, secondary school teaching experience, and possession of a concurrent position correlated positively with higher satisfaction. Race, sex, and "surprisingly" (p. 28), employment status (part-time or full-time) were not significantly related to satisfaction.

Kepple (1978), in his nationwide survey of 374 full-time faculty, found that faculty over the age of 50 exhibited greater satisfaction than did younger faculty, and that tenured faculty expressed greater satisfaction than did nontenured faculty. In addition, those who had taught for six years or more displayed greater satisfaction than did faculty who had taught less than two years, and instructors holding a master's degree proved more satisfied than faculty holding a doctorate. Satisfaction proved unrelated, however, to such factors as sex, formal study of the community college, and prior enrollment as a community college student.

Finally, in Moorehead's (1979) study of 173 full-time faculty in Connecticut, the following results were observed. Of the factors of age, sex, educational level, teaching experience, and race, only race related significantly to satisfaction. In Moorehead's study, Caucasians displayed significantly higher satisfaction than did minority faculty members.

Defining the Model Two-Year College Faculty Member

The literature contains several descriptions of the model two-year college faculty member which reflect the values of the two-year colleges in terms of the personal qualities, attitudes, and abilities believed necessary to insure efficient and happy community college teaching. The most prominent of these descriptions are summarized below. Included are Kelley and Wilbur's (1970, pp. 55-57) "Ten Commandments" for successful senior-community college teaching, Blai's (1975, p. 187) descriptors of "A good community college teacher. . . ." and three sources bearing strong similarity: Palinchak's (1973, pp. 261-266), Jamerson's (1979, p. 7), and Lansing Community College, Michigan, Open Admissions Committee's (1980, pp. 40-41) profiles of the "ideal" faculty member.

1. The ideal community college faculty member is selected for his/her teaching abilities and potential.

   You must desire and enjoy teaching (Kelley & Wilbur, Item #1)
   You must be dedicated to your task (Kelly & Wilbur, Item #6)

   A faculty member should be selected for potential teaching competence and performance aptitude as matched to job competency rather than for assumed competence based on credentials, degrees, and so-called "equivalent" experience (Lansing Community College, Item #1).

A faculty member should have had prior teaching experience (Lansing Community College, Item #6)

2. The model community college faculty member is vitally concerned about his students.

A faculty member should perceive his/her role as a teacher first and subject-matter specialist second (Lansing Community College, Item #2).

You must be vitally concerned about the growth and development of your students (Kelley and Wilbur, Item #7).

A faculty member should have a firm commitment to involvement in student and community affairs prior to employment (Lansing Community College, Item #3).

You must prefer teaching a variety of adults, young and old (Kelley and Wilbur, Item #2).

You must have other personal attributes that make you a genuine, emphathetic human being (Kelley & Wilbur, Item #10).

A good community college teacher gives most of his time to students (Bali, Item #1).

A good community college teacher is student oriented (Blai, Item #2).

A good community college teacher is admired by students (Blai, Item #3).

[A successful two-year college teacher] places the interests and concerns of students above his field of study or his outside-of-college activities (Monore, 1972, p. 278).

3. The ideal community college faculty member is an advocate of the community college philosophy.

You must be sold on the values and contributions of junior college education to society (Kelley & Wilbur, Item #3).

A faculty member should be committed to the concept of the community college and help to keep individuals within the community informed of the significance of its existence (Lansing Community College, Item #9).

Teachers have a responsibility to be committed to the idea of the community college if they choose to be employed by one (Jamerson, 1979, p. 7).

You must know your subject matter and students and express positive attitudes toward both (Kelley & Wilbur, Item #9).

4. The ideal community college faculty member is accepting of the college's mission.

A faculty member should understand the concept of equal access and open admissions to the community college (Lansing Community College, Item #4)

A faculty member should recognize that counseling, remediation, and referral services are primary concerns (Lansing Community College, Item #5).

5. The ideal community college faculty member is a professional educator.

You must strive to become an excellent teacher, one who knows and uses effective methods and techniques (Kelley & Wilbur, Item #8).

A faculty member should have some knowledge or training in the areas of learning theory, program planning, curricular strategies, evaluation techniques (Lansing Community College, Item #10).

A faculty member should recognize and accept the concept of evaluation and educational assessment at the broadest levels of application. Evaluation principles should be discussed and developed as they are applied to students, teachers, administrators, and institutions (Lansing Community College, Item #7).

A faculty member should have the ability to deal with students who require special attention to overcome deficiencies (Lansing Community College, Item #11).

A faculty member should be aware that he/she will be expected to conduct informal research which might involve inquiries into the effects of teaching and learning, student attitudes and values, varying grading systems, teacher effectiveness, evaluation of goals, etc. [sic], with the aid of the Office of Institutional Research (Lansing Community College, Item #8).

6. The ideal community college faculty member is attuned with his/her professional environment.

A faculty member should have flexibility in adapting and adjusting to changes (Lansing Community College, Item #12).

You must like a community college atmosphere of academic work and life (Kelley & Wilbur, Item #4).

You must be reasonably satisfied with the maximum salaries and benefits you can obtain at the two-year college level (Kelley & Wilbur, Item #5).

Descriptors of Two-Year College Faculty

Demographic descriptors.

1. Size of population--The number of community college teachers has increased substantially over the past two decades from 29,000 in 1960 to 105,000 in 1970 (O'Banion, 1972, p. 79) to over 220,000 in 1981 (AACJC, 1982, p. 75). Since 1975 part-time faculty have comprised the majority of all two-year college instructors (Cohen & Brawer, 1977, p. 56; AACJC, 1982, p. 75).

2. Age--The average full-time two-year college faculty member was in his or her early 40s (Kurth & Mills, 1970; National Educational Association, 1979). The average part-time faculty member was 35 years of age or younger (Grymes, 1976; Quanty, 1976; Cohen & Brawer, 1977). According to Cosand (1979, p. 25), the average age of teachers has increased due to a decline in academic mobility at the community college level.

3. Sex--The male-to-female ratio among two-year college faculty was approximately 3:2 (AACJC, 1978). Women, however, have been

entering into community college teaching with increasing frequency, and their growing presence has been noted especially within the part-time ranks (Abel, 1976; Leslie, Kellams, & Gunne, 1982, p. 15).

4. Race--Caucasians made up 90% of more of both full-time and part-time faculty (Bayer, 1970, 1973; Bushnell, 1973; Quanty, 1976; Grymes, 1976; Cohen & Brawer, 1977).

Experiential descriptors.

1. Sources of recruitment--Many individuals were coming into community college teaching after their master's and doctorate degrees (Palinchak, 1973, p. 219). Some were entering the profession during their graduate studies (Cohen & Brawer, 1977, p. 60). Fewer were being recruited away from public school teaching (Phair, 1975; Kelly & Connolly, 1970). (For older data, see O'Banion, 1972, p. 120).

2. Teaching experience--About half of all full-time two-year college instructors have had prior public school teaching experience (Knurth & Mills, 1968; Kelley & Wilbur, 1970; Bushnell, 1973; NEA, 1979). Part-time faculty were less likely to have had any teaching experience (Grymes, 1976; Friedlander, 1979) or to have had as much teaching experience (Cohen & Brawer, 1977, p. 60).

3. Highest degree held--Approximately 75% of all full-time two-year college teachers had earned a master's degree (Bayer, 1973; Grymes, 1976, NEA, 1979). Approximately 55% of all part-time faculty had earned a master's degree as their highest academic credential (Grymes, 1976; Quanty, 1976). Approximately 15% of all full-time faculty had earned a doctorate (Grymes, 1976; Cohen & Brawer, 1977;

NEA, 1979). Estimates of part-time faculty holding a doctorate range from 7.5% (Grymes, 1976) through about 12% (Bender & Breuder, 1973; Cohen & Brawer, 1977) to as high as 15% (Quanty, 1976). (For older data, see O'Banion, 1972, p. 120).

4. Currently enrolled--Less than one-third of all full-time faculty were currently pursuing a higher degree (Bushnell, 1973; Cohen & Brawer, 1977, p. 60).

5. Knowledge of the community college environment--Few faculty members formally studied the community college as an educational institution. Estimates range from 46% (Knurth & Mills, 1968) to 33% (Medsker & Tillery, 1971) of faculty who have undertaken such study.

6. Attendance at the community college--Less than one-third, and perhaps only one-fourth of all full-time faculty had ever attended a two-year college themselves (Medsker, 1960; Knurth & Mills, 1968; Medsker & Tillery, 1971; Cohen & Brawer, 1977).

7. Years in the employ of their colleges--A chronological interpretation of available data indicate that the most full-time faculty employed within the two-year colleges were recruited between 1965 and 1970 and have, for the most part, remained in their position (c.f., Medsker & Tillery, 1971; Bushnell, 1973; Bayer, 1973; Cohen & Brawer, 1977; NEA, 1979). More than half of the part-time faculty surveyed had been employed at their college for two years or less (Quanty, 1976; Cohen & Brawer, 1977).

Professional descriptors.

1. Rank--Only about one-third of all full-time faculty were accorded professorial rank (Bayer, 1970, 1973; NEA, 1979). Not all two-year colleges confer academic rank upon their faculty.

2. Tenure--The percentage of full-time two-year college faculty holding tenure has been rising (Cosand, 1979, p. 25; National Center for Education Statistics, 1980, p. 184). According to the NCES, approximately 74% of all full-time public two-year college faculty had been granted tenure as of the 1978-1979 academic year. Their figures indicate that more men than women are tenured, but that women have been making significant gains. In a supplementary finding, the NEA (1979) reported that the average full-time community college teacher received tenure after five years of service.

Functional descriptors.

1. Work load--The average full-time two-year college instructor taught four class sections per week for fifteen contact hours, or a total of approximately 41 in-school hours (NEA, 1979). Bayer (1973) found that half of all full-time instructors taught a fifth class as well. Most part-time faculty were assigned a single course to teach (Quanty, 1976), or two courses, at most (Abel, 1976). The two-year college teacher spends most of her or his time teaching and not in research (Cohen & Brawer, 1977, p. 52). Bayer (1973) reported, for example, that 60% of all full-time instructors surveyed spent no time at all planning or conducting research.

2. Scheduling of faculty--According to Lombardi (1975), full-time community college faculty taught primarily during the daytime, but some supplemented their income by teaching evening courses. Both Abel (1976) and Quanty (1976) indicated that a majority of part-time faculty were assigned to teach evening courses. Only 17% of Quanty's (1976) sample of part-time faculty taught solely daytime classes.

Summary of General Literature About Two-Year College Faculty

The literature reveals that prominent researchers, such as O'Banion (1974), and Cohen and Brawer (1972, 1977) remain highly critical of the low professional level at which community college instructors function. They find that many instructors disagree with the student-oriented, open-admissions philosophies of the community colleges and lack empathy for the many students who display low academic abilities. They criticize the majority of instructors for remaining subject-matter specialists first and members of the community college teaching profession second. Various researchers, including O'Banion (1972, 1974), Gaff (1976), and Hammons, Smith-Wallace, and Watts (1978) recommend that pre-service and in-service training opportunities be extended.

Several models of the ideal community college instructor have been published. The community college authorities are seeking candidates: (a) who have developed teaching abilities and who show potential; (b) who are vitally concerned about their students; (c) who are advocates of the community college philosophy; (d) who are

accepting of their college's mission; (e) who intend to assume the responsibilities of the professional educator; and (f) who are attuned to their professional environment.

Relatively little research has been performed using part-time instructors, a faculty subpopulation that became a majority of the instructional force in 1975. Among the numerous economic and social advantages reported for their employment, flexibility of programming is primary. Among the disadvantages, however, is that compared with full-time faculty, their quality is less dependable (Leslie, Kellams, & Gunne, 1982), and their instructional-related practices are generally less stringent. According to recent studies, the part-time faculty appears to be a heterogeneous group. Some part-time instructors share many attributes and interests in common with full-time faculty, while others do not.

Most studies demonstrate that the vast majority of community college instructors are generally satisfied with their jobs. Yet faculty commonly find fault with their working conditions. Part-time faculty express concerns about their job security, salary, and status. Inferences of job satisfaction have been derived from responses to single, direct questions, as well as from responses to a battery of job-related questions. Responses to batteries of questions have been rank-ordered, summated monodimensionally, and grouped into factors. Variable clusters have been defined both intuitively and by factor analysis.

O'Banion's (1972) often reproduced summary of the characteristics of two-year college faculty reads as follows:

> The typical community-junior college faculty member is a 30-to-50 year-old middle-class male whose previous work experience has been in public schools or in business and industry. He has a master's degree in his subject area. His course work has been taken at four-year institutions exclusively; it has seldom included the study of the community-junior college. This lack of experience in the academic field and in work is compounded by the faculty member's relatively recent entry into a community-junior college position, a new position that he may have found by chance in his local region (p. 55).

Among the recent changes affecting the community college faculty profile are (a) women entering into community college teaching with increasing frequency, (b) a decrease in the percentage of faculty that has taught in the lower grades, (c) a decline in academic mobility at the community college level which has increased both the average age of in-service teachers and the percentage of tenured faculty.

The Two-Year College Music Instructor

Music in the Two-Year Colleges

The incidence of music in the two year colleges. Music has long been offered at most two-year colleges across the nation. Among the early surveyors of two-year college curriculum, Eels (1930, p. 489) reported that 57% of 279 public and private two-year colleges across the nation were offering music. A decade later, Colvert (1939, p. 87) found that 61.5% of 195 public junior colleges surveyed included music in their curriculum. Although the figures cited suggest that some music was available at most junior colleges, two factors

influenced the general distribution of music within these institutions. The first is the regional disparities in the distribution of music. For example, Temple (1939), cited by Feman (1962, p. 27) asserted that music was available within 75% of the junior colleges in the North Central region of the United States, a percentage higher than that reported for the country as a whole. The second factor pertained to the particularities of individual institutions. Colvert (1939, p. 87) observed that the larger a junior college's student enrollment, the greater the probability that it offered music.

Later figures indicated that by 1970, music had gained acceptance into the vast majority of two-year colleges. A Music Educators National Conference (MENC) study conducted by Stover et al. (1970) indicated that 90% of 586 public and private junior colleges included music in their offerings. A recent survey in Michigan by Merkel (1977) demonstrated that music was offered at most two-year colleges within the state. Merkel (1977) stated that, "all [three of the] church-related [two-year] colleges, and [all but one] of the [29] public community colleges [in the state] offer some music. None, [however] of the [three] private business colleges offers music" (p. 117).

Scope of music curricula. The two-year college, as an institution, is known for the variety of students it serves. In keeping with the community college philosophy, music programs tend to be

designed for more than just the music major. As Feman (1968) stated, the study of music as a living art, is beneficial for all students:

> The purpose of introducing music to the public junior college program was to meet avocational and vocational needs by stressing music not only as an academic pursuit but as an area for the development of appreciative, interpretive, cultural, and creative abilities for the individual student. In many situations, these musical activities have involved considerable community participation (p. 28).

Merkel (1977) reported that in Michigan, the needs of the general student are addressed by the vast majority of two-year college music programs.

> The role of music in 55% of the public community colleges [in Michigan] is currently directed toward satisfying the needs of both music-majors and the general student. 39% of the colleges have programs geared only toward the general student, and only 6% of the colleges have music programs designed expressly for the music major (p. 118).

He further reported (p. 118) an increasing trend of colleges to list in their catalogs nonconventional courses, such as barbershop singing, harmonica, and old-time fiddle. The implications are, therefore, that the community colleges need nonconventional types of teachers to cover the spectrum of courses offered within a diversified curriculum.

One factor that has historically limited the scope of two-year college music programs has been the size of a college's student enrollment. Colvert's 1939 data (p. 87) indicated that schools with larger enrollments tended to offer more music per semester than did schools with smaller enrollments. This observation has been supported most recently by Merkel (1977). Merkel's chart (p. 109) indicated

that community colleges in Michigan with student enrollments of over 3,000 advertised twice as many different classes in music as did colleges with enrollments below 3,000. Pollard (1977) contributed additional insight into the relationship between the scope of the music curricula and student enrollment. Pollard found that rural public community colleges tended to have small student enrollments, fewer course offerings, and consequently, smaller music faculties than did public community colleges situation in either metropolitan or urban areas.

Staffing Patterns for Two-Year College Music Programs

Historically, the two-year colleges have employed very few music teachers. The earliest references to the staffing of two-year college music programs (Talley, 1938, p. 141; Daniels, 1946, p. 80) indicated that only one or two faculty members were assigned to teach all the music included within the curriculum. White (1967, p. 21) in his investigation into the status of music at the junior college level, noted that junior college music departments were operated most often by two faculty members: one, a choir-voice-keyboard teacher, and the other, an instrumental-music history, and theory teacher. Stover et al. (1970, p. 19) came to a similar conclusion. They found that nearly half of all junior colleges offering music supported either a one- or two-person staff.

It has long been recognized that many junior college music programs were understaffed. Martensen (1940) reported:

> Because of strained financial conditions many administrators desiring to maintain a music department, decide the only way to run it economically is to cut the faculty number as low as possible. [But] the result is an overload for teachers (p. 403).

More recently, Campbell (1968) concluded that "many [two-year] colleges do not have an adequate number of music instructors for the number of courses they offer, and in some instances, appear not to offer courses due to insufficient faculty" (abstract). As Stover et al. (1970) stated: "[the] diversity of music courses, catering to both community and senior college needs, is very often attempted by a very small staff" (p. 19).

During the 1970s, responding to increasing student enrollments, the number of two-year college music faculty increased. A comparison of two editions of the Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities provides evidence for this. The 1967 edition of the Directory reported that of the 12 Michigan two-year colleges listed, six colleges employed only one faculty member each. The 1974 edition, however, indicated an increase in the number of music faculty employed, with only two of the 13 listed community colleges employing one faculty member each. Two colleges each in 1974 were shown to employ two through five music faculty members. More recently, Merkel (1977, p. 109) indicated that larger community colleges in the state of Michigan employed a total of either eight or nine music faculty members apiece, while smaller community colleges with student enrollments of under 3,000 tended to employ either one or two music teachers.

Employment status of music instructors. At some schools, music was taught by a single instructor hired on a part-time basis. Greene (1968) reported, for instance, on music in the early community colleges of New York State:

> Student involvement with music was limited to extracurricular participation in a glee club or band, often directed by either a part-time music teacher from a local high school or in many cases by a member of the general studies faculty who had interest (but little or no background) in music (p. 56).

In other schools, however, the music program had been entrusted to a full-time music instructor. Feman (1962) reported such a case in a community college program also in New York State. He recounted (pp. 56-57) that during the 1950s, one full-time music instructor taught the entire program. Eventually, a part-time faculty member was added to teach "voice production." Several years later, a second full-time faculty member was assigned the voice class; henceforth, part-time faculty were employed to teach any music classes offered sporadically.

According to recent data (Merkel, 1977, p. 97), a greater percentage of part-time music instructors are now in the instructional force than every before. Goetz's data (1940, p. 393) accounting for 223 faculty members employed by 105 schools in 35 states, demonstrated that 89% of all music faculty were employed on a full-time basis. By the late 1960s, Stover et al. (1970, p. 6) reported and were supported by other sources, that full-time faculty comprised approximately 60% of music faculty employed within the junior colleges. Most recently, Merkel (1977, p. 97) indicated that in

Michigan, only 30% of all two-year college music instructors were employed full time.

A majority of two-year colleges employ part-time music faculty. Stover and his associates (1970, p. 15) ascertained that part-time staff were working within 62% of all junior colleges offering music. The percentage of rural community colleges using part-time music instructors is higher still. Pollard (1977), in a study of 123 rural public community colleges in 31 states, reported that part-time music teachers are found within 89% of all rural colleges offering music. In fact, 25% of rural community colleges were observed to use part-time music teachers exclusively (Pollard, 1977, abstract).

Most colleges (54%), according to Stover et al. (1970, p. 15) use a combination of full-time and part-time music instructors. In 1970, 37.5% of 517 junior colleges reporting a music staff indicated that employed no part-time faculty, while 16.5% of the schools reported they employed no full-time music faculty.

Wozniak's tables (1973, p. 53) indicated that while most community colleges supplemented their staff with part-time music teachers, many colleges had, as of 1973, employed only one or two full-time music teachers. Half of the 64 northeastern community colleges surveyed employed a single full-time music instructor whereas another 20% engaged a second full-time teacher. While this practice accounted for 70% of the sample, further data indicated that the number of full-time music faculty employed by a school could range

up to ten. Wozniak's finding matched that of Aslanian (1976, p. 135) who found that California community colleges employ between one and eleven full-time music faculty per school, depending on the size of the community and the interest in music.

Duties and Responsibilities of Two-Year College Music Faculty

Merkel (1977, p. 121) ascertained that full-time music instructors in Michigan two-year colleges utilized most of their working hours (16 to 18 hours per week) in teaching. Faculty devoted at least two hours of their on-campus time per week to (a) serving office hours, (b) maintaining their performance skills, (c) undertaking administrative duties, and (d) keeping up with their professional reading (Merkel, 1977, pp. 84-85). Among the activities consuming more than one hour each, per week, but less than two hours a week of faculty time were (a) recruiting, (b) conducting public relations, and, (c) attending to committee work (Merkel, 1977, p. 85).

Teaching assignments. Stover et al. (1970, p. 6) indicated that few full-time junior college music faculty throughout the country (14%) were assigned to a single subject area. Most (56%) were given multiple assignments. An additional 30% of staff members, according to the authors, fell "somewhere in between generalists and specialists." Morgan (1966, p. 72) found that a large majority of junior college music teachers in California taught both vocal and instrumental music. There were no other data to suggest that this pattern applied

to faculty in other states. Jansen's findings (1971, p. 5) indicated that a large proportion of two-year college music instructors taught applied music. According to his data, there were more instrumental music teachers,including piano instructors, than vocal teachers.

Much information is available regarding the most common types of courses found within the two-year college music curriculum. The general consensus (Morgan, 1966, p. 40; Jansen, 1971, p. 4; Belford, 1970, p. 410; Gagermeier, 1968, p. 90; Viggiano, 1954, p. 122) was that music theory was the most frequently offered music course at the two-year level. Music appreciation or history, vocal, and instrumental ensembles, and applied were also widely found.

Two surveys investigated the content of the music curriculum in the Michigan community colleges. Faxon (1974, p. 127) indicated that the most widely offered community college music courses were, in order (a) music appreciation (offered at 28 campuses); (b) music theory (22 campuses); (c) keyboard (18 campuses); (d) music education (17 campuses); (e) individual voice (16 campuses); (f) band (15 campuses); and (g) stage band (11 campuses). Merkel's findings (1977, p. 120), reported in Table 2.4, indicated that choir, music for classroom teachers, and freshman theory were the most widely available music offerings.

Music faculty workload. According to Stover et al. (1970, p. 7), the average two-year college music faculty member spends more time giving instruction per week than does his or her senior college

TABLE 2.4.--Course Offerings in Music on the Public and Private Two-year College Campuses in Michigan (1977)[a]

General Course Title	Percentage of Campuses Offering Course
Choir	84%
Music for Classroom Teachers	79%
Freshman Theory	74%
Music Literature	66%
Applied Music:	
Piano	66%
Vocal	61%
Instrumental	55%
Music History	55%
Class Piano	55%
Band	55%
Sophomore Theory	50%
Jazz History	47%
Glee Club/Madrigal Ensemble	45%
Vocal Pedagogy	26%

[a]Statistics arranged according to the information provided by Merkel (1977, p. 120).

counterpart. The difference in terms of contact hours between two-year and four-year college faculty is to some degree attributable to research demands imposed on senior college faculty. Because community college faculty are not expected to engage in research, research time is not allotted to them as part of their contractual load.

Stover et al. (1970, p. 7) found full-time music faculty spending an average of 20 hours a week in contact with students. They documented contact hours ranging from 6 to 37 hours, with 95% of their sample falling within the 15-to-30-hour range. Belford (1970, p. 409) cited a range of 15 to 20 contact hours for full-time faculty, and Brawer (1976, p. 2), who investigated music history and music appreciation instructors, found that almost half of the instructors sampled (including some part-time personnel) indicated they taught 16 or more instructional hours per week. Merkel (1977, p. 65) found in Michigan that the number of contact hours for full-time music faculty ranged from 12 to 20 hours a week, with a mean of 16.4 hours.

Class preparations. Belford (1970, p. 409) reported that the average full-time music instructor prepared to teach four to six different classes per week. Merkel (1977, p. 62) indicated a mean number of class preparations at 3.4, with the number of classes taught per week ranging from one to seven. His data (p. 104) revealed that the number of faculty preparations per week related to the size of a college's student enrollment: the greater the number of teachers employed at a college, the lower the average

number of preparations an individual teacher was responsible for per week.

Functions of part-time music instructors. Historically, part-time music instructors have been used when administrators found that instructional services were needed during the evening or at remote locales. Goetz (1940, p. 393), for example, mentioned that part-time music faculty were employed most frequently by junior colleges connected with high schools, because the high schools were ceded to the junior colleges only for night classes. Similarly, Sly (1947, p. 95) alluded to the "well-established practice" of employing part-time faculty to teach adult students, segregated by scheduling. Today, it is not uncommon to find part-time faculty teaching night courses. They also, however, are frequently assigned to teach individual music courses at off-campus locations. In Michigan, there are community colleges that have more than one campus and sponsor music courses at their annexes. In addition, part-time staff teach music courses at such locales as retirement centers, satellite centers, and prisons.

Part-time music faculty have been particularly sought after to teach specialty courses. Where no full-time music staff has been employed, part-time staff have been called in as "music specialists." Martensen (1940, p. 402), for instance, reported a number of junior colleges without organized music departments were offering choral groups directed by part-time instructors. Froh (cited by Curtis, 1938, p. 148) mentioned that, "the public school man" was regularly engaged

on a part-time basis to teach the music course for elementary teacher training certification.

Currently, the major use of part-time personnel is to teach applied music. Merkel (1977, p. 62) assumed that many part-time music teachers in Michigan community colleges were employed to teach applied music, and that, to his knowledge, many of these instructors had only one or two students. Saunders (1980) reported that most community colleges in Michigan maintained close ties with locally active applied music instructors. These instructors are approved by the colleges, but not necessarily contracted directly by them. In many cases, the students pay the instructors directly, and receive college credit for their studies. This practice coincides with that reported by Aslanian (1976):

> Most community colleges do not have adequate staff for individual instrumental or vocal instruction. Even if they did, the cost of such a program would be prohibitive. One solution to the problem of adequately prepared performers on a major instrument or in voice has been achieved through the association of local private music instructors with the community colleges [in California] (p. 136).

Part-time music faculty are sometimes assigned to teach or direct classroom courses. Belford (1970, p. 409) found that part-time music faculty most frequently taught music history and literature, music education, and composition; they rarely taught theory, or music appreciation, and they did not conduct ensembles. In contrast, Merkel (1977, p. 120) found that in Michigan, part-time music faculty most frequently taught applied music courses, including class paino; part-time faculty were assigned less frequently to conduct the glee

club, or to teach sophomore theory, music history, or music for classroom teachers.

In larger centers of musical activity, the community colleges have a wide range of music specialists to employ. Bader (1980), for example, reported that

> Composers, conductors, and arrangers from the world of classical, chamber music, jazz, popular music, the Broadway show, "club dates," and other areas have been engaged as adjunct faculty at Kingsborough [Community College, in Brooklyn, New York] (p. 121).

Descriptors of Two-Year College Music Faculty

Demographic Descriptors.

1. Size of population--The total number of music teachers employed in public community colleges is unknown. Stover, Clausen, Hansen, and Hammer (1970, p. 12) however, indicated that their MENC-sponsored survey of junior college music faculty included data about 1024 faculty from 517 colleges reporting music staff.

2. Age--According to the few sources available, two-year college music teachers tended to be in their early and mid-30s. Greene (1968, p. 294) found a plurality of faculty members fell within the 25 to 34 age cohort. Wozniak (1973, p. 50) found that 63% of her sample of full-time faculty listed ages within the 30 to 49 bracket. A plurality (37.7%) ranged in age from 30 to 39. In Brawer's (1976, p. 1) sample of 90 music history and music appreciation instructors, faculty clustered in the age groups of 31 to 35 and 46 to 50, followed by 36 to 40.

3. Sex--Sources indicated that males predominated among the ranks of music faculty. Greene (1968, p. 290) based his 85% male to 15% female ratio on a small sample population of 34, most of whom were full-time faculty members. Wozniak's (1973, p. 50) 64% to 26% ratio was based on 138 full-time faculty from five northeastern states. Brawer (1976, p. 1) found that of the 90 music-in-the-humanities instructors she sampled (80% of whom were employed full time), 81% were male.

Experiential descriptors.

1. Teaching experience--Researchers have reported disparate findings regarding the distribution of community-junior college teaching experience among music faculty. Jansen (1971, p. 3) reported that a plurality of his sample of 505 music faculty (22.4%) were employed 15 years or longer, and only 6% had been employed for less than a year. Wozniak (1973, p. 50) stated that nearly half of her sample of full-time music faculty had taught for five years or less; more than half of the remaining faculty had been employed between 6 and 15 years, and an additional 23.3% of those remaining had over 16 years of junior college teaching experience. A plurality of Brawer's (1976, p. 2) sample of music history and appreciation instructors claimed 5 to 10 years of teaching experience; the plurality was followed by reports of those clustering in the 3 to 4, 1 to 2, 11 to 20, and over 20 years experience cohorts, respectively.

2. Public school teaching experience--It is commonly reported that many two-year college instructors had taught previously within

the secondary schools. This was true for a majority of Greene's (1968, p. 306) music faculty sample. For Jensen (1971, p. 5) and Brawer (1976, p. 2), 40% and 79% of their respective samples indicated having this experience. In a similar vein, Morgan (1966, p. 41) indicated that a minority (12.4%) of her sample of California junior college music teachers were teaching concurrently at another grade level. On the other hand, Fleming (1971, abstract) reported in a study of faculty from 11 southern states, that many persons who went into vocal teaching at the junior college level had no prior teaching experience at all.

Jansen (1971, p. 5) found that a majority of music instructors he sampled had been private instructors (59.6%) and/or piano performers (50.2%). Brawer (1976, p. 2) found that the entire university-level teaching experience of 58% of music-in-the-humanities instructors had been as teaching assistants.

3. Academic credentials--During the earlier period of junior college development, the baccalaureate was the most widely held academic degree among music instructors. More than 40% (41.2%) of the 223 music faculty sampled by Goetz (1940, p. 393) held a bachelor's degree as their highest degree. The most common specific degree at the time was the bachelor of music. An additional 29.5% of Goetz's sample held a master's as their highest credential, the most prevalent of which was the master of music. Approximately 4% of the faculty were doctoral recipients (including one D.D.S.). The remaining quarter of the sample indicated they held no degree at all. A similar faculty profile was presented by Martensen (1940, p. 402).

Martensen's survey of 62 music faculty from 19 Texas junior colleges, however, contained no doctoral recipients.

More recently, Greene (1968, p. 295) reported that 64.8% of his sample of 34 music faculty employed in New York State administered community colleges held a master's degree. Some 17.6% of all faculty surveyed held a doctorate, and 14.7% held a bachelor's degree as their highest degree. Only 2.9% were teaching without any degree. Belford (1970, p. 409) also reported that the average faculty member among the 419 he sampled held a master's as their highest academic credential. Of those serving as administrators, virtually all (97%) held a graduate degree, including the 14% who held a doctorate. Of all music staff members sampled, 8% held a doctorate.

Stover et al. (1970, p. 6) found that 83% of the 517 junior colleges reporting a music staff required master's degress for full-time faculty. Less stringent demands, however, were made for part-time faculty. Only 47%, less than half the colleges, required a master's degree from part-time music teachers, 39% required part-time staff to hold a bachelor's degree, and 24% posited no degree requirements at all for part-time faculty.

Jansen (1971, p. 6) reported that approximately 70% of the 505 music faculty surveyed held a master's degree, with the degree often accompanied by additional credits. He also noted that proportionally more doctoral recipients were employed by colleges offering music transfer programs than by colleges catering solely to nonmusic majors. Wozniak (1973, p. 50) found that only of 2 of 138 full-time music

faculty members surveyed were teaching without a degree. Most (70.3%) claimed a master's as their highest degree, while a fairly large proportion (17.4%) reported holding a doctorate. Only 10.9% of the sample held a bachelor's degree as the highest credential. Most recently, Merkel (1977, p. 90) reported that only about 1% of Michigan's two-year college music instructors held a doctorate. In light of contemporary findings, however, this estimate is suspect.

4. Pursuit of higher degrees--Although most two-year college music teachers do not hold the highest possible graduate degree, relatively few are currently upgrading their credentials. Morgan (1966, p. 72) found that of her sample of California junior college music instructors, more than 50% were not pursuing a graduate degree of any kind. Respondents' reasons for not pursuing a graduate degree were (a) lack of time, and (b) the belief that an additional degree would not benefit them in their present position. Brawer (1976, p. 3) reported that of the 90 music-in-the-humanities teachers she surveyed, 76% were not presently working on any degree, but that most (90%) would either like to take further coursework or to matriculate in a degree program within the next five years.

Professional descriptors.

1. Tenure--No data regarding the granting of tenure to two-year college music faculty could be located.

2. Academic rank--According to Stover et al. (1970, p. 6), most junior colleges surveyed by the MENC Committee in 1968 (66%) did not designate academic rank. Since 1968, however, conditions may

have changed somewhat. Whereas in the 1968-69 edition of the Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities only 4 of the 12 Michigan two-year colleges listing music faculty identified their staff members by academic rank, 7 of the 13 departments listed in the Directory's 1974-76 edition did so. Even within this latter edition, however, only 9 of the 49 music teachers listed (or 17%) were identified as holding a professional rank; a majority of the faculty members, 29 of the 49 names, were referred to simply as instructors. Nevertheless, Merkel (1977) concluded that "[full-time] music faculty in [Michigan's] two-year colleges are accorded the rank . . . of their college positions" (p. 2).

One anomalous finding regarding academic rank was reported by Greene (1968). Greene maintained (p. 309) that approximately 60% of the music faculty employed within the New York State-administered community colleges received academic rank. Greene's figure of 60% of the faculty holding the rank of assistant professor or higher exceeds the general expectations of the time.

Job Appraisals

Advantages and disadvantages of teaching music at the two-year college level. In their study of two-year college faculty, Kelley and Wilbur (1970, pp. 77-78) queried seven full-time music teachers about the advantages and disadvantages of teaching at the two-year college level. The advantages noted by music faculty pertained primarily to their relations with students. Teachers cited the following as

advantages: (a) the close personal contact with students, (b) the opportunities to see student progress, (c) the satisfaction of helping students find purpose and beauty in their lives, (d) the chance to transfer ideals and enthusiasm to those who would someday be teachers, (e) the opportunity to apply in a concrete manner what one has learned about music, and (f) the opportunity to work with students on a performance (allowing for social and professional interaction).

The disadvantages cited by Kelley and Wilbur related to the conditions under which music is taught. Teachers complained about the following: (a) the time they had to spend in rehearsing and in presenting performances; (b) their teaching load was too heavy, and (c) not enough high-quality students were available for performing groups.

A perennial complaint by teachers and administrators alike has been that music courses are often taught in impoverished surroundings. In an early study, Martensen (1940, p. 404) reported that 9 of 19 program directors from Texas junior colleges believed they were operating with inadequate facilities. She noted that junior college music programs needed (a) buildings and equipment for applied music, (b) better practice facilities, (c) more phonograph records and library materials, and (d) more band and orchestra equipment. Martensen concluded that "administrators must realize that musical equipment meeting the needs of a successful music program must consist of more than a blackboard, chairs, and a 'banged-up' out-of-tune piano" (p. 404).

Thirty-four years later, the Faxon report (1974) reached similar conclusions:

> A lack of physical facilities, unfortunately has stood squarely in the way of any rapid or extensive growth of community college arts programs [in Michigan] and will apparently continue to do so without some sort of special assistance. Forty-one percent of the schools said that a lack of space is the greatest problem facing their music programs (p. 126).

Two-year college music faculty job satisfaction. Accounts of music faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction are indeed limited, and apparently no consideration at all has been given to assessing the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of part-time instructors. The evidence suggests that full-time, two-year college music instructors are generally satisfied with their positions. Brawer (1976) stated specifically that two-year college music history and music appreciation instructors "are more likely to cluster in the high satisfaction groups" (p. 8). Merkel (1977) observed that, "in spite of some problems, the [Michigan] two-year colleges provide satisfying positions for music teachers" (p. 123). It seemed to Merkel, whose sample was composed solely of full-time faculty, that

> most [full-time] instructors enjoy their work and obtain sufficient gratification to want to remain in their positions even though the two-year music programs are not on a par with the programs in the senior colleges in terms of facilities, number of faculty, performance opportunities, and performance results (pp. 123-124).

Wozniak (1973), too, found a high degree of satisfaction among the full-time faculty. Wozniak's study is, to date, the most sophisticated study about the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of music faculty in two-year colleges. Her sample consisted of 138 full-time

music instructors from 64 two-year colleges in five eastern states. For the study, she employed two attitudinal measures and a questionnaire to collect demographic information.

She utilized the Brayfield-Rothe Satisfaction Index (1951) to estimate generalized satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Subjects were asked to use a 5-step rating scale to register their agreement or disagreement with 18 statements pertaining to their jobs. A summated score for the 18 statements was used to index overall attitudes. With regard to this measure, Wozniak found (p. 64) a high degree of satisfaction among the faculty. Only a small "somewhat dissatisfied" group manifested itself, accounting for only 3.6% of the sample. In addition, no significant correlation was found between generalized satisfaction and the demographic variables of either age or sex (p. 65).

The second measure, developed in 1971 by Wickstrom, asked the subjects to relate two critical job-related incidents. First, subjects were asked to recount a particularly good experience in their job careers, and then to report a particularly unpleasant experience. Subjects were than asked to judge the relative importance of specified factors in contributing to their feeling at the time of the negative and positive critical incidents. The factors specified in the Wickstrom measure were those hypothesized by Herzberg (1959) to correlate with either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Wozniak, therefore, analyzed the data derived from the Wickstrom measure to test Herzberg's set of hypotheses. She confirmed Herzberg's hypothesis of unidirectionality of factors (p. 72), for the rank-ordered

factors in response to Wickstrom's happy and unpleasant incidents tasks proved to be unrelated. Wozniak conceded (p. 73), however, that her findings did not replicate exactly Herzberg's normative findings. Only four of Herzberg's eight normatively substantiated dissatisfiers proved to be, in this instance, important sources of dissatisfaction.

According to Wozniak's study (p. 90) the strongest satisfiers for full-time two-year college music faculty were (a) achievement, (b) job interest, (c) interpersonal relations with students, and (d) recognition. The greatest dissatisfiers were (a) policy and administration, (b) working conditions, (c) effect of job on personal life, (d) achievement, and (e) supervision. (Achievement was found to serve both as a satisfier and as a dissatisfier, which contradicts Herzberg's expectation of unidirectionality of factors.)

Role awareness. There is little information available regarding music faculty awareness of their role within community college education. One older study, by Hudgins (1959) indicated that junior college music faculty were poorly informed about the function and philosophy of the junior college music program. The only other extent evidence suggested that some full-time music instructors do not fully appreciate the importance of the community college's general educational function. Much literature (ably summarized by Greene, 1968) recommended that two-year college music programs emphasize general education. This priority was recognized by music administrators who, according to Belford (1967), rated general education as the music

program's most important objective and professional training as the least important. Pollard (1977), in contradiction, reported that full-time rural community college music faculty from 31 states tended to perceive the music major function as the most important goal of the music program.

Related study: senior college music faculty job-choice determinants. One related study conducted by Aurand (1970) focuses on job-choice determinants of senior college music faculty. Aurand studied 1085 music faculty members teaching at four-year institutions accredited by the National Association of Schools of Muisc (NASM). He sought to identify the factors that brought faculty to their current position, kept them there, and that would be important in selecting a future position. His factors of job-choice determinants were derived from the seventeen environmental items specified by Brown (1967, p. 200) in his "Academic Market Study" relating to job mobility.

Aurand and Blackburn (1973, p. 166) found that music faculty were attracted to their present position by the following factors: (a) salary, (b) courses they would teach, (c) a chance to participate in university governance, and (d) the research/performance facilities. According to the authors, music faculty "look for a future position using most of the same criteria [they] used in selecting [their] present [positions]" (1973, p. 166). The music faculty's satisfaction with their current position was contingent on somewhat different factors. The five most satisfying aspects relating to their current

position were (a) teaching desired courses, (b) competency of colleagues; (c) congeniality of colleagues, (d) faculty performance opportunities, and (e) participation in job decisions.

Summary of Literature Pertaining to Two-Year College Music Faculty

For more than four decades, the two-year colleges have offered a diversity of music courses, catering to both community and senior college needs. Very often, however, according to a Music Educators National Conference (MENC) Committee report (1970), the junior college's music faculty consisted of either one or two teachers. Most commonly, the colleges employed a choir-voice-keyboard teacher and an instrumental-music history-theory teacher. Since the mid 1970s, the two-year colleges have augmented their music faculty primarily by increasing their employment of part-time staff. The MENC committee was surprised to find that in 1968, 44% of all two-year college music instructors nationwide were hired on a part-time basis. Merkel (1977) found that more than 70% of Michigan two-year college music instructors were part-time employees.

There is very little information available about part-time community college instructors. It was reported that most part-time music instructors in Michigan were likely to be teachers of applied music, and that many were not directly contracted by their college. As a sample population, they had intentionally been omitted from research studies.

Wozniak (1973) found that full-time two-year college music instructors were generally satisfied with their jobs. Full-time

faculty were found to receive the greatest satisfaction from the factors of achievement, job interest, interpersonal relations with students, and recognition. They derived dissatisfaction from the factors of policy and administration, working conditions, effects of job on personal life, achievement, and supervision.

No real attempts were made to assess awareness of their role by music faculty. Findings suggest, however, that unlike music administrators, full-time music instructors in rural community colleges tended to underestimate the importance educational leaders place on general education.

SAMPLE, INSTRUMENT, AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The study focused on three goals: to compile information about the characteristics and attitudes of music teachers employed within Michigan's community colleges; to construct representative profiles for full-time, part-time general, and part-time applied music instructors; and to assess the faculty's professional self-image.

To attain these goals, the following procedures were followed:

A questionnaire was designed to collect data reflecting faculty characteristics and attitudes. Names and addresses of all currently employed music faculty were solicited from administrators representing music programs in Michigan's 29 community colleges. The questionnaires were distributed by mail, returned, and their data prepared for computer analysis. Finally, the statistical procedures were selected to analyze the data.

Methodology

The present study used the most common descriptive research method, the survey. The mail questionnaire, a survey technique employed in this study, has been widely used to collect both factual and attitudinal data. In similar studies, the mail questionnaire has proven useful in gathering information from a large population. It allows for data collection from individuals dispersed over a wide

geographic area, and allows each to complete the survey at the subject's leisure.

Yet, the mail questionnaire has some serious drawbacks. As Cohen and Brawer (1977) stated: "Gathering reliable data on two-year college faculty [by this technique] is a useful but precarious exercise" (p. 8). The primary concern voiced by Kerlinger (1967, p. 397) is that responses to mail questionnaires are generally poor. He indicates (p. 397) that a researcher conducting a mail survey might expect returns as low as 40% to 50%. Certain procedures may, however, enhance the return rate. Techniques used in the present study to promote a higher return rate were the following: (a) questionnaires were mailed directly to a faculty member by name, and if possible, they were mailed to a home address; (b) a letter was included with each questionnaire explaining the study's objectives and the importance of faculty participation; and (c) a vigorous follow-up procedure was implemented.

Kerlinger's secondary concern with the mail questionnaire is the inability to verify the data collected. The veracity of a subject's response is, indeed, a serious concern. The present study, however, endeavored to elicit honest response from faculty by impressing on them the importance of the research, appealing to their professional standards, and assuring the confidentiality of their responses. Having taken these steps, it was hoped that the drawbacks of the mail questionnaire would be minimized.

Construction of the Community College Music Faculty Questionnaire

The primary means to obtain information from music teachers was through a questionnaire developed especially for the present study. A full copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix 2. A summary of its content follows.

Summary of the Questionnaire's Content

The questionnaire, four pages in length, was comprised of five parts. A summary of its contents is presented in Table 3.1.

Current status. Part I of the questionnaire contained ten questions, some of which called for factual answers. Respondents, for example, were asked to indicate whether or not they were employed full time or part time, whether or not they held a position in addition to their community college appointment, and to list the number of hours a week they taught. Other questions requested that respondents state their priorities regarding the type of position they would find most attractive, the authority to which they owed their greatest professional allegiance, and the student group they felt deserved the most attention. A third type of question had the respondents determine the psychological weight of their teaching load, their reasons for entering into community college teaching, and whether or not they would stay in community college teaching.

Position satisfaction scale. Part II was specifically designed to measure aspects of job satisfaction. The 40 items represented

TABLE 3.1.--Summary of the Questionnaire's Content

Section	Number of Items	Levels of Measurement	Content Areas Covered	Classification of Responses
Part I	10 questions	9 items: nominal 1 item: ratio	Current status: Attitudes:	Factual Evaluative, priority
Part II	40 items	40 items: inter (5-step rating scale plus "not applicable")	Position satisfactions: (attitudes)	Evaluative
Part III	56 items	56 items: integer (3-step rating scale)	Instructional difficulties: (attitudes)	Evaluative
Part IV-a	7 questions	7 items: nominal	Current status: Function:	Factual Factual
Part IV-b	10 questions	8 items: nominal 2 items: ratio	Educational and professional background: attitudes:	Factual Priority
Part V-a	2 questions	1 item: nominal 1 item: ratio	Demographic:	Factual
Part V-b	3 questions	Open-ended questions	Professional background: Advice:	Factual evaluative

sources of satisfaction that the respondent might encounter on the job. This list included such diverse topics as salary, congeniality of colleagues, adequacy of group rehearsal facilities, and school reputation. The teachers were asked to evaluate the degree of satisfaction they derived from each item and then were given a rating scale of descriptions covering the range of satisfaction with which to indicate the level appropriate to them.

Instructional difficulties scale. Part III elicited faculty attitudes toward possible sources of instructional difficulties. This section contained 56 items covering a broad spectrum of possible problem situations. Several items concerned the instructor's relationship to students (e.g., relating to students of a different socioeconomic class), and performance of instructional-related organizational tasks (e.g., preparing tests). Other topics elicited a respondent's opinion toward achieving instructional goals (e.g., promoting psychomotor flexibility). Subjects were instructed to use the three-step rating scale to evaluate each topic.

Background and function. Part IV was designed to collect additional factual data from the respondent. Respondents were asked to indicate their academic rank, whether or not they were currently the music administrator for their programs, and whether or not they had been granted tenure. They were also asked when, where, and what courses they taught, the types of students they taught, as well as questions pertaining to their education and professional background, such as had they ever been a community college student, and if they

had ever studied the background and principles of the community college as a modern institution. Other questions in this section sought information regarding the number of years the respondents had served on the job and within the teaching field. One question sought to identify those areas in which respondents had prior professional experience. The only attitudinal question in this section pertained to the respondent's musical taste.

Demography and open-ended questions. A set of optional questions concluded the questionnaire. Respondents were provided the option of specifying their age and gender. For those willing to contribute additional information, the following three questions were included: (a) "What types of experiences (formal or otherwise) did you find most useful in preparing you to teach at the community college level?" (b) "What advice would you give to prospective community college music teachers?" and (c) "Is there a question you were not asked that you would like to answer?" These questions could be answered in either point form or paragraph form.

A space was provided at the end of the questionnaire for subjects to indicate if they cared to receive the results of the study.

Procedural Review

Determination of the questionnaire's content. Four goals determined the content of the questionnaire. The first consideration was to conduct a survey that would elicit a wide variety of responses. It was important not only to determine a person's demographic background and

his/her functional responsibilities, but also to sample attitudes. It was believed that by including attitudinal questions, a more personal profile than is presently available could be drawn of those individuals currently teaching music in Michigan's community colleges. Another goal was to include content that would serve to differentiate one employment subgroup from another. Therefore, questions were included to which faculty reacted differentially.

A third goal was to utilize as many questions as would prove acceptable to respondents. Certainly, the constraints of space and respondent attention span were foremost in mind as this researcher formulated the questionnaire. It was considered desirable, however, to include as much material as possible, within such constraints, so as to maximize the opportunity to survey the faculty.

The final consideration regulating the questionnaire's content pertained to the types of questions to be studied. It was felt that including questions employed by other researchers in similar surveys of higher education faculty would lend face validity to the present instrument.

Selection of content and format. A review was conducted to identify and inventory the content of questionnaires employed to survey higher education faculty. These questionnaires (whose contents are summarized in Appendix 3) were edited for purposes of the present study and the inventory of questions were supplemented with questions derived from informal discussions with community college faculty over

the period of a year and a half. Other questions were adapted from the open-ended responses collected by Kelley and Wilbur (1970). The questionnaire's format was patterned after models presented within texts on questionnaire construction (e.g., Oppenheimer, 1966; Berdie and Anderson, 1974). Further advice on questionnaire construction was provided by a research consultant affiliated with the Michigan State University College of Education's Office of Research Consultation.

After being edited and revised, the instrument was then submitted for criticism to a ten-person panel of community college instructors and administrators from a local community college. The panel members, who were either involved with the school's professional development program or were familiar with research techniques, were asked to comment on the suitability of the instrument. They provided useful commentary regarding the length, wording, and response format of the questionnaire. In addition, follow-up interviews were conducted with several panel members to clarify certain points they had criticized. The critics' comments and suggestions were included in later revisions of the instrument.

The instrument was resubmitted to the researcher's disseration committee for further criticism. Final revisions were then made, and the questionnaire was typeset. The typesetters were able to print the contents of the questionnaire on both sides of an 11" x 17" sheet of paper. When the sheet was folded in half, four printed sides of the document appeared.

Construction of the Position Satisfaction Scale

Content of the scale. The Position Satisfactions Scale, Part II of the questionnaire, contained 40 items. Each item represented a specific aspect of the school environment from which faculty may derive satisfaction. The scale items were classified intuitively into eight topical categories. (See Appendix 4). In essence, faculty were asked to evaluate the benefits (economic, social, personal, and external) they enjoy, the environmental conditions (physical, interpersonal, and professional) in which they work, and their job responsibilities. An empirical categorization of items was accomplished through factor analysis.

Source materials. The Position Satisfactions Scale is an amalgam of the most pertinent items employed by four previous researchers: Brown (1967), Shank (1968), Aurand (1970), and Kelley and Wilbur (1970). All 16 items in Brown's (1967) Academic Market Study (satisfaction subsection) have been adapted for use in the present study (see Appendix 3). Brown asked university and college faculty who had vacated an academic position to assign a degree of importance to the factors that influenced their decision. Faculty responses were based on the three-step scale provided for their use. Shank (1968) employed 10 of these same items and 8 others in his study of new senior college education faculty. His measure, the "Position Satisfaction Questionnaire," employed a 6-step rating scale. Unlike Brown's measure, which focused on "dissatisfaction," Shank's measure

analyzed "satisfaction," and included a column to register a "no satisfaction" response. Shank reported an internal consistency reliability for his scale of .82 (1968, p. 22).

Aurand (1970) also employed 14 of Brown's original scale items within a study of four-year college music faculty. Aurand's study, like Brown's (1967), investigated faculty perception of the importance of environmental factors related to academic mobility. Aurand provided his respondents with a seven-step rating scale. Many of these same items are identical with the comments collected in open-ended format by Kelley and Wilbur (1970). Kelley and Wilbur questioned a sample of full-time community/junior college teachers about the satisfactions and dissatisfactions of their positions.

Format of the scale. In the present study, a five-step rating scale and a "not applicable" column were employed. The rating scale is displayed below:

Presently Employed Position Satisfaction Rating Scale

Great Satisfaction	Considerable Satisfaction	Average Satisfaction	Below Average Satisfaction	Little, if any, Satisfaction	Not Applicable
5	4	3	2	1	na

The rating scale employed here most closely approximates one used by Shank (1968):

Shank's (1968) Rating Scale

Degree of Satisfaction					
None	Little	Below Average	Above Average	Considerable	Great

SOURCE: "Position Satisfactions Questionnaire," Shank (1968, Appendix)

Both rating scales, (a) pertain solely to satisfaction, (b) make possible the expression of a "no satisfaction" response, and (c) locate average satisfaction at about the middle of the rating scale.

Use of the "not applicable" column. The "not applicable" column is included in the Position Satisfaction rating scale for descriptive purposes only. It was assumed that not all faculty members come into contact with every environmental aspect represented by items in the measure. For example, not all music faculty members are expected to conduct ensembles as part of their community college teaching responsibilities. Therefore, some means had to be devised to differentiate between a subject's "low appraisal" satisfaction response and a "lack of exposure" response. The "not applicable" option was provided for just this purpose.

Construction of the Instructional Difficulties Scale

Content of the scale. The Instructional Difficulties Scale, Part III of the questionnaire, contained 56 items. Each item

represents a source of potential difficulty to a teacher performing his/her instructional responsibilities. When categorized intuitively, each item appears to relate to at least one of four clusters (listed in Appendix 5): (a) instructional skills, (b) classroom management chores, (c) educational objectives, and (d) interaction with students. An empirical categorization of items was accomplished through factor analysis.

Source materials. Items used in the Instructional Difficulties Scale were written specifically for the present study. Among the sources consulted for formulating the scale, however, were materials published by McCall, Jamrich, Hereford, Thomas, and Friedman (1961), Siehr (1964), Kelley and Wilbur (1970), Ferrett (1975), and Friendlander (1979). These sources were supplemented by information obtained through discussions with community college faculty and professional development staff.

Format of the scale. A three-step rating scale was fitted to the Instructional Difficulties measure. The rating scale is displayed below:

Presently Employed Instructional Difficulties Rating Scale

Of MAJOR[1] Difficulty	Of AVERAGE[2] Difficulty	Of LITTLE[3] or NO Difficulty

The researcher received assurances from statistical consultants that even a three-step rating scale, with interval level measurement, can be submitted to factor analysis.

The Sample

The primary procedural objectives of the study were to identify and to enlist the participation of as many individuals teaching music within the Michigan public community colleges as possible. While no comprehensive list of music faculty was available, figures derived from Merkel's (1977) statistics indicate that 158 music teachers were employed by Michigan public community colleges in 1976.

Fewer than 50 music instructors were listed by name within the College Music Society's publication, Directory of Music Faculties in Higher Education (Short, 1976). Even fewer names could be obtained from current community college catalogs. Administrators from all Michigan community colleges were therefore contacted and asked to provide the names and addresses of each music teacher employed by their institutions. Administrators were also asked to specify the number of full- and part-time music faculty they employed.

Results of the Initial Inquiry

Representatives from 23 of the 29 public community colleges provided information about their music facilities by submitting 235 names and addresses. The names of three music instructors who taught for schools which had not replied were obtained from their college's catalogs. Notes were received from three colleges that no

music program existed at their schools. Despite personal telephone calls, three administrators declined to provide the information requested.

Although a total of 238 names of music teachers compiled, administrators claimed to employ only 177 music faculty of which 44 were full-time instructors (25%) and 133 part-time instructors (75%). The remaining 61 names, unaccounted for within the 238 names provided, constitute a body of instructors undesignated as to either full- or part-time employment. Several factors may account for this discrepancy. The lists of faculty submitted may have been out of date and, therefore, may have contained names of individuals no longer employed. It is possible that certain faculty members whose names were provided, but were not included in the tally of employed faculty belonged to a pool of instructors to draw from when the need arose. These individuals may be part of the adjunct, or off-campus faculty, most of whom teach applied music.

In any event, some of the names provided by administrators would not apply to the present study. Evidence also suggests, however, that some names were omitted from the lists submitted. Several administrators noted that they employed a number of adjunct music instructors, but failed to name them. Under these conditions, it is assumed that the sample studied is largely, but not entirely, congruous with the population of community college music instructors within the state.

Dissemination and Retrieval of the Questionnaire

On April 25, 1981, 231 music faculty members were mailed a copy of the Community College Music Faculty Questionnaire, together with a cover letter (see Appendix 1) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Seven names from the 238 names collected were immediately disqualified. Of the seven faculty eliminated, six had left the employ of this author's home institution; the seventh name removed was that of the author. Home addresses were available for 134 of the 231 music faculty. The remaining 97 questionnaires were mailed to faculty members at their institutional addresses.

A post card urging that the questionnaires be returned was mailed to each faculty member not heard from within ten days after the initial mailing. Eleven days later, a follow-up letter was mailed to all nonrespondent faculty. Included with the second letter was a duplicate copy of the questionnaire and a second return envelope. Finally, on June 1, sixteen days after the second reminder, a mimeographed letter was forwarded to elicit questionnaires from those who had not already responded.

Response to the Questionnaire

Response rate information was as follows: 123 of the returned questionnaires contained usable data. Of the 123, 121 questionnaires were identifiable by employment status. This group (N = 121) constituted the sample from which most analyses were based.

Among the subjects disqualified were those who, first, disqualified themselves; second, could not be located at any address; or

third, were disqualified by the present author. The largest number of individuals disqualified (N = 22) chose to disqualify themselves, including 17 who indicated that they were no longer associated with their community colleges. Many stated that they had left their institution several years before, and while employed, they had instructed students privately for community college credit. An additional two indivdiuals indicated they had retired, and three individuals noted they were associated with their college only indirectly as, for example, conductor of a civic orchestra or band.

A second group of instructors, 17 in all, could not be reached by mail. Questionnaires sent to these individuals proved undeliverable. (Fourteen of these subjects were private teachers employed by a single institution.) The final group of subjects were disqualified by the researcher. Of these, seven instructors from the author's home institution were disqualified for reasons already enumerated. In addition, three returned questionnaires judged so incomplete as to be unusable; they were therefore, discarded.

In all, 49 (20%) of the original names were declared invalid for purposes of this study. In total, 172 (72%) of the 238 names were accounted for. Sixty-six faculty names (17.7%) remained unaccounted for. Thus out of a possible total of 189 subjects (123 usable questionnaires and 66 unaccounted for), a 65% response rate was obtained.

In summation, the size of the sample was limited by the following four factors: (a) failure of administrators from three community colleges to respond to the present researcher's request for information;

(b) failure of administrators to provide the names of all their music faculty; (c) failure of instructors to complete and return their questionnaires; and (d) failure to reach subjects through the mail.

Treatment of the Data

Editorial Decisions

During data preparation, one must often alter the coding of the questions (Youngman, 1979). These editorial changes should not alter the essential meaning of the responses provided, but should make possible a clearer interpretation of the phenomenon studied. Coding alternations were performed within the present study for the following reasons: (a) where a multiple response was warranted, and both response options were specified, a third alternative indicating the combination of response options 1 and 2 was created (cf., questionnaire, page 3, part IV, items 4 and 5); (b) where a sufficient number of respondents specified a response that was not provided for, an accommodating response was created, (cf., page 4, item 17); (c) where a distributional breakdown within a continuous variable would aid description, continuous variables (such as age and length of service) were dichotomized or trichotomized; (d) where contrast could be enhanced by collapsing similarly-titled columns, a dichotomized or trichotomized variable was created (cf., page 1, item); (e) where a subject's response was obviously misclassified, a specified response was recoded under an existing rubric; and (f) where a multiple response was totally inappropriate, the subject's response was discarded.

A differential policy was adopted with regard to use and interpretation of the Position Satisfaction Scale "not applicable" column. "N/A" responses were counted along with missing data when "lack of exposure" responses were tallied. The procedure was used when individual Position Satisfaction item means were rank-ordered by faculty subgroup. "N/A" responses were counted along with "little, if any satisfaction" responses, however, when "low appraisal of satisfaction" responses were counted. This was done when the Position Satisfaction Scale items were submitted to factor analysis.

The reason for this differential policy is two-fold. First, it may be argued that while "low appriasal of satisfaction" and "lack of exposure" responses are denotatively different, their results, in terms of personal satisfaction derived, is about the same--low satisfaction. Within this context, lack of exposure to a positively valued source of satisfaction creates within a respondent "no" satisfaction rather than "average" satisfaction. Thus it is logical to treat the "not applicable" response as different from "little if any satisfaction" when the response reason is of primary interest, and not to differentiate between "not applicable" responses when the response quantity is of primary interest. Secondly, were all "not applicable" responses to be treated as missing data, it is doubtful if factor analysis could be performed.

Factor Analysis of the Attitudinal Measures

In the present study, factor analytic technique, an appropriate tool for use in descriptive research, was used to clarify the

information contained within the two attitudinal measures. Factor analysis identifies subsets of variables from among a larger set. Each subset, or factor, that is identified can usually be given a name that summarizes the general attribute held in common between the most characteristic of its component variables.

Factor analysis was employed to avoid calculating a summated score for an attitudinal measure as a whole. Summated scores sometimes conceal relationships that become apparent when subscales are examined. In addition, factor analysis also identifies scale items that do not relate (or load) significantly to any of the defined factors. These less relevant variables can then be ignored, thus simplifying the contents of a measure. When factor analysis is employed, internal consistency is estimated for each subscale, rather than for the measure as a whole.

Two factor analyses were performed--one for each of the attitudinal measures included in the questionnaire. In both cases, standard factoring procedure was followed. The initial factors were identified by the principal-components method (PA2). PA2 was selected because "[it] can handle most of the initial factoring needs of the user. At present [it] is the most widely accepted factoring method" (Nie et al., 1975, p. 480). To simplify the factor structure, a method of rotation was employed. The Varimax method, the most widely used method of rotation (Nie et al., 1975, p. 485) was deemed the most suitable because it simplified interpretation of the factor columns.

Factor Analysis of the Position Satisfaction Scale

A factor analysis was performed on the Position Satisfaction Scale, after its "not applicable" and "little, if any, satisfaction" columns were combined in accordance with the editorial policy explained earlier. The analysis identified four factors, each of which was converted into a subscale to be used within subsequent statistical analyses. In all, 22 of the 40 original scale items were included within the four factors. Items included within each factor are listed in Table 3.2.

Ten items loaded on the first factor with coefficients greater than .50. These ten items were labeled the "Survival" factor because of their common element. Each item pertained to one social or professional benefit that had been hypothesized. The first and most important factor accounted for 58% of the scale's variance. The factor's reliability was estimated to be .86.

Five items loaded on the second factor. This factor was named the "Facilities" factor, having incorporated all five of the variables hypothesized relating to the physical environment. The "Facilities" factor accounted for 19.2% of the scale's variance. Its reliability was estimated at .84.

The third factor was comprised of three items, two of which pertained to interpersonal relationships. This "Social" factor accounted for 14.1% of the scale's variance. Its reliability was estimated at .76.

TABLE 3.2.--Subscales of the Satisfaction Measure[a]

Factor 1:	Survival
	10 items: 8, 9, 11, 18, 20, 21, 30, 32, 38, 39
	Salary Fringe benefits Future salary prospects Diversity of teaching assignments Job security Rotation of teaching assignments Lecturing Participation in job decisions Opportunities for professional advancement Opportunities for professional growth
	N = 113 % of variance: 58.3 Alpha = .86864 Eigenvalue: 7.55158
Factor 2:	Facilities
	5 items: 13, 16, 25, 26, 36
	Adequacy of music library Adequacy of classroom facilities Adequacy of group rehearsal facilities Adequacy of practice facilities Adequacy of office space
	N = 117 % of Variance: 19.2 Alpha = .84937 Eigenvalue: 2.48342
Factor 3:	Social
	3 items: 1, 2, 27
	Congeniality of colleagues Competency of colleagues Personal contact with head of department
	N = 115 % of Variance: 14.1 Alpha = .76555 Eigenvalue: 1.82879
Factor 4:	Prestige
	4 items: 3, 5, 6, 7
	Reputation of the school Teaching load Quality of the students Academic rank
	N = 109 % of Variance: 8.5 Alpha = .71796 Eigenvalue: 1.09533

[a] n for each factor determined by listwide deletion. Items selected with a minimum factor loading of .50.

The fourth and final factor, accounting for 8.5% of the variance, was comprised of four items. Labeled the "Prestige" factor, it corresponded to items found within the hypothesized social benefits and professional environment factors. Reliability of this fourth factor was estimated at .71.

Factor Analysis of the Instructional Difficulties Scale

A factor analysis was performed on the 56-item Instructional Difficulties Scale. Of the 56 items included in the analysis, 16 items were essential in constructing four factors. Items included within each factor are listed in Table 3.3.

Definition of the four instructional difficulties factors. Five items with factor loadings of greater than .50 comprised the first factor names "Student musical-involvement." Its items were drawn from three of the four hypothesized factors listed in Appendix 5. It may be described most aptly as a factor in which professional expectations and student involvement play a role. The factor accounted for 52.5% of the scale's variance, and its reliability was estimated at .76.

Three items clustered together to yield a "Student Responsibilities" factor. Two of the items pertain to classroom mananagement duties, and the third to interaction with students. This factor reflects instructors' problems in servicing students who fall behind in their assignments. This factor accounted for 17% of the variance, and its reliability was estimated at .65.

TABLE 3.3.--Subscales of the Difficulty Measure[a]

Factor 1:	Student Musical Involvement
	5 items: 6, 17, 35, 44, 46
	Encouraging mastery of musical materials Expanding students' perspectives Teaching students who do not practice Enhancing musicality of student performances Maintaining students' interest
	N = 111 % of Variance: 52.5 Alpha = .76329 Eigenvalue: 8.29221
Factor 2:	Student Responsibilities
	3 items: 11, 24, 55
	Providing make-up examinations Teaching students who do not do their assigned readings Getting students to turn in their assignments on time
	N = 110 % of Variance: 17.0 Alpha = .65213 Eigenvalue: 2.68578
Factor 3:	Organization of Course
	3 items: 16, 33, 34
	Pacing materials over the term Sequencing materials over the semester Preparing tests
	N = 111 % of Variance: 15.4 Alpha = .71130 Eigenvalue: 2.43139
Factor 4:	Utilizaton of Materials
	5 items: 4, 13, 14, 25, 42
	Finding supplementary class materials Making do with insufficient instructional resources Using a diversity of media to advantage Setting up the classroom Making do with limited physical facilities
	N = 110 % of Variance: 15.1 Alpha = .70703 Eigenvalue: 2.38306

[a]n for each factor determined by listwise deletion. Items selected with a minimum factor loading of .50.

Three items constituted the "Organization of Course" factor. These items were drawn from an originally hypothesized "Instructional Skills" factor. The "Organization of Course" factor accounted for 15.4% of the scale's variance, with an estimated reliability of .71.

The fourth and final factor consisted of five items. This factor was named for its emphasis on instructors' abilities to use existing resources effectively. Thus it was termed the "Utilization of Materials" factor. It related to both the hypothesized "Instructional Skills" and "Classroom Management" factors. The factor accounted for 15.5% of the variance and exhibited an estimated reliability of .70.

Analytical Procedures

Several methods were determined necessary to analyze the data. These methods included (a) cross-tabulation and application of the chi-square test, (b) univariate analysis of variance, (c) rank-ordering and distributional comparison, and (d) content summary of written comments. The construction of faculty profiles, the study's primary objectives, could be accomplished only when the large amount of qualitative data collected was submitted for cross-tabulation. In simple cross-tabulation, a bivariate table is constructed. Levels within the tabular columns were assigned to full-time, part-time general, and part-time applied music faculty. Tabular rows, on the other hand, were accorded to levels within whatever other variables was examined.

For the purpose of identifying significant differences between faculty subgroups, each bivariate distribution was evaluated. The significance of a cross-tabulation's frequency distribution may be appraised through the chi-square test, "the best-known statistical procedure," according to Weisberg and Bowen (1977, p. 164). A chi-square statistic that is assigned a coefficient of significance beyond the .05 level indicates, in the context of this study, a significant difference between employment subgroups.

Because most of the tables were larger than two columns by two rows, the suitable statistic to be reported as a measure of association was Cramer's V. The V statistic is a corrected phi coefficient, and is, therefore, similar to the Pearson Correlation Coefficient of Association. When a 2 x 2 table was constructed, however, the phi coefficient was reported.

A different procedure, the univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA), was used to assess the relationships between faculty subgroups and the Position Satisfaction and Instructional Difficulties subscales. As a statistical tool, ANOVA allows comparison of inter- and intra-group means and variances. When the ratio of inter-group variance exceeds extra-group variance by a specified margin, the subgroup means are judged to differ significantly from each other. The ANOVA program, as written for the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was suitable for use in this study. According

to Nie et al. (1975, p. 400), the ANOVA program is equipped to accommodate nonmanipulative variables, designs that are not experimental, and designs with unequal cell frequencies.

Data from the attitudinal measures were also subjected to formal means of analysis. Subgroup means for each of the Position Satisfaction and Instructional Difficulties scale items (there were 40 of one and 56 of the other) were rank-ordered independently. The Position Satisfaction scale range was partitioned to permit identification of a set of items from which faculty may derive "greater" satisfaction, and a second set of items from which faculty may derive "lesser" satisfaction. In addition, a marginal zone was established on either side of the line of demarcation to further identify items only marginally classified. The Instructional Difficulties scale range, on the other hand, was partitioned to form three categories. It was thus possible to identify items which faculty considered "most troublesome," "of moderate trouble," and "of little trouble" in performing their instructional responsibilities. Subgroup lists were then compared, and commonalities as well as dissimilarities noted. Written comments, contributed by faculty in response to the three open-ended questions appended to the questionnaire, were summarized.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this section the results of four sets of descriptive analyses are reported. The analyses were designed with different objectives in mind, and each is presented in a separate part. The analysis of the nominal and continuous variables of the questionnaire is reported in part I of this section. These items are organized topically and the distributions cross-tabulated by employment subgroup. Faculty are described demographically, experientially, professionally, functionally, and attitudinally. Details accompanying each cross-tabulation can be read to determine the standing of the faculty as a whole and each of the three employment subgroups.

In part II the individual items comprising the two additional measures in the questionnaire are provided with employment subgroup means, and then assigned to a categorically-named list according to those means. The lists are compared and similarities and differences between the employment subgroup lists are enumerated. The objective was to identify, by subgroup, the environmental items from which faculty derive the most and the least position satisfaction, and to identify the items posing the greatest problems to faculty in performing their instructional duties. Also appended to this report are distributional analyses for each attitudinal measure, and an analysis of Position Satisfaction items which more than 20% of cases rated as "not applicable."

Dimensional analyses for the attitudinal measures are reported in part III. The eight attitudinal subscales, derived by factor analysis, served as dependent variables for analyses of variance. The objectives in this part were to interpret the direction and ordering of subgroup subscale means and determine which, if any, of the subgroup means differ significantly.

Finally, part IV contains a summary of comments received in response to the three open-ended questions appended to the questionnaire. The primary objective in this part was to present the advice faculty members wished to convey to prospective community college music instructors.

Descriptors of Respondents

Breakdown by Employment Status

Employment status. Three-quarters of all music faculty who responded to the survey were employed on a part-time basis (see Table 4.1).

TABLE 4.1.--Identification of Full-time and Part-time Employment Status

Status	n	% of Sample
Full time	31	25
Part time	91	75
(Unidentifiable)	(1)	--
TOTAL	122	100%

Distribution of faculty within the part-time ranks. Less than 30% of all part-time faculty responding to the survey were employed solely to teach private music lessons. More than 70% of part-time faculty were assigned general teaching responsibilities (see Table 4.2).

TABLE 4.2.--Identification of Part-time Subgroup Status

Status	n	% of Sample
Private lessons only	25	27.5
General responsibilites	66	72.5
TOTAL	91	100.0

Distribution of faculty within the full-time ranks. Virtually all full-time faculty were assigned general or multiple teaching responsibilities. No full-time faculty were employed to teach private music lessons, as many are at the senior colleges (see Table 4.3).

TABLE 4.3.--Identification of Full-time Subgroup Status

Status	n	% of Subgroup
Private lessons only	0	0.0
Administrative duties only[a]	1	3.3
General responsibilities	30	96.7
TOTAL	31	100.0

[a]Omitted from cross-tabulations requiring identification of subgroup status.

Constitution of the faculty as a whole. Part-time general faculty constituted the majority of all music faculty responding to the questionnaire (see Table 4.4).

TABLE 4.4.--Breakdown of Sample by Faculty Subgroup

Status	n	% of Sample
Full time general	30	24.8
Part time general	66	54.5
Part time applied	25	20.7
TOTAL	121	100.0

Demographic Descriptors

Sex. More males than females taught music within the Michigan community colleges. The vast majority of female instructors were employed on a part-time basis (see Table 4.5).

TABLE 4.5.--Distribution of Gender by Status

Status	Females (n = 48)	Males (n = 72)
Full time	6.3%	38.9%
Part time	93.7%	61.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

Although the sexes were disproportionately represented between full-time and part-time status, the proportion of male to female

instructors was more evenly balanced. In fact, a majority of part-time applied teachers are female (see Table 4.6).

TABLE 4.6.--Distribution of Gender Across Subgroups

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 119)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Female	40.3	10.0	46.9	60.0
Male	59.7	90.0	53.1	40.0

V = .373
Raw chi-square = 16.625
Significance = .0002

Age. Faculty members ranged between 21 and 64 years of age. The average instructor was almost 38 years old. A majority of the faculty (52%) fell between the ages of 26 and 37 (see Table 4.7).

TABLE 4.7.--Age: Central Tendencies for the Sample

Parameter	Value		
Mean	37.838	SD	10.265
Mode	28.000	Maximum	64.000
Minimum	21.000	Median	35.200

Full-time faculty tended to be older than part-time faculty. More than 79% of full-time faculty were over the age of 36. The average full-time instructor was 45 years old. In contrast, only

38% of part-time faculty were over the age of 36, with the average age 36. Part-time general faculty differed minimally from part-time applied faculty in terms of mean age (see Table 4.8).

TABLE 4.8.--Age: Breakdown by Subgroup[a]

	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	n
Full time	45.000	9.7505	29
Part time general	34.967	9.1149	62
Part time applied	36.625	10.0987	24
Sample	37.843	10.3064	115

[a]F = 11.3029
df = (2,114)
Sig. = .0000

Locale of college. The location of a community college to some degree influenced the overall composition of its music faculty. For example, both rural and suburban colleges relied heavily on part-time general staff. Part-time general instructors, however, constituted a lesser proportion of music instructors at urban community colleges. Urban colleges employed a greater proportion of both full-time and part-time applied faculty. In fact, in the urban community college, full-time faculty were found in greatest supply, although at no locale did they constitute a majority of the music faculty employed (see Table 4.9).

Regarding the within-subgroup distribution, one finds that an appreciable number of both part-time general and part-time applied

TABLE 4.9.--Staffing Patterns: Breakdown by Locale

Locale	Full Time (N = 30)	Part-Time General (N = 66)	Part-Time Applied (N = 25)
Urban	45.5%	27.3%	27.3%
Suburban	19.4%	61.3%	19.4%
Rural	11.5%	73.1%	15.4%

staff were employed at suburban community colleges, which employ a majority of music faculty (51.2%). The urban colleges, however, provided employment for half of all full-time music instructors considered in this study. Urban colleges also employed a sizable proportion of all currently working part-time applied faculty. A smaller proportion of members from all subgroups found employment at rural colleges (see Table 4.10).

TABLE 4.10.--Staffing Patterns: Breakdown by Subgroups

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time%	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Urban	27.3	50.0	13.6	36.0
Suburban	51.2	40.0	57.6	48.0
Rural	21.5	10.0	28.8	16.0

V = .257
raw chi-square = 16.017
Significance = .0030

Experiential Descriptors

Number of years on the job. Full-time faculty members tended to have been employed longer than had part-time faculty. On the average, full-time staff members had been at work for 12 years, between two and three times longer than had part-time faculty. A large portion of the group (45%), composed mainly of part-time faculty, had been employed between one and three years (see Tables 4.11 and 4.12).

TABLE 4.11.--Years in Current Position: Central Tendencies of the Sample

Parameter	Value		
Mean	6.336	S.D.	.484
Mode	2.000	Maximum	33.000
Minimum	1.000	Median	4.643

TABLE 4.12.--Years in Current Position: Breakdown by Subgroups

	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	n
Full time	12.066	6.0226	30
Part time General	4.015	3.1499	65
Part time Applied	5.160	3.6592	25
SAMPLE	6.266	5.3275	120

F = 39.8870
df = (2,119)
Sig. = .0000

Total teaching experience. Full-time faculty in this survey had taught longer than had part-time faculty. The average full-time faculty member had taught for about 20 years. In comparison, part-time faculty had taught, on the average, for about 11 years. Of the faculty 50% had taught for less than 11 years (see Tables 4.13 and 4.14).

TABLE 4.13.--Total Teaching Experience: Central Tendencies of the Sample

Parameter	Value		
Mean	13.521	S.D.	9.798
Mode	5.000	Maximum	50.000
Minimum	1.000	Median	10.438

TABLE 4.14.--Total Teaching Experience: Breakdown by Subgroups

	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	N
Full time	20.200	8.5879	30
Part time General	11.453	9.8689	64
Part time Applied	10.760	7.2243	25
SAMPLE	13.512	9.7987	119

F = 10.9734
df = (2, 118)
Sig. = .0000

Academic credentialing. A majority of community college music instructors (52.1%) held a master's degree as their highest credential.

Moreover, it was found that 6.6% of the faculty had earned a doctorate, that nearly one-third of all faculty members held a bachelor's degree as their highest credential, and that 8.3% of the faculty were teaching without a degree.

Notable differences appeared between faculty subgroups regarding the degrees they held. Full-time faculty held a higher percentage of doctoral and master's degrees than did part-time faculty. None of the full-time instructors reported holding a degree lower than the master's. Unlike other faculty, members of the part-time general staff are represented across the spectrum of degrees. They accounted, in fact, for all those teaching without a degree. Like part-time general faculty, a sizable portion of the applied staff held a bachelor's degree as their highest credential (see Table 4.15).

TABLE 4.15.--Academic Degrees

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
No Degree	8.3%	0.0	15.2	0.0
Associate	.8%	0.0	1.5	0.0
Bachelor's	31.4%	0.0	40.9	44.0
Master's	52.1%	83.3	37.9	52.0
Doctorate	6.6%	16.7	3.0	4.0
Other	.8%	0.0	1.5	0.0

V = .390
raw chi-square = 36.893
sig. = .0001

Current enrollment toward a degree. Only a minority of music faculty (13.3%) were currently enrolled in a degree-granting program. Fewer full-time faculty than part-time faculty were upgrading their credentials. Within the ranks of the part-time faculty, the general faculty member was more likely than the applied music teacher to be continuing his/her education (see Table 4.16).

TABLE 4.16.--Current Enrollment Toward a Degree

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	13.3	3.3	18.5	12.0
No	86.7	96.7	81.5	88.0

V = .185
Raw chi-square = 4.113
Sig. = .1278

Community college attendance. One-quarter of all staff members surveyed reported that they had attended a community college. Those most likely to have had this experience were members of the part-time general staff. Least likely were members of the part-time applied staff (see Table 4.17).

Formal study of the community college environment. Only 17% of the entire community college faculty reported having studied the function and purpose of the community college as an institution.

TABLE 4.17.--Community College Attendance

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 120)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	25.0	16.7	35.4	83.3
No	75.0	8.0	64.6	92.0

V = .269
raw chi-square = 8.702
sig. = .0129

Proportionally more full-time than part-time faculty indicated they had undertaken such study sometime during their careers (see Table 4.18).

TABLE 4.18.--Formal Study of the Institution

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 117)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	17.1	26.7	14.5	12.0
No	82.9	73.3	85.5	88.0

V = .151
Raw Chi-square = 2.688
Sig. = .2608

Performing abilities. Most community college music faculty, as many as 85%, reported they had maintained their performance skills. The percentage of full-time faculty who had not maintained their skills is slightly greater than that reported by part-time general faculty. In turn, part-time general faculty were more likely than applied faculty to have allowed their skills to lapse. Only 2.5% of the faculty indicated they never had developed performing capabilities as can be seen in the following Table 4.19.

TABLE 4.19.--Performing Abilities

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 120)	Subgropu Distribution		
		Full time %	Part time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	85.0	80.0	86.2	88.0
Not Presently	12.5	15.7	12.3	8.0
No	2.5	3.3	1.5	4.0

V = .078
Raw chi-square = 1.497
Sig. = .8271
N = 120

Professional background. An overwhelming majority of all faculty (90.1% reported they taught privately. Of all the experiences

that contributed to preparation of these community college music instructors, none was so widely and uniformly shared as that of private instruction (see Table 4.20).

TABLE 4.20.--Private Teaching Experience

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	90.1	90.0	89.4	92.0
No	9.9	10.0	10.6	8.0

V = .033
Raw chi-square = .138
Sig. = .9333

A far greater proportion of full-time faculty than either part-time general or part-time applied faculty indicated they had taught at the public school levels (see Table 4.21).

TABLE 4.21.--Public School Teaching Experience

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	45.5	80.0	36.4	28.0
No	54.5	20.0	63.6	72.0

V = .403
Raw chi-square = 19.712
Sig. = .0001

Relatively few music faculty members reported they had been employed in the music industry. Members from the part-time general subgroup were the most likely (22.7%) to have had this experience (see Table 4.22).

TABLE 4.22.--Music Industry Experience

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	16.5	10.0	22.7	8.0
No	83.5	90.0	77.3	92.0

V = .183
Raw chi-square = 4.082
Sig. = .1298

More part-time general faculty than other faculty had worked as commercial or studio musicians. Part-time applied faculty exhibited the least experience in this area (see Table 4.23).

TABLE 4.23.--Experience as a Commercial/Studio Musician

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	37.2	36.7	43.9	20.0
No	62.8	63.3	56.1	80.0

V = .191
Raw chi-square = 4.453
Sig. = .1079

Three of every ten instructors had served as a teaching assistant during their college education. Fewer part-time general faculty than other faculty indicated they had served in this capacity (see Table 4.24).

TABLE 4.24.--Experience as a Graduate Teaching Assistant

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	30.6	40.0	22.7	40.0
No	69.4	60.0	77.3	60.0

V = .186
Raw chi-square = 4.216
Sig. = .1215

Nearly half of all music faculty reported they had served in some other professional capacity. Some were church musicians: others were either composers or orchestral instrumentalists (see Table 4.25).

TABLE 4.25.--Other Musical Experience

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	46.3	46.7	45.5	48.0
No	53.7	53.3	54.5	52.0

V = .020
Raw chi-square = .049
Sig. = .9755

Information pertaining to the professional experiences of community college music faculty is summarized in Tables 4.26 and 4.27.

TABLE 4.26.--Summary of Professional Experience Patterns for the Sample

% of Sample	Descriptor
90.1	Private teaching
46.3	Other musical experience
45.5	Public school teaching
37.2	Commercial/Studio musician
30.6	Graduate assistant
16.5	Music industry

Concurrent employment. Of the faculty surveyed, 70% indicated they held another job concurrent with their community college position. It could not be determined, however, if respondents depended on their noncollege position to supply the majority of their income. Nevertheless, part-time faculty were more likely than full-time faculty to report they held another position of any sort (see Table 4.28).

Regional recruitment. Three of every ten music instructors indicated they had been new to the community when they first accepted their positions. Fewer part-time general faculty than others had been recurited from outside their school's community (see Table 4.29).

TABLE 4.27.--Summary of Professional Experience Patterns by Subgroup

Percent	Descriptor
	Full-time Faculty
90.0	Private teaching
80.0	Public school teaching
46.7	Other experience
40.0	Graduate assistant
36.7	Commercial musician
10.0	Music industry
	Part-time General
89.4	Private teaching
45.5	Other experience
43.9	Commercial musician
36.4	Public school teaching
22.7	Graduate assistant
22.7	Music industry
	Part-time Applied
92.0	Private teaching
48.0	Other experience
40.0	Graduate assistant
28.0	Public school teaching
20.0	Commercial musician
8.0	Music industry

TABLE 4.28.--Concurrent Employment

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 120)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes, in Music	65.6	26.7	78.5	79.2
Yes, Nonmusic	5.0	0	6.2	8.3
No	29.4	73.3	15.4	12.5

V = .398
Raw chi-square = 37.798
Sig. = .0000

TABLE 4.29.--Source of Regional Recruitment

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 120)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	30.0	48.3	18.2	40.0
No	70.0	51.7	81.8	60.0

V = .291
Raw chi-square = 10.192
Sig. = .0061

Professional Descriptors

Academic rank. Only 9% of the total faculty were accorded professorial rank, and virtually all were full-time staff members. Even among full-time faculty, however, academic rank has not been conferred that frequently. Only 30% of all full-time staff has been accorded rank; many (46.7%) were referred to simply as "instructors," while some (23.3%) acknowledged that their college bestowed no academic rank at all. Of all part-time faculty surveyed (but no full-time faculty) 28% referred to themselves as "adjunct" or off-campus instructors. No one claimed to hold the rank of "associate professor" (see Table 4.30).

TABLE 4.30.--Academic Rank

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full Time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Professor	6.6	23.3	1.5	0.0
Associate Professor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Assistant Professor	2.5	6.7	1.5	0.0
Instructor	60.3	46.7	68.2	56.0
Adjunct Instructor	21.5	0.0	22.7	44.0
Other or No Rank	9.1	23.3	6.1	0.0

V = .424
Raw chi-square = 43.626
Sig. = .0000

Tenure. Virtually all of the full-time faculty surveyed (90%) were tenured. The fact that a few part-time faculty reported they held tenure indicates that at least one community college had implemented some sort of tenure system for part-time employees (see Table 4.31).

TABLE 4.31.--Tenure

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 119)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	26.9	90.0	6.3	4.0
No	73.1	10.0	93.8	95.0

V = .826
Raw chi-square = 81.308
Sig. = .0000

Functional Descriptors

Number of hours taught. A majority of full-time instructors (80%) taught between 15 and 20 hours per week, for an average of nearly 18 hours per week. The mean number of hours taught by part-time general faculty was 8.4, and for part-time applied faculty, 6.4 hours per week. Both of the part-time subgroups exhibited a standard deviation of 6.3 hours, which indicated that some part-time faculty did very little teaching for their college while others were carrying the equivalent of a full-time load. Approximately 20% of all part-time faculty taught 15 hours or more each week (see Table 4.32).

TABLE 4.32.--Number of Hours Taught

	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	N
Full time	17.866	3.6173	30
Part-time General	8.393	6.3411	61
Part-time Applied	6.434	6.2728	23
Sample	10.491	7.2481	114

F = 34.5778
df = (2, 113)
Sig. = .0000

Music administrators. Of all full-time faculty surveyed, 40% indicated they had served as the music administrator for their program. The 10% of part-time general faculty who claimed to serve in this capacity, however, accounted for more than one-third of all administrators (see Table 4.33).

TABLE 4.33.--Music Administrators

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	15.7	40.0	10.6	0
No	84.3	60.0	89.4	100.0

F = .399
Raw chi-square = 19.332
Sig. = .0001

Where they taught. Community college music instruction is undertaken both on and off campus. In this survey, most faculty (74%) reported teaching solely on campus, although about 9% of the faculty indicated they taught both on and off campus. A majority of part-time applied faculty (52%) taught solely off campus (see Table 4.34).

TABLE 4.34.--Place of Instruction

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 120)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
On Campus	74.2	93.3	78.5	40.0
Off Campus	16.7	0	10.8	52.0
On & Off Campus	9.2	6.7	10.8	8.0

V = .359
Raw chi-square = 31.089
Sig = .0000

When they taught. Community college music instruction was offered at various times: during the day, the evening, and even during the weekend. Full-time faculty were most often (73%) required to teach both day and evening courses. In contrast, about half of all part-time faculty taught solely during the day. A minority of part-time faculty (but no full-time faculty) reported working evenings only, weekends, and at all times (see Table 4.35).

TABLE 4.35.--Times of Instruction

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Only Days	43.8	26.7	50.0	48.0
Only Evenings	13.2	0.0	18.2	16.0
Weekends	2.5	0.0	1.5	8.0
Days & Weekends	37.2	73.3	28.8	16.0
All times	3.3	0.0	1.5	12.0

V = .376
Raw chi-square = 34.252
Sig. = .000

Who they taught. A majority of instructors came into contact with music majors, general nonmusic students, and avocational or occasional music students. Fewer instructors reported teaching commercial-music students, those who were training to enter the popular music field immediately upon graduation.

In general, full-time instructors were more familiar with the range of students enrolled in their colleges than were members of the other employment subgroups. Part-time applied faculty, especially had limited contact with nonmusic majors (see Table 4.36).

What they taught. Applied music was frequently taught by full-time and part-time faculty alike. Private instrumental lessons (including piano lessons) were taught by about half of all respondents (see Table 4.37).

TABLE 4.36.--Kinds of Students Taught

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Music Majors	71.9	86.7	65.2	72.0
General Students	76.9*	96.7	75.8	56.0
Avocational Students	71.9	76.7	75.8	56.0
Commercial Music Students	33.9*	50.0	37.9	4.0
Other Students	9.1	10.0	9.1	8.0

*Significance of X^2 < .01.

TABLE 4.37.--Applied Instrumental Lessons

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	51.2	43.3	53.0	56.0
No	48.8	56.7	47.0	44.0

V = .093
Raw chi-square = 1.062
Sig. = .5880

Private voice lessons were taught by less than one-third of respondents (see Table 4.38).

TABLE 4.38.--Applied Vocal Lessons

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	27.3	16.7	25.8	44.0
No	72.7	83.3	74.2	56.0

V = .209
Raw chi-square = 5.304
Sig. = .0705

Approximately 57% of both full- and part-time general faculty taught group lessons in a classroom setting (see Table 4.39).

TABLE 4.39.--Class Applied Instruction

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	57.3	56.7	57.6	0.0
No	42.7	43.3	42.4	0.0

Phi = .008
Corrected chi square = 0.0
Sig. = 1.0000

Music theory and ear training were the most frequent academic music courses within the Michigan community colleges. More than half of all full-time faculty and nearly one-quarter of all part-time general faculty taught these courses (see Table 4.40).

TABLE 4.40.--Music Theory and Ear Training

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	35.4	60.0	24.2	0.0
No	64.6	40.0	75.8	0.0

Phi = .346
Corrected chi-square = 10.018
Sig. = .0016

Music appreciation was another frequent academic music course. As with music theory, music appreciation was taught more by full-time faculty than by part-time general faculty. It was one of the few courses taught by more than half of all full-time staff members surveyed (see Table 4.41).

Music history courses were taught by a relatively small portion of the respondents. That part-time faculty were employed to teach music history at all suggests that they were used to supplant rather than supplement full-time faculty in this area (see Table 4.42).

A school's music fundamentals course for elementary education majors was usually taught by a full-time instructor. One in three full-time faculty were assigned to this area (see Table 4.43).

TABLE 4.41.--Music Appreciation

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	30.2	63.3	15.2	0.0
No	69.8	35.7	84.8	0.0

Phi = .486
Corrected chi-square = 20.482
Sig. = .0000

TABLE 4.42.--Music History

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	15.6	20.0	13.6	0.0
No	84.4	80.0	86.4	0.0

Phi = .081
Corrected chi-square = .242
Sig. = .6222

TABLE 4.43.--Music for Education Majors

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	13.5	33.3	4.5	0.0
No	85.5	66.7	95.5	0.0

Phi = .389
Corrected chi-square = 12.244
Sig. = .0005

A unique attribute of the community college music program has been the inclusion of music industry-oriented courses into its curriculum. Only 3.1% of the entire faculty, however, reported teaching these courses; of these few, all were part-time general faculty members (see Table 4.44).

TABLE 4.44.--Music Business/Industry Courses

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	3.1	0.0	4.5	0.0
No	96.9	100.0	95.5	0.0

Phi = .121
Corrected chi-square = .306
Sig. = .5798

Approximately three-quarters of all full-time faculty indicated they were assigned to direct an ensemble. By comparison, less than one-third of all part-time general faculty claimed to hold responsibilities in this area. The slight increase in the number of part-time faculty assigned to direct instrumental ensembles may be due to the increasing number of nontraditional instrumental ensembles, such as guitar ensembles or jazz bands (see Tables 4.45 and 4.46).

Full-time faculty were more likely than part-time general faculty to have taught a course other than those listed on the questionnaire (see Table 4.47).

TABLE 4.45.--Conduct Vocal Ensemble

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	20.8	40.0	12.1	0.0
No	79.2	60.0	87.9	0.0

Phi = .318
Corrected chi-square = 8.102
Sig. = .0044

TABLE 4.46.--Conduct Instrumental Ensemble

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	25.0	36.7	19.7	0.0
No	75.0	63.3	80.3	0.0

Phi = .181
Corrected chi-square = 2.327
Sig. = .1271

TABLE 4.47.--Other Course Assignment

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 96)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	12.5	30.0	4.5	0.0
No	87.5	70.0	95.5	0.0

Phi = .356
Corrected chi-square = 10.001
Sig. = .0016

Summary of faculty course assginment information. Information regarding faculty course assignments is summarized in the following two tables. Table 4.48 contains a rank-ordering of the frequencies with which courses are assigned to faculty members and the percentages of staff assigned to each subject area. The figures show that the greatest number of faculty were involved in teaching private or class applied music, and that fewer were assigned to teach academic music courses.

Table 4.49 contains information about the apportionment of courses to full-time and part-time faculty. The first course listed in the table utilizes the greatest number of full-time staff in relation to part-time staff. Past the table's midpoint, part-time staff increases over full-time staff. It is apparent that part-time faculty comprise the majority of those who taught applied music and the minority of those who taught selected academic music courses.

Correlates of course assignments. Music administators tend to teach music education (r = .58) and to direct a vocal ensemble (r= .58). Tenured faculty are associated with teaching music appreciation (r = .59). Music appreciation teachers are often assigned to teach theory/ear training (r = .41), a vocal ensemble (r - .36) and music history (r = .25). Instrumental ensemble teachers are likely to teach private instrumental music lessons (r = .36) and theory/ear training (r = .20).

Table 4.48.--Rank Ordering of the Frequency with which Courses Are Assigned

Number of Faculty Assigned to the Course	Descriptor	Percentage of Entire Staff[a]	Rank	Percentage of Staff Excluding Applied Only[b]	Rank
62	Applied instrumental	50.8	1	50.0	2
55	Class applied	45.1	2	57.3	1
34	Theory/ear training	27.9	3	35.4	3
33	Applied voice	27.0	4	22.9	6
29	Music appreciation	23.8	5	30.2	4
24	Instrumental ensemble	19.7	6	25.0	5
20	Vocal ensemble	16.4	7	20.8	7
15	Music history	12.3	8	15.6	8
13	Music for education Majors	10.7	9	13.5	9
12	"Other" music courses	9.8	10	12.5	10
3	Music business/industry	2.5	11	3.1	11

[a] $N = 122$

[b] $N = 96$

TABLE 4.49.--Apportionment of Course Assignments

Item #	Full Time	Part Time	Descriptor
1	76.9%	23.1%	Music for education majors
11	75.0%	25.0%	"Other" music courses
4	65.5%	34.5%	Music appreciation
9	60.0%	40.0%	Vocal ensemble
2	52.9%	47.1%	Theory/ear training
10	45.8%	54.2%	Instrumental ensemble
3	40.0%	60.0%	Music history
8	30.9%	69.1%	Class applied
7	21.0%	79.0%	Applied instrumental
6	15.2%	84.8%	Applied voice
5	0.0%	100.0%	Music business/industry

Correlates of course assignments. Music administrators tend to teach music education (r = .58) and to direct a vocal ensemble (r = .58). Tenured faculty are associated with teaching music appreciation (r = .59). Music appreciation teachers are often assigned to teach theory/ear training (r = .41), a vocal ensemble (r = .36) and music history (r = .25). Instrumental ensemble teachers are likely to teach private instrumental music lessons (r = .36) and theory/ear training (r = .20).

Attitudinal Descriptors

Reasons why faculty members entered community college teaching. Faculty were provided a set of possible responses and asked to

identify all those that would help explain why they chose to enter the profession. Fewer than three of every ten faculty members indicated they entered community college teaching, in part, because they were prepared in college to teach at the junior college level (see Table 4.50).

TABLE 4.50.--Reason for Entry: Professional Preparation

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	28.1	26.7	27.3	32.0
No	71.9	73.3	72.7	68.0

V = .044
Raw chi-square = 0.241
Sig. = .8864

Proportionally fewer full-time faculty than part-time faculty reported entering community college teaching, in part, because a friend or relative worked in the vicinity (see Table 4.51).

Only part-time faculty reported they had entered community college teaching, in part, to secure a second job (see Table 4.52).

Of all faculty surveyed, 14% indicated the desire to avoid public school teaching had influenced their decision to enter the profession. Full-time faculty were more likely to select this response than were part-time faculty (see Tabel 4.53).

TABLE 4.51.--Reason for Entry: Relative was Employed in the Vicinity

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	19.8	6.7	25.8	20.0
No	80.2	93.3	74.2	80.0

V = .197
Raw chi-square = 4.728
Sig. = .0940

TABLE 4.52.--Reason for Entry: Needed a Second Job

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N - 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	33.9	0.0	48.5	36.0
No	66.1	100.0	51.5	64.0

V = .423
Raw chi-square = 21.705
Sig. = .0000

TABLE 4.53.--Reason for Entry: To Avoid Public School Teaching

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	14.0	23.3	12.1	8.0
No	86.0	76.7	87.9	92.0

V = .160
Raw chi-square = 3.102
Sig. = .2120

Only part-time faculty indicated they had entered community college teaching to use leisure time (see Table 4.54).

TABLE 4.54.--Reason for Entry: To Fill Leisure Time

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	10.7	0.0	18.2	4.0
No	89.3	100.0	81.8	96.0

V = .266
Raw chi-square = 8.604
Sig. = .0135

More than 13% (13.2%) of all faculty reported they had entered community college teaching partially for the prestige attached to the position. A somewhat greater proportion of part-time applied faculty members than others found this response accurately described their feelings (see Table 4.55).

TABLE 4.55.--Reason for Entry: For the Prestige

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	13.2	13.3	10.6	20.0
No	86.8	86.7	89.4	80.0

V = .107
Raw chi-square = 1.394
Sig. = .4979

Among all the respondents, only a small minority of part-time general faculty indicated they had entered community college teaching due to the unavailablility of a public school teaching position (see Table 4.56).

TABLE 4.56.--Reason for Entry: Unavailability of Public School Position

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	5.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
No	95.0	100.0	90.9	100.0

V = .208
Raw chi-square = 5.260
Sig. = .0720

A minority of all faculty (14%) reported they had entered community college teaching due to the unavailability of a senior college position (see Table 4.57).

TABLE 4.57.--Reason for Entry: Unavailability of Senior College Position

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	14.0	16.7	13.6	12.0
No	86.0	83.3	86.4	88.0

V = .046
Raw chi-square = .266
Sig. = .8753

More part-time faculty than full-time faculty indicated they had entered the profession to gain teaching experience. This response was selected by a majority of part-time general faculty (see Table 4.58).

A minority of all faculty (8.3%) reported they had obtained their positions while completing a graduate degree (see Table 4.59).

Many respondents, a majority of full-time faculty (63.3%) and a minority of part-time faculty (40%), indicated they had entered community college teaching for reasons other than those offered to them for appraisal. Faculty members noted that they were attracted to community college teaching because it was consistent with their

TABLE 4.58.--Reason for Entry: To Gain Teaching Experience

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full Time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	45.5	26.7	56.1	40.0
No	54.5	73.3	43.9	60.0

V = .250
Raw chi-square = 7.565
Sig. = .0228

TABLE 4.59.--Reason for Entry: Employment while Completing Graduate Degree

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	8.3	6.7	9.1	8.0
No	91.7	93.3	90.9	92.0

V = .036
Raw chi-square = .162
Sig. = .9218

philosophy of education. Others indicated that the position was offered to them; they had not sought it (see Table 4.60).

TABLE 4.60.--Reason for Entry: Other Factors

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full Time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Yes	45.5	63.3	39.4	40.0
No	54.5	36.7	60.6	60.0

V = .206
Raw chi-square = 5.145
Sig. = .0763

Summary of reasons why faculty members entered community college teaching. No single reason for entering community college teaching was selected by a majority of the sample (see Table 4.61).

A majority of full-time faculty (63.3%) reported that they accepted their position for reasons other than those offered. About half of all part-time general faculty members indicated they entered community college teaching to gain experience and to secure a second job. Many part-time applied faculty (40%) indicated they entered the profession to gain teaching experience and for other reasons than those listed (see Table 4.62).

Job preference. Only a minority of faculty (16.3%) specified "community college teaching" as the position they would find most attractive. Community college teaching was, however, the choice of

TABLE 4.61.--Rank-Ordering of Reasons for Entry into Position

Ranking for Entire Sample	Descriptor	Frequency with which Item was Selected
1.5	To gain teaching experience	45.5%
1.5	"Other" reason ("...to be employed")	45.5%
3.0	Needed a second job	33.9%
4.0	Prepared to teach at the junior college level	28.1%
5.0	Spouse or relative was employed in the vicinity	19.8%
6.5	To avoid having to teach at the public school levels	14.0%
6.5	No job openings at the 4-year college or university levels	14.0
8.0	For the prestige	13.2%
9.0	To fill in leisure time	10.7%
10.0	To be employed while finishing a graduate degree	8.3%
11.0	No job openings at the public school levels	5.0%

TABLE 4.62.--Ordering by Subgroup of Reasons for Entry into Position

Percent	Descriptor
	Full-time Faculty
63.3	Other reason
26.7	Gain experience
26.7	Preparation
23.3	Avoid public school
16.7	No senior college jobs
13.3	Prestige
6.7	In graduate school
6.7	Relative in vicinity
0.0	Second job
0.0	Leisure time
0.0	No public school jobs
	Part-time General Faculty
56.1	Gain experience
48.5	Second job
39.4	Other reason
27.3	Preparation
25.8	Relative in vicinity
18.2	Leisure time
13.6	No senior college jobs
12.1	Avoid public school
10.6	Prestige
9.1	No public school jobs
9.1	In graduate school
	Part-time Applied Faculty
40.0	Other reason
40.0	Gain experience
36.0	Second job
32.0	Preparation
20.0	Prestige
20.0	Relative in vicinity
12.0	No senior college jobs
8.0	Avoid public schools
8.0	In graduate school
4.0	Leisure time
0.0	No public school jobs

a majority (55.2%) of full-time faculty. An additional 24% of full-time faculty preferred to teach at the four-year college level. Among part-time faculty, many indicated a desire to teach privately or perform. A plurality of part-time applied faculty (45.8%), however, envisioned themselves as university teachers (see Table 4.63).

TABLE 4.63.--Job Preference

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 118)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full Time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Teaching				
Community College	26.3	55.2	21.5	4.2
University level	28.7	24.1	26.2	45.8
Public School Level	6.8	0.0	10.8	4.2
Administration				
Community College	.8	3.4	0.0	0.0
University Level	1.7	3.4	1.5	0.0
Private Teaching or Performance				
Other Music	32.2	13.8	36.9	41.7
Nonmusic Occupation				
Nonmusic	2.5	0.0	3.1	4.2

V = .355
R Chi Square = 29.895
Sig. = .0029

Professional allegiance. The vast majority of music instructors (93.2%) reported they owed their greatest professional allegiance either to their students (46.2%) or to the discipline of music (47%); not many respondents identified with either the teaching profession or their college.

Relatively few full-time instructors (26.7%) were music-discipline oriented in comparison with part-time faculty. Of all respondents, part-time general faculty members were the least likely to report they owed their greatest professional allegiance to their students (see Table 4.64). Student orientation was most highly correlated with a teacher's having taught within the public schools (r = .26).

TABLE 4.64.--Professional Allegiance[a]

Descriptor	General Distribution % (N = 117)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full Time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Teaching	4.3	10.0	3.2	0.0
College	2.6	3.3	3.2	0.0
Students	46.2	60.0	37.1	52.0
Music	47.0	26.7	56.5	48.0

[a]When the "Teaching" and "Student" allegiance columns were combined, the distribution attains significance (V = .247, p < .0280).

V = .213
Raw chi-square = 10.701
Sig. = .0981

Preferred program orientation. Nearly half of all instructors indicated that their institutions should serve the music major first and foremost. This attitude was most representative of part-time applied teachers (69.6%) and least representative of full-time teachers (40.7%). Of the 17.1% of those who felt that general students deserve their program's primary consideration, full-time faculty were most fully represented (29.6%) (see Table 4.65).

TABLE 4.65.--Preferred Program Orientation

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 105)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full Time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Music Majors	49.5	40.7	45.5	69.6
General Students	17.1	29.6	14.5	8.7
Avocational Students	11.4	3.7	12.7	17.4
Commercial Music Students	10.5	11.1	12.7	4.3
Others	11.4	14.8	14.5	0.0

V = .246
Raw chi-square = 12.773
Sig. = .1199

Personal motivation. When asked to describe their present motivational state, a majority of all music faculty (72.9%) indicated they were "excited about teaching." Fewer instructors (16.1%),

mainly part-time general faculty members, reported they were preoccupied with something other than teaching. Virtually none of the respondents reported being bored with his or her routine (see Table 4.66).

TABLE 4.66.--Motivational State

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 118)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Excited	72.9	70.0	72.3	78.3
Preoccupied	16.1	10.0	21.5	8.7
Bored	.8	3.3	0.0	0.0
Other	10.2	16.7	6.2	13.0

V = .186
Raw chi-square = 8.194
Sig. = .2242

Perception of teaching load. A majority of full-time faculty (50%) felt their teaching load was "heavy." By contrast, a majority of both part-time applied and part-time general faculty (70.8% and 58.1%, respectively) considered their teaching load to be "light" (see Table 4.67).

Musical preference. Most community college music faculty (78.5%) indicated that they value art music above all other types of music. Of all music faculty, part-time applied instructors appeared to have the most catholic of musical preferences, as 92% reported their

TABLE 4.67.--Perception of Teaching Load

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 116)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part-time Applied %
Heavy	25.9	50.0	22.6	4.2
Light	50.0	16.7	58.1	70.8
Other	24.1	33.3	19.4	25.0

V = .312
Raw chi-square = 22.587
Sig. = .0002

preference for art music. Part-time general faculty, on the other hand, displayed the most divergent of musical tastes. A sizeable proportion (13.6%) of the part-time general staff, for example, were unwilling to specify a particular musical preference (see Table 4.68).

TABLE 4.68.--Musical Preference

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 121)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General %	Part time Applied %
Art Music	78.5	80.0	72.7	92.0
Pop	.8	0.0	1.5	0.0
Folk	.8	0.0	1.5	0.0
Jazz	8.3	10.0	7.6	8.0
Other	2.5	3.3	3.0	0.0
No Preference	9.1	6.7	13.6	0.0

V = .175
Raw chi-square = 7.440
Sig. = .6833

Future plans. Whether or not instructors planned to stay in community college teaching was related to their employment status. Most full-time faculty (80%) indicated they intended to stay in their present positions. By contrast, only one in three part-time faculty reported they intended to retain their status. The majority of part-time faculty (approximately 50%) were uncertain of their future plans. Relatively few faculty members had definitely decided to leave the profession (see Table 4.69).

TABLE 4.69.--Professional Plans

Descriptors	General Distribution % (N = 120)	Subgroup Distribution		
		Full time %	Part-time General	Part-time Applied %
Will Stay	47.5	80.0	36.9	36.0
Uncertain	40.8	16.7	47.7	52.0
Will Leave	11.7	3.3	15.4	12.0

V = .268
Raw chi square = 17.259
Sig. = .0017

Categorization of Environmental Variables

Two attitudinal measures were incorporated within the body of the questionnaire. The first was a 40-item measure of position satisfaction, and the second, a 56-item measure of instructional difficulties. This part of the section presents descriptive analyses of the manner in which faculty classified these environmental variables.

Classification of Position Satisfaction Variables

For each of the three employment subgroupings, the set of 40 Position Satisfaction item means were rank-ordered. For this procedure item means were calculated excluding "not applicable" reponses and missing responses. Items with means equalling or exceeding "average satisfaction," "3.00" and above, were designated as sources of "greater satisfaction" (see Appendix 6). Items with means falling below "average satisfaction" were named as sources of "lesser satisfaction" (see Appendix 7).

A comparison of the three subgroup lists indicated that (a) eleven items were identified by faculty in common as constituting sources of greater satisfaction; (b) fifteen items were considered to be sources of greater satisfaction by only full-time faculty; (c) one item was considered a source of greater satisfaction by full-time and part-time applied faculty, but not by part-time general faculty; (d) one item was considered a source of greater satisfaction by only part-time applied faculty; and (e) six items were identified by faculty in common as sources of lesser satisfaction. These results are detailed in Table 4.70.

Appendix 8 contains the distribution of responses across each of the 40 Position Satisfaction items. This table includes "not applicable" responses.

Further information regarding the "not applicable" column appears in Appendix 9. This appendix provides a breakdown by subgroup of Position Satisfaction items which elicited "not applicable" responses

TABLE 4.70.--Summary Table: Faculty Perception of Position Variables

Items from which faculty in common derive greater satisfaction (rank ordered)
1. Academic freedom
2. Congeniality of colleagues
3. Scheduling freedom
4. Personal contacts with department chairperson
5. Competency of colleagues
6. Courses taught
7. Opportunities for outside income
8. Nearness to friends and relatives
9. Reputation of school[c]
10. Beauty of geographical region
11. Performance facilities[a,c]
Items more satisfying to part-time applied faculty only
1. Adequacy of group rehearsal facilities[(b)]
Items more satisfying to part-time general faculty only
None identified
Items more satisfying to full-time faculty and part-time general faculty
Teaching load
Cultural opportunities[b(c)]
Lecturing[a]
Conducting*
Administration of the department[b(c)]
Quality of students[a,b]
Items more satisfying to full-time faculty and part-time applied faculty
1. Adequacy of classroom facilities

TABLE 4.70.--Continued

Items more satisfying to part-time faculty only
None identified
Items more satisfying to full-time faculty only (rank ordered)
1. Fringe benefits
2. Job security
3. Participation in job decisions(b)
4. Salary
5. Diversity of teaching assignments(b)(c)
6. Adequacy of office space
7. Academic rank(b)
8. Opportunities for professional growth
9. Future salary prospects
10. Opportunities for professional advancement
11. Quality of support services
12. Recital opportunities#
13. Nearness to graduate schoola(b)(c)
14. Rotation of assignments#
15. Climatea(b)(c)
Items from which faculty members in common derive less satisfaction
Adequacy of music library
Low priority accorded to research
Research opportunities
Research facilities
Adequacy of practice facilities(a)
Faculty recital demand

a = Full-time faculty
b = Part-time general faculty
c = Part-time applied faculty

Symbols by themselves indicate "marginally more satisfying"
Symbols enclosed within parentheses indicate "marginally less satisfying."

from more than 20% of the subjects. Inspection of this table reveals that most "not applicable" responses derive from part-time faculty, and that the general direction of the response is clear. Faculty members who employed other than the "not applicable" response found the majority of items in this appendix contributed minimally to their satisfaction. Part-time applied instructors found 13 of the 15 items to be sources of lesser satisfaction, while part-time general instructors identified 11 items as sources of lesser satisfaction. Full-time faculty listed five of these items among the seven items they considered to be sources of lesser staisfaction.

Classification of Instructional Difficulties Variables

Subgroup means were claculated for each of the 56 Instructional Difficulties scale items. Items with means ranging from "1.000" through "2.399" were ordered by subgroup within Appendix 10, and are labeled the "most troublesome" instructional difficulties faced by community college music faculty. Items whose means ranged from "2,400" through "2.699" were ordered by subgroup in Appendix 11, representing instructional related variables of "moderate difficulty." Finally, items whose means ranged from "2.700" through "3.000" were ordered by subgroup in Appendix 12, and are labeled the "least troublesome" instructional variables faced by the respondents.

Table 4.71 is a summary which contains the information from Appendices 10, 11, and 12. The lists in the summary table enumerate seven variables considered in common to be most problematic, eight

TABLE 4.71.--Instructional Difficulties Scale Summary

Commonly identified difficulties (Rank-Ordered)

1. Teaching students who do not practice
2. Contending with student absences
3. Working with immature students
4. Expanding students' perspectives
5. Encouraging mastery of musical materials
6. Teaching students with minimal musical talent
7. Providing students with a realistic evaluation of their abilities

Difficulties perceived by part-time applied faculty only

None indicated

Difficulties perceived by part-time faculty only

None indicated

Difficulties perceived by part-time general faculty only

Making do with insufficient instructional resources
Making do with limited physical facilities

Difficulties perceived by both part-time general faculty and full time faculty

Encouraging affective response to music listening
Teaching students who do not do their assigned readings
Encouraging musical inventiveness or creativity
Combating students' tone deafness
Enhancing musicality of student performances
Contending with a student's defeatist attitude
Getting students to turn in their assignments on time
Teaching a class in which a wide range of student abilities are displayed

Difficulties perceived by full-time faculty only

Providing make-up examinations
Inducing students to seek tutorial help
Relating musical concepts to students with divergent musical tastes
Having to demonstrate techniques several times for a student's benefit
Teaching students who display learning disabilities
Having to make do with incomplete instrumentation

TABLE 4.71.--Continued

Commonly identified items of moderate difficulty

Using a diversity of media to advantage
Promoting psychomotor flexibility
Encouraging students to continue on in music
Inducing students to maintain their own opinions
Explaining ideas as concretely as possible
Maintaining students' interest
Making work demands on students explicit
Concluding class on time

Commonly identified items of least difficulty

Speaking loudly enough in the classroom
Relating to students of a different ethinic or racial background
Maintaining discipline in the classroom
Working with adult students
Singing in front of a class
Lecturing without undue recourse to notes
Setting up the classroom
Preparing enough class materials to go around
Sequencing materials over the semester
Relating to students of a different socio-economic background
Performing in front of a class

Items of least difficulty as perceived by part-time applied faculty only

Providing make-up exams
Making do with insufficient instructional resources
Starting class on time
Inducing students to seek tutorial help
Answering naive questions
Making do with limited physical facilities
Having to make do with incomplete instrumentation

Items of least difficulty as perceived by both part-time applied and general faculty

Taking time away from instruction to give tests
Using real musical illustrations, not just theoretical ones
Preparing tests
Correcting papers

TABLE 4.71.--Continued

Items of least difficulty perceived by both part-time applied faculty and full-time faculty
Finding supplementary class materials Contending with too large a class Getting enough rock or jazz into the curriculum Getting enough art music into the curriculum Ordering textbooks through the proper channels Selecting appropriate class materials Using a broad range of music in teaching
Items of least difficulty as perceived by part-time general faculty only
None uncovered
Items of least difficulty as perceived by full-time faculty
Pacing materials over the term

variables considered moderately problematic, and eleven variables considered to pose little or no difficulty in performing instructional responsibilities. In addition, Table 4.71 contains variables identified by only one or two of the subgroups as proving of greater or lesser difficulty.

Appendix 13 displays the distribution of responses across each of the 56 instructional Difficulties items.

Attitudinal Measure Subscale Analysis

In the previous part of this section, the manner in which faculty categorized individual attitudinal items was examined. In this part, consideration is given to faculty's assessment of variable clusters. Each cluster was defined through factor analysis and is represented in terms of a subscale. Analysis of variance will be applied to identify differences between subgroup subscale means.

Analysis of the Position Satisfaction Subscale Means

Personal Welfare ("Survival") Subscale. The first Position Satisfaction subscale is referred to as the Survival subscale. Its items relate to faculty members' personal and professional well-being. Subgroup means for this subscale are presented in Table 4.72.

Results indicate that Survival subscale means for full-time and part-time faculty differed significantly (see Tables 4.73 and 4.74). Subgroup means for part-time general and part-time applied faculty are not significantly different (see Table 4.75).

TABLE 4.72.--Survival Subscale: Subgroup Means

	Mean	S.D.	N
Full Time	3.479	.581	29
Part-time General	2.096	.610	64
Part-time Applied	1.943	.605	23
Sample	2.412	.862	116

TABLE 4.73.--Survival Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-A Differences

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Between groups	44.4774	2	22.2387	61.2548	.0000*
Within groups	41.0249	113	.3631		
TOTAL	85.5023	115			

*p < .001
"Surv" by "subgroups" (The three-level variable represents the three subgroups)

TABLE 4.74.--Survival Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-G Differences

	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	38.2323	1	38.2323	105.5939*
Within groups	32.9484	91	.3620	
TOTAL	71.1807	92		

*p < .001

TABLE 4.75.--Survival Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and PT-A Similarities

	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	.3963	1	.39632	1.0672*
Within groups	31.5649	85	.37135	
TOTAL	31.9612	86		

*NS = nonsignificant

Facilities subscale. The second subscale, labeled the Facilities subscale, refers to the adequacy of on-campus facilities as perceived by the faculty member. Subgroup means for the Facilities subscale are presented in Table 4.76.

TABLE 4.76.--Facilities Subscale: Subgroup Means

	M	S.D.	N
Full time	3.062	.993	29
Part-time General	2.292	.942	64
Part-time Applied	2.347	1.104	23
Sample	2.495	1.033	116

Full-time and part-time faculty differed significantly with respect to the Facilities subscale (see Tables 4.77 and 4.78). No significant differences were evidenced between part-time general and part-time applied faculty (see Table 4.79).

TABLE 4.77.--Facilities Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-G Differences

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Between groups	12.4561	2	6.2280	6.3763	.0024*
Within groups	110.3718	113	.9767		
TOTAL	122.8278	115			

*p < .01
"Fac" by "Subgroups" (the three-level variable representing the three subgroups)

TABLE 4.78.--Facilities Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-A Differences

	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	6.5435	1	6.5435	6.0114*
Within groups	54.4257	50	1.0885	
TOTAL	60.9692	51		

*p < .05

TABLE 4.79.--Facilities Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and PT-A Similarities

	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	.05237	1	.05237	.05378*
Within groups	82.76350	85	.97368	
TOTAL	82.8158	86		

*Nonsignificant

Social relations subscale. The third subscale, termed the Social subscale, contains items relating to faculty members' relations with their colleagues. Subgroup means for this subscale are presented in Table 4.80.

TABLE 4.80.--Social Relations Subscale: Subscale Means

	M	S.D.	N
Full time	3.703	.997	27
Part-time General	3.650	.943	63
Part-time Applied	3.304	1.029	23
Sample	3.592	.9766	113

In Table 4.81, an analysis of variance with the Social subscale used as a dependent variable indicates that the employment subgroup means were not significantly different from one another. Therefore, it appears that faculty members from the three subbroups reported that they derived approximately the same degree of satisfaction with regard to the Social subscale items.

TABLE 4.81.--Social Subscale: ANOVA Indicating Lack of Significant Differences

	SS	df	M.S.	F	Sig. of F
Between groups	2.4577	2	1.2288	1.2951	.2780*
Within groups	104.3722	110	.9488		
TOTAL	106.8299	112			

*Nonsignificant
"Soc" by "Subgroups"

Prestige subscale. The fourth and final Position Satisfaction subscale, referred to as the Prestige subscale, includes items from which faculty members may derive prestige. Subgroup means for this subscale are presented in Table 4.82.

TABLE 4.82.--Prestige Subscale: Subgroup Means

	M	S.D.	N
Full time	3.308	.694	30
Part-time General	3.036	.848	64
Part-time Applied	2.500	.875	24
Sample	2.996	.856	118

Results indicate that part-time applied faculty differed significantly from both full-time and part-time general faculty with respect to their ability to derive professional prestige (see Tables 4.83 and 4.84). Subgroup means for part-time general and full-time faculty were not significantly different (see Table 4.85).

TABLE 4.83.--Prestige Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-A and FT Differences

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Between groups	8.9357	2	4.4678	6.6751	.0018*
Within groups	76.9726	115	.6693		
TOTAL	85.9083	117			

*$p < .01$

TABLE 4.84.--Prestige Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-A and PT-G Differences

	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	5.0231	1	5.0231	6.8588*
Within groups	62.9844	86	.7323	
TOTAL	68.0075	87		

*p < .05.

TABLE 4.85.--Prestige Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-G Similarities

	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	1.5097	1	1.5097	2.3404*
Within groups	59.3476	92	.6450	
TOTAL	60.8573	93		

*Nonsignificant

Summary: Interpretation of Position Satisfaction Subscale Means. All four of the full-time faculty's subscale means, since they are above a mean score of "3.000," fall within the range of "greater" satisfaction. Two of the part-time general faculty's subscale means (Social and Prestige), and only one of the part-time applied faculty's subscale means (Social) fall within the "greater" satisfaction range.

Significant differences between subgroup means were found among three of the four Position Satisfaction subscales. Full-time

faculty appeared to obtain significantly greater satisfaction from the variables in the Survival and Facilities subscales than did part-time faculty subgroups. Part-time applied faculty appeared to derive significantly less satisfaction than other subgroups from the variables lending "Prestige" to their positions. There were no significant differences between members of the three subgroups in their ability to receive greater than average satisfaction from the variables in the Social subscale.

The Social subscale variables were found to constitute the primary source of position satisfaction for members of all three subgroups. All subgroups appeared to gain somewhat greater satisfaction from the Prestige variables than from the Facilities variables. Were it not for the different way full-time and part-time faculty view their personal and professional benefits (Survival variables), the rank-orderings for the subgroups would prove identical.

The results outlined above are summarized in Table 4.86.

Analysis of the Instructional Difficulties Subscale Means

Student musical-involvement subscale. The first of the four Instructional difficulties subscales is referred to as the Student Musical Involvement ("SMI") subscale. It contains items that reflect a faculty member's concern with the enlistment of student musical involvement. Subgroup means for this subscale are presented in Table 4.87.

In Table 4.88 an analysis of variance with the Student Musical-Involvement subscale used as a dependent variable indicates that the

TABLE 4.86.--Summary Table: Position Satisfaction Subscale Means by Subgroup

Position Satisfaction Subscales	$\bar{x}$ for Full-time Subgroup	Rank[a]	$\bar{x}$ for Part-time General Subgroup	Rank	$\bar{x}$ for Part-time Applied Subgroup	Rank
Survival[b]	3.479	2	2.096	4	1.943	4
Facilities[b]	3.062	4	2.292	3	2.347	3
Social[c]	3.703	1	3.650	1	3.304	1
Prestige[d]	3.308	3	3.306	2	2.500	2

[a]The primary rank for the Position Satisfactions subscales is awarded to the subscale whose variables represent the source from which faculty derive their greatest satisfaction.

[b]The full-time subgroup mean is significantly different than both the part-time subgroup means.

[c]Differences between subgroup means are nonsignificant.

[d]The part-time applied subgroup mean is significantly different than both the full time and part-time general subgroup means.

TABLE 4.87.--Student Musical-Involvement Subscale: Subgroup Means

	M	S.D.	N
Full time	2.177	.539	29
Part-time General	2.219	.431	64
Part-time Applied	2.210	.520	23
Sample	2.207	.474	116

TABLE 4.88.--SMI Subscale: ANOVA Indicating Lack of Significant Differences

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Between groups	.0355	2	.0177	.0776	.9254*
Within groups	25.8358	113	.2286		
TOTAL	25.8713	115			

*Nonsignificant

employment subgroup means were not significantly different from one another. Thus, it appears that faculty members from the three subgroups assigned approximately the same degree of difficulty to items in the SMI subscale.

Student requirements subscale. The second subscale, called the Student Requirements ("SR") subscale, represents items relating to the tasks teachers face in helping students meet their course requirements. Subgroup means for the SR subscale are presented in Table 4.89.

TABLE 4.89.--Student Requirements Subscale: Subgroup Means

	M	S.D.	N
Full time	2.222	.505	30
Part-time General	2.415	.493	61
Part-time Applied	2.666	.311	17
Sample	2.401	.490	108

Results suggest that SR subgroup means differed significantly only between full-time and part-time applied faculty (see Table 4.90). The mean of part-time general faculty neither differed significantly from that of full-time nor that of part-time applied faculty (see Tables 4.91 and 4.92).

TABLE 4.90.--SR Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-A Differences

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Between groups	2.1712	2	1.0856	4.8395	.0098*
Within groups	23.5531	105	.2243		
TOTAL	25.7243	107			

*P < .01.

TABLE 4.91.--SR Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-G Similarities

	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	.7496	1	.74967	3.0331*
Within groups	21.9976	89	.24716	
TOTAL	22.7472	90		

*Nonsignificant

TABLE 4.92.--SR Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and PT-A Similarities

	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	.8398	1	.8398	3.9534*
Within groups	16.1458	76	.2124	
TOTAL	16.9856	77		

*Nonsignificant

Organization subscale. The third Instructional Difficulties subscale, identified as the Organization subscale, includes item relevent to the organizational tasks a teacher must perform. Subgroup means for this subscale are presented in Table 4.93.

In Table 4.94 an analysis of variance with the Organization subscale used as a dependent variable shows that the employment subgroup means proved nonsignificantly different from one another. It appears, therefore, that faculty members from all three subgroups assigned approximately the same degree of difficulty to items within the Organization subscale.

TABLE 4.93.--Organization Subscale: Subgroup Means

	M	S.D.	N
Full time	2.733	.375	30
Part-time General	2.737	.370	61
Part-time Applied	2.777	.379	18
Sample	2.743	.370	109

TABLE 4.94.--Organization Subscale: ANOVA Indicating Lack of Significant Differences

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Between groups	.0263	2	.0131	.0942	.9101*
Within Groups	14.7811	106	.1394		
TOTAL	14.8073	108			

*Nonsignificant

Materials subscale. The fourth and final Instructional Difficulties subscale, termed the Materials subscale, contains items which pertain to faculty member's use of their school's resources. Subgroup means for the Materials subscale are presented in Table 4.95.

Results indicate that Materials subscale means differed significantly between part-time general faculty and both full-time and part-time applied faculty (see Tables 4.96 and 4.97). No significant differences were evidenced between full-time and part-time applied faculty (see Table 4.98).

TABLE 4.95.--Materials Subscale: Subgroup Means

	M	S.D.	N
Full time	2.713	.343	30
Part-time General	2.462	.458	62
Part-time Applied	2.757	.294	20
Sample	2.582	.423	112

TABLE 4.96.--Materials Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and FT Differences

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Between groups	2.0128	2	1.0064	6.1282	.0030*
Within groups	17.9007	109	.1642		
TOTAL	19.9135	111			

*p < .01.

TABLE 4.97.--Materials Subscale: ANOVA Showing PT-G and PT-A Differences

	SS	df	MS	F
Between group	1.2679	1	1.2679	7.0207*
Within group	16.2544	90	.1806	
TOTAL	17.5223	91		

*p < .01.

TABLE 4.98.--Materials Subscale: ANOVA Showing FT and PT-A Similarities

	SS	df	MS	F
Between group	.0234	1	.0234	.22194*
Within group	5.0611	48	.1054	
TOTAL	5.0845			

*Nonsignificant

Summary: Interpretation of Instructional Difficulties Subscale means. Two of the full-time faculty subscale means (Student Musical-Involvement and Student Responsibilities), that range between a score of "1.000" and "2.399," can be considered representative of the "most troublesome" instructional related problems. By contrast, two other subscale means (Organization and Materials), with mean scores higher than "2.700," are indicative of "least troublesome" problems for full-time faculty. Part-time general faculty rated only one subscale (Student Musical Involvement) as "most troublesome." They classified two of their subscales (Student Responsibilities and Materials), with means ranging from "2.400" through "2.699," as variables posing "moderate" difficulties, and their remaining subscale (Organization) as being "least troublesome." Part-time applied instructors found one subscale (Student Musical-Involvement) to be "most troublesome," one subscale (Student Responsibilities) to be "moderately troublesome," and two subscales

(Materials and Organization) to be "least troublesome" in the performance of their instructional responsibilities.

Significant differences between subgroup means were found among two of the four Instructional Difficulties subscales. Part-time general faculty appear to assign significantly more difficulty to the variables in the Materials subscale than do members from the other subgroups. Part-time applied faculty appear to assign significantly less difficulty to the variables in the Student Responsibilities subscale than do full-time faculty, but the part-time general SR subscale mean did not differ significantly from either that of full-time or part-time applied faculty. Employment subgroup means did not differ significantly regarding the variables in the Student Musical-Invovlement and Organization subscales.

All three subgroups exhibited the same rank-ordering of Instructional Difficulties subscale means. Faculty rated the encouragement of Student Musical-Involvement as their greatest instructional-related difficulty. They considered the helping of students to meet their responsibilities (Student Responsibilities) to be of major or moderate difficulty. They experienced little or no difficulties in managing their instructional resouces (Materials) and in performing organizational tasks (Organization).

The results outlined above are summarized in Table 4.99.

Content Analysis of Faculty Response to Open-Ended Questions

Three open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire permitted faculty responses in either point or paragraph form. The

TABLE 4.99.--Summary Table: Instructional Difficulties Subscale Means by Subgroup

Instructional Difficulties Subscale	$\bar{x}$ for Full-time Subgroup	Rank[a]	$\bar{x}$ for Part-time General Subgroup	Rank	$\bar{x}$ for Part-time Applied Subgroup	Rank
Student Musical Involvement[b]	2.177	1	2.219	1	2.210	1
Student Responsibilities[c]	2.222	2	2.415	2	2.666	2
Materials[d]	2.713	3	2.462	3	2.757	3
Organization[b]	2.733	4	2.737	4	2.777	4

[a]The primary rank for the Instructional Difficulties subscales is awarded to the subscale whose variables represent the source of greatest difficulty.

[b]Differences between subgroup means are nonsignificant.

[c]The full-time subgroup mean is significantly different than the part-time applied mean; part-time general faculty did not differ significantly from other subgroups.

[d]The part-time general subgroup mean is significantly different than both the full-time and part-time applied subgroup means.

questions pertained to their professional preparation, the advice they give to prospective community college teachers, and to any other topic they felt should be included. The responses to these questions are summarized below.

Content Analysis of Question 1

"What types of experiences (formal or otherwise) did you find most useful in preparing you to teach at the community college level?" Most faculty members felt best prepared for community college teaching by participating in a variety of music-related activities. One of every three individuals, among the 81 respondents to this question, credited their performing experiences as an aid to their preparation. Faculty alluded to participation as recitalists, accompanists, conductors, and vocal and instrumental ensemble members in their answer. Also, mentioned were performing classical and popular music in a variety of professional, semiprofessional, and amateur situations.

One in our faculty credited their prior teaching experiences with helping to prepare them to teach at the community college level. They mentioned both their private teaching and public school teaching experiences. Some faculty members expressed satisfaction with their experience of teaching in the public schools.

Many faculty members also believed their own educational background had helped them to become better teachers. Faculty members appear to be quite proud of their college preparation. Several persons specifically credited their pedagogy classes, the master

classes they attended, and their own private lessons as preparation for their current positions.

Other experiences that influenced their careers included the following: (a) serving as a church musician, (b) being a composer, (c) attending concerts, (d) attending workshops, (e) raising children, and (f) having worked in a general sales position.

Content Analysis of Question 2

"What advice would you give to prospective community college music teachers?" Some 78 instructors contributed advice to prospective community college music teachers. Their advice may be grouped within the following eight categories:

1. Know who your students are

   Be aware that you are likely to encounter students of all different backgrounds and interests (10 comments).

   Be cognizant that your students are likely to have had poor musical and academic preparation, exhibit poor study habits, and might not prove very talented (7 comments).

   Judge your students' abilities realistically.

2. Hold realistic expectations about your job

   Acquaint yourself with the philosophy of your institution (5 comments).

   Understand that you are not teaching at a conservatory or a major four-year university.

   Do not expect a large departmental budget or fancy facilities.

Understand that you are going to teach nonconventional students.

Prepare yourself to derive nonmusical satisfaction from what your students may achieve.

3. Learn to deal with diversity and adversity

Be flexible and versatile (10 comments).

Learn to make do with existing resources (7 comments).

Have patience.

Learn to cope with anything and everything.

Avoid "elitist" attitudes about music.

4. Orient yourself toward students

Show an interest in your students and their problems (10 comments).

Convey enthusiasm.

Like people.

5. Encourage student development

Maintain high standards (6 comments).

Give direction to student learning.

Encourage student participation.

Start with what is most familiar to students.

Be available for help.

6. Learn recruiting techniques

Learn public relations and how to recruit.

Expect a large student turnover; work on student retention.

Create your own demand.

Establish contact with your local high school music program.

7. Be professionally prepared

   Get as much and as varied a musical education as possible (8 comments).

   Develop performance capabilities.

   Public school teaching experience is beneficial.

   Visit the community college at which you intend to teach.

   Understand the learning process.

8. Part-time faculty should expect to encounter certain difficulties

   Plan to find ways to supplement your income.

   Do not expect to receive many fringe benefits.

   Expect to be taken advantage of.

Content Analysis of Question 3

"Is there a question you were not asked that you would like to answer?" Twenty-five individuals commented on this question and the most frequently contributed response was: "Why do you continue to teach at an institution where negative factors outweigh positive factors?" Among the answers to this question were the following:

> I need the money.
>
> Because the satisfaction of teaching both music majors and nonmajors of a wide variety far superceded anything else.
>
> My husband is based here, [and] I have been able to propel a few outstanding students in the right direction, [students who would not have been able] . . . to continue their studies elsewhere.

In response to a similar question, the following advantages of teaching in a community college were put forth:

> The enthusiasm of my students, the mutual respect and support of fellow teachers, and the academic freedom I encountered were heady experiences.
>
> Emphasis on teaching, not research or performance; allows you to teach a variety of music subjects (or other); allows you time to perform, cut wood, whatever; plenty of chance for creativity in teaching; no real discipline problems; allows for interaction with colleagues from other disciplines.

SUMMARY, PROFILES, AND DISCUSSION

Summary

This study was devoted to the analytical description of music faculty employed within Michigan's public community colleges. The study's primary purpose was to construct profiles for three types of music faculty: full-time, part-time general, and part-time applied faculty. Secondary purposes included an examination of self-reported job satisfaction among the three faculty subgroupings and a determination of what subgroup members perceived to be their major instructional related difficulties. Additional purposes were to appraise professional self-image, to summarize the advice given by faculty members to prospective community college music instructors, and to recommend practices intended to stimulate professional growth.

A preliminary survey of music administrators identified 238 music teachers employed in the Michigan community college during 1981, some 82 teachers more than the number reported by Merkel (1977, pp. 58, 59, 109). The questionnaire was mailed to virtually all of the identified instructors. From this population, 123 usable questionnaires were returned, as well as reports that 49 teachers were not currently employed. A response rate of 65% was obtained, including the 123 respondents and the 66 questionnaires not returned.

The questionnaire developed for the study was modeled on existing descriptive surveys of two-year college faculty and refined by a

panel of community college faculty and administrators. It included demographic, situational, and attitudinal questions. Most items were coded at the nominal level of measurement, and thus could be displayed in contingency tables and assessed by means of the chi-square statistic. Of primary concern, however, was each item's proportional distribution among the three faculty subgroups.

Two discrete attitudinal measures were included within the questionnaire. The items comprising each measure were both rank ordered according to faculty subgroup means and factor analyzed. Internal consistency estimates of reliability for the four factors extracted from the Position Satisfaction measure ranged from .71 to .86. Reliability of the four Instructional Difficulties factors ranged from .65 to .76. These factors were submitted to univariate analysis of variance to test for faculty subgroup differences.

Correlates of Subgroup Status

Many of the items included in the questionnaire were found to relate significantly with subgroup status. Among these variables, the following may be used to differentiate between full-time and part-time faculty:

1. Tenure
2. Number of years on the job
3. Number of hours taught per week
4. Academic rank
5. Possession of concurrent employment
6. Serving as music administrator
7. Academic degree
8. Total teaching experience

9. Age
10. Public school teaching experience
11. Gender

A more detailed comparison of full-time and part-time faculty is contained in Appendix 15.

Part-time general and part-time applied faculty cannot be differentiated as easily as can full-time and part-time instructors. Differences between the part-time subgroups were most marked with respect to the following variables:

1. Site of instruction
2. Attended community college
3. Experience as a commercial/studio musician
4. Preferred program orientation
5. Musical taste
6. Job preference

Further details regarding the comparison of part-time general and part-time applied faculty may be found in Appendix 16.

Findings Relating to Use of the Position Satisfaction Scale

The full-time faculty members demonstrated position satisfaction more clearly than did the part-time faculty. Full-time staff members identified approximately twice as many variables and more clusters of variables as providing average satisfaction than did part-time faculty. Full-time instructors reported deriving average satisfaction or better for all four factors defined through factor analysis. (The four factors represented personal and professional

well-being, use of campus facilities, status of collegial relations, and job-related prestige.) Part-time general faculty reported satisfaction for two factors: status of collegial relations and job-related prestige. Part-time applied teachers reported satisfaction for a single factor: status of collegial relations.

A comparison of subgroup means revealed the following relationships:

1. Full-time faculty derived significantly greater personal and professional satisfaction from their jobs than did part-time faculty. This Survival factor, whose reliability was estimated at .86, included ten items: salary, fringe benefits, future salary prospects, diversity of teaching assignments, lecturing, participation in job decisions, opportunities for professional growth, and opportunities for professional advancement.

2. Full-time instructors also received significantly greater satisfaction than did part-time staff from use of campus facilities. Included in the Facilities factor, whose reliability was estimated at .84, were five variables: adequacy of the music library, classroom facilities, group rehearsal facilities, practice facilities, and office space.

3. No significant differences in satisfaction appeared between faculty subgroups regarding status of collegial relations, a factor that elicited the highest ratings of satisfaction from all three subgroups. This Social factor had reliability estimated at .76, and included three items: congeniality of colleagues, competency of colleagues, and personal contact with the department head.

4. Part-time applied teachers obtained significantly less satisfaction from the variables representing job-related prestige than did other faculty members. Included in this Prestige factor, with an estimated reliability of .71, were four variables: reputation of the school, teaching load, quality of students, and academic rank.

Findings Relating to Use of the Instructional Difficulties Scale

Full-time instructors identified more instructional related variables and clusters as most troublesome than did part-time faculty. Full-time teachers clearly identified two factors as problematic: encouraging student musical involvement, and helping students meet course requirements. Part-time general teachers rated encouraging student musical involvement as a source of difficulty. They also identified helping students meet course requirements and managing existing resources as secondary areas of concern. Reporting the least number of instructional related difficulties were the part-time applied teachers, who rated a single factor, encouraging student musical involvement, as problematic.

A comparison of subgroup means revealed the following:

1. Subgroups in common identified encouraging student musical involvement as their most persistent instruction-related problem. This Student Musical Involvement factor, with its reliability estimated at .76, included five variables: encouraging mastery of musical materials, expanding students' perspectives, teaching

students who do not practice, enhancing musicality of student performances, and maintaining students' interest.

2. Part-time applied instructors indicated significantly less difficulty than did full-time teachers in helping students meet course requirements. Part-time general teachers did not differ significantly from either full-time or part-time applied instructors regarding this Student Requirements factor. The factor included three variables: providing make-up exams, teaching students who do not do their assigned readings, and getting students to turn in their assignments on time. Reliability was estimated at .65.

3. Faculty in common rated the performance of organizational tasks to be little or no problem. This Organization factor had reliability estimated at .71, and included three variables: pacing materials over the term, sequencing materials, and preparing tests.

4. Part-time general faculty reported greater difficulty than did other instructors in employing their school's resources to best advantage. Included in this Materials factor, with its reliability estimated at .70, were five items: finding supplementary class materials, making do with insufficient instructional resources, using a diversity of media to advantage, setting up the classroom, and making do with limited physical facilities.

Advice Given by the Music Faculty to Prospective Teachers

Many faculty members were willing to contribute advice to prospective community college music instructors. Their comments were

generally positive, stressing the practical considerations one must encounter in order to function comfortably in the position. They counseled prospective teachers to pursue as thorough and as varied a musical education as possible and to supplement formal training with performing and public school teaching experience. Some respondents stressed the need to maintain flexibility in attitude and methodology to serve best the diversity of students one may encounter, many of whom are likely to have had poor musical and academic preparation. In dealing with students, a few instructors advised: be tolerant, but maintain high standards.

Faculty also recommended that prospective teachers learn recruiting techniques to replenish a predictably high student turnover and that part-time faculty find ways to supplement their income.

Data obtained in this study may be segregated to form the following profiles of full-time, part-time general, and part-time applied community college music instructors.

Profile of Full-time Community College Music Instructors

The average full-time music instructor is over the age of 45 (50%), is male (90%), and has served the college for 10 years or longer (70%). The teacher might serve as the administrator for the music program (40%) in addition to teaching an average of 17.8 hours a week. The instructor is assigned to teach a variety of academic music courses and applied music in a classroom setting (57%). Often he/she is asked to teach private instrumental music lessons as

well (43%). The teacher's students include both music majors (87%) and general students (97%). The instructor (73%) teaches at least one evening course in addition to a daytime load. He/she almost certainly has been granted tenure (90%), but only 30% holds academic rank.

Most full-time music instructors hold a master's degree (83%), while some of their full-time co-workers have earned a doctorate (17%). They have had experience in teaching privately (90%) and at the public school levels (80%). They value art music above all other types (80%) and are likely to have maintained their performance skills (80%). Although it is unlikely that they have taken a course about the community college as an institution (17%), there is some chance (27%) that they have studied the community college's functions and philosophy.

These instructors remain excited about teaching (70%) and report that they derive at least average satisfaction from the courses taught (93%). They are not overly impressed by the quality of students encountered; the plurality of full-time instructors (42%) report deriving only average satisfaction from student quality. A minority of full-time faculty (26%) finds less than average satisfaction from student quality. The majority of full-time faculty members do, however, report owing their greatest professional allegiance to students (60%) and given the opportunity to guide the program, they would endeavor to favor the nonmusic majors (60%).

No single reason can be cited for the average full-time faculty member's entry into community college teaching. Some of his/her

colleagues accepted their jobs to gain teaching experience (27%) because they were trained to enter the field (17%), and to avoid public school teaching (23%). Some were apparently asked to assume their position. None, however, reported that they entered the field because they needed a second job. The typical full-time music instructor does, nevertheless, consider community college teaching to be his or her desired profession (55%) and intends to retain this position (80%). Some, as expected, do covet a university teaching position (24%), but virtually none would prefer to enter into a higher administrational post at the community college level.

Full-time faculty derive average satisfaction or better from the variables comprising the factors of (a) personal and professional well-being, (b) use of on-campus facilities, (c) status of collegial relations, and (4) job-related prestige. They identified the following as their ten most satisfying position variables: (a) academic freedom, (b) contact with chairperson, (c) fringe benefits, (d) job security, (e) participation in decisions, (f) school reputation and congeniality of colleagues, (g) scheduling freedom, (h) opportunities for outside income, and (i) administration of department.

Full-time faculty report experiencing instruction-related difficulties when encouraging student musical involvement, and helping students meet their course requirements. They found lesser difficulty in managing existing resources and performing specified

organizational tasks. They identified the following individual variables (with item means ranging up to 2.09) as most troublesome: (a) contending with student absences, (b) teaching students who do not practice; (c) teaching immature students, (d) expanding students' perspectives, (e) encouraging mastery of musical materials.

More than other faculty members, full-time instructors are aware that a music program's strength depends on the quality of music students produced by the local high schools. They advocate establishing good relations with the music departments of their neighboring schools.

Profile of Part-time General Instructors of Music

The average part-time general music teacher is under 36 years of age (66%), is apt to be male (53%), and has served the college between one and three years (64%). This teacher lacks both tenure (6%) and academic rank (3%) and is unlikely to serve as the program's music administrator (11%).

While the instructor generally teaches between one and six hours a week for the college (46%), there is some chance that he/she is employed 15 hours or more per week (23%). Indeed, some general instructors (23%) consider their teaching load to be heavy.

The average general instructor is commonly assigned to teach either applied instrumental music in private (53%) or a variety of applied music courses in a classroom setting (58%). Their other duties tend to be specialized. Many are asked to teach an academic music course (47%), notably, music theory (24%). Others are asked to

direct some of the instrumental ensembles (19%), vocal ensembles (12%) or to teach whatever pop music or music business courses are offered (5%).

Often, the general instructor has entered into community college teaching with a nonconventional background. Members of this faculty subset report that they worked either in the music industry (23% of all part-time general instructors), or as a commercial/studio musician (44%).

In general, instrumental music instructors hold a bachelor's degree or less (74% for those who teach no academic music classes and 66% for those whose duties include teaching academic music classes). In contrast, the typical vocal music teacher (26% of the subgroup) is most likely to possess a master's degree (66% for those who teach no academic music classes and 90% for those whose duties include teaching academic classes). The diversity of musical taste noted among instrumental music instructors is not matched by part-time general vocal instructors.

The part-time general faculty contain a high percentage of instructors who are drawn from their local communities (82%), and some general instructors who have been community college students (35%). A relatively low precentage have taught in the public schools (36%) or have studied the functions and philosophy of the community college (15%).

The average part-time general instructor remains excited about teaching (72%), yet some (22%) report that they are preoccupied with

matters besides teaching. While most (88%) obtain average satisfaction or better from the courses they teach, many general instructors (41%) derive less than average satisfaction from the quality of community college students. Of all faculty, general instructors were least likely to report that they owed their greatest allegiance to the student body (37%), but most favored orienting their music programs toward other than the music major (54%).

The part-time general instructor did not consider community college teaching the preferred vocation (only 22% did), and wished instead to be employed as a performer or private teacher (37%), or as a university teacher (26%). They entered into community college teaching in order to gain teaching experience (56%) and to secure a second job (49%) supplementary to the one currently held (85%). Some took positions because no public school teaching jobs were available (9%). This subset of faculty has not decided whether to remain in the field (48%).

Part-time general faculty receive average satisfaction or better from the variables comprising the following factors: status of collegial relations and job-related prestige. They report deriving less than average satisfaction relating to personal and professional well-being and utilizion of on-campus facilities. These instructors identify the following seven individual items (with means ranging above 3.5) as their most satisfying position variables: (a) academic freedom, (b) congeniality of colleagues, (c) contacts with chairperson, (d) competency of colleagues, (e) courses taught, (f) scheduling freedom, and (g) nearness of relatives.

Part-time general faculty report experiencing their greatest difficulties with the encouragement of student musical involvement. They encounter moderate difficulties in helping students meet course requirements and find lesser difficulty performing organizational tasks. They identify the following individual variables (with item means ranging up to 2.19) as most troublesome: (a) teaching students who do not practice, (b) contending with a range of student abilities, (c) contending with student absences, (d) teaching students who do not do their assignments.

Profile of Private Music Instructors

The average part-time applied instructor is likely to be a female (60%) whose median age is 36. The teacher holds neither academic rank (0%) nor serves as music administrator for the program (0%). Some, however, report having been granted a form of tenure (4%). Indeed, a majority of applied faculty (56%) have been associated with their college for four years or longer. Most (88%) do not depend on community college teaching for their entire income.

Many applied teachers (60%) teach between one and six hours a week for their college, although some (20%) are engaged for 15 hours or more per week. Their lessons are given primarily off campus; in fact, most (52%) teach off campus exclusively. Most consider their teaching load to be light (71%).

The average applied teacher holds at least a bachelor's degree and, most commonly (52%), a master's degree as the highest academic credential. The instructor has neither taught at the public

school levels (28%) nor worked as a commercial or studio musician (20%) and has not been employed in the music industry (8%). Rarely has the teacher been a community college student (8%) or has studied the functions and philosophy of the institution for which he/she works (12%).

Applied instructors are concentrically oriented to classical music (92%) and to the needs of music majors (70%), the student group they encounter most often (72% to 56% for nonmajors). They remain excited about teaching (78%) and report that they derive at least average satisfaction from their teaching assignment (87%). Although many report that they obtain less than average satisfaction from the quality of students they encounter (50%), they tend to report that they owe their primary professional allegiance to students (52%), rather than to the discipline of music (48%). Of the various reasons for entering into community college teaching, the most frequent ones given by applied faculty were to gain teaching experience (40%) and to obtain a second job (36%). In addition, some report they entered the profession because they were trained to do so (32%) while others (20%) indicate they were attracted to community college teaching for its prestige. Community college teaching is not a preferred vocation, however (4%). Applied faculty are likely to prefer teaching at the four-year college level (46%) or to teach privately and to perform (42%). Most have not decided whether or not they will stay in community college teaching (52%).

Part-time applied instructors derive average satisfaction or better from the variables comprising the factors representing the

status of collegial relations. They report that they derive less than average satisfaction regarding such factors as personal and professional well-being, use of on-campus facilities, and job-related prestige. These instructors identified the following seven individual items (with means ranging above 3.5) as their most satisfying position variables: (a) scheduling freedom, (b) geography of the region, (c) congeniality of colleagues, (d) opportunities for outside income, (e) adequacy of group rehearsal facilities, (f) academic freedom, and (g) courses taught.

Part-time applied faculty apparently encounter great difficulties encouraging student musical involvement. They also experience moderate difficulty helping students meet course requirements, and find least difficult the management of existing resources and performing specified organizational tasks. They identified the following individual variables (with item means ranging up to 2.16) as most troublesome: (a) teaching students who do not practice, (b) teaching students of minimal talent, (c) contending with student absences, and (d) teaching immature students.

Conclusions

The data indicate there are enough descriptive differences between full-time and part-time faculty to conclude that they are significantly dissimilar. Appreciable age and gender differences exist along with a notable lack among part-time instructors of public school teaching experience and a variance in job-related attitudes.

Moreover, the groups differed in their teaching responsibilities and in their rewards.

Descriptive differences between part-time subgroup members were not nearly so pronounced. Of all three subgroups, however, the part-time general instructors appeared to be the most heterogeneous in academic background, range of professional experience, and musical taste.

As might be expected, classroom teachers claimed to encounter more instructional related difficulties than did private music teachers. Full-time instructors, for example, met with greater difficulty than applied faculty in helping students fulfill course requirements, and part-time general instructors experienced more problems than did other faculty in utilizing their school's resources to best advantage. Many faculty members, however, expressed frustration in coping with students who do not practice, contending with student absences, working with immature students, and teaching students of minimal musical talent.

The majority of teachers appeared to be generally satisfied with their positions. Most teachers expressed high morale, average satisfaction or better with their teaching assignments, and high satisfaction with collegial relations. However, full-time teachers were found to derive satisfaction from a broader range of job-related variables than did part-time faculty. Full-time faculty reported significantly greater satisfaction than part-time faculty from personal and professional benefits of community college teaching, and

from use of campus facilities. Part-time applied instructors indicated receiving less satisfaction in terms of prestige than did other faculty.

Regarding professionalization, it appeared that many instructors identified only minimally with the community college philosophy. Many part-time faculty, especially, displayed attitudes contrary to those considered desirable. A sizable portion of the music faculty, for example, were dissatisfied with the quality of their students and did not report owing their greatest professional allegiance to students. In addition, many instructors preferred to work at a profession other than community college teaching.

The number of full-time music teachers employed in Michigan public community colleges had (as of Spring 1981) remained constant since 1977, while the number of part-time faculty had risen. An increase in the number of part-time faculty employed has been made in schools across all enrollment categories. The largest increases were registered in schools with enrollments exceeding 10,000 students; the smallest gains were made within schools with enrollments of under 2,000.

Statistics collected by the present researcher matched Merkel's (1977, p. 109) exactly with regard to the average number of full-time music teachers employed by institutions categorized by size of enrollment. An average of three full-time teachers were employed in (urban) schools with enrollments above 10,000; however, current data indicate an increase from 6 to 8 in the average number of part-time

instructors at these schools. Two full-time teachers are employed in (suburban or rural) institutions with enrollments of 5,000 to 9,999. The average number of part-time employees has, however, increased from 6 to 9. One full-time music instructor is all that is generally employed in (mixed-setting) schools which enroll between 2,000 and 4,999 students. Yet their average number of part-time instructors has apparently risen from one staff member to five. Finally, it is generally the case that no full-time music instructors are employed by (rural) colleges with enrollments of under 2,000. These colleges have, however, increased their part-time staff from 1 to 1.5 music teachers.

Discussion

The job-related attitudes of the subjects surveyed revealed that the professional identity of a large segment of community college music faculty, primarily part-time employees, has been incompletely developed. This conclusion is supported by five findings. First, many respondents (47%) reported that they owed their greatest professional allegiance to the discipline of music, despite the expectation that community college instructors should perceive themselves professionally as teachers first, and then as specialists. With respect to the diminishing importance of community college transfer programs, the percentage of music teachers expressing discipline-oriented values appears to be excessive. Second, many subjects (35%) indicated they derive less than average satisfaction from the quality of students they encountered, and more than half of all who identified reasons to

leave community college teaching cite the quality of students as a factor. This was so, despite official policies designed to develop open-admissions institutions in which "the beginning and continuing point of reference is the learning needs and interests of the people" (Gleazer, 1980, p. 88). Third, most teachers (74%) did not express a preference to teach at the community college level, despite Cohen and Brawer's (1972) and Hill's (1975) insistence that failure to do so is a sign of professional immaturity. Fourth, many respondents (50%) indicated they believe that their music programs should be oriented primarily toward the university-bound music major. Their opinions, however, contradict statements that to serve this minority of students (the university-bound music majors) foremost often proves impractical and runs counter to the goals of general education. Finally, that some part-time general faculty (21.5%) reported that they are preoccupied with other than teaching is to reveal their dysfunctional status within the "teaching college."

Within social systems analysis, the present problem of faculty expressing attitudes contrary to those desires is said to involve the "work-group" and its "culture."

As explained by Hoy and Miskel 1982), organizational behavior (Here, the expression of job-related attitudes) results from interaction among institutional role expectsions, the work-group, and individual needs. Of these factors, the work-group may be most significant to explain the set of values adopted by the group. Whereas role expectations tend to be flexible (with a minimum of rules imposed), the

culture within the schools is determined normatively by the work-group.

Those wishing to alter the normative culture established by the work-group can attempt to modify the group's values through either the imposition of greater bureaucratic controls or through preservice and in-service training. According to Cohen and Brawer (1982, p. 68), the imposition of even stricter bureaucratic controls could alienate the faculty. They assert that such restrictions tend to transform participants into hourly workers, the outcome of which is undesirable.

Many researchers consider pre- and in-service training as a better means of influencing teacher behavior. When Jamerson (1979, p. 7) and others suggest that the gap between the stated goals of the community college and their realization can be narrowed if individuals are provided information and training about the community college's purpose, they are actually suggesting that (1) values within the work group can be shaped through the introduction of new members with a pre-service training background, and (2) in-service intervention can alter the values of current members of the work group.

Of the two approaches designed to develop faculty potential, pre-service training is preferable. In-service workshops, seminars or conventions cannot substitute for thorough pre-service training, even though content may overlap. The two methods may differ in specificity, depth of inquiry, term of instruction, and most importantly, type of instruction. Within pre-service training there is a greater likelihood that the abstract problems encountered in teaching can be approached within the music classroom.

In fact, pre-service training of two-year college music instructors within the music education curriculum was advocated as early as 1959 by Hudgins. More recently, support for pre-service intervention under the control of music educators came from Bonelli (1973). He recommended that "supervised teaching at the graduate level . . . should involve a variety of specialized concerns such as applied music study and music programs in community colleges" (Bonelli, 1973, p. 81). Such supervised teaching, according to Bonelli, can be initiated in special courses and seminars.

Recommendations

Although usually conceived as a graduate level activity, pre-service training can start during one's undergraduate education. Until more research is conducted, however, to determine in detail what superlative music teaching and learning at the community college level entails, university-based music education specialists will have little concrete information from which to organize a specific course. Until such information is forthcoming, students would be well advised to enroll in any available general education course designed to orient students to the community college. These courses should help acquaint the student with the general literature that pertains to the history, philosophy, and function of the community college as a modern institution. The interested student will also benefit by reading materials specifically about the role of music in the community colleges. Some of these sources are referred to in this study. In addition, the prospective community college teacher can become

acquainted with the community college's environment by spending time at one or more of its campuses and by interviewing its staff.

Practical experience may be gained most advantageously, as recommended by Bonelli (1973, p. 81), by teaching under the supervision of master teachers. The sequence of experiences (to extrapolate from Bonelli's paradigm) might begin with the observation of model community college teachers working with music majors and general community college students. Next, the student could progress to micro-teaching under direct supervision, and then, to serving as an intern at the community college itself. These experiences are, of course, supplementary to the student's basic musical education, which should be as broad and as thorough as possible.

In-service assistance might then be employed to promote adjustment to one's new job, to promote professional role identification, to help resolve instructional-related difficulties, and to remain professionally current. In addition to extant professional development programs, music administrators can aid in faculty development. the following procedural suggestions might stimulate such growth.

1. Create an environment that encourages faculty to keep current with innovations in the music profession and education. This may be accomplished by subscribing to a number of professional magazines and journals. Encourage discussion of professional trends at departmental meetings.

2. Implement a part-time faculty evaluation program. It may focus on self-evaluation in which the faculty member is asked to compare his/her performance against a set of specified criteria.

3. Let faculty be creative. Try to discern and use areas of untapped faculty expertise. Experiment with an open-classroom set up, team teaching, more unique student combinations. Encourage faculty use of instructional media.

4. Teach, encourage, and help faculty to recruit students. Discuss ways to use all kinds of limited resources to best advantage.

5. Maintain frequent contact with part-time, applied, and adjunct instructors. Encourage them to evaluate their students regularly. Find ways to reward them for taking part in the musical life of the college. Involve them in decision making and help them to see their importance to the program.

6. Invite a well-respected community college music teacher to organize an in-service workshop, and encourage faculty to attend. Videotape the session so that other music programs can benefit from the experience.

7. Promote unity between part-time faculty and full-time faculty, and between faculty and administration. Avoid intergroup rivalry based on employment status and function.

8. Use departmental meetings to discuss instructional problems (such as encouraging student musical involvement or helping students meet course requirements), adoption of new materials, curricular development, and curricular revision.

9. Encourage faculty to continue their own education and to learn more about the community college, its foundations, and its clientele.

10. Encourage faculty participation in a professional music association. Support their attendance at the annual Michigan Community College Arts and Humanities Association convention. Help organize a regional meeting of music administrators/faculty.

The institution of more rigorous pre-service and in-service training procedures are indeed important to develop the potential of all who desire to teach music at the community college level. There is, however, another commonly overlooked factor which influences professional growth, and that is the collective force of the faculty members themselves.

Two leaders in the community college movement place the onus of professionalization upon members of the faculty: Stoops (1966) and Cohen and Brawer (1977). Stoops (1966, pp. 52-53) asserted that the development of professional standards within the community colleges could only be achieved through the exercise of academic freedom by faculty in the process of self-examination and self-criticism. He believed that the destiny of the community college hinged on the ability of the faculty to judge its own competence. Cohen and Brawer concurred. They state: The community college faculty's "shortcomings as a profession are seen in its failure to control entry into and to police its own ranks. . . . Further, it has developed neither a unique ethos nor a code of ethics to which its members subscribe" (Cohen & Brawer, 1977, xi).

Indeed, responsibility for the professional development of music teachers has been assigned historically to members of the profession

itself. Music teachers have not been satisfied with defining themselves solely as elementary school teachers or high school teachers. They have sought to bring to their institutions a self-identity based on their involvement with music. The concern shown in 1884 by public school music teachers brought together by common interests led to the organization of the Department of Music within the National Education Association. Then, as Birge states (1928): "The resulting consciousness of the power in united effort brought about a desire on the part of many leading [music] supervisors for an independent national association" (p. 240). This national association, founded in 1907 by individuals drawn together by professional concerns, became the Music Educators National Conference, the organization, according to Sunderman (1971), responsible for the developing"consciousness on the part of educators that music education is a profession in its own right" (p. 336).

While the voluntary assemblage of school music teachers to discuss matters of common interest may have led to their unionization (in the best sense of the word), their growing concern about education, and their institutions secured their professional status. As former MENC President Hood noted in 1952, professional recognition results from the continuing involvement of music educators in all field related to the teaching of music:

> It takes more than good teaching today to make a successful recognized profession of music education. . . . We know . . . that it behooves us to be part of education and the schools as a whole and not a small, highly specialized, separate, technical area of the curriculum. . . . We cry for professional recognition, but sometimes forget that

> such recognition must be preceded by active participation. . . . in our field [and] in all related fields that affect us, in both local and widespread situations (Hood, 1952, pp. 15, 17).

President Hood's words suggest that the truly professional community college music educator should function within the stated philosophy of the community college, and that he or she should be an asset to the institution. The professional community college music teacher, in other words, should accede to "place the interests and concerns of students above his field of study" (Monroe, 1972, p. 178). The professional performing musician, the academician, and the improperly trained instructor, all are more likely to follow traditional standards, which are better suited to an elitist institution than to the community college.

In the past, there had been recognition that the junior college's function differed from that of other institutions. The MENC Committees on Music in the Junior Colleges formed during the late 1930s, in 1954, and in 1970 are examples. None, however, has managed to survive, ostensibly for lack of support from music instructors in service at two-year colleges.

If progress toward professionalization is to be made, however, current instructors have to show more interest than they have in the past in pursuing their own professional interests. Instructors will need to explore the expertise within their own ranks if their common problems are to be solved. In a state such as Michigan in which little intradepartmental communication has been established, initiating intrafaculty contact will be difficult.

It might be appropriate for department chairpersons to establish contact among themselves at an annual meeting of the Michigan Community College Arts and Humanities ASsociation, and for them to agree to organize regional meetings so that instructors would not need to travel long distances to attend. At each regional meeting, a floating series of workshops might well be organized. These workshops would bring to local community colleges materials and methods intended to inform faculty members of innovations within their profession. The workshops could be organized topically: one might deal with curriculum development and revision, another with aptitude and achievement testing, and a third might pertain to the teaching of applied music. Results of the regional meetings and workshops could be reported at the annual MCCAHA convention. It would be helpful, also, if some of the regional meetings could be scheduled to coincide with other professional functions, such as the annual MENC Midwest Conference held in Ann Arbor. This would give faculty members a chance to see what other members of the music profession are doing.

Given increased interest among community college music teachers, it might be worthwhile for faculty members to affiliate with the MENC and to organize into a special interest group. Doing so would enable the MENC and its federated state organization (in Michigan, the Michigan Music Educators Association) to assist in the identification of role models for prospective teachers and current teachers to emulate and in the composition of data banks of information specific to teaching music at the community college level. The MENC could also

help generate guidelines under which teachers may be trained. In addition, a fuller examination of music at the community college level may be undertaken and its findings disseminated to a wider range of music educators than has theretofore been possible.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further research about the community college music faculty needs to be conducted within other regions and nationally. It would be appropriate for an organization such as the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) to commission a national study of music instructors and the environment in which they work. Of particular merit would be a study which included applied music instructors, a group that has been unduly neglected.

Researchers wishing to replicate the present study within another region should take the following suggestions into consideration:

1. When soliciting the names of instructors, have administrators indicate clearly which teachers are currently employed, because sometimes their lists are outdated. If this is done, it should be possible to determine sampling bias more accurately.

2. Try to conduct the study during fall semester so as to survey the maximum number of instructors likely to be employed during the academic year.

3. Revise the survey instrument to elicit employment status and function more clearly. Respondents should specify if their only responsibilities are to teach private lessons. It may also be useful to identify instructors employed solely to teach private lessons, applied music class(es) and/or ensembles.

4. Revise the attitudinal measure rating scales according to research purposes. The Position Satisfaction measure may be fitted with a bi-polar (satisfaction/dissatisfaction) scale. The Instructional Difficulties rating scale may be expanded from three- to five-steps.

5. Revise the list of questions to include the following:

   At what stage in your career did you make the decision to become a community college teacher?

   Are you generally satisfied with your job?

   Full-time instructors: Had you started your community college teaching career as a part-time teacher?

   Part-time instructors: Do you aspire to full-time status?

   What percentage of your total income does community college teaching account for?

   If neither salary nor tenure were of concern, would you remain in community college teaching?

   List the professional music organizations to which you belong.

   To what degree do you support the goals of open admissions and remedial education?

   Estimate the total time spent each week in performing community college-related activities.

It is also recommended that additional research be conducted in the following areas:

1. Identify, analyze, and document superlative community college music teaching. Such research should identify appropriate research activities for current instructors. It should also lead to the development of a methods text for teaching music at the community college level.

2. Compile and analyze community college music administrators' views on relevant accreditation standards for community college music programs. Administrators may also be surveyed with regard to the criteria used in granting tenure to community college music faculty.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

April 25, 1981

Dear Colleague,

I am contacting you at this time to ask a personal favor. It is that you share with me your perceptions about your job. As a community college music instructor, you probably have some fairly definite attitudes and opinions about your job, and how it may be improved. I would very much like to hear your concerns and incorporate them into the doctoral study I am conducting of community college music instructors and their working conditions.

Being a community college music instructor myself, I became curious as to the kinds of problems we encounter on a daily basis. My curiosity led me to develop the present study, which has been approved by members of the Department of Music Education at Michigan State University.

I am sure that you will appreciate the importance of this investigation, and certainly hope that you will participate in it. All that is asked is that you complete the enclosed questionnaire.

You will find that the questionnaire has been designed so that there are no right or wrong answers. So please feel free to express your true feelings. And I assure you that all information collected will be kept in strict confidentiality. In reporting the data, no reference will be made to any particular music program or music faculty member.

I would be most appreciative if you would complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible. A stamped, self-addressed envelope has been provided for your convenience.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Mark Finkelstein
Doctoral Candidate, and
Community College Music Instructor

Enclosures

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE

_____ (1-4)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE MUSIC FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you plan to stay in community college teaching? ☐ Yes[1] ☐ No[2] ☐ Uncertain[3] (16)

2. What were some of the reasons why you entered community college teaching? (Check as many as apply) (17-27)
   - ☐ you were prepared in college to teach at the junior college level[1]
   - ☐ your spouse or relative works in the vicinity[2]
   - ☐ you needed a second job[3]
   - ☐ to avoid having to teach at the public school levels[4]
   - ☐ to fill in leisure time[5]
   - ☐ for the prestige[6]
   - ☐ no job openings at the public school levels[7]
   - ☐ no job openings at the 4-year college or university levels[8]
   - ☐ to gain teaching experience[9]
   - ☐ to be employed while finishing a graduate degree[10]
   - ☐ other[11]

3. What is your employment status? (During Spring 1981) ☐ Full-Time[1] ☐ Part-Time[2] ☐ Other[3]_____ (28)

4. Are you employed elsewhere? ☐ Yes, in music[1] ☐ Yes, but not in music[2] ☐ No[3] (29)

5. Which one of the following positions do you find *most* attractive? (Check only one) (30)
   - ☐ community college teaching[1]
   - ☐ university teaching[3]
   - ☐ public school teaching[5]
   - ☐ job in the music-business, or -industry[7]
   - ☐ other[9]_____
   - ☐ community college administration[2]
   - ☐ university administration[4]
   - ☐ public school administration[6]
   - ☐ non-music position in business or industry[8]

6. How would you describe your present motivational state? (Check only one) (31)
   - ☐ I am excited about teaching[1]
   - ☐ I find my routine boring[3]
   - ☐ I have other things on my mind at present besides teaching[2]
   - ☐ other:[4]_____

7. To which, among the following, do you owe your greatest allegiance? (Check only one) (32)
   - ☐ the teaching profession[1]
   - ☐ your students[3]
   - ☐ your college[2]
   - ☐ the discipline of music[4]

8. In your opinion, which student group *should* receive the most attention from your music program? (33)
   - ☐ university-track music majors[1]
   - ☐ occasional (avocational) students[3]
   - ☐ other:[5]_____
   - ☐ general, non-music students[2]
   - ☐ commercial-music students[4]

9. How do you perceive your teaching load? (Check only one) (34)
   - ☐ it tends to be heavy[1]
   - ☐ it tends to be light[2]
   - ☐ other:[3]_____

10. How many class hours a week do you teach? _____ (35-36)

PART II. POSITION SATISFACTIONS

Using the columns to the right, please evaluate the degree of satisfaction you derive from each of the following:

In addition: please circle those items you feel would contribute significantly to your wanting to leave community college teaching. (57-80)

	Great Satisfaction	Considerable Satisfaction	Average Satisfaction	Below Average Satisfaction	Little, if any, Satisfaction	Not Applicable	
1. congeniality of colleagues	5	4	3	2	1	na	(16)
2. competency of colleagues	5	4	3	2	1	na	(17)
3. reputation of school	5	4	3	2	1	na	(18)
4. courses taught	5	4	3	2	1	na	(19)
5. teaching load	5	4	3	2	1	na	(20)
6. quality of students	5	4	3	2	1	na	(21)
7. academic rank	5	4	3	2	1	na	(22)
8. salary	5	4	3	2	1	na	(23)
9. fringe benefits	5	4	3	2	1	na	(24)
10. opportunities for outside income	5	4	3	2	1	na	(25)
11. future salary prospects	5	4	3	2	1	na	(26)

In addition: please circle those items you feel would contribute significantly to your wanting to leave community college teaching. (57-80)

		Great Satisfaction	Considerable Satisfaction	Average Satisfaction	Below Average Satisfaction	Little, if any, Satisfaction	Not Applicable	
12.	nearness to graduate school	5	4	3	2	1	na	(27)
13.	adequacy of music library	5	4	3	2	1	na	(28)
14.	regional climate	5	4	3	2	1	na	(29)
15.	cultural opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	na	(30)
16.	adequacy of classroom facilities	5	4	3	2	1	na	(31)
17.	scheduling freedom	5	4	3	2	1	na	(32)
18.	diversity of teaching assignments	5	4	3	2	1	na	(33)
19.	low priority accorded to research	5	4	3	2	1	na	(34)
20.	job security	5	4	3	2	1	na	(35)
21.	rotation of teaching assignments	5	4	3	2	1	na	(36)
22.	quality of support services	5	4	3	2	1	na	(37)
23.	research opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	na	(38)
24.	research facilities	5	4	3	2	1	na	(39)
25.	adequacy of group rehearsal facilities	5	4	3	2	1	na	(40)
26.	adequacy of practice facilities	5	4	3	2	1	na	(41)
27.	personal contacts with head of department	5	4	3	2	1	na	(42)
28.	beauty of geographical region	5	4	3	2	1	na	(43)
29.	faculty recital demand	5	4	3	2	1	na	(44)
30.	lecturing	5	4	3	2	1	na	(45)
31.	conducting	5	4	3	2	1	na	(46)
32.	participation in job decisions	5	4	3	2	1	na	(47)
33.	administration of department	5	4	3	2	1	na	(48)
34.	faculty recital opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	na	(49)
35.	adequacy of performance facilities	5	4	3	2	1	na	(50)
36.	adequacy of office space	5	4	3	2	1	na	(51)
37.	nearness to friends and relatives	5	4	3	2	1	na	(52)
38.	opportunities for professional advancement	5	4	3	2	1	na	(53)
39.	opportunities for professional growth	5	4	3	2	1	na	(54)
40.	academic freedom	5	4	3	2	1	na	(55)
41.	other (specify)_____	5	4	3	2	1	na	(56)

PART III INSTRUCTIONAL DIFFICULTIES

As teachers, we face many instructional difficulties. Some are more of a problem than others. Using the scale provided: (1) please evaluate the difficulty you *personally* experience with each of the following; (2) *circle* the two most difficult problems you face.

		Of MAJOR[1] Difficulty	Of AVERAGE[2] Difficulty	Of LITTLE[3] or NO Difficulty	
1.	contending with student absences	☐	☐	☐	(16)
2.	working with immature students	☐	☐	☐	(17)
3.	speaking loud enough in the classroom	☐	☐	☐	(18)
4.	finding supplementary class materials	☐	☐	☐	(19)
5.	relating to students of a different ethnic or racial background	☐	☐	☐	(20)
6.	encouraging mastery of musical materials	☐	☐	☐	(21)
7.	maintaining discipline in the classroom	☐	☐	☐	(22)
8.	working with adult students	☐	☐	☐	(23)
9.	singing in front of your class	☐	☐	☐	(24)
10.	contending with too large a class	☐	☐	☐	(25)
11.	providing make-up examinations	☐	☐	☐	(26)
12.	getting enough rock or jazz into the curriculum	☐	☐	☐	(27)
13.	making do with insufficient instructional resources	☐	☐	☐	(28)
14.	using a diversity of media to advantage	☐	☐	☐	(29)
15.	promoting psychomotor flexibility	☐	☐	☐	(30)
16.	pacing materials over the term	☐	☐	☐	(31)

		Of MAJOR[1] Difficulty	Of AVERAGE[2] Difficulty	Of LITTLE[3] or NO Difficulty	
17.	expanding students' perspectives	☐	☐	☐	(32)
18.	starting class on time	☐	☐	☐	(33)
19.	inducing students to seek tutorial help	☐	☐	☐	(34)
20.	encouraging affective response to music listening	☐	☐	☐	(35)
21.	lecturing without undue recourse to notes	☐	☐	☐	(36)
22.	relating musical concepts to students with divergent musical tastes	☐	☐	☐	(37)
23.	taking time away from instructional time to give tests	☐	☐	☐	(38)
24.	teaching students who do not do their assigned readings	☐	☐	☐	(39)
25.	setting up the classroom	☐	☐	☐	(40)
26.	using real musical illustrations, not just theoretical ones	☐	☐	☐	(41)
27.	answering naive questions	☐	☐	☐	(42)
28.	getting enough art music into the curriculum	☐	☐	☐	(43)
29.	preparing enough classroom materials to go around	☐	☐	☐	(44)
30.	encouraging musical inventiveness, or creativity	☐	☐	☐	(45)
31.	providing students with a realistic evaluation of their abilities	☐	☐	☐	(46)
32.	encouraging students to continue on in music	☐	☐	☐	(47)
33.	sequencing materials over the semester	☐	☐	☐	(48)
34.	preparing tests	☐	☐	☐	(49)
35.	teaching students who do not practice	☐	☐	☐	(50)
36.	combating students' tone-deafness	☐	☐	☐	(51)
37.	inducing students to maintain their own opinions	☐	☐	☐	(52)
38.	relating to students of a different socio-economic background	☐	☐	☐	(53)
39.	performing in front of your class	☐	☐	☐	(54)
40.	explaining ideas as concretely as possible	☐	☐	☐	(55)
41.	ordering textbooks through the proper channels	☐	☐	☐	(56)
42.	making do with limited physical facilities	☐	☐	☐	(57)
43.	having to demonstrate techniques several times for a student's benefit	☐	☐	☐	(58)
44.	enhancing musicality of student performances	☐	☐	☐	(59)
45.	teaching students who display learning disabilities	☐	☐	☐	(60)
46.	maintaining students' interest	☐	☐	☐	(61)
47.	making work demands on students explicit	☐	☐	☐	(62)
48.	having to make do with incomplete instrumentation	☐	☐	☐	(63)
49.	correcting papers	☐	☐	☐	(64)
50.	concluding class on time	☐	☐	☐	(65)
51.	selecting appropriate class materials	☐	☐	☐	(66)
52.	teaching students of minimal musical talent	☐	☐	☐	(67)
53.	using a broad range of music in your teaching	☐	☐	☐	(68)
54.	contending with a student's defeatist attitude	☐	☐	☐	(69)
55.	getting students to turn in their assignments on time	☐	☐	☐	(70)
56.	teaching a class in which a wide range of student abilities are displayed	☐	☐	☐	(71)
57.	other: _____	☐	☐	☐	(72)
58.	other: _____	☐	☐	☐	(73)

PART IV. BACKGROUND

Job Description:

1. What is your academic rank? ☐ professor[1] ☐ associate professor[2] ☐ assistant professor[3] ☐ instructor[4] ☐ adjunct instructor[5] ☐ other[6] _____ (16)

2. Are you the music administrator for your program? ☐ Yes[1] ☐ No[2] (17)

3. Do you have tenure? ☐ Yes[1] ☐ No[2] (18)

4. At what times do you teach? ☐ day courses[1] ☐ evening courses[2] ☐ weekend courses[3] (19)

5. Where, for the college, do you teach? ☐ on campus[1] ☐ off campus[2] (20)

6. What types of students do you teach? (Check all that apply) (21-25)
   - ☐ university-track music majors[1]
   - ☐ general, non-music students[2]
   - ☐ occasional (avocational) students[3]
   - ☐ commercial-music students[4]
   - ☐ other:[5] _____

7. Check (✓) the courses that you are now teaching. (26-36)
   - ☐ music for education majors[1] ☐ theory or ear training[2] ☐ music history[3] ☐ music appreciation[4]
   - ☐ music business/industry course[5] ☐ private lessons: (☐ vocal[6] ☐ instrumental[7])
   - ☐ class instruction (applied)[8] ☐ vocal ensemble[9] ☐ instrumental ensemble[10] ☐ other:[11] _____

Background:

8. Are you a performing musician? ☐ Yes[1] ☐ Not at present[2] ☐ No[3] (37)
9. What is the highest degree that you have earned? (38)
   ☐ none[1] ☐ associate[2] ☐ bachelors[3] ☐ masters[4] ☐ doctorate[5] ☐ other:[6]
10. Are you working on a degree at present? ☐ Yes[1] ☐ No[2] (39)
11. Were you ever a community college student? ☐ Yes[1] ☐ No[2] (40)
12. Have you taken any courses about the community college? ☐ Yes[1] ☐ No[2] (41)
13. How long have you been employed by your college? _____ years. (42-43)
14. How long have you been teaching? total of _____ years. (44-45)
15. Aside from your present position, what professional experience in music do you have? (Check all that apply) (46-51)
    ☐ graduate assistant[1] ☐ private teaching[2]
    ☐ music industry[3] ☐ commercial/studio musician[4]
    ☐ taught at the public school levels[5] ☐ other:[6]_____
16. Were you new to the community when you first accepted your current job? ☐ Yes[1] ☐ No[2] (52)
17. What music do you value most? And which second? (Indicate # 1 and # 2) (53-54)
    ☐ art music[1] ☐ pop[2] ☐ rock[3] ☐ folk[4] ☐ jazz[5] ☐ other:[6]_____

PERSONAL DATA: (optional)

1. What is your age? _____ (55-56)
2. What is your sex? ☐ female[1] ☐ male[2] (57)

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS: (optional)

1. What types of experiences (formal or otherwise) did you find most useful in preparing you to teach at the community college level?

2. What advice would you give to prospective community college music teachers?

3. Is there a question you were not asked that you would like to answer?

** *THANK YOU* **

Would you like to receive the results of this study? ☐ Yes ☐ Not necessary

---

Please return this questionnaire to: Mr. Mark Finkelstein, Department of Music Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

APPENDIX 3

INVENTORY OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS AND THEIR SOURCES TABLE

TABLE A-3.1.--Inventory of Questionnaire Items and Their Sources

Variable Name	Sample Source
1. Degree	a, b, c, e, f, i, j, m
2. Prior teaching experience	b, c, e, f, j, m
3. Teaching load	a, e, h, j, l
4. Age	a, b, c, e, j
5. Sex	a, b, c, e, j
6. On-the-job experience	b, e, g, h
7. Rank	a, e, j
8. Tenure	a, j
9. Courses taught	e, h
10. Job preference	b, f
11. Career plans	c
12. Concurrent job	b
13. Classification of students	d
14. Employment status	b
15. Serve as administrator	b
16. When teach	e
17. Attended community college	b
18. Preferred program aim	k
19. Locale of school	f

Sample Sources:
a = Bayer, 1973
b = Brawer, 1976
c = Eaton, 1964
d = Fleming, 1978
e = Greene, 1968
f = Hill, 1976
g = Jansen, 1971
h = Merkel, 1977
i = Morgan, 1966
j = NEA, 1979
k = Pollard, 1978
l = Stover, 1970
m = Wozniak, 1973

APPENDIX 4

POTENTIAL SOURCES OF POSITION SATISFACTION TABLE

TABLE A-4.1.--Potential Sources of Position Satisfaction

Economic Benefits

1. Salary (B,S,A)
2. Future salary prospects (B,A)
3. Opportunities for outside income (B)
4. Fringe benefits (B,S,A)

Social Benefits

1. Reputation of the school (B,S,A)
2. Academic rank (S,A)

Function

1. Courses taught (B,A)
2. Teaching load (B,A)
3. Lecturing or conducting
4. Low priority given to research (S)
5. Faculty performance demand

Personal Benefits

1. Participation in job decisions (A)
2. Scheduling freedom (A)
3. Academic freedom
4. Diversity of teaching assignments
5. Rotation of teaching assignments
6. Job security

Physical Environment

1. Adequacy of office (S)
2. Adequacy of rehearsal facilities (group and individual)
3. Adequacy of performance facilities (A)
4. Adequacy of classroom facilities (S)
5. Adequacy of research facilities (B,S,A)

Interpersonal Environment

1. Congeniality of colleagues (B,S,A)
2. Personal contacts with head of department (S)

TABLE A-4.1.--Continued

Professional Environment

1. Competency of colleagues (B,A)
2. Administration of department (B,S,A)
3. Quality of support services (S)
4. Quality of students (B,S,A)
5. Research opportunities (B,S)
6. Faculty performance opportunities (A)
7. Opportunities for professional advancement (B,S)
8. Opportunities for professional growth (S)
9. Quality of music library

External Benefits

1. Nearness to graduate school (B)
2. Nearness to friends and relaties (B,A)
3. Climate (B,A)
4. Cultural opportunities (B,S,A)
5. Physical attractiveness of the geographical region (S)

SOURCES: Brown, 1966 = B; Shank, 1968 = S; Aurand, 1970 = A.

[a]Totals: (B,S,A) = 8
(B,S) = 14, inclusive
(B,S) = 10, inclusive
(s) = 18, inclusive
(A) = 19, inclusive
(B) = 18, inclusive

APPENDIX 5

POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INSTRUCTIONAL-RELATED DIFFICULTIES TABLE

TABLE A-5.1.--Potential Sources of Instructional-Related Difficulties[a]

I. Instructional Skills

1. Teaching a class in which a wide range of abilities are displayed
2. Maintaining student's interest
3. Explaining ideas as concretely as possible
4. Teaching students who display learning disabilities
5. Contending with prolonged or sporadic absences
6. Making do with limited physical facilities
7. Making do with diminishing instructional resources
8. Preparing tests
9. Pacing materials over the semester or term
10. Sequencing the materials over the semester or term
11. Selecting appropriate class materials for student purchase
12. Relating musical concepts to students with divergent musical tastes
13. Teaching students of minimal musical talent
14. Having to make do with incomplete musical instrumentation
15. Providing students with a realistic evaluation of their abilities
16. Finding materials to supplement class materials
17. Using a diversity of media to best advantage
18. Inducing students to maintain their own opinions
19. Lecturing without undue recourse to notes
20. Singing in front of the class
21. Making use of real musical illustrations, not just theoretical ones
22. Demonstrating formal performance skills in front of the class
23. Contending with a student's defeatist attitude

II. Classroom management skills or chores

1. Correcting papers
2. Maintaining discipline in the classroom
3. Making work demands on students explicit
4. Taking time away from instructional time to give tests
5. Preparing tests
6. Providing make-up examinations
7. Preparing enough classroom materials to go around
8. Ordering class materials through the proper channels
9. Providing students with a realistic evluation of their abilities
10. Starting class on time
11. Concluding class on time
12. Speaking loud enough in the classroom
13. Setting up the classroom
14. Getting students to turn in their assignments on time
15. Contending with too large a class

TABLE A-5.1.--Continued

III. Educational Objectives

1. Combating tone-deafness
2. Promoting psychomotor flexibility
3. Enhancing musicality of student performances
4. Encouraging affective response to music listening
5. Encouraging musical inventiveness or creativity
6. Encouraging mastery of musical materials
7. Selecting and using a broad range of music
8. Getting enough art music into the curriculum
9. Getting enough rock or jazz into the curriculum

IV. Interaction with students

1. Inducing students to seek tutorial help
2. Having to demonstrate techniques or procedures several times for the benefit of an individual
3. Working with immature students
4. Teaching students who do not do their assigned readings
5. Working with adult students
6. Teaching students who do not practice
7. Providing students with a realistic evluation of their abilities
8. Answering naive questions
9. Maintaining discipline in the classroom
10. Inducing students to maintain their own opinions
11. Expanding students' perspectives
12. Relating to students of a differing socio-economic background
13. Relating to students of a differing ethnic or racial background
14. Encouraging students to continue on in music

[a]Some items appear within more than one factor.

APPENDIX 6

RANK-ORDERING OF MOST SATISFYING POSITION VARIABLES BY SUBGROUP TABLE

TABLE A.6-1.--Rank-Ordering of Most Satisfying Position Variables by Subgroup[a]

Rank	Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
Full-Time				
1	40	Academic freedom	4.069	.923
2	27	Contact with chairman	3.962	1.371
3	9	Fringe benefits	3.903	.908
4	20	Job security	3.900	1.125
5	32	Partic. in decisions	3.897	.939
6.5	3	School reputation	3.893	1.068
6.5	1	Congeniality of colleagues	3.893	1.098
8	17	Scheduling freedom	3.862	.990
9	10	Opp. for outside income	3.852	.989
10	33	Admin. of department	3.828	.805
11	8	Salary	3.767	.728
12	18	Diversity of assignments	3.750	.844
13	2	Competency of colleagues	3.710	.864
14	31	Conducting	3.696	1.063
15	15	Cultural opportunities	3.655	1.111
16	36	Office space	3.633	1.189
17	7	Academic rank	3.619	1.117
18.5	4	Courses taught	3.600	.932
18.5	30	Lecturing	3.600	1.041
20	39	Growth	3.536	.962
21	11	Salary prospects	3.483	1.022
22.5	16	Classroom facilities	3.429	1.399
22.5	28	Geography	3.429	1.200
24	38	Advancement	3.400	.932
25	37	Nearness/relatives	3.321	1.090
26	5	Teaching load	3.276	1.066
27	22	Support Staff	3.267	.907
28	34	Recital opportunity*	3.167	1.007
29	12	Near grad school*	3.125	1.147
30	35	Performance facilities*	3.103	1.372
31	21	Rotation of assistants*	3.100	1.372
32	14	Climate*	3.074	1.207
33	6	Quality of students*	3.032	.948
Part-Time General				
1	40	Academic freedom	4.000	.957
2	1	Congeniality of colleagues	3.852	.980
3	27	Contacts with chairman	3.800	1.176
4	2	Competency of colleagues	3.656	.892
5	4	Courses taught	3.581	.950
6	17	Scheduling freedom	3.579	1.133
7	37	Nearness/Relatives	3.531	1.309
8	35	Performance facilities	3.393	1.406

TABLE A.6-1.--Continued

Rank	Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
Part-Time General				
9	3	School reputation	3.371	1.044
10	10	Opportunity for outside income	3.320	1.347
11	5	Teaching load	3.317	1.112
12	28	Geography	3.268	1.243
13	31	Conducting*	3.130	1.392
14	33	Administration*	3.056	1.235
15	15	Cultural opportunity*	3.050	1.096
16	6	Quality of students*	3.031	1.168
17	30	Lecturing*	3.000	1.015
Part-Time Applied				
1	17	Scheduling freedom	4.095	.831
2	28	Geography	3.727	1.120
3	1	Congeniality/colleagues	3.714	1.056
4	10	Opportunity outside income	3.647	1.455
5	25	Group rehearsal	3.583	.996
6	40	Academic freedom	3.526	1.073
7	4	Courses taught	3.522	1.163
8	16	Classroom facilities	3.474	.905
9	37	Nearness/relative	3.421	1.261
10	2	Competency of colleagues*	3.318	.839
11	35	Performance facilities*	3.316	1.390
12	27	Contacts with chairman*	3.304	1.428
13	3	School reputation*	3.000	1.056

[a]Statistics computed excluding the "not applicable" column.

*Indicates that the variable is marginally classified.

APPENDIX 7

RANK-ORDERING OF LEAST SATISFYING POSITION VARIABLES BY SUBGROUP TABLE

TABLE A-7.1.--Rank-Ordering of Least Satisfying Position Variables by Subgroup[a]

Rank	Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
Full-Time				
1	24	Research facilities	2.350	1.226
2	29	Recital demand	2.556	.856
3.5	19	Low research priority	2.700	1.174
3.5	23	Research opportunities	2.700	1.174
5	13	Music library	2.724	.841
6	25	Group research facilities*	2.852	1.486
7	26	Practice facilities*	2.897	1.398
Part-time General				
1	9	Fringe benefits	1.628	1.155
2	24	Research facilities	1.957	.928
3	29	Recital demand	1.972	.971
4	20	Job security	2.000	1.010
5	13	Music library	2.018	.963
6	23	Research opportunities	2.095	.889
7	38	Advancement	2.241	1.063
8	19	Low res. priority	2.250	.786
9	11	Future salary	2.263	1.261
10	26	Practice facilities	2.283	1.403
11	36	Office space	2.340	1.300
12	21	Rotation of assistants	2.417	.974
13	34	Recital opportunities	2.447	1.348
14	22	Support services	2.717	.974
15.5	16	Classroom facilities	2.766	1.137
15.5	8	Salary	2.766	.955
17	39	Growth	2.797	1.229
18	14	Climate*	2.824	.994
19	32	Decisions*	2.848	1.333
20	7	Rank*	2.865	.991
21	18	Diversity*	2.889	1.112
22	25	Group rehearsal facilities*	2.902	1.375
23	12	Near graduate school*	2.960	1.475
Part-time Applied				
1	24	Research facilities	1.700	.949
2	9	Fringe benefits	1.769	1.363
3.5	23	Research opportunities	2.000	1.000
3.5	30	Lecturing	2.000	.953
5	11	Future salary	2.053	1.177
6	19	Low res. priority	2.125	.835

TABLE A-7.1.--Continued

Rank	Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
7	38	Advancement	2.167	.985
8	13	Music library	2.176	.951
9	29	Recital demand	2.250	.931
10	34	Recital opportunities	2.294	1.263
11	32	Priority decisions	2.400	.985
12	5	Teaching load	2.409	1.098
13	31	Conducting	2.429	1.618
14.5	21	Rotation of assistants	2.500	.850
14.5	22	Support services	2.500	1.092
16.5	20	Job security	2.529	1.419
16.5	7	Rank	2.529	1.007
18	8	Salary	2.636	1.049
19	6	Quality of staff	2.708	1.197
20	39	Growth	2.722	1.018
21	36	Office space	2.769	1.423
22	26	Practice facilities	2.773	1.510
23	33	Administration*	2.824	1.131
24	12	Near graduate school*	2.833	1.267
25	14	Climate*	2.895	.875
26	15	Cultural opportunities*	2.913	.793
27	18	Diversity*	2.923	1.188

[a]Statistics calculated excluding the "not applicable" column.

*Indicates that the variable is marginally classified.

APPENDIX 8

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE 40 POSITION SATISFACTION ITEMS TABLE

TABLE A-8.1.--Frequency Distribution for the 40 Position Satisfaction Items[a]

No.	Descriptor	Great Satis-faction	Consider-able Satis-faction	Average Satis-faction	Below Average Satis-faction	Little if any Satis-faction	Not Appli-cable	Number Missing
1	Colleague congeniality	29%	31%	28%	3%	3%	5%	3
2	Colleague competency	16%	37%	35%	7%	1%	4%	3
3	School reputation	17%	31%	35%	8%	7%	2%	3
4	Courses taught	20%	29%	38%	8%	3%	3%	4
5	Teaching load	13%	24%	31%	19%	8%	5%	5
6	Quality of students	11%	21%	29%	32%	7%	0%	3
7	Academic rank	8%	13%	35%	15%	8%	20%	10
8	Salary	8%	19%	44%	17%	8%	3%	2
9	Fringe benefits	11%	13%	12%	5%	33%	27%	3
10	Outside income	21%	24%	19%	6%	9%	21%	3
11	Future salary prospects	7%	15%	23%	17%	26%	12%	3
12	Nearness to graduate school	8%	9%	13%	10%	7%	54%	6
13	Adequacy of music library	1%	8%	28%	28%	23%	13%	4
14	Regional climate	5%	15%	38%	15%	9%	16%	6
15	Cultural opportunities	12%	24%	34%	20%	5%	5%	4
16	Classroom facilities	14%	19%	30%	19%	11%	7%	2
17	Scheduling freedom	25%	33%	20%	9%	2%	10%	3
18	Diversity of assignments	9%	23%	23%	14%	6%	25%	7
19	Low research priority	1%	4%	17%	12%	9%	57%	9
20	Job security	11%	14%	19%	14%	23%	18%	3
21	Rotation of assignments	3%	5%	20%	14%	5%	53%	5

TABLE A-8.1.--Continued

No.	Descriptor	Great Satis-faction	Consider-able Satis-faction	Average Satis-faction	Below Average Satis-faction	Little if any Satis-faction	Not Appli-cable	Number Missing
22	Quality of support services	5%	15%	32%	17%	9%	22%	6
23	Research opportunities	1%	4%	16%	11%	13%	55%	5
24	Research facilities	1%	3%	12%	12%	18%	53%	8
25	Group rehearsal facilities	14%	15%	18%	15%	14%	24%	4
26	Practice facilities	14%	12%	18%	18%	32%	6%	4
27	Personal contacts with chairman	37%	19%	26%	3%	9%	5%	7
28	Beauty of region	20%	21%	31%	9%	8%	9%	5
29	Recital demand	0%	4%	24%	15%	19%	39%	6
30	Lecturing	4%	19%	19%	10%	8%	39%	4
31	Conducting	8%	15%	9%	6%	7%	55%	4
32	Participation in decisions	13%	17%	24%	10%	12%	24%	4
33	Administration of department	13%	25%	27%	12%	8%	15%	4
34	Recital opportunities	8%	16%	19%	18%	19%	25%	5
35	Performance facilities	23%	25%	19%	14%	19%	4%	5
36	Office space	13%	15%	20%	13%	21%	18%	4
37	Nearness to friends	19%	21%	27%	6%	8%	18%	5
38	Opportunities for advancement	2%	18%	26%	21%	19%	14%	3
39	Opportunities for growth	8%	24%	29%	15%	13%	11%	4
40	Academic freedom	30%	34%	21%	3%	3%	8%	4

[a]Percentages are rounded to the nearest integer.

APPENDIX 9

POSITION VARIABLES RATED INAPPLICABLE BY MORE THAN 20% OF CASES TABLE

TABLE A-9.1.--Position Variables Rated Inapplicable by More than 20% of Cases

Item	Descriptor	% of Sample	Full Time (N = 31)			Part Time General (N = 66)			Part Time Applied (N = 25)		
			Freq.	Valid Cases	% of Valid Cases	Freq.	Valid Cases	% of Valid Cases	Freq.	Valid Cases	% of Valid Cases
19	Low research priority	57%	11	28	39%	42	62	68%*	15	23	65%*
23	Research opportunities	55%	11	29	38%	43	64	67%*	13	24	54%*
31	Conducting	55%	8	30	27%	41	65	63%*	17	24	71%*
12	Nearness to grad school	54%	15	29	52%	39	64	61%*	11	23	48%
21	Rotation of assignments	53%	11	30	37%	40	64	62%	13	23	46%*
24	Research facilities	53%	11	27	41%	40	63	63%	14	24	58%*
29	Recital demand	39%	13	28	46%	28	64	44%	7	24	29%
30	Lecturing	39%	6	30	20%	30	64	47%	12	24	50%*
9	Fringe benefits	27%	0	30	0%	21	64	33%	11	24	46%
34	Recital opportunities	25%	7	30	23%	17	64	26%	6	23	26%
18	Diversity of assignments	25%	3	29	10%	18	63	29%	10	23	43%
25	Group rehearsal facilities	24%	4	30	13%	14	65	21%	11	23	48%
32	Participation in decisions	24%	2	30	7%	18	64	28%	9	24	37%
10	Opportunities/outside income	21%	4	31	13%	14	64	22%	7	24	29%
7	Academic rank	20%	10	28	36%	8	60	13%	7	24	29%

*Rated "not applicable" by 50% or more of the subgroup.

APPENDIX 10

RANK-ORDERING OF MOST TROUBLESOME INSTRUCTIONAL VARIABLES BY SUBGROUP TABLE

TABLE A-10.1.--Rank-Ordering of Most Troublesome Instructional Variables by Subgroup

Rank	Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
Full Time				
1	1	Student absences	1.839	.688
2	35	Student, practicing	1.900	.662
3	2	Immature student	1.968	.706
4	17	Student perspectives	2.065	.772
5	6	Mastery	2.097	.700
6.5	55	On-time assignment	2.161	.583
6.5	24	Do not do assignment	2.161	.583
8	52	Minimal talent	2.226	.669
9	22	Divergent tastes	2.258	.631
10	56	Range of ability	2.267	.691
11	48	Instrumentation	2.280	.792
13	54	Defeatist attitude	2.290	.643
13	20	Affective resp.	2.290	.588
13	19	Tutorial couns.	2.290	.588
16.5	36	Tone-deafness	2.300	.702
16.5	44	Student musicality	2.300	.596
16.5	45	Learning disability	2.300	.596
16.5	31	Evaluation	2.300	.466
19	30	Creativity	2.333	.606
20	43	Multiple demonstration	2.345	.614
21	11	Make-up exams	2.387	.715
Part-time General				
1	35	Student practicing	1.719	.701
2	56	Range of ability	1.905	.756
3	1	Student absences	1.985	.754
4	52	Minimal talent	2.141	.710
5	17	St. perspectives	2.159	.723
6	24	Do not do assignment	2.190	.780
7	2	Immature students	2.212	.734
8	6	Enc. mastery	2.242	.583
9	42	Limited facilities	2.270	.723
10	36	Tone-deafness	2.274	.682
11	54	Deafeatist attitude	2.290	.584
12	30	Creativity	2.297	.728
13	55	On time assignments	2.317	.668
14	31	Evaluation	2.344	.672
15	13	Insufficient inst. res.	2.355	.680
16	44	Student musicality	2.391	.657
17	20	Affective response	2.393	.690

TABLE A-10.1.--Continued

Rank	Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
Part-Time Applied				
1	35	Student practicing	1.727	.767
2	52	Minimal talent	2.043	.706
3	1	Student absences	2.120	.833
4	2	Immature students	2.160	.624
5	6	Mastery	2.200	.577
6	17	Student perspectives	2.217	.736
7	31	Evaluation	2.318	.568

APPENDIX 11

INSTRUCTIONAL VARIABLES RATED MODERATELY PROBLEMATIC TABLE

TABLE A-11.1.--Instructional Variables Rated Moderately Problematic

Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
Full Time			
14	Media usage	2.677	.541
23	Time away/tests	2.677	.653
26	Real music	2.677	.475
27	Naive questions	2.677	.475
34	Preparing tests	2.677	.541
40	Explanations	2.677	.541
50	Concluding class	2.677	.599
15	Psychomotor	2.613	.558
18	Starting on time	2.613	.667
46	Student interest	2.600	.563
47	Work demands	2.548	.568
13	Instruct. res.	2.516	.626
37	Student opinions	2.516	.570
42	Physical facilities	2.516	.677
49	Grading papers	2.484	.724
32	Guidance	2.467	.571
Part-time General			
16	Pacing materials	2.692	.465
10	Class size	2.688	.639
15	Psychomotor	2.684	.540
11	Make-up exams	2.683	.502
12	Rock/jazz in our curriculum	2.677	.505
50	Concluding on time	2.651	.544
40	Explanations	2.641	.545
27	Naive questions	2.625	.549
37	Student opinions	2.623	.637
28	Art music in curriculum	2.610	.526
18	Starting on time	2.606	.551
32	Guidance	2.603	.525
19	Tutorial counsel.	2.600	.616
51	Selecting materials	2.594	.610
46	Student interest	2.563	.500
4	Supplem. materials	2.538	.663
41	Ordering texts	2.508	.744
48	Instrumentation	2.500	.707
47	Work demands	2.484	.591
53	Diversity of musics	2.476	.644
43	Multiple demonstr.	2.469	.642
14	Media	2.452	.694
22	Divergent tastes	2.431	.612
45	Learning disability	2.413	.663

TABLE A-11.1.--Continued

Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
Part-Time Applied			
56	Range of ability	2.684	.582
37	Student opinions	2.682	.477
43	Multiple demonstration	2.682	.477
15	Psychomotor	2.667	.483
45	Learning Disability	2.667	.483
20	Affective resp.	2.650	.489
40	Explanations	2.636	.492
16	Pacing materials	2.609	.583
50	Concluding on time	2.600	.598
55	On time assignments	2.588	.507
14	Media	2.550	.605
54	Defeatist attitude	3.545	.595
22	Divergent tastes	2.524	.602
24	Do not do assignments	2.500	.513
30	Creativity	2.500	.512
44	Student musicality	2.478	.665
36	Tone deafness	2.476	.512
47	Work demands	2.455	.596
32	Guidance	2.435	.590
46	Student interest	2.429	.676

APPENDIX 12

RANK-ORDERING OF LEAST TROUBLESOME INSTRUCTIONAL VARIABLES BY SUBGROUP TABLE

TABLE A-12.1.--Rank-Ordering of Least Troublesome Instructional Variables by Subgroup

Rank	Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
Full-Time				
2	4	Supplemenatry materials	2.968	.180
2	8	Adult students	2.968	.180
2	21	Lecturing	2.968	.180
5	3	Speaking voice	2.935	.359
5	7	Discipline	2.935	.250
5	9	Singing in class	2.935	.250
7	39	Performing	2.903	.301
9.5	5	Ethnicity	2.839	.374
9.5	25	Setting up	2.839	.454
9.5	38	Socio. background	2.839	.374
9.5	41	Ordering texts	2.839	.454
13.5	53	Diverse musics	2.774	.497
13.5	16	Pacing mater.	2.774	.425
13.5	29	Preparing materials	2.774	.497
13.5	33	Sequencing materials	2.774	.497
16	51	Selecting materials	2.710	.461
18	10	Class size	2.742	.575
18	12	Rock/jazz in curriculum	2.742	.631
18	28	Art music in curriculum	2.742	.445
Part-time General				
1	8	Adult students	2.938	.242
2	39	Performing	2.919	.275
3	3	Speaking voice	2.906	.344
4.5	5	Ethnicity	2.877	.331
4.5	7	Discipline	2.877	.331
6	38	Socio-econ.	2.859	.393
7	49	Grading papers	2.850	.360
8	21	Lecturing	2.831	.461
9	9	Singing	2.823	.385
10	29	Preparing materials	2.820	.500
11	26	Real music	2.797	.443
12	34	Preparing tests	2.787	.451
13	33	Sequence materials	2.750	.471
14	25	Set up class	2.730	.601
15	23	Time for tests	2.700	.561
Part-time Applied				
3	3	Speaking voice	3.000	.000
3	8	Adult students	3.000	.000

TABLE A-12.1.--Continued

Rank	Item	Descriptor	M	S.D.
3	9	Singing/class	3.000	.000
3	39	Performing	3.000	.000
3	41	Ordering texts	3.000	.000
6	7	Discipline	2.955	.213
7	38	Socio. background	2.952	.218
8	29	Preparing materials	2.947	.229
9	4	Supplementary materials	2.913	.288
10.5	21	Lecturing	2.905	.301
10.5	26	Real Music	2.905	.301
12	25	Setting up	2.900	.513
13	11	Make-up exams	2.895	.315
14	23	Time away/tests	2.889	.323
15	49	Grading papers	2.882	.332
16	5	Ethnicity	2.870	.344
17	10	Class size	2.857	.359
18.5	34	Preparing tests	2.833	.383
18.5	48	Instrumentation	2.833	.383
20	12	Rock/jazz in curriculum	2.800	.523
21	51	Selecting materials	2.789	.419
22	27	Naive questions	2.773	.429
23.5	19	Tutorial couns.	2.762	.436
23.5	28	Art music in curriculum	2.762	.436
25	53	Diverse musics	2.727	.456
26.5	13	Insufficient res.	2.714	.561
26.5	33	Sequencing material	2.714	.463
28.5	18	Starting on time	2.700	.470
28.5	42	Limited facilities	2.700	.470

APPENDIX 13

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR THE 56 INSTRUCTIONAL DIFFICULTIES ITEMS TABLE

TABLE A-13.1.--Frequency Distribution for the 56 Instructional Difficulties Items[a]

No.	Descriptor	Of little or No Difficulty	Of Average Difficulty	Of Major Difficulty	Number Missing
1	Student absences	27%	44%	29%	0
2	Immature students	32%	49%	19%	0
3	Speaking loud enough	95%	3%	2%	5
4	Supplementing materials	78%	17%	5%	3
5	Ethnic/racial diversity	87%	13%	0%	3
6	Encouraging mastery	31%	58%	11%	0
7	Maintaining discipline	91%	9%	0%	4
8	Working with adults	96%	4%	0%	3
9	Singing for class	89%	11%	0%	7
10	Too large a class	80%	13%	7%	6
11	Make-up Exams	68%	27%	4%	9
12	Rock/jazz in curriculum	76%	19%	4%	9
13	Poor instructional res.	56%	36%	9%	8
14	Using media	61%	31%	8%	9
15	Promoting psychomotor	69%	28%	3%	13
16	Pacing materials	71%	28%	1%	3
17	Student perspectives	35%	45%	20%	5
18	Starting on time	67%	29%	4%	5
19	Students seek tutorial	60%	35%	5%	10
20	Encouraging affect	50%	42%	8%	10
21	Lecturing	90%	8%	2%	11
22	Divergent tastes	47%	46%	7%	5
23	Devoting time for tests	77%	17%	6%	13
24	Students & Assignments	38%	47%	15%	8
25	Setting up classroom	84%	11%	5%	8
26	Using real music	79%	20%	1%	6
27	Naive questions	68%	30%	2%	5
28	Art music in curriculum	69%	30%	1%	11

TABLE A-13.1.--Continued

No.	Descriptor	Of little or No Difficulty	Of Average Difficulty	Of Major Difficulty	Number Missing
29	Preparing materials	86%	11%	3%	11
30	Student creativity	45%	45%	10%	6
31	Student evaluation	40%	53%	7%	6
32	Vocational guidance	56%	41%	3%	6
33	Sequencing materials	77%	21%	2%	6
34	Preparing tests	78%	20%	2%	12
35	Students do not practice	15%	46%	39%	6
36	Student tone-deafness	43%	47%	10%	9
37	Eliciting student opinion	66%	29%	5%	8
38	Socio-economic background	88%	11%	1%	6
39	Performing for class	93%	7%	0%	8
40	Explaining concretely	67%	31%	2%	5
41	Ordering texts	77%	14%	9%	10
42	Limited physical facilities	53%	36%	11%	8
43	Multiple demonstrations	53%	41%	6%	7
44	Enhancing student musicality	48%	44%	8%	5
45	Student learning disabilities	49%	43%	8%	8
46	Maintaining class interest	57%	40%	3%	7
47	Expressing work demands	54%	42%	4%	5
48	Incomplete instrumentation	63%	25%	12%	21
49	Correcting papers	79%	17%	4%	14
50	Concluding class on time	70%	26%	4%	8
51	Selecting materials	70%	27%	3%	8
52	Students of minimal talent	33%	49%	18%	4
53	Using broad range of music	66%	29%	5%	6
54	Defeatist attitudes	40%	53%	7%	7
55	On-time assignments	40%	51%	9%	11
56	Range of student abilities	37%	40%	23%	10

APPENDIX 14

CORRELATES OF SELECTED VARIABLES TABLE

TABLE A-14.1.--Correlates[a] of Selected Variables[b]

Tenure	r	Sex (female/male)		Music Administrator	r
status	.80	Entered cc teaching-relative		status	.40
on job	-.58	in vicinity	.46	school teaching	.30
hours teach	-.55	tenure	-.37	tenure	.24
higher degree	.47	status	-.36	hours teach	-.22
(years) teaching	-.45	excited about teaching	.22	degree	-.22
age	-.41	other job	.22	other job	-.19
other job	-.40	former cc student	-.22	prefer job	.18
stay/ leave cc	.39	student/ music oriented	.21	student/ music oriented	.18
school teaching	.38	on job	.20	sex	-.17
sex	-.37	teach applied voice	.18		
prefer job	.32	administrator	-.17		
rank	.32				
new to community	.26				
administrator	.24				
studied the cc	.21				

[a]Correlations calculated with pair-wise deletions

[b]Variables appear in dichotomized form.

APPENDIX 15

COMPARISON OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS

COMPARISON OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS

Demographically. Full-time faculty were older (79% of full-time instructors were over age 36, compared with 38% of part-time instructors) and more likely to be male (90% to 49%) than were part-time faculty.

Experientially. Full-time faculty held higher academic degrees (100% of full-time instructors indicated holding a master's degree or above, compared with 42% of part-time instructors), and were more experienced as community college teachers; most full-time teachers (70%) had been employed for 10 years or longer, while most part-time faculty (58%) had served from one to three years. Full-time faculty (27%) were somewhat more likely than part-time faculty (13%) to have studied the functions and philosophy of the community college. Fewer full-time faculty (27%) than part-time faculty (85%) held concurrent positions, including employment as church or society band musicians.

Functionally. Full-time faculty (40%) were more likely than part-time general faculty (11%) to serve as music administrators for their programs.

Attitudinally. The majority of all faculty reported they remain "excited" about teaching (73%) and derive average satisfaction or better from the courses they teach (87%). Full-time faculty, however, were the most positive in their preference for community

college teaching (55% to 17% for full-time and part-time faculty, respectively) and most (80%) planned to remain at their positions. Most part-time faculty were undecided.

When asked to determine their priorities, full-time faculty were less likely than part-time faculty to report that they owe their greatest professional allegiance to the discipline of music (27% to 53%), and more likely to acknowledge their allegiance to students (60% to 41%, for full-time and part-time staff, respectively). Full-time teachers were also less likely to have identified music majors as the student group deserving of primary consideration (41% for full-time instructors as compared with 53% for part-time instructors).

Part-time and full-time instructors differed somewhat in their reasons for entering community college teaching. Full-time faculty (0% compared with part-time 45%) were unlikely to have accepted their positions while in search of a second job and were less likely than part-time personnel to have sought employment because a relative worked in the vicinity (7% to 24%) or to gain teaching experience (27% to 52%). Of all individuals surveyed, full-time faculty were the most likely to have entered the profession for reasons other than those listed (63% compared with 40% for part-time faculty), to avoid having to teach at the public school levels (23% to 11%), and because no senior college position was available (17% to 13%).

APPENDIX 16

COMPARISON OF PART-TIME GENERAL FACULTY AND PART-TIME APPLIED FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS

COMPARISON OF PART-TIME GENERAL FACULTY AND PART-TIME APPLIED FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS

Demographically. A greater proportion of applied faculty (50%) than general faculty (33%) were above the age of 36. Applied instructors (60% to general 47%) were also somewhat more likely to be female.

Experientially. Regarding on-the-job experience, more applied teachers (40%) than general instructors (27%) had held their positions between four and nine years. Similarly, applied faculty (16% as compared with 9% of general instructors) were more likely to have served their college for 10 years or longer.

Part-time general faculty were more heterogeneous than applied teachers in academic background and professional music experience. General faculty, for example, were less likely than applied faculty to have earned a master's degree or higher (40% to 52%), but were more likely to have been community college students themselves (35% of general instructors, as compared with 8% of applied instructors) and to have worked as either a commercial/studio musician (44% to 20%) or in the music industry (23% to 8%).

Part-time general faculty (82%) were also more likely than either applied instructors (60%) or full-time instructors (52%) to have resided within their college's community district when they first accepted their teaching positions.

Functionally. The range of time spent by part-time faculty on campus appears to vary widely. Nevertheless, more applied teachers (60%) than part-time general teachers (46%) taught only between one and six hours a week for their college. Moreover, most applied teachers (52%, in contrast with 11% of general instructors) taught solely off-campus. One further functional difference between general and applied instructors was that a small minority of general instructors (11%) held the post of music administrator.

Attitudinally. Part-time general instructors (22%) were somewhat more likely than applied instructors (4%) to indicate community college teaching as their primary vocational preference. While a substantial segment of both part-time subgroups favored teaching at the four-year college level, the general instructors (26%, as compared with 46% of applied faculty) were less prone to consider the senior college their reference group. Consistent with the applied teacher's orientation, however, was their conformity of musical preference. More applied faculty (92%) than general faculty (73%) identified art music, meaning "classical" music as their first preference.

When professional allegiance is considered, most applied instructors (52% as compared with 37% of general faculty) indicated their primary loyalty to students. There was greater agreement among

applied instructors (70%) than among general instructors (46%), however, that music majors should be given preferential treatment.

Applied and general teachers displayed similar motivations for entering into community college teaching. Part-time general instructors, however, were somewhat more likely than were applied faculty to report entering the profession to gain teaching experience (56% for general teachers vs. 40% for applied faculty), and to obtain a second job (49% to 36% for general and applied faculty, respectively). On the other hand, part-time general instructors (9%) were alone in reporting that they accepted their positions because no jobs were available at the public school levels.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Albert, L. S., & Watson, R. J. Mainstreaming part-time faculty: Issue or imperative? New Directions for Community Colleges, 1980, 8(2), 73-80.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1980 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1982.

Aslanian, V. The music program in the community colleges of California. In the Report of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting, College Music Symposium, 1970, 10, 134-137.

Atkinson, K. A. Michigan full- and part-time vocational instructors' perceptions toward their professional development relative to their occupational role as public two-year college instructors (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1981), Dissertation Abstracts International, 1982, 42, 3402A. (University Microfilms No. 8202389).

Aurand, C. H., Jr. A preliminary study of career patterns and selected determinants of job choice as they affect job mobility of music faculty in institutions accredited by the N.A.S.M. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 4233A. (Universtiy Microfilms No. 72-4819).

Aurand, C. H., Jr. & Blackburn, R. T. Career patterns and job mobility of college and university music faculty. Journal of Research in Music Education, 1973, 21(2), 162-168.

Bader, Y. Music and the community college student. College Music Symposium, 1974, 14, 71-75.

Bakkegard, B. M. Music in the junior college. Junior College Journal, 1952, 23(2), 87-90.

Baldwin, R. Adult and career development: What are the implications for faculty? Current Issues in Higher Education, 1979, 1 (2), 13-20.

Bayer, A. E. College and university faculty: A statistical description (ACE Research Report, Vol. 5, No. 5). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, June 1970.

Bayer, A. E. Teaching faculty in academe: 1972-1973 (ACE Research Reports, Vol. 8, No. 2). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, August 1973.

Belford, M. L. Investigation and the analysis of the public junior college curriculum with emphasis on the problems of the transfer music major. Journal of Research in Music Education, 1970, 18 (4), 407-413.

Bender, L. W., & Breuder, R. Part-time teachers--Step children of the community college. Community College Review, 1973, 1(1), 29-37.

Bender, L., & Hammons, J. O. Adjunct faculty: Forgotten and neglected. Community and Junior College Journal, 1972, 43(2), 20-22.

Benoit, R. J. Characteristics and attitudes of Florida community college faculty (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 5889A. (University Microfilms No. 7907723).

Berdie, D. R., & Anderson, J. F. Questionnaires: Design and Use. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Birge, E. B. History of public school music in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1966. (Originally published, 1928).

Blai, B. Jr. What makes a good junior college teacher? Improving College and University Teaching, 1975, 23 (3), 187.

Blocker, C. E., Plummer, R. M., & Richardson, R. C. The two-year college: A social synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Bonelli, E. The role of the music administrator. In Monographs on music in higher education (No. 1). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Schools of Music, 1973, 77-83.

Brawer, F. B. Personality characteristics of college and university faculty: Implications for the community college. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 026 048).

Brawer, F. B. A profile of music instructors in two-year colleges. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126 974).

Brawer, F. B. Satisfaction and humanities instructors in two-year colleges. (ERIC Clearing house for Junior Colleges topical paper No. 56). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 128 048).

Brawer, F. B. Personality attributes of two-year college instructors. Community College Frontiers, 1979, 7 (3), 22-26.

Brown, D. G. The market for college teachers. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

Burnett, C. W. The Trojan horse phenomenon reconsidered. Community College Review, 1982, 10 (1), 18-23.

Bushnell, D. S. Organizing for change: New priorities for community colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Campbell, F. K. A survey and appraisal of music programs of accredited two-year colleges of the United States (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 29, 624A. (University Microfilms No. 68-12,089).

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Continuity and discontinuity: Higher education and the schools; A report and recommendations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. Confronting identity: The community college instructor. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. The two-year college instructor today. New York: Praeger, 1977.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. The American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Cohen, A. M., & Friedlander, J. What do community college instructors want? Community College Review, 1980, 7 (3), 66-71.

Cosand, J. P. The community college in 1980. In A. C. Eurich (Ed.), Campus 1980: The shape of the future in American higher education. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1969, 134-149.

Cosand, J. P. Perspective: Community colleges in the 1980's. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1979. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 156 269).

Curtis, L. W. Junior college music for general and special students. Speech and discussion in Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1938. Chicago, Ill.: Music Educators National Conference, 1938, 141-155.

Dahl, R. W. Faculty in the two-year college. In Collins W. Burnett (Ed.), The community and junior college. Lexington, Kentucky: Center for Professional Development, College of Education, University of Kentucky, n.d., 95-116.

Eaton, J. M. A study of orientation of new faculty members in Michigan community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964). Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25, 6329. (University Microfilms No. 65-01733).

Eckert, R. E., & Stecklein, J. E. Career motivations and satisfactions of junior college teachers. Junior College Journal, 1959, 30 (2), 83-89.

Eels, W. C. The junior college. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.

Eliason, N. C. Part-time faculty: A national perspective. New Directions for Community Colleges, 1980, 8(2), 1-12.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. About the faculty: A brief highlighting important literature since 1971 on faculty characteristics, attitudes, satisfaction, preparation, evaluation, and collective bargaining. Los Angeles: Author, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 125 702).

Faxon, J. (Chairperson). The status of the arts in Michigan. (Report on the Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts). Lansing, MI.: Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts, 1974.

Feman, M. K. A study of the music program at Orange City Community College. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Ferrett, S. K. The implementation of a staff development program for part-time faculty in a community college based on Havelock's theoretical model of the change process: A case study (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 3292A. (University Microfilms No. 76-27093)

Fleming, J. R. The pre-service preparation of junior college vocal music teachers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 526A. (University Microfilms No. 72-09069).

Frankel, J. Junior college faculty job satisfaction. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 081-425).

Freidlander, J. We are satisfied with our jobs; It's only the working conditions that we don't like. In The humanities in two-year colleges: Faculty characteristics. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1976, 61-68. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 130 721).

Friedlander, J. Instructional practices of part-time faculty in community colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, San Diego, California, May 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 169 971).

Gaddy, D. Faculty recruitment. Junior College Research Review, 1969, 4 (1). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Nol ED 032 864).

Gannon, P. J. Fifty years of community involvement in Michigan. In R. Yarrington (Ed.), Junior colleges: 50 states/50 years. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. 104-115.

Gaff, J. G. Toward faculty renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Gagermeier, M. J. The role of music in the junior college (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28, 5089A. (University Microfilms No. 68-07602).

Garrison, R. H. Junior college faculty: Issues and problems. A preliminary national appraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 177).

Garrison, R. H. Teaching in a junior college: A brief professional orientation. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Gleazer, E. J., Jr. AACJC approach: Preparation of junior college instructors. Junior College Journal, 1964, 35 (1), 3-4.

Gleazer, E. J., Jr. The community college: Values, vision, and vitality. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.

Gloster, E. D. A faculty morale study in a community college. Unpublished doctoral practicum, Nova University, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 111 453).

Goetz, E. Music in the junior college today. In Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1939-1940, 30, 392-399.

Goetz, E. Junior college music. In Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1939-1940, 30, 388-391.

Greene, C. M. The scope and function of music in the community colleges under the supervision of the state university of New York (Doctoral disseration, Florida State University, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 29, 751A. (University Microfilms No. 69-11,298).

Greenwood, R. P. Making "what's-his-face" feel at home: Integrating part-time faculty. New Directions for Community Colleges, 1980, 8 (2), 55-60.

Grymes, R. J., Jr. A survey and analysis of part-time instructors at J. Sargent Reynolds Community College. Richmond, Va.: J. Sargent Reynolds Community College, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 125 687).

Guthrie-Morse, B. The utilization of part-time faculty. Community College Frontiers, 1979, 7 (3), 8-17.

Hammons, J., Wallace, T. H., Smith & Watts, G. Staff development in the Community college: A handbook. (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges topical paper No. 66). Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 154 887).

Hendrix, V. L. Functional relationships of junior college environments and selected characteristics of faculties, students, the administration, and the community. (Office of Education, Project No. 5-0770). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Hill, M. D. The relationship between socialization, experience, reference group identity and attitudes of community college faculty. (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 777A. (University Microfilms No. 76-17, 175).

Hood, M. V. Music in American education: our heritage demands action, not defense. Music Educators Journal, 1952, 38 (6), 17-19.

Hoth, E. K. Factors of faculty job satisfaction as related to communication satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 40, 5702A. (University Microfilms No. 8010145).

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. Educational administration. New York: Random House, 1978.

Hudgins, J. W., Jr. A critical analysis of the pre-service preparation for music instructors in public junior colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1959). Dissertation Abstracts, 1960, 20, 2659. (University Microfilms No. 59-06714).

Jamerson, F. The community college teacher: A confused identity. Community College Frontiers, 1979, 7 (3), 4-7.

Jansen, U. H. Music curricula in the junior colleges. Unpublished paper. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 050 714).

Kelley, W., & Wilbur, L. Teaching in the community junior college. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Kelly, M., & Connolly, J. Orientation for faculty in junior colleges. (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges Monograph No. 10). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, June, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 043 323).

Kepple, R. A. The relationship between selected status characteristics and job satisfaction of two-year college faculty (Doctoral dissertation, American University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 5890A. (University Microfilms No. 7907555).

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Koltai, L. The part-time faculty and the community college. Speech given at the Conference on Part-time Teachers, Inglewood, California, January 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 118 174).

Kuhns, E. P. Part-time faculty. Junior College Journal, 1963, 33, (5), 8-12.

Kurth, E. L., and Mills, E. R. Analysis of degree of faculty satisfaction in Florida community-junior colleges. Final report. Gainesville: Florida University, Institute of Higher Education, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 027 902).

Kyre, K. K. A comparative description of part-time and full-time faculty in the South Carolina technical education system on selected characteristics pertinent to the teaching role (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1982, 42, 2992A. (University Microfilms No. 8129329).

Lansing Community College Open Admissions Committee. Report of the open admissions committee. Unpublished manuscript, Lansing Community College (Michigan), 1980.

Leslie, D. W., Kellams, S. E., & Gunne, G. M. Part-time faculty in American higher education. New York: Praeger, 1982.

Levy, L. Significance of similarities and differences between community college teaching groups. Junior College Journal, 1958, 28 (8), 444-451.

Lincoln, H. B. (Ed.). Directory of music faculties in colleges and universities, U.S. and Canada: 1972-1974 (4th ed.). Binghamton, N.Y.: College Music Society, 1972.

Lombardi, J. Part-time faculty in community colleges. (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges topical paper NO. 54). Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 115 316).

London, H. B. In between: The community college teacher. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1980, 448, 62-73.

Lopp, J. E. A curriculum analysis of problems in the music curricula of selected junior colleges in Georgia (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 5591A. (University Microfilms No. 74-04834).

Macnow, G. Two-year colleges thriving. Detroit Free Press, September 2, 1981, pp. 1A, 11A.

Martensen, T. A suggestive music program for Texas junior colleges. In Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1939-1940, 30, 402-409.

Mason, R. J. Designing music programs for junior colleges. Music Educators Journal, 1968, 54 (8), 89-93.

Martorana, S. V. The community college in Michigan (The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan, Staff Study No. 1). Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, 1956.

McCall, H. R., Jamrich, J. X., Hereford, K. T., & Friedman, B. D. Problems of new faculty members in colleges and universities. East Lansing, MI.: Michigan State University, 1961.

Medsker, L. The junior college: Progress and prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Medsker, L., & Tillery, D. Breaking the access barriers: A profile of two-year colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Merkel, R. P. An investigation of the duties and responsibilities of music teachers in Michigan two-year colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 3355A. (University Microfilms No. 77-26309).

Moorehead, R. E. An analysis of faculty job satisfaction in the public regional community colleges and the state technical colleges of Connecticut (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 635A. (University Microfilms No. 7917363).

Monroe, C. R. Profile of a community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Morgan, H. B. An evaluation of adequacy of graduate music offerings at California colleges and universities. Los Angeles: Claremont Graduate School and University Center, 1966. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 017 066).

Moss, F. P. The perception of selected faculty of the departments of music of Alabama state universities of the music major transfer students from Alabama state junior colleges (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 3356A. (University Microfilms No. 77-25873).

National Association of Schools of Music. Guidelines for junior college music programs. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1972.

National Association of Schools of Music. NASM Handbook 1981. Reston, Va.: Author, 1981.

National Center for Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education Division, 1979.

National Education Association. Higher education faculty: Characteristics and opinions. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 174 154).

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

O'Banion, T. Teachers for tomorrow: Staff development in the community-junior college. Tucson, AR.: University of Arizona Press, 1972.

O'Banion, T. Staff development: A priority on persons. In Roger Yarrington, (Ed.), New Staff for new students: Educational opportunity for all. (Report of the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974, 23-41. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 089 803).

Palinchak, R. S. The evolution of the community college. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Park, Y. Junior college faculty: Their values and perceptions. (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges Monograph No. 12). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Junior Colleges, June 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 050 725).

Parsons, M. H. Realizing part-time faculty potential. New Directions for Community Colleges, 1980, 8 (2), 47-54.

Pollard, J. M. The scope and nature of music programs in rural public community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 3899A. (University Microfilms No. 77-29569).

Quanty, M. Part-time instructor survey. Overland Park, Kansas: Johnson County Community College, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 127 000).

Raney, C. Community college and the educational assistant. College Music Symposium, 1972, 12, 14-19.

Reiss, M. The place of the junior college in training musicians. Music Educators Journal, 1950, 36, (3), 20-21.

Robinson, J. P., Athanasiou, R., & Head, K. B. Measures of occupational attitudes and occupational characteristics. Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, 1969.

Sanders, A. D. Faculty morale: A study of a community college system. In C. Burnett (Ed.), The two-year institution in American higher education. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky, 1971, 45-52.

Schmeltekopf, D. D. Professional status and community college faculty: The role of the associations. New Directions for Community Colleges, 1983, 10 (3), 77-89.

Schneider, E. H., & Cady, H. L. Evaluation and synthesis of research studies related to music education. Cooperative Research Porject No. E- 016, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1965.

Schultz, R. E. A historical perspective of community college teachers and teaching. In O. K. McCullough (Ed.), Proceedings: Conference on the Community/junior college. Knoxville: University of Tennessee College of Education, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 188 702).

Shank, P. C. An exploratory investigation of the inter-relationships among the primary elements within the rewards system, position requirements and position satisfactions for faculty in six colleges of education in Michigan (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 29, 1736A. (University Microfilms No. 68-17132).

Short, C. R. (Ed.). Directory of music faculties in colleges and universities. U.S. and Canada, 1974-1976 (5th ed.). Binghamton, N.Y.: College Music Society, 1974.

Siehr, H. E. Problems of new faculty in community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962). Dissertation Abstracts, 1963, 24, 596. (University Microfilms No. 63-01757).

Siehr, H. E., Jamrich, J., & Hereford, K. T. Problems of new faculty members in community colleges. East Lansing, MI.: Michigan State University, 1963.

Sillman, D. Sources and information: Using part-time faculty effectively. New Directions for Community Colleges, 1980, 8 (2), 89-100.

Sly, A. The music department of the junior college. Proceedings of the Music Teachers National Association, 1947, 41, 94-103.

Stoops, J. A. Teachers for the community college. In John A. Stoops, (Ed.), The community college in higher education. Bethlehem, PA.: Lehigh University Press, 1966, 51-67.

Stover, E. L., Clausen, L. P., Hansen, C., & Hammer, H. Music in the junior college. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1970.

Sunderman, K. F. Historical foundations of music education in the United States. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971.

Viggiano, F. A. A new look at the junior college music program. Junior College Journal, 1955, 26 (3), 159-163.

Wager, W. J., & McGrath, E. J. Liberal education and music. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1962.

Weisberg, H. F., & Bowen, B. D. An introduction to survey research and data analysis. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1977.

White, C. H. Music philosophies, faculites, and curriculums. Junior College Journal, 1967, 37, (7), 20-21.

Wille, J. H. An analysis of career motivations and job satisfactions among public community college faculty in selected states (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 42, 1455A. (University Microfilms No. 8122252).

Wilson, R. C., Gaff, J. G., Dienst, E. R., Wood, L., & Barry, J. L. College professors and their impact on students. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Wolfram, V. Music in the junior college. Junior College Journal, 1957, 28 (4), 216-219.

Wozniak, L. C. A study of the relationship of selected variables and the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction of music faculty in two-year colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 2349A. (University Microfilms No. 73-25151).

Wurster, S. R. Community junior college faculty: Needs, characteristics, and sources. Unpublished paper, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 036 294).

Youngman, M. B. Analyzing social and educational research data. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.