71-15,068

SUPER, Sister Dolores, 1930-
MUSICAL PERFORMANCE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION: 1850 TO 1951.

The University of Michigan, Ed.D., 1970
Music

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

MUSICAL PERFORMANCE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION: 1850 to 1951

by

Sister Dolores Super

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
(Music)
in the University of Michigan
1970

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Allen P. Britton, Chairman
Professor Robert T. Blackburn
Associate Professor Robert C. Clark
Professor Marguerite V. Hood
Professor Eugene W. Troth

ABSTRACT

MUSICAL PERFORMANCE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION: 1850 TO 1951

by
Sister Dolores Super

Chairman: Allen P. Britton

Musical performance, which to many persons represents the art of music, has long been a part of the musical life of the American college and university. However, the granting of academic credit for performance was only initiated in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Unfortunately, the musical profession as such and the performer in particular did not enjoy the prestige of other professions whose schools comprised units of the university.

The university ideal in music spelled out by John S. Dwight in 1877 presupposed the incorporation in the university of a school of music to give instruction in both the scholarly and artistic aspects of the art. This ideal was exemplified in one American university in the nineteenth century. The relationship of professional to liberal education was carefully spelled out in the affiliation of the New England Conservatory of Music with Boston University in 1872. Unfortunately, the affiliation was discontinued with the death of the founder of the conservatory, Eben Tourjee, in 1891.

Although the nineteenth century liberal arts college generally allowed credit only for the study of music history and theory, the affiliation of conservatories with colleges provided opportunities for vocal and instrumental instruction

for many students. Accounts of higher education in thirty-four states, compiled by the U. S. Bureau of Education between 1887 and 1903, revealed widespread opportunities for the study of performance in college conservatories throughout the country.

The importance of the Music Teachers National Association in gaining academic credit for performance is noteworthy. This organization acted as an open forum in which arguments for and against the inclusion of performance in the music curriculum of higher education were aired. In addition, many studies undertaken by the group between 1897 and 1934 revealed the gradual acceptance of performance in the curriculum.

Other studies of music in higher education completed between 1906 and 1935 by such agencies as the U. S. Bureau of Education, the Association of American Colleges, and the National Bureau for the Advancement of Music provided a rationale for the gradual inclusion of performance in colleges and universities: (1) Prejudices against any subject could not keep a subject out of the curriculum once it had been well taught. (2) State universities, particularly those in the Midwest and West, won acceptance for the study of all aspects of music by including among their professional schools a school of music. (3) Since the best possible music instruction available in many parts of the country was found in the college conservatory, music study undertaken there merited academic credit.

In establishing minimum requirements for the bacca-

laureate and graduate degrees in music over a period of twenty-five years, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) brought to a focus the workings of many individuals. Minimum standards for the Bachelor of Music degree were promulgated in 1929, those for the Bachelor of Arts degree in performance in 1933, and those for the Master of Music degree in 1938. In 1951, with the NASM approval of the Doctor of Musical Arts degree program in two American universities, the recognition of musical performance in higher education from the baccalaureate through the doctoral level had been achieved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Dr. Allen P. Britton for guidance in the preparation of this thesis and to Dr. Robert T. Blackburn, Mr. Robert C. Clark, Miss Marguerite V. Hood, and Dr. Eugene W. Troth for their help and encouragement. To members of my Benedictine community and my family special thanks are due for their innumerable manifestations of support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION. 1

Chapter

I. MUSICAL PERFORMANCE: ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES IN EARLY AMERICA 4

II. MUSICAL PERFORMANCE AND AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION TO 1900. 12

III. MUSICAL PERFORMANCE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION: 1900-1925. 69

IV. MUSICAL PERFORMANCE IN BACCALAUREATE AND GRADUATE DEGREES IN MUSIC: 1925-1951. . . . 123

SUMMARY 163

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 165

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Standards Assigned to Music Curricula in Institutions of Higher Education 85

2. Performance and Theoretical Study of Music Curricula in Higher Education 86

INTRODUCTION

Musical performance, to many persons the sum and substance of what is meant by music, has been the most controversial subject of all the studies which comprise the music curriculum in higher education. Pleas for the recognition of the artistic aspect of a college musical education span nearly a century of educational discussion.

For example, in 1877, John S. Dwight stated that the ideal university in the United States "should cover under its maternal wing a Complete School of Music, on an equal footing with its Schools of Medicine, of Law, [and] Theology."[1] In 1894, W. S. B. Mathews noted that to "any good musician" a musical education included not only a knowledge of the literature, but also the "mechanically-psychological art of reproducing it in sound."[2] In the same year, Waldo Selden Pratt argued that the university, a miniature society, must include all the aspects of music found in the larger world. Music in higher education, therefore, presupposed the "technical treatment" of the best conservatories. Pratt stated:

> We have our own musical centres, with their organized resources and institutions. It is a reasonable question

---

[1]"Who Will Endow Music in the University? I," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXVII (Aug. 18, 1877), 78.

[2]"Music as Discipline and Culture," Music, VI (July 1894), 351.

> whether all our large universities are not proper places to become in some degree such centres for musical and other artistic work as they already are for scientific and literary work.[1]

Some seventy years later, Wiley L. Housewright, president of the Music Educators National Conference, issued a statement similar to that of Pratt. Colleges and universities in the United States were obliged to erect creative arts centers devoted to the education of both highly literate amateurs as well as competent professional musicians.[2] In 1968, Lawrence E. Dennis, speaking for the American Association for Higher Education, explicitly stated the responsibility of universities for the education of the professional artist:

> Universities are now generally accepted, both by the public and by the artistic community, as logically the major training centers for professional artists. So assertively has the university assumed its responsibilities for the training of professional artists in recent years that it is now not possible to consider any other agencies in our society as having the resources and commitments necessary to serve as training centers for professional artists. . . . It is safe to predict that in the seventies, universities, in addition to the many academic and public service functions they already perform, will become cultural magnets attracting a wide range of professional artists to training and professional development programs under university auspices.[3]

An examination of educational developments during the

1"Music as a University Study," Music, VI (August 1894), 419-420.

2"Music in Higher Education," MEJ, LIV (October 1967), 107-109.

3"The Arts Study Project," in The Arts in Higher Education, ed. by Lawrence E. Dennis and Renate M. Jacob (Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1968), p. 17.

time spanned by the above statements reveals the many-faceted elements which have shaped the attitudes toward and the place of performance in the study of music in higher education. This study is an examination of such elements from the inclusion of musical performance in the college curriculum to the establishment of the professional doctorate for the performer. In order to understand developments, the inquiry includes an investigation of the way in which higher education developed in the United States as well as attitudes toward musical performance from the earliest days of American life.

CHAPTER I

MUSICAL PERFORMANCE: ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES IN EARLY AMERICA

England, the homeland of the majority of colonists who arrived in the new world during the first half of the seventeenth century, was a land known for its long musical heritage. In seventeenth century English life, vocal and instrumental music was widely practiced by humble artisans as well as accomplished musicians. "From beggar to sovereign, Englishmen sang music, played music, and heard music."[1]

Despite allegations by historians that the Puritans worked "disastrous effects upon the evolution of musical art in New England,"[2] this faction of English colonists had a healthy respect for the practice of music. However, the religious leitmotif pervading the entire fabric of living regulated the hierarchy of values by which the Puritans lived. Music had its particular place in this value system: praiseworthy and promoted in weekly worship, lawful and admitted in daily living. The ordinary colonist may not have owned a virginal or viol, but he did have his voice which he was obligated to

---

[1]Irving Lowens, Music and Musicians in Early America (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 17-18.

[2]W. L. Hubbard, ed., The American History and Encyclopedia of Music (New York: Irving Squire, 1910), VIII, 140.

use as an instrument to praise God in the singing of psalms, and which he surely must have used as a means of enjoyment in the home.

As prosperity and trading with the homeland increased, instruments, presumably for private enjoyment, became more common in the colonies. Nonetheless, despite a basic regard for the art, the attitude toward musical performance as an "expendable in the Puritan scale of values"[1] is evidenced early in the American life. The attitude toward music as an ornament rather than an essential element of life, although not original with the American Puritan,[2] is recorded within the first half century of colonization in a letter from Leonard Hoar to his nephew, a student at Harvard (1661):

> Music I had almost forgot. I suspect you seek it both to soon and to much. This be assured of that if you be not excellent at it its worth nothing at all. And if you be excellent it will take up so much of your mind and time that you will be worth little else; and when all that excellence is obtained your acquest will prove little or nothing of real profit to you unlesse

---

[1]Lowens, p. 26.

[2]Constance Rourke, in The Roots of American Culture (Port Washington, N. Y.: Kennikat Press, Inc., 1942), traces this concept to the new Renaissance man of wealth whose affluence proceeded from commercial interests. "Not only the gentleman but the new man of wealth appeared in the Renaissance, who if he could not practice the arts could buy them. . . . For the rich person the arts were no longer common or broadly practised as in the rural feudalisms of the Middle Ages. They became an adornment, a symbol of wealth, . . . and thus something which could be added to or subtracted from life, but not an inherent or necessary part of it" (27-28). "It was inevitable that these ideas should have their influence here [America]: they were the conscious ideas of the arts with which our culture began, streaming down from the late Renaissance" (34).

> you intend to take upon the trade of fidling. Howbeit hearing your mother's desires were for it for your sisters, for whom it is more proper and they also have more leizure to look after it: For them I say I had provided the instruments desired.[1]

This letter, with its allusions to music as a feminine study and as a debilitating endeavor, was one of the first recorded examples of an attitude toward musical performance that later hindered the acceptance of the artistic study of music in institutions of higher learning.

To understand the place of musical performance in the lives of colonists in seventeenth and eighteenth century America, one must distinguish between musical practices in the northern and southern colonies. The northern colonies, guided by strict religious tenets, had, as noted, a place for music in their scale of values. The southern colonies, peopled primarily by Englishmen loyal to the Crown and Church of England, imitated, as far as possible, musical practices of English society. Like fashionable Londoners, prosperous southern planters engaged dancing and music masters to provide entertainment and instruction for their families.[2] To perform on an instrument was a social accomplishment. Thus, sons and daughters of the landed gentry learned to play an instrument

---

[1]Quoted in John T. Howard, Our American Music (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1946), p. 21.

[2]A clear exposition of the role these teachers played in musical performance among southern colonists is found in Norman A. Benson, The Itinerant Dancing and Music Masters of Eighteenth Century America (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1963).

as part of a polite education.

Factors contributed both by the northern and southern colonies are included in the haphazard listing Sonneck puts together as elements shaping eighteenth century American musical environment and hence also defining the limits of musical performance:

> After 1720 we notice a steadily growing number of musicians who sought their fortunes in the Colonies, an increasing desire for organs, flutes, guitars, violins, harpsichords, the establishment of "singing schools", an improvement in church music, the signs of a budding music trade from ruled music paper to sonatas and concertos, the advent of music engravers, publishers and manufacturers of instruments, and tentative efforts to give English opera a home in America, [and] the introduction of public concerts.[1]

The need, initially in the South and later throughout the colonies, for organists and for instructors and professional performers accounted for the influx of musicians and the growth of musical trade. These needs satisfied an ever prospering society whose aristocratic leanings made possible the transplanting of fashionable European ideals: musical performance as entertainment and as part of a polite education.[2]

---

[1]O. G. Sonneck, Early Concert-Life in America: 1731-1800 (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1907), pp. 8-9.

[2]That music was considered an "expendable" in life continued to be recorded in American thinking. Entries in the diary of John Adams read: "By the Way Peter Chardon is a promising Youth. He aspires, and will reach to a considerable Height. . . . This fellows Thoughts are not employed on Songs and Girls, nor his Time, on flutes, fiddles, Concerts and Card Tables. He will make Something." Similarly, "I would not however conclude, peremptorily, against sending Sons or Daughters to dancing, or Fencing, or Musick, but had much rather they should be ignorant of em all than fond of any one of em." Diary and Autobiography of John Adams, ed. L. H. Butterfield (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1961), I, 46; II, 46-47.

Although the possession of musical instruments and the performances of gentlemen amateurs could be found outside the South in eighteenth century America, the chief vehicle for musical performance among the people was the singing school begun and promoted in the North by clergymen desirous of improving psalm singing in the churches. This institution created an environment that led to the demand of a native repertoire. By 1800, literally hundreds of tunebooks whose musical roots lay deep in popular culture appeared and were the tangible expression of an art-form of the people.

Thus, by the end of the eighteenth century elements favorable to the growth of musical performance were present in American society. Not the least of these was the measure of musical literacy achieved by the efforts of the singing school master who, as the nation expanded, extended his influence from New England into all the settled areas of the country. Although musical literacy is not absolutely essential for musical performance, it certainly is a powerful incentive toward singing and playing. A huge segment of the American population must have enjoyed this attainment if we can believe Lowens that:

> Carpenters, physicians, storekeepers, legislators, farmers, blacksmiths, printers, painters, schoolteachers, tavern-keepers, lawyers, newspaper editors, housewives, hatters, tanners, members of virtually every trade and profession that can be mentioned, not only sang and played music but taught it and wrote it.[1]

---

[1]Lowens, p. 192.

The Englishmen who came to America initially as organists in Anglican congregations and later in the reformed churches helped create an interest in instrumental musical performance by providing opportunities for instruction on many instruments and by establishing shops for the sale of instruments and music.[1] High praise for their contribution to American musical growth has been given these organists whose preparation and performance, regarded as more than ordinary musical skill by the average citizen, helped to weaken but not, unfortunately, to dispel the prejudice against persons who devoted themselves exclusively to music:

> It is to these early church organists that the chief credit belongs for creating among the people a taste for instrumental music. Their efforts were not confined to organ playing alone, for many of them were excellent performers on the harpsichord, spinet, viol, and other instruments as well.[2]

Thus, music in America during its first 150 years may have been provincial, but it was not primitive.[3] Attitudes toward musical performance as well as performance practices were an outgrowth of those of the homeland in addition to the native contribution of the singing school.

Consequently, nineteenth century musical practices flowed from the earlier singing and instrumental experiences. However, political and economic factors colored the attitudes

---

[1]For example, a music store was opened in Boston as early as 1714. By midcentury, musical merchandise such as opera scores, chamber music, concertos, militia marches, flutes, violins, and viols was available to Bostonians. See: Benson, p. 377.

[2]Hubbard, pp. 257-258

[3]Sonneck, p. 324.

and practices. The first leaders of the new republic had been the learned men of the day, the men of culture. Early in the nineteenth century, at a time when the expanding country was undergoing rapid economic development, a democratic element with a strong belief in the "superiority of inborn intuitive, folkish wisdom"[1] opposed the cultivated, learned gentlemen, came into public power, and pervaded American life.

The earlier interest in musical performance, however, continued. The energy and enterprise of the citizens in the new democracy produced wealth that paid for the services of trained European professionals immigrating into the republic. Some of these musicians became residents and helped establish permanent musical organizations, choral and instrumental. Others crisscrossed the country under the auspices of such impresarios as P. T. Barnum. A certain flamboyant spirit that enveloped the prospering nation, especially the rapidly growing frontier areas, applauded and learned to expect virtuosity.

These and other enterprises spurred popular interest, and after 1865, the total number of private music teachers "increased prodigiously"[2] throughout the nation. Performances awakened a desire for instruction; instruction

---

[1]Richard Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), p. 154. A detailed account of the decline of the patrician elite is given in pages 145 to 171.

[2]Waldo S. Pratt, ed., Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, American Supplement (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920), VI, 33.

created an environment for the sale of musical products. By midcentury, some 200 establishments manufactured musical instruments.[1]

Those Americans, however, who wanted advanced training in performance went to the European conservatories, or after 1870, to conservatories established in various parts of this country. Policy makers in American higher education had no need to be concerned with the aspirations of those seeking a higher musical education since students desiring such an education obtained it in institutions outside the realm of the traditional college. However, with the agitation for the inclusion of professional education at the undergraduate level, colleges and universities had to face the issue of accepting for college credit courses in the scholarly and artistic aspects of music study.

---

[1]Pratt, p. 15.

CHAPTER II

MUSICAL PERFORMANCE AND AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION TO 1900

A survey of music courses in colleges and universities in the United States in 1897 revealed that, although 172 of 300 institutions provided instruction in music, only 36 granted academic credit for both the scholarly and artistic study of music. This ambivalence--the evident willingness of administrators to provide facilities for musical study with the general reluctance to grant credit for any or all musical study--was due in large measure to the nature of American higher education as such, and to popular attitudes toward music which tended to belittle musical performance in the eyes of college men. This chapter treats of both these developments as well as of the place and status of musical performance in colleges and universities in the United States to 1900.

The Development of Higher Education in the United States

Harvard College, established in 1636 "to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity"[1] was patterned on the English college from which the Puritan colonist had been

---

[1] New England's First Fruits, 1643, reprinted in Old South Leaflets, Vol. III, No. 51 (Boston: Directors of the Old South Work, n.d.), p. 1.

graduated. Harvard's first candidates for the baccalaureate degree in 1642, like the candidates in English colleges, had been tutored in prescribed studies, and on commencement day, recited "exercises" in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and in addition presented answers to logical, ethical, physical, and metaphysical questions.[1]

The prescribed course of study had its roots in the medieval liberal arts, in Aristotelian philosophy, and in Renaissance humanistic studies. At Harvard, between 1640 and 1724, the prescribed studies included logic, rhetoric, Greek, Hebrew, ethics, metaphysics, and to a lesser degree, mathematics and natural sciences.[2] The Harvard resident fellows in 1721 described the content and aims of an education in the liberal arts throughout the college's first century of existence thus:

> Now the great End for which the College was founded, was a Learned, and pious Education of youth, their Instruction in Languages, Arts, and Sciences, and having their minds and manners form'd aright.[3]

At no time did the "Arts" referred to by the Harvard fellows include the art of music among the prescribed studies. The musical activities, sacred and secular, recorded among Harvard students as early as Leonard Hoar's letter in 1661 refusing to

---

[1]George Gary Bush, History of Higher Education in Massachusetts, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information 1891, No. 6 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1891), p. 34.

[2]Samuel E. Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard: 1636-1936 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1946), pp. 29-30.

[3]Quoted in Morison, p. 23.

send musical instruments to his nephew at Harvard remained peripheral to the main goals of the college.

The fundamental character of the college as exemplified in the first century of Harvard's existence remained unchanged among the nearly 180 colleges founded in the nation prior to the Civil War. The content, methods, and aims of the newer colleges resembled those of the earliest institutions.[1] The goals of a collegiate education as expressed in the Yale Report of 1828 were an extension of those of the Harvard statement a century earlier:

> The two great points to be gained in intellectual culture, are the discipline and the furniture of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge.[2]

If anything, the Yale Report underscored the belief that a "liberal education, . . . a course of discipline . . . to strengthen and enlarge the faculties of the mind," was acquired through prescribed studies built upon the "Languages, Arts, and Sciences."[3] However, the very need to issue a statement confirming a course of study which through the years had acquired a certain permanence exhibited the concern of the Yale faculty over new pressures affecting institutions of higher learning. In answer to the question whether the colleges should respond to the needs of the country and of its citizens, the faculty

---

[1]George P. Schmidt, "Intellectual Crosscurrents in American Colleges, 1825-1855," The American Historical Review, XLII (October 1936), 47.

[2]"Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education," American Journal of Science, XV (January 1829), 300.

[3]"Original Papers," p. 324.

agreed that the traditional college had an obligation to remain true to established policies rather than to lower standards by admitting new studies into the curriculum. A disdain for colleges not measuring up to revered standards was evident in the faculty response to this question:

> We are not sure, that the demand for thorough education is, at present, sufficient to fill all the colleges in the United States, with students who will be satisfied with nothing short of high and solid attainments. But it is to be hoped that, at no very distant period, they will be able to come up to this elevated ground, and leave the business of second-rate education to the inferior seminaries.[1]

The primacy of the educational aims of eastern colleges among newer institutions founded in the central and southern states is evident from results of a study of college aims written between 1852 and 1876. Of the twenty-seven statements examined, more than half listed mental discipline and character development as the prime goals of a liberal education.[2]

Although objectives such as were found in the above study remained uppermost in the minds of many college administrators, other nineteenth century developments aided the expansion of aims and range of studies in higher education. Reassessments of the content and goals of a liberal education appeared. At the meeting of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1873, W. P. Atkinson of the Massachusetts Institute of

---

[1]"Original Papers," p. 321.

[2]Leonard V. Koos and C. C. Crawford, "College Aims Past and Present," School and Society, XIV (Dec. 3, 1921), 500. Mental discipline was included in twenty-two statements and morality and character in fifteen.

Technology reaffirmed the value of mental discipline as a main goal of a college education. However, Atkinson pointed out the necessity of considering new conditions in society and the accumulation of knowledge as forces influencing liberal education in the nineteenth century.[1] Atkinson cited as examples of these forces the advances in modern sciences and the attempt to combine democratic ideals with traditional education so as "to make the education of the whole people liberal," in place of the former "privileged classes and protected professions."[2]

Finally, these new forces included the "growing perception that art and aesthetic culture are equally necessary as an element in all education worthy of the name."[3] The very fact that Atkinson included the arts among factors to be considered in higher education was significant. Although by 1873 colleges were beginning to incorporate scientific subjects into the curriculum and were providing educational opportunities for women, few were welcoming music courses into the curriculum. Atkinson recognized this fact and admitted that the NEA need not spend time then discussing the implications of this force since there would be an "abundance of time" before the arts came into the mainstream of higher education.[4]

In addition to attempts to redefine the content of

---

[1]"Liberal Education of the Nineteenth Century," NEA Proceedings (Elmira, N. Y., 1873), pp. 141-163.

[2]Atkinson, p. 142. Among the "whole people" Atkinson included in colleges were women.

[3]Atkinson, p. 142.

[4]Atkinson, p. 162.

liberal education as such, colleges and universities found themselves forced to respond to occupational needs of the community and broaden the curriculum rather than lose students to emerging technical schools. A broadened curriculum necessitated some type of elective system; an elective system opened the door to specialization at the college level. Research techniques acquired by American students in the German universities promoted the cause of specialization and hence advanced the development of professional schools and graduate departments. Private colleges added professional and graduate departments and expanded into universities. In addition, new universities provided for by individual state constitutions were founded as the capstone of a system of public instruction directly responsible to the needs of the constituency.

In 1903, Charles F. Thwing, historian of higher education in the United States, in reviewing the development of the nation's universities, stated:

> The recognition of the value of all studies as disciplines has become general and hearty. Although there is a great difference between knowledge as knowledge and the same knowledge used as a subject for the training of youth, yet it has become evident that knowledge of any department of being may be so formed and formulated as to become a worthy academic discipline. The American university therefore usually includes in its curriculum all knowledges.[1]

If, in theory, the recognition of the value of all studies as worthy academic disciplines included the study of music in its entirety, in practice, the implementation of

---

[1]"American Universities," in Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1903 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905), pp. 305-306.

its general and hearty acceptance was slow in reaching the majority of institutions. Thwing recognized this, and with regard to the arts in higher education, stated:

> A political democracy is prone to make its fine arts merely decorative. It is hard to teach or to convince people that the fine arts minister to the highest education of man. The university, however, through both teaching and example should impress upon the democractic community that painting and poetry, architecture, sculpture, and music represent fundamental desires, passions, and needs of the human character.[1]

Changes in educational policy have always come about slowly. Despite the expressed need of vocational and pre-professional offerings at the undergraduate level, the National Council of Education in 1886 issued a statement on goals in higher education which reaffirmed the position of the Yale faculty in 1828. Listed in order of importance, these aims were: (1) to train the separate faculties of the mind; (2) to open the mind to truth; (3) to accumulate knowledge; (4) to develop character. Last in order of importance was the goal: (5) to unfold individual talents.[2] Furthermore, the prescribed curriculum was advocated. Other "incidental and self-assumed" activities, such as athletics or fine arts, were cited as beneficial, but were not to be included among the regular college studies:

> The best benefit comes from the intermingling of these duties [athletics and fine arts] incidental and self-assumed, with regular, required work. . . . What rich

---

[1]Thwing, p. 311.

[2]A. L. Chapin, "Higher Institutions Required," NEA Proceedings (Topeka, Kansas, 1886), pp. 285-286.

> contributions of refined thought and practical invention the world has received from the incidental activities of busy men in what they called their odd hours or minutes of leisure or recreation![1]

According to an assessment by Pratt in 1920, the wide variety of educational opportunities in nineteenth century America, although long ignoring artistic aspirations, steadily paved the way for the "rational pursuits of artistic topics" in educational institutions.[2] Despite the fact that the National Council of Education regarded the arts as peripheral to higher education, the interest in music created by the activities of performing organizations, private teaching, public school music, and commercial enterprise, and colored by the "peculiar zeal in America for the development of education democratically,"[3] affected higher education. In the latter years of the nineteenth century colleges began to accept credits in music toward the baccalaureate degree. The scholarly aspects of music could and were more easily adapted to respected college standards. To provide an equal acceptance for musical performance revealed prejudices and attitudes that worked against the incorporation of musical performance as an accepted college study.

Attitudes Affecting the Place of Performance in Higher Education

Deprecation of performance. Generally speaking, the

---

[1]Chapin, p. 289.

[2]Waldo Selden Pratt (ed.), Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, American Supplement (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920), VI, 32.

[3]Pratt, p. 33.

nineteenth century American could not conceive of musical performance as a profession worthy of anyone's total devotion.[1] The profession was considered useful as the means of making a little pin money,[2] for what other accomplishment provided immediately gainful returns while at the same time leaving adequate opportunity to attend to other business?[3] But as a profession, musical performance was considered beneath the "earnest, thoughtful attention of men who have solid work to do."[4] This attitude stemmed mainly from two sources: a regard for performance as technical exhibition devoid of any mental action and a regard for music as a feminine study.

During the first half of the nineteenth century the majority of professional musicians in the United States were foreigners some of whom made brief tours through the states while others settled in various parts of the country. Many were seasoned artists whose performance and instruction "spread a knowledge of standard musical works and of executive skill,"[5] but many others were merely "transient exploiters."[6] The transient exploiters" left their mark in communities, and according

---

[1]"The Conservatory of Music," Dwight's Journal of Music, I (April 24, 1852), 19.

[2]Frederic Louis Ritter, Music in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), p. 405.

[3]N. Lincoln, "Music--A Somewhat Practical View," Dwight's Journal of Music, XL (March 13, 1880), 41.

[4]John Fillmore, "How Shall We Increase the Respect of Educated Men for Music and Musicians?" The Etude, VIII (January, 1890), 204.

[5]Pratt, p. 21.

[6]Pratt, p. 82.

to the editor of Dwight's Journal of Music, affected a "numerous section" who believed that "to play brilliantly is accounted the thing," and to whom perfection in the art had more to do with the "fingers rather than the feelings."[1]

Advocates in 1873 for a national conservatory of music clearly exposed this type of performance as the cause of so much harm to the musical profession:

> The star-system is justly regarded as an evil, which carries away the money, and substitutes exhibitions for performances, elevates execution above composition, ministers to the egotism of the performer, and results in a sensation show, with conjuror tricks and acrobat manoeuvres on the part of the executant, based upon a substratum of musical composition.[2]

The United States, before 1867, did not have musical conservatories where students could receive an artistic education comparable to that to be obtained in Europe. However, American students studying in the European schools recognized the need for such an institution as one means of raising the level of musical taste and instruction and thus helping to eliminate the disdainful and indifferent attitude toward musical performance. In 1852, the American correspondent for Dwight's Journal of Music at the Leipzig Conservatory wrote:

> Such an institution is much needed in our country. A Conservatory of Music upon a proper basis, and under suitable regulations, would do much for the advancement of a pure style, and correct taste. It . . . would raise the standard of musical education, and the qualifications of music teachers; and put forth an influence in many ways

---

[1][John S. Dwight], "Fashion Versus Music," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXIV (June 24, 1864), 258.

[2]"A National Conservatorio," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXIII (Sept. 6, 1873), 84.

> to promote the cause of secular and sacred, vocal and instrumental music in the land.[1]

Among the first conservatories in this country to be established on a "proper basis" and under "suitable regulations" was the New England Conservatory of Music founded by Eben Tourjee in 1867. The "very systematic, very comprehensive and very thorough"[2] course of instruction designed by Tourjee became a model for similar instruction in other independent conservatories. Within ten years, music schools had been established in Oberlin, Cincinnati, Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Detroit.[3]

In 1870, the New England Conservatory was incorporated by the Massachusetts Legislature as a nonprofit organization. This phenomenon so impressed Granville Howe that in his account of music in the United States written in 1889, Howe stated:

> One of the most . . . striking features of interest [in the New England Conservatory] is the fact that with all its immense educational machinery and corresponding means for making money, "it yields no profit, dividend or emolument of any kind in any way to any person or association of persons," and this, notwithstanding that its average attendance for the past six years has been 2,065 students.[4]

Before any conservatory in the United States was ten years old, music schools organized primarily for commercial

---

[1]"Concert by the Pupils of the Conservatory of Music," Dwight's Journal of Music, I (May 15, 1852), 44.

[2][Musical Correspondence], Dwight's Journal of Music, XXVI (Nov. 24, 1866), 352.

[3]Pratt, p. 34.

[4]A Hundred Years of Music in America (Chicago: G. L. Howe, 1889), p. 454.

gain rather than any educational benefit were common enough to elicit this forceful censure of the abuse:

> If there is any business in danger of being overdone, it is that of music teaching. . . . [T]he ruling spirit of material acquisition, the money-making spirit, ever on the watch to turn into a marketable commodity whatever interests one's fellowmen . . . is quick to see visions of fat dividends and powerful monopolies in music-making and in music-teaching. . . . . Indeed enterprise does duty for all other talents, knowledges and virtues in our "fast" American idea of life.[1]

Following a description of a grandiose plan of a "Grand National American University of Music" on display in a Boston shop window, the author concluded:

> Now that grand project was a fair type, if an extreme one . . . of the speculating business spirit which runs so many of the music mills,--Conservatories, Schools, Colleges,--in all the cities of the land.[2]

The "speculating business spirit" continued to dominate certain music schools throughout the last quarter of the century. Arthur Manchester, chairman of a national music study for the U. S. Bureau of Education in 1908, stated that, although many conservatories of serious purpose could be found in the country, a "host of independent schools calling themselves Conservatories" existed primarily as money-making enterprises.[3] Unfortunately, providing quality instruction was not the main interest of the school, and the results of poor instruction

---

[1]"Musical Education," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXIII (Aug. 23, 1873), 78.

[2]"Musical Education," p. 78.

[3]Music Education in the United States, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1908, No. 4 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1908), p. 15.

fostered, in the minds of many, the notion that the substance of musical performance was technical display. For example, the average educated American voiced little respect for the musician whose education of three to six months in a city conservatory had equipped him to perform insignificant parlor pieces in a "fluent and showy" manner.[1] Likewise, a college president stated that too often performance study was "merely learning to play pretty, brilliant, or even difficult pieces," and such an accomplishment fostered "narrowness and conceit."[2]

Musicians themselves were among the most forceful critics of that type of musical education which regarded technical facility as the sole goal of study. W. S. B. Mathews, editor of Music, denounced performances which were little more than the "semi-mechanical association of fingers and eyes for reproducing certain printed passages in a certain order."[3] Manchester stated that enough persons were of the opinion that all that was needed to make a musician was a "certain amount of talent, regardless of brains" without musicians themselves manifesting a lack of "intellectual power" in performance.[4] P. C. Hayden summarized the criticisms of musicians when he stated:

Some music teachers . . . have encouraged the idea

---

[1]Fillmore, p. 204.

[2]M. Evans, "Reply to Open Letter," The Etude, VII (April 1889), 53.

[3]"Music as Discipline and Culture," Music, VI (July 1894), 356.

[4]A. L. Manchester, "Music in American Colleges: An Open Letter," Music, I (April 1892), 555.

> that the brilliant performance of fine compositions upon some instrument or with the voice is the only high end in music, and the belief that only the few can hope to attain such heights of acrobatic experience is widespread, deep-seated and founded on ages of experience.[1]

A second reason why musical performance was not considered a worthy lifework was the popular notion that music was a feminine study.[2] The "boarding-school ideal," that is, vocal and instrumental instruction given "simply as a part of the final varnish which the young woman receives before she is shipped into the world of fashionable society,"[3] had roots in traditions surrounding the education of women.

Although women of "education and culture"[4] were found in certain homes of the settlers from the earliest days, it was not generally thought important that women be given educational benefits equal to that of men. The women's place was in the home, and the education proffered her was intended to keep her interests there. Up to and including the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the common elements of education

---

[1]"Music as an Educator," Music, XI (November 1896), 42.

[2]Thomas Hill, in his inaugural address as president of Antioch College in 1859, said: "There is a prevalent impression that music, and the fine arts in general, tend to produce effeminacy of character, and that if education embraces these departments it will have the effect, so far as it goes, of destroying that strength, energy, courage, and love of freedom, which are so essential to national prosperity." See: Integral Education (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1859), p. 22.

[3]Edward Dickinson, "The Place of Music in a Liberal Education: II," The Etude, IX (February 1891), 281.

[4]Bush, p. 397. Bush acknowledged that the substance of his chapter on the higher education of women was taken from the History of Mount Holyoke Seminary published by Sarah D. Stowe in 1887.

were usually considered sufficient for women. In addition, for those who had the means, and this was particularly true in the South, instruction in ornamental branches "finished" a young woman's education.[1]

In the northern colonies, girls were not allowed to attend the common schools until the last years of the eighteenth century, and then only in the summer months "when there were not boys enough to fill them."[2] Not until the first years of the nineteenth century were academies established in the North where girls could receive an education beyond that of the common school. One of the most popular academies was Catharine Beecher's seminary in Hartford, Connecticut, where girls received instruction in the "higher branches" of arithmetic, philosophy, history, Latin, and English composition.[3]

Southern academies for young girls placed great importance on vocal and instrumental instruction as an element of education for young women. Nearly all the female seminaries and colleges in the South included in the accounts of higher education written for the U. S. Bureau of Education between 1887 and 1903 maintained departments of music as integral parts of the institutions. The historian of higher education in South Carolina went so far as to state that until 1850 the education of women in his state "was confined to the acquirement of

---

[1]Bush, p. 398.

[2]Bush, p. 394. In the summer months only reading, writing, and morals were required to be taught (395).

[3]Bush, p. 397.

certain accomplishments, such as music, painting, wax-working, and fancy needle-work."[1] An account of commencement exercises in Georgia Female College in 1852 described the musical accomplishments of graduates in one southern college:

> The examination was enlivened and relieved from the tedium usually felt upon such occasions, by being interspersed with rich treats of music from seven elegant Pianos. . . accompanied by the Flute or Violin. . . . . We were especially surprised at the perfect time. We suppose that during the evening almost every young lady in the school had a hand at the music; and, whether it were one at a time, or twenty-one at a time, it was the same thing; the time was perfect.[2]

The popularity of musical instruction in southern seminaries and colleges for women was not dimmed by the effects of the Civil War. In fact, the music departments often played a major role in the success of the college. For example, in 1888, Southern Female College, founded in LaGrange, Georgia, in 1843, regarded its music school as the "most interesting and important, the most thoroughly equipped and ably taught" of the ten departments in the college.[3] Not only did the

---

[1]Colyer Meriwether, History of Higher Education in South Carolina, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 3, 1888 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889), p. 103.

[2]From the Augusta Chronicle, quoted in Dwight's Journal of Music, I (July 10, 1852), III. An account of an "exhibition" by music students at Oxford Female Institute, Oxford, Mississippi, in 1842, included performances of forty-one vocal and instrumental works. The entire program is reprinted in: Edward Mayes, History of Education in Mississippi, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1899 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899), pp. 93-94.

[3]Charles Edgeworth Jones, Education in Georgia, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 4, 1888 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889), p. 72.

music school enjoy this reputation in the college itself, but according to Jones, was regarded so throughout the South.[1] As a proof of its excellence, Southern Female College pointed to the fact that its students, who had the opportunity to study violin, organ, piano, voice, and guitar, had won the performance prizes at state fairs for a number of years. Furthermore, the popularity of the music school was attested to by the enrollment. At the time of the writing of the history of the school, Southern Female College had an enrollment of 182 students. Of these, 144 were students in the music school.[2]

The nineteenth century female seminary and college had its critics who deplored the superficiality of the education and the undue appropriation of time allotted to acquiring accomplishments. Criticisms of women's education came from the South, where the institutions for women were more numerous, as well as from other areas of the country. As early as 1829 in Mississippi, the annual report sent to the board of trustees of Elizabeth Female Academy read:

> The time has been when the education of females was limited to those branches in which their immediate occupations lie. For those destined . . . to move in the higher circles, personal accomplishments, music, dancing, and a superficial acquaintance with the more showy parts of literature were deemed sufficient. . . . Happy for the present age, . . . the public sentiment has undergone an important change in favor of female cultivation. Without undervaluing personal accomplishments, or disregarding domestic duties, we are permitted to aspire to the dignity of intellectual beings.[3]

---

[1]Jones, p. 72.

[2]Jones, p. 73.

[3]Quoted in Mayes, p. 44.

The implementation of this new sentiment spread slowly in schools for women in the South. Toward the end of the century, a professor in a woman's college in North Carolina wrote:

> It seems to me that the more cultured . . . of our people care less for a substantial education for their girls than the masses do. Poverty and necessity are driving us from the heathenish notion that all the preparation a woman needs for the battle of life is a delicate body, a pretty face, and a musical voice.[1]

Despite the fact that after 1860 the educational opportunities for women began to approximate the quality of those in traditional colleges, the notion persisted that musical performance was a study proper for women. Even in the most respected conservatories the majority of students were women. It was the disparity between the number of women and men graduates in the 1888 New England Conservatory of Music commencement that led one writer to state that even in "musical Boston," music had not reached the status of a "serious study worth the attention of men." Music was still regarded as a "pastime, an accomplishment of young ladies, or a means for the fair sex of making a livelihood, if necessary, in a rather genteel manner--and nothing more."[2]

---

[1]Quoted in Charles Lee Smith, The History of Education in North Carolina, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1888 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1888), p. 126. Although the author did not elaborate on the new type of education to which he referred, he may well have had in mind the coeducational schools which were established in the central states after 1860. According to statistics gathered by H. S. Tarbell, coeducation existed in 154 colleges by 1880. See: "Co-Education," Education, IV (March 1884), 427-434.

[2]From Kunkel's Musical Review, cited by E. E. Ayres, "Woman as Musician," The Etude, VI (November 1888), 166. The

Furthermore, to a majority of persons in the 1890's, the musical profession remained an "elegant and inoffensive means of frittering away energies which, if fed on stronger diet, might harden to the accomplishment of useful results."[1]

Social status of the musician. The musician--performer and teacher--in the United States during the nineteenth century did not generally enjoy the social status of men in other professions. Not only was the respect shown by the general population to other professional men withheld from musicians, but doctors, lawyers, and bankers characterized the musician as oversensitive, highstrung, unbusinesslike, and incapable of speaking intelligently of any subject other than music.[2] The founders of the Harvard Musical Association stated in 1837 that support from "educated men for the cultivation of music would be a new thing in our country."[3] That this was true was not surprising since musical performance was considered a "steady pursuit worthy only of sybarites, dreamers and women,"[4] and the acquiring of technical skill devoid of intellectual activity.

During the latter years of the century musicians

---

differences in numbers of men and women graduates referred to were: piano--25 women, 3 men; voice--29 women, 3 men; organ--4 women, 3 men.

[1]Edward Dickinson, "The Place of Music in a Liberal Education: I," The Etude, IX (January 1891), 6.

[2]E. A. Smith, "How Can the Individuality of the Musical Profession be Raised to a Higher Level?" The Etude, VIII (May 1890), 76.

[3]Quoted in Ritter, p. 243.

[4]Dickinson, p. 6.

themselves tried to sift out the myths from the facts in order thus to gain for the profession a healthy respect from Americans in general, but especially from college educated men, the "best minds in the country."[1] The patronizing smile with which persons too often dismissed music and musicians would disappear only if college men came to respect music for what it was.[2]

In 1888, the editor of The Etude addressed an open letter to college presidents requesting candid opinions on musicians as artists, educators, and members of society.[3] Six answers from presidents representing the small liberal arts college, the larger university, and the woman's college were printed in subsequent issues of the journal. Of the six institutions, three were in the Midwest, two in the East, and one in the South.[4]

The presidents of the two women's colleges spoke favorably of musicians as artists, educators, and citizens. The president of Lake Erie Seminary admitted that although twenty years ago the answers would not have been as favorable, musicians in 1889 were worthy representatives of art as such,

---

[1]Fillmore, p. 204. [2]Fillmore, p. 204

[3]"An Open Letter to Educators," The Etude, VI (December 1888), 193.

[4]The institutions were: Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota; Eureka College, Eureka, Illinois; Lake Erie Seminary, Painesville, Ohio; Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island; Colby University, Waterville, Maine; and Female College, Brownsville, Tennessee. The statements of the six educators to which references are made below appeared in: "The Estimation of the Musical Profession by College Presidents," The Etude, VII (February, 1889), 24.

"very valuable members of society," and patient and painstaking educators. Theodore Smith of Female College agreed that musicians were more accepted in society. In fact, those of worthy character were "eagerly sought, as guests, in the choicest circles."

The president of Brown University included among professional musicians only those who, in addition to musical training, had also received a literary and scientific education. This minority contributed to "refinement of taste and general culture," were esteemed as educators and citizens, and ministered most effectively to the "elevation of the moral sentiments of society." The president of Colby University did not separate musicians into categories based on previous education, but unequivocally stated that eminent men in music were the equal of eminent members of any profession.

The presidents of Carleton and Eureka Colleges had less favorable estimates of musicians. As a class, professional musicians were neither high representatives of art, nor worthy teachers or citizens. This was due to an education which provided only for the development of technical skill. "No man can be a 'specialist' of the very highest order, without a broad culture and the development of the best within him." So spoke James Strong of Carleton College. Similarly, the president of Eureka College had little good to say about the professional musician. Most musicians had a very high opinion of their own superiority and thus were "exceedingly 'touchy,' hard to deal with, [and] very hard to manage."

Furthermore, it was difficult to respect the many musicians who showed so little regard for the ability of fellow artists. This judgment of Carl Johann was based upon twenty years of experience with performers and teachers.

Two years after the open letter, John Fillmore, in an article in The Etude, elaborated upon the myths and facts that hindered college men such as Strong and Johann from considering the musician on an intellectual par with men in other professions. Until administrators allowed courses in the art of music into the regular college curriculum, the majority of college graduates would remain ignorant of and indifferent to music. They would continue to look upon the numerous self-taught music teachers, the "graduates" of a three month conservatory course, or the soprano in the church choir as representatives of the musical profession. Certainly not all college men thought this way, nor were all musicians so poorly educated. Fillmore admitted he was speaking primarily of conditions as they existed in the midwestern and western states where he had taught. Nonetheless, his suggestion that musicians better their reputations by becoming conversant in fields other than music was intended for students in conservatories and music departments throughout the nation. Furthermore, Fillmore's recommendation took into account the fact that to gain the respect of college men, musicians would have to bow to accepted educational standards, and in addition to providing for a thorough musical education, make available studies accepted by educators for their disciplinary value:

> But it is not enough for us musicians, in order to command such respect as we desire from educated men, to confine our self-training and knowledge to purely musical subjects. Thorough musical knowledge and efficiency is much, and absolutely indispensable; but no musician can have the highest intelligence, even in his own speciality, without a good deal of knowledge of other things. . . . . It is extremely desirable that every professional musician should have, in addition to his special musical training, a really liberal education.[1]

Liberal versus professional education. The discussion of liberal versus professional studies at the college level was a recurrent topic at annual meetings of the NEA during the latter years of the nineteenth and the first years of the twentieth century. College educators were firm in their belief that undergraduate education should train a man to be, not to do. To educate a man to be meant "to discipline the powers of the mind, to develop its faculties, to give it power of thought, clearness of perception, accuracy of reasoning, [and] confidence in itself."[2] Only after a student had acquired this mental training through certain prescribed subjects was he properly prepared to begin professional studies. Although a consensus could not be reached on the specific courses or the number of years needed to acquire a liberal education, educators, and in particular those representing influential institutions, agreed that the Bachelor of Arts degree should be a prerequisite for entrance into the professional school.[3]

---

[1]Fillmore, pp. 204-205.

[2]William A. Mowry, "The College Curriculum," NEA Proceedings (Topeka, Kansas, 1886), p. 360.

[3]For example, educators who spoke for this requirement

Educators speaking at the NEA meetings did not include music among the "learned" professions for which they were making recommendations. As has been noted, the status of the musical profession among college men generally was not one of high esteem. However, musicians who were concerned about improving the status of the musical profession by eliminating the evils attributed to specialization recommended the inclusion of liberal arts studies into the curricula of conservatories. These courses were thought of as studies to be taken concurrently with music courses, not as studies preparatory to professional study.

The many music schools affiliated with colleges and universities during the last quarter of the century were generally regarded by administrators as a convenient facility in which interested students who could afford the extra expense had the opportunity to receive musical instruction in addition to a college education. Very few institutions came to grips with the problem of settling the liberal-professional aspects of a musical education and working out a carefully conceived professional degree. The colleges which incorporated music into the regular curriculum did so after the administration was convinced of the disciplinary merits of individual music courses.

---

at the 1903 meeting of the NEA included Charles W. Eliot, Harvard University; Nicolas Murray Butler, Columbia University; William Harper, University of Chicago; Andrew West, Yale University. See: Elmer Ellsworth Brown, et al., "The Length of the Baccalaureate Course and Preparation for the Professional Schools," NEA Proceedings (Boston, Mass., 1903), pp. 489-516.

Musical Performance in the Nineteenth Century College and University

The university ideal in music. Two hundred years after the founding of Harvard, a group of alumni organized the Harvard Musical Association to promote the cause of music in the university:

> The ultimate object proposed is the advancement of the cause of music particularly in this university. We would have it regarded as an important object of attention within its walls, as something which sooner or later must hold its place in every liberal system of education; but that place not accidental or a stolen one, but formally recognized. We that love music feel that it is worthy of its professorship, as well as any other science.[1]

John S. Dwight, one of the "most enthusiastic and active members" of the Association,[2] kept the issue alive in his weekly Dwight's Journal of Music begun in 1852. In a series of articles written between 1854 and 1877, presumably by Dwight, the ideal for music in the American university took shape.

In 1854 Dwight began to question why the study of music was not included in the nation's institutions of higher learning.[3] If music had been successfully introduced into the public schools with the approval of the general public, why could it not be likewise introduced into colleges? Although he had no ready answer as to what or how music should enter higher education, Dwight envisioned a course that would be useful and practical,

---

[1]Quoted in Ritter, p. 240. [2]Ritter, p. 310.

[3]"Music in Universities," Dwight's Journal of Music, V (July 29, 1854), 133.

adapted both to the circumstances and place of the college as well as to the "wants and position of the older student."[1]

Ten years later, Dwight suggested as one of the surest ways to raise the status of music in the country the endowment of a conservatory complete with facilities for instruction in all branches of music.[2] In 1877, in an article on music in universities, Dwight quoted verbatim from this 1864 article. However, in place of the suggestion that some benefactor endow a conservatory, he inserted:

> Another [way] is to establish a complete School of Music under the wing of a powerful University, which shall give it the guaranty of respectability, of disinterestedness--thereby distinguishing it from the one hundred and one so-called "Conservatories" in this country.[3]

Dwight specifically recommended that Harvard University, "so manysided, comprehensive, and so rich in means," establish, as one of its professional departments, a "Complete School of Music, on an equal footing with its Schools of Medicine, of Law, Theology, [and] Natural History."[4] Furthermore, Dwight emphatically stated that no university could "fully realize the University idea" without including a complete school of music as one unit of the whole.[5]

---

[1]"Music in Universities," p. 133.

[2]"Apropos of 'Mus. Doc.'," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXIV (Sept. 3, 1864), 303.

[3]"Who will endow Music in the University? I," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXVII (Aug. 18, 1877), 78.

[4]"Who will endow Music: I," p. 78.

[5]"Who will endow Music in the University? III," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXVII (Oct. 13, 1877), 110.

As for reasons why the university in the 1870's should include a school of music, Dwight stated:

> Music is an important element of modern culture, a refining social influence, a subject about which few cultivated persons nowadays are willing to be thought ignorant or indifferent, an Art which in one way or another actually interests more thousands of people, more occupies their thoughts, more ministers to their enjoyment, than any science or than most branches of literature and learning.[1]

Furthermore, Dwight argued that this ideal should be realized so that the comparatively few with outstanding talent would have an adequate opportunity to become "musicians in the highest sense."[2]

If any one theme recurred in the articles written between 1854 and 1877, it was an insistence that the conservatory needed the "disinterested, wise, respected" authority of the university.[3] An established institution of higher learning was able to provide a sense of permanence lacking in the independent music school. If universities would provide this authority, the "so-called" conservatories guided by mercenary motives would disapper.

Despite the fact that, according to Dwight, the time was ripe for realizing the ideal he described, the professorship of music as established by Harvard in 1875 was only a "good beginning" toward that ideal.[4] Elective courses

---

[1]"Who will endow Music: III," p. 110.

[2]"Who will endow Music: III," p. 110.

[3]"A Musical Professorship at Harvard: I," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXV (Aug. 21, 1865), 78. See also: "Musical Education: I," XXXIII (Aug. 23, 1873), 78; "Who will endow Music in the University? II," XXXVII (Sept. 29, 1877), 102.

[4]"A Musical Professorship: I," p. 78.

receiving credit toward the Bachelor of Arts degree were offered in the theory and history of music. No provisions were made for performance study.

Although Harvard University had made only a "good beginning" in the university ideal promoted by Dwight, Boston University had, in 1872, become affiliated with the New England Conservatory of Music as a College of Music with Tourjee as director of the school. Boston University, incorporated in 1869, was unlike other eastern universities in its manner of origin. Rather than beginning as an undergraduate liberal arts college to which professional and graduate departments were added, the university began as a collection of existing professional schools. Boston Theological Seminary was the first school to be transferred to the new university. This arrangement gave the sanction of university authority to existing professional institutions of collegiate grade; it exemplified the ideas governing the institution. These principles, carefully delineated in the first edition of the University Year Book (1874), established a close relationship between liberal and professional education in one American university.

The first principle aimed at reconciling two opposing conceptions of higher education in the United States: first, that which upheld the university as an institution solely to "produce gentlemen of broad intelligence and high-toned culture" with, second, that which refused to recognize all but the training of youth for "trades and callings of an industrial or

professional character."[1] According to the organizers of Boston University, the ideal American university combined these two functions as far as possible by generalizing professional education and specializing general education:

> It should do this by carrying the general education of each pupil as high as possible before giving him the special, and by giving the most favored in respect to general education some practical adaptation to serve the world, if only by serving science, literature, and art.[2]

The second governing idea allowed for a loose affiliation of comparatively independent professional and technical schools rather than a tightly organized single unit. The esprit de corps between students and faculty in independent departments helped to create the environment necessary for superior educational benefits.

Lastly, the founders of Boston University believed that the acquiring of any knowledge, to be vital and stimulating, must be accompanied by practical application. This implied a close connection between general studies and professional education. European universities from which the American institutions had developed had originally been established on this premise. The continental universities, however, did not anticipate nor incorporate into the life of the university the "wonderful developments of modern industrial and art education." Had they done so, they would have remained the "institutional Träger of the intellectual and aesthetic life"[3] on the continent.

---

[1] Boston University Year Book, ed. by the University Council (Boston: H. O. Haughton & Co., 1874), I, 21.

[2] Boston University Year Book, I, 21-22.

[3] Boston University Year Book, I, 23.

Thus reasoned the founders of Boston University who resolved to restore the original intent of the university ideal.

The incorporation of the New England Conservatory of Music as Boston University College of Music[1] was the direct application of these governing principles to an established, reputable conservatory. A complete artistic education was offered by the university. Adequate preparation in the science and art of music were regarded as of equal importance. To this were added liberal arts studies:

> Such a preparation should embrace not only a comprehensive knowledge of the science of Music, and a good degree of skill as an executant upon some instrument, or as a vocalist, but also a familiarity with two or three of the ancient or modern languages, mathematics, sciences, literature, and the fine arts. . . . . Every facility necessary for the acquisition of the highest artistic and scientific education in all departments of Music, is now offered to the students in this College, the authorities of the University being determined that nothing shall be wanting to make this branch of the institution in every respect equal to any similar school in existence.[2]

The course of instruction, designed "exclusively for the graduates of Musical Conservatories and Seminaries," presupposed previous musical instruction.[3] The university diploma

---

[1]The distinction between school and college was stated in the Statutes and Organization of Boston University: "The departments of Boston University shall consist of two general classes: first, those which presuppose on the part of the student a previous collegiate training; and second, those which do not. The former shall be called Schools, the latter Colleges." Quoted in The Origin and Process of Boston University (Boston: University Offices, 1893), p. 15.

[2]Boston University Year Book, I, pp. 44-45.

[3]General Catalogue of Boston University 1872-73 (Riverside Press, 1873), p. 3.

was granted upon completion of the three year course. In addition, the university awarded the Bachelor of Music degree to those who distinguished themselves in the musical course if these students had also earned the Bachelor of Arts degree in course or by examination. In this respect, the administrators of Boston University showed themselves in perfect agreement with educators who believed that the professional degree was inadequate unless accompanied by the time honored arts degree.[1]

Few students at Boston University were awarded the Bachelor of Music degree. Few, very likely, had the means or the time to spend on acquiring the double degree. For example, between the years 1872 and 1885 the university conferred the music degree on only two graduates. The administration did not look upon this small number of degree graduates as any deficiency in the college. Rather, the president in the annual report of 1886 cited this condition as a particularly praiseworthy aspect of the institution:

> Every year many desire to enter [the collegiate course], but discover that they have not the requisite qualifications. Fortunately for the cause of musical education in America those most influential in the management of the college are not the least impatient for numbers, or for a superficial popular favor.[2]

Tourjee himself was a firm believer in the education of "all the faculties to their highest power."[3] Thus he provided

---

[1]See page 34 of this study.

[2]Quoted in Bush, p. 356.

[3]Tourjee, quoted in Howe, p. 464. The entire quotation reads: "Education . . . is a whole, simply because man is a unit, and one part of man cannot be developed to the highest point without the cultivation of the other parts of his

a wide selection of general studies in the curriculum from which the majority of students, those working toward the diploma, could select without the restrictions or requirements demanded by the degree program. By so doing, Tourjee hoped to dispel the prevailing impression that the "concentration of effort necessary to insure the success of students pursuing a musical course precludes all possibility of mental development in other directions."[1] The successful completion of the course of study which included both liberal and professional subjects was proof that the two types were compatible and necessary for the music student at the undergraduate level:

> Few persons devoting themselves to this profession are able to complete a liberal education before beginning their special musical training. Nor, indeed, ought they to do it. The best years for acquiring scholastic culture are also the best years for cultivating the voice, the ear, and the hand. A generous intellectual and aesthetic culture is needed by every professional musician; but it is best acquired, not before or after, but in connection with, his special studies.[2]

---

nature. A free education is the harmonious development of all the faculties to their highest power, and their application to the highest use."

[1]Calendar, New England Conservatory of Music and College of Music of Boston University (Boston: Deland and Hart, 1881), pp. 24-25.

[2]Boston University Year Book, ed. by the University Council (Boston: University Offices, 1883), X, 66. The need for a liberal and musical education progressing side by side was voiced also by the president of Lake Erie Seminary in response to the open letter in The Etude. When music and general studies are closely related from the earliest years, a student "is ready to carry on harmoniously a musical course of study with a classical, scientific, or literary course of study with great profit on both sides. I regret the broad line of separation in most of our college catalogues between the music and art departments and the other departments of study. It belittles music and narrows the study of the other arts and sciences." M. Evans, "Reply to Open Letter," The

The Boston University College of Music was discontinued after the death of Eben Tourjee in 1891. In announcing the separation of the New England Conservatory from Boston University, officials of the University stated:

> It will always redound to the honor of the University that in its very infancy it set and maintained a standard of attainment in this department of culture such as no existing American institution had set.[1]

The closing of the college was very unfortunate for the cause of music in the university, for the country lost its one example of a well coordinated plan of education for the professional musician in the university.

The liberal arts ideal in music. Although Boston University supported a professional school of music for some years, other colleges and universities regarded only those aspects of music study esteemed for their cultural value as suitable college courses. To learn to appreciate, not to produce, was a function of the college. For music to take its true place under this ideal:

> It should be approached for study upon the side that makes it enter into the intellectual equipment of cultivated men and women--that is, the people who hear and understand and enjoy music, not those who are especially trained in the art, to create or to interpret music.[2]

Under no circumstances were the colleges or universities to undertake the teaching of "piano playing, singing, [and] violin

---

Etude, VII (April 1889), 53.

[1]Boston University Year Book, ed. by the University Council (Boston: University Offices, 1893), XIX, 80.

[2]H. E. Krehbiel, "Music in Columbia College--What the New Department Ought to Be," Music, X (June 1896), 206.

playing."[1] The literature of music was the proper musical study, and intended for all students, not just the talented few. This study demanded of the student as much intellectual vigor as the study of traditional college subjects. Hence, music trained the intellect to the same "alertness, precision and concentration" as mathematics.[2] Theoretical courses and performance study were considered professional, not liberal studies. Performance study fell even less under the mantle of the liberal arts than the study of theory, since to acquire technical facility was considered to be so demanding that the student often became completely absorbed by the work and, "by inevitable law," stopped all mental growth in himself.[3]

The development of music study at Vassar College from its founding in 1861 to the end of the century is an example of the encroachment of the liberal arts ideal upon a program which from the beginning had included all aspects of music study. In a sketch of the college written in 1873, President John H. Raymond outlined the thinking which guided the organization of the college. The trustees, charged with establishing the school, wanted a liberal education for women which, while adapted to the special needs of the sex, accomplished essentially the same goals as the most respected college for men.

---

[1]Krehbiel, p. 207.

[2]John S. Van Cleve, "The Dignity of Music," Music, I (November 1891), 12.

[3]Edward Dickinson, "The Music Teacher and the Demand of the Times," The Etude, XI (March 1893), 57.

This implied the full collegiate course leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree. It also implied a respect for the ideal of womanly refinement and grace:

> The claims of aesthetic culture were therefore at once recognized; the provisions made for instruction in the arts of design and in music must be ample, and adequate time be allowed for this culture in the regular curriculum.[1]

This principle, that elements of artistic study be included in the regular curriculum, was carried out in practice. Students were permitted to take one art or music course in addition to the regular course. In the last two years of study, proficiency in music was accepted as an equivalent for one or another prescribed course in literature or science.[2] Hence, courses in music--piano, organ, singing, and harmony--became a part of the regular curriculum.

During its earliest years, Vassar College did not consider itself as a special art or music school. In providing for instruction in music, the school aimed to reconcile two beliefs: "a proper subordination to the claims of the academic course, and a high order of instruction in the arts themselves."[3] After seven years of practical application, the president concluded that the two beliefs were not only compatible, but also

---

[1]John H. Raymond, Vassar College: Its Foundation, Aims, Resources, and Course of Study (New York: S. W. Green, 1873), p. 21.

[2]From Vassar College Catalogue, 1867-68, cited in Historical Sketch of Vassar College (New York: S. W. Green, Printer, 1876), p. 46.

[3]Raymond, p. 67.

complimentary: "It is a noteworthy fact, that the students who are most diligent and successful in the severer disciplinary studies, as a rule, become the most thorough musicians."[1] Thus, music study, including performance, made its initial entrance into the Vassar curriculum not on the merits of any disciplinary value, but as a necessary element in aesthetic education.

In 1877, Vassar converted its department of music into a separate school with its own director and faculty. Music became a special study rather than a study in the regular curriculum. Requirements for students entering the music school were not on a par with requirements for students entering the collegiate course.[2] In fact, within a few years the term "special" came to denote a "variety of intellectual equipment,"[3] and students in the music school were considered academically inferior to the college students. Thus, the diploma granted by the school was recognized and accepted as inferior to the college degree.

The music school continued its separate existence until 1891 when, according to President James Taylor, a consideration of the "place of the arts in a college curriculum

---

[1]Raymond, p. 68.

[2]By 1874, entrance requirements for students in the collegiate course at Vassar were comparable to those in the best universities for men. Freshmen entering Harvard in 1874 were examined in Classics, Mathematics, Modern Languages, English, History, and Science. See: James M. Taylor and Elizabeth H. Haught, Vassar (New York: Oxford University Press, 1915), p. 61; and Morison, p. 369.

[3]Taylor and Haight, p. 159.

was forced on us."[1] Taylor's recommendations for the special schools which were accepted and implemented were:

> First, to make the art professors members of the college faculty and to abolish the schools, as such; second, to admit to the study of the arts only those of college rank; third, to place in the college curriculum the history and science of Music (and Fine Arts), opening them to all students of junior and senior grade; and fourth, to provide the best instruction in practice, as an extra collegiate study.[2]

The study of performance was not among the aspects of music included in the regular curriculum. Taylor reasoned thus;

> Be it remembered in this connection, that here we do not aim at preparation in any special "discipline," not even the preparation of teachers. Our aim is distinctly a general and liberal education.[3]

Thus, Vassar College, among the first to accept the artistic study of music into the regular curriculum had, over a twenty year period, come to exclude performance as an element of a college education. In 1896, George Gow, professor of music at Vassar, explicitly stated: "Instruction in the mastery of an instrument is not considered to be in the line of a college education."[4] The study of the "rich and varied" literature was the sum and substance of music study in a liberal arts education.[5]

Gow criticized the colleges and universities for

---

[1]James M. Taylor, "Address of Welcome," MTNA Proceedings (Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 1912), p. 8.

[2]Taylor, p. 8

[3]Taylor, p. 8

[4]"Music in Vassar College," Music, X (June 1896), 105-106.

[5]Gow, p. 109.

failing to comprehend the liberal arts ideal in music. Instead of offering courses in music literature, institutions gave instruction in the theory of music. Furthermore, theoretical study was the aspect of music accepted for its disciplinary value and awarded academic credit. Students, therefore, with an interest in music as a liberal art were forced to choose among courses designed not for them, but for "aspirants to professionalism."[1]

Those who forwarded the liberal arts ideal in music firmly believed that music courses offered by the undergraduate college were to be a preparation for professional training, not a substitute for it. As early as 1857 this ideal had been expressed as the goal for music in universities:

> We [colleges and universities] should not aim to make Musicians. To them the Academy of Music and the Conservatoire are open. Nor, on the other hand, would we advocate smattering superficiality in the musical education of the college. Let the instruction be thorough. . . . Then may those in whom nature has implanted a strong desire to go further . . . go to the Conservatoire. . . and give to the well-trained mind of the scholar a complete education in Art.[2]

The college conservatory: response to popular demand. According to data included in the U. S. Bureau of Education Circulars between 1887 and 1903, many conservatories and departments of music in certain parts of the country came into existence in response to popular demand. Between 1887 and 1903, the Bureau of Education published histories of higher

---

[1]Gow, p. 106.

[2]"Music in Universities," Dwight's Journal of Music, XI, (August 29, 1857), 170.

education in thirty-four states--eleven in the East, fourteen in the South, eight in the Midwest, and one in the West. Of 393 institutions included in the accounts of 34 states, 208 included departments or conservatories of music.

The most significant fact revealed in the data was the prevalence of musical conservatories in colleges located in the Midwest, and in particular, the denominational colleges in the Midwest. Of the 181 colleges cited in this area, 111 included conservatories of music.

On the whole, the U. S. Bureau of Education Circulars recorded only factual data. However, a statement about the development of one Kansas institution revealed that administrators were quick to make use of the popular demand for musical instruction as a means of attracting students to the college. According to the Kansas historian, the new president of Ottawa University in 1883 carefully planned to increase enrollment by adding to the college four new departments: normal, business, music, and art. The result of this action was noted thus:

> With the exception of music, these courses did not seem to take root in the school, and after several years of trial they were discontinued without appreciable diminution of attendance. The music department . . . grew rapidly and quickly attained an enviable reputation, and has continued to attract large numbers of students from far and near.[1]

Although statements such as this do not accompany the data recorded of other colleges, statistics do indicate that conservatories in many other colleges enjoyed a popularity

---

[1]Frank W. Blackmar, Higher Education in Kansas, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1900 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900), p. 143.

equal to that of Ottawa University. For example, Southwest Kansas College had, in 1892, an enrollment of 558 students in five departments; music students totaled 189. The total faculty count was twenty-five; six were instructors in the conservatory.[1] Baker University, also in Kansas, had included a department of music from the date of its founding, 1858. By 1900, the department had grown from "elementary instruction to a full course on the piano and organ, with studies in harmony, counterpoint, and composition."[2]

In Iowa, instruction in music was common enough for the recorder to include as one of twelve general statements concerning all denominational colleges in the state: "Facilities for the study of art and of music are generally found either in distinct college departments or in close connection with them."[3] Statistics indicated the extent of music study in individual colleges. For example, Drake College, founded in 1880, had an enrollment of 907 in 1892. Of these students, 567 were enrolled in the normal and music departments, and the remainder in seven other departments.[4] Simpson College, over a period of twenty-two years, graduated 162 in the collegiate course. During the same period, an estimated 5,000 enrolled in the normal, commercial, art, and music departments.[5]

---

[1]Blackmar, pp. 159-160. [2]Blackmar, p. 125.

[3]Leonard F. Parker, Higher Education in Iowa, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 6, 1893 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893), p. 130.

[4]Parker, p. 136. [5]Parker, p. 159.

In Nebraska, Hastings College reported an enrollment of 242 in 1898. Of these, 105 were students in the musical conservatory.[1] Wesleyan University, established in 1888, was obliged by 1900 to build a new conservatory in order to accomodate the numbers of applicants.[2]

The prevalence of college conservatories in the Midwest was one fact highlighted by the data in the government circulars. Other patterns connected with geographic location were also noticeable. Music conservatories were regular departments of the 92 colleges for women located in the southern states. The same was not true for the remaining colleges and universities in the South. Of these, only 26 provided facilities for musical instruction. Geographically, the lowest percentage of college music departments was found in the eastern states. Twenty-seven per cent of the total number of colleges and universities in the East had music departments. The percentage dropped to 18.6 when the nine colleges for women, each of which included a music department, were removed from the total number of colleges. If Colorado, the only western state included among the historical accounts, were representative of the West, conservatories there were as common as in the Midwest since each of the Colorado colleges included in the survey reported a flourishing conservatory.

---

[1]Howard W. Caldwell, Education in Nebraska, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 3, 1902 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902), p. 158.

[2]Caldwell, p. 135.

Although statistics in the historical accounts indicated the inclusion of music departments in 53 per cent of the nation's colleges and universities, information on the type and quality of instruction was lacking in the surveys. However, the detailed account of the development of one conservatory in a Missouri liberal arts college leads one to believe that what was true of the instruction in one college may have been true of instruction in other liberal arts colleges.

Drury College was founded by the Congregational Church in Springfield, Missouri, in 1873, and like many colleges, aspired to establish as "comprehensive a course of study and as high a standard of instruction and scholarship as prevailed in other American colleges of first rank."[1] The faculty and administration, throughout the earliest years of the college, discovered that to further this aim and to attract students to this southwestern college were not at one and the same time compatible. The eagerness to attract large numbers of students presupposed courses of study designed to "let through those contented with a little."[2] Consequently, the goal to provide the southwestern section of the country with a college whose standard of scholarship was on a par with the best New England colleges remained little more than words in print.

Emphasis on efforts to increase enrollment resulted

---

[1]Articles of Association, quoted by Frederic A. Hall, "Drury College" in Higher Education in Missouri, ed. by Marshall A. Snow, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1898 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898), p. 104.

[2]Hall, p. 108.

in the establishment of a conservatory of music. No other event did more to make the college "at once favorably known with the masses than this study of music."[1] The enrollment in the conservatory grew steadily until 1881, when the character of the work required was upgraded by a new director, a graduate of the New England Conservatory of Music. Although the revised curriculum was like the former in its emphasis on performance, the new plan required the student to exhibit "actual proficiency" before moving from one grade of study to the next.[2] This upgrading had an immediate effect on the enrollment. Whereas 236 had enrolled in the conservatory in 1881, only 82 registered in 1882.[3]

The author concluded that the efforts to increase enrollment, that is, the establishment of music and art departments, resulted in making the college a popular school rather than a first-rate institution. Only when these departments demanded a higher quality of work did the college become first-rate:

> So long as the music and art departments were satisfied with numbers and insisted only on light duties, a general looseness was through the entire institution. Students were let into college "on trial." The examinations were nominal. A promising young man or woman could go to college classes if he, or she, showed a general disposition to study.[4]

One cannot judge the quality of musical instruction in departments of music in other colleges with that recorded of

---

[1]Hall, p. 109.

[2]Hall, p. 109.

[3]Hall, p. 111.

[4]Hall, p. 112.

a single conservatory. However, one cannot but notice the similarity between the popularity of conservatories and music departments in other colleges with that enjoyed by the conservatory at Drury College before 1881. Although the government circulars do not include qualitative comments on other music departments, such a statement was made by Peter Lutkin in 1906 on the conservatory attached to a midwestern university during this period. Lutkin, who became director of music at Northwestern University in 1891, referred thus to the conservatory established at the university in 1873:

> The facilities offered in the "Conservatory" varied from time to time under different regimes, but at no time did they rise to the plane of thorough academic standards or to high artistic ideals. It was a "Conservatory of Music" in the ordinary sense of the word and the head of it assumed all financial and educational responsibility. A percentage of the receipts was paid into the university treasury, the director making what profit he could out of it. This haphazard plan did not reflect much credit upon the University authorities for their pedagogical oversight, nor speak very flatteringly of the esteem in which the study of music was held.[1]

If, by 1898, Drury College in Missouri had in reality attained the status of the most successful New England type college in the West,[2] it was significant that the college maintained a conservatory at all, for the educational opportunities of the eastern colleges did not readily extend to musical performance. In 1898, the conservatory was organized into three departments: piano, organ, and theory. Of prime

---

[1]"The School of Music in the University," MTNA Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), p. 32.

[2]Hall, p. 127.

importance in insuring thorough instruction was the graded course in piano and organ. In addition to this instruction, harmony, counterpoint, and composition were available in the theory department. Moreover, lectures on the development of piano music and the analysis of musical forms were given. The college, however, granted no degree in music nor did music courses count toward the Bachelor of Arts degree.[1]

By the end of the century, the university ideal in music had undergone a trial run in one university. Efforts to limit the music curriculum to the study of music literature had been tried at other colleges. However, in the majority of colleges and universities no one course of study was accepted as standard, and the breadth of music offerings in the institution was often determined by the director of the music department.

Performance in Higher Education at the Close of the Century

Toward the end of the century, attitudes toward the

---

[1]Hall, p. 122. Few of the state histories included detailed information on the scope of musical instruction in the college conservatories. The following description of the music curriculum at Hamline University in St. Paul, Minnesota, gives as detailed an account as recorded among the thirty-four states: "The department of music furnishes instruction in piano playing, singing, harmony, and music history. The instruction in music, both instrumental and vocal is by private lessons and not in classes. . . . Lessons last half an hour, and cost at the rate of $1 each, payable per term in advance. To secure the best results students should take two lessons each week. A graded course in piano playing, with theory of music as an adjunct, has been arranged. . . . Certificates of ability are given according to advancement in and completion of this course of study." John N. Greer, The History of Education in Minnesota, U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1902 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902), p. 183.

artistic study of music as well as the place it should occupy in higher education were found in statements of musicians concerning courses of study already in existence or others proposed for some real or ideal institution. The actual status of musical performance, however, was revealed in answers to a questionnaire sent, in 1896, by the editor of Music to professors of music in leading American universities and colleges and in the results of a study of music in higher education conducted by the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) in 1897.

The what and why of music study in higher education was a timely topic during the last decade of the century. Five musicians whose plans for music study appeared in print were Edward MacDowell, Waldo Selden Pratt, Henry Hanchett, W. S. B. Mathews, and Wardner Williams.[1] All five described music study in higher education as they saw it then and as they thought it should be.

Although the five musicians upheld music study in higher education as both a cultural and professional study, the limits ascribed to each area, and in particular to performance study, varied with the men. Hanchett believed the

---

[1]The five musicians were or had been in some manner connected with music in higher education. The composer, Edward MacDowell, became professor of music at Columbia University in 1896. Pratt taught at the Hartford Theological Seminary and Williams at the University of Chicago. Henry Hanchett, lecturer and recitalist, taught at the Metropolitan College of Music in New York. Mathews, the editor of Music, although not actively engaged in higher education during these years, had taught in colleges in previous years.

study of music literature the fundamental study of music in colleges.[1] However, this did not presuppose setting a limit on opportunities for music study in colleges which could, if properly conceived, include the "most thorough study of technique and composition."[2] MacDowell envisaged original work in composition as the proper university work in music, but also encouraged the establishment of a complete school of music as a unit of the university.[3] Mathews regretted that a music school or university where the art of music could be mastered in its entirety was hard to find in any part of the world.[4] Pratt not only regretted this fact but insisted that the university recognize its position as a miniature society and include in this smaller world all facets of the larger world.[5]

Each argued for the inclusion of advanced professional music study in higher education despite existing problems hindering the full realization of this study. MacDowell stated that the music courses offered at Columbia in 1896 were a compromise between theory and practice. Since the lower

---

[1]Henry G. Hanchett, "University Work in Music," Music, X (August 1896), 369.

[2]Hanchett, p. 369.

[3]Edward MacDowell, "Music at Columbia," Columbia University Bulletin, XV (December 1896), 15.

[4]W. S. B. Mathews, "Music as Discipline and Culture," Music, VI (July 1894), 352.

[5]Waldo S. Pratt, "Music as a University Study," Music, VI (August 1894), 419-420. "What music is to the great world without, it must in some measure be to the lesser world within, if the latter is the preparation for the former that it aims to be" (420).

schools provided "little or no substratum of musical culture" on which to build, colleges and universities, of necessity, had to offer instruction of an elementary nature not properly within their sphere of activity.[1] Furthermore, Hanchett reasoned that the quality and scope of college and university work was shaped by the constituency it represented. With the undue emphasis on acquiring technical facility common to music study of the day, institutions of higher learning had a hard time maintaining a proper perspective toward professional music study.[2] Pratt offered a suggestion to correct deficiencies in university music instruction: the thorough division and organization of music study into primary, intermediate, and higher grades.[3]

Professional aspects of music would only be accepted in colleges and universities if administrators were convinced of their value in terms of accepted college objectives. Hence, Mathews argued that the study of musical performance required as much mental vigor as any scholastic endeavor, and that the artistic performance of a masterwork was a demonstration of first-class scholarship.[4] Pratt also defended the value of musical performance as a means of providing "rigid intellectual discipline."[5] Beyond the disciplinary value of music study, Pratt appealed to the philosophy advocating the education of the whole man as an aid to accepting a widened range of music

---

[1]MacDowell, p. 13.

[2]Hanchett, pp. 360-361.

[3]Pratt, p. 429.

[4]Mathews, pp. 354-355.

[5]Pratt, p. 420.

studies in higher education.[1]

A discussion of whether credits earned in artistic aspects of music study should be counted toward a baccalaureate degree as were courses in the scholarly study of music was considered by several. Williams' plan for music study at the University of Chicago allowed for two separate programs of study for those interested in performance. Williams believed that the university should be responsible for the education of those aspiring to a performing career. This course of study would be devoted primarily to performance with a minimum amount of theoretical study and therefore, would lead to a certificate rather than a degree. However, in his second program, culminating in a Bachelor of Music degree, Williams re-emphasized the importance of a thorough artistic education, but also included in the program cultural as well as professional courses.[2] Pratt did not separate performers into categories. Rather, music courses for all students whose interests lay in performance were to be so designed "as to be counted as regular University courses, leading up to suitable degrees, the highest being Doctor of Music."[3]

Pratt was convinced that sooner or later colleges and universities would come to consider in full, as they then did in part, the study of music both as an artistic and scholarly

---

[1]Pratt, p. 420.

[2]John L. Mathews, "Music and the University," Music, VI (September 1894), 551-552.

[3]Pratt, pp. 430-431.

study leading to appropriate degrees.[1] Pratt was speaking about developments that were yet to come. The questionnaire from the editor of Music and the study conducted by the MTNA presented the actual conditions surrounding musical performance in higher education at the close of the century.

In 1896, W. S. B. Mathews issued a circular letter to musicians in a few leading institutions to ascertain the extent of what he considered to be a "very important advance" in the status of music among American college men.[2] Whereas formerly, educated men did not hesitate to feign ignorance of artistic matters and of music in particular, recent movements indicated progress in the dispelling of old prejudices. Among the hopeful signs cited by Mathews were the introduction of music professorships in college, the frequency of superior musical performances, and the occasional recognition of the disciplinary value of musical study.[3]

Among the questions addressed to musicians in universities and colleges was an inquiry on the types of musical instruction given, and whether the recognition of the disciplinary value of such instruction resulted in the granting of academic credit for courses in music. In addition, the editor of Music questioned whether the social status of the performer showed signs of improvement, and what aspects of a college

---

[1]Pratt, pp. 427, 430-431.

[2]"Music in American Universities," Music, IX (April 1896), 643.

[3][Editorial], Music, IX (April 1896), 653.

education, if any, ought to be included in the education of the musical performer.[1]

Replies from musicians in eight institutions, representing the East, Midwest, and West, were printed in the journal. These schools--including private and public institutions, colleges and universities--were Harvard University, Tufts College, Yale University, Vassar College, Oberlin College, University of Michigan, Northwestern University, and Pomona College.[2]

Two eastern institutions, Harvard and Tufts, offered courses in the theoretical and historical aspects of music. Credit toward the Bachelor of Arts degree was granted for this study. Vassar and Yale provided instruction in musical performance as well as in theoretical subjects but insisted upon considerable instrumental proficiency as an entrance requirement into performance study. In addition, Yale required that theoretical courses supplement vocal and instrumental instruction. In neither school was the study of performance awarded credit toward a degree. George Gow clearly stated that instruction in the mastery of any instrument was permitted at

---

[1]"Music in American Universities," pp. 643-644.

[2]See: John L. Mathews, "In Harvard University," Music, IX (April 1896), 644-649; A. A. Stanley, "University of Michigan," pp. 649-652; John C. Fillmore, "Music in Pomona College," X (May 1896), 67-68; Fenelon B. Rice, "Music in Oberlin College," pp. 69-70; George C. Gow, "Music in Vassar College," X (June 1896), 105-111; Horatio W. Parker, "Music in Yale University," pp. 181-185; P. C. Lutkin, "Music in Northwestern University," X (July 1896), 236-238; Leo R. Lewis, "Music in Tufts College," pp. 253-254.

Vassar as an extra study and not as a part of a regular college education.[1]

These four schools incorporated music departments as part of the general structure of the college. On the other hand, two universities in the Midwest--Michigan and Northwestern--maintained a close relationship with a separate music school. Albert Stanley, although the only professor of music at the University of Michigan, boasted that nearly every type of musical instruction, "theoretical and practical, from elementary harmony to the most advanced counterpoint, and the applied forms of playing upon instruments and singing," was available at the University School of Music.[2] The school was not technically a part of the university, and any credits granted in music were earned in the elective courses taught by Stanley and counted toward the Bachelor of Arts degree.

Musical instruction similar to that described by Stanley was offered at the School of Music of Northwestern University. P. C. Lutkin described the school as one of the professional units of the university maintaining its separate deans and faculty. Only the director, however, was officially a professor on the university faculty. As at Michigan, students enrolled in the liberal arts college could receive credit toward a baccalaureate degree in theoretical or historical music courses. A four year course in composition led to the Bachelor of Music degree. No credit toward any degree, however,

---

[1]Gow, pp. 105-106. [2]Stanley, p. 649.

could be earned in performance study.

In contrast to the policies of the above institutions, Fenelon Rice reported from the Oberlin Conservatory that theoretical, historical, and advanced performance study received credit in "any course leading to a degree" at Oberlin College.[1] All departments of music study, therefore, were recognized as having disciplinary value. John Fillmore at Pomona College concurred on the disciplinary value of music study. Musical instruction in this western college, however, was too new an area of study for Fillmore to make definite statements sought by the editor of Music.

Rice and Lutkin were the only two responding on the question regarding the social status of the performer. Both agreed that musicians were held in higher esteem than that formerly enjoyed by members of the profession.[2] All, with the exception of John Knowles Paine at Harvard, commented on the value of studies other than music as a means toward broadening the performer's perspective. Horatio Parker, professor of music at Yale, concluded that the music student should be allowed to choose the courses that appealed to him, since the mastery of any subject would "broaden the mind and help to make a better musician."[3] Parker argued, however, that the chief study of the musician should be music itself

---

[1]Rice, p. 69.

[2]Rice, p. 70; Lutkin, p. 238.

[3]Parker, pp. 184-185.

and not the psychology or mathematics or history of music. Gow, on the other hand, insisted that the student interested in pursuing a performing career needed the breadth provided by a wide range of college studies. Consequently, he was advised to choose these courses even to the neglect of some aspects of music study.[1]

The editor of Music sent his letter to schools he regarded as leading institutions of learning in the country. If any one conclusion can be drawn from the answers of the eight musicians, it is that in 1896 the policies governing music study in these colleges and universities were shaped by the thinking of the men who headed the respective departments.

Among the eight, Oberlin was the only institution granting academic credit for the study of musical performance. Rice made an unequivocal statement that all aspects of music study at the college had disciplinary value and hence were worthy of academic credit. Rice regretted that this had not always been so at Oberlin, for the plan to credit music had been adopted by the administration within the past ten years. Stanley felt that the officials at the University of Michigan would adopt a similar policy soon since "considerable progress" had been made in recent years in "determining the just valuation of musical studies of different kinds as compared with the regular studies of the course for the literary degree."[2] Performance was included among the studies of "different

---

[1]Gow, p. 110.

[2]Stanley, p. 650.

kinds." Stanley concluded: "This is of course an ideal, but the principle has been practically recognized in the University of Michigan."[1]

Paine regarded the education of composers and critics as the main aim of the music department at Harvard and thus dismissed the study of performance as outside the realm of this goal. Any Harvard student interested in instrumental or vocal study was advised to seek suitable instruction in Boston. Gow supported the granting of credit to the study of music as a liberal art, but this to him did not include instruction in instrumental or vocal music. Although performance study was not included at Tufts College, Lewis recommended separate courses for composers, critics, and performers as an ideal toward which music departments should work.

The eight musicians responding to Mathews described not only the extent of musical instruction in their respective institutions but also the motives for the policies. A more comprehensive view of the extent of musical instruction in colleges and universities in the nation was revealed in a study conducted by the Music Teachers National Association in 1897. The MTNA, organized by Theodore Presser and William Dana in 1876 to "aid the teacher of music, especially the one whose opportunities were limited,"[2] had, by the adoption of the new

---

[1]Stanley, p. 650.

[2]William H. Dana, "The Beginnings of the M.T.N.A.," MTNA Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1914), p. 180.

constitution in 1899, expanded its range of interests to include all phases of musical activity throughout the country.[1] The promotion of musical instruction in higher education was one of these new interests.

Of 900 questionnaires sent by the MTNA to institutions of higher learning in 1897, 300 were answered and returned to the study committee. Of the 300 institutions responding, 172 offered some form of musical instruction and 128 no instruction in music. Sixty-six of the 172 schools granted credit toward a degree for courses in music: 25 in theory, 5 in performance, and 36 in both theory and performance. Instruction in vocal and instrumental music was available as an extra study in many of the remaining 106 institutions.[2]

Despite the difference between the number of schools examined in the two studies, 12.5 per cent on the eight schools surveyed by Mathews and 13.5 per cent of the wider sampling in the MTNA study granted academic credit for the study of musical performance. The colleges and universities offering musical instruction either included a music department as one unit of the college or maintained some type of affiliation with a conservatory of music. Many elements shaped the policies governing the extent of musical instruction in the

---

[1]Arthur L. Manchester, "The Policy of the M.T.N.A. from 1900 to 1902," MTNA Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1914), p. 184.

[2]"Report of Music in the Colleges of the United States," MTNA Official Report, 1897, p. 78, cited by Edmund Jeffers, Music for the General College Student (New York: King's Crown Press, 1944), pp. 27-28.

institutions. In the matter of granting credit for musical performance, the final decision rested with the administration who had to be persuaded that such study was on a par with other studies receiving credit toward the baccalaureate degree.

CHAPTER III

MUSICAL PERFORMANCE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION: 1900-1925

Between 1900 and 1925 the status of musical performance as a subject of study in American colleges and universities was revealed in studies carried out under the auspices of the Music Teachers National Association, the Eastern Educational Conference, and the United States Bureau of Education. These show a growth in its acceptance for academic credit. They also point to the necessity of establishing minimum standards.

The Status of Performance: 1906-1923

MTNA Study, 1906. The program committee for the 1906 meeting of the MTNA set for itself an enormous task when it undertook to present to the association members a "complete and representative scheme for music study in colleges."[1] A questionnaire was sent to directors of music departments and conservatories throughout the country. Unfortunately, too few replies were received before the meeting to make the sampling sufficiently representative. Nonetheless, on the basis of forty-eight replies, Sleeper described four

---

[1]Henry D. Sleeper, "Music as a College Study," MTNA Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), p. 43.

patterns of music study in American institutions of higher learning; gave reasons for the developments that had occurred; and made suggestions for the direction music study should take in the future.

According to Sleeper's analysis, music study in the nation's colleges fell into four patterns with, however, forty-eight "more or less widely differing opinions" concerning aims and procedures.[1] The majority of the departments could be numbered in three of the four patterns: (1) departments emphasizing the study of composition; (2) conservatories with primary interest in vocal and instrumental instruction; (3) departments stressing the cultural value of music through courses in music appreciation. Departments exemplifying the first and third ideals were located primarily in the East. The majority of the college conservatories were found in the Midwest and South.

The fourth pattern, designated by Sleeper as the educational ideal, encompassed the study of music in its entirety. Unfortunately, too few examples of this model existed. Many reasons were cited. Music study in colleges was too new and experimental to be comprehensive in scope. The student body as a whole was absorbed in other interests or too poorly prepared for advanced work in music. Since many administrators were either indifferent to or hostile toward music study, many departments lacked facilities adequate for its full study. Despite these many adverse conditions, Sleeper

---

[1]Sleeper, p. 43.

singled out a "critical dividing-point" which was preventing the development of the educational ideal in music: the refusal to recognize performance as a study suitable for college credit.[1]

Only eight of the forty-eight colleges granted credit for the study of performance. The question facing these schools was how much credit to grant and how to evaluate courses in performance. As for why the forty remaining schools denied the credit, some noted a lack of facilities, others a lack of demand. For most, the conviction that performance was not a proper college study was, according to Sleeper, "nothing but prejudice."[2] Fortunately, the manner in which higher education in the United States had developed was proof enough that the arguments growing out of prejudice were too feeble to keep any one area of study out of higher education once a subject had been well taught:

> In the light of history, then the fact that there is a large college constituency which objects to placing practical work in music on the same basis with language, philosophy, history and science, is but a feeble argument. . . . The fact that practical music has been, and still is, poorly taught in many cases, should be considered in the light of the fact that it can be and is well taught in other cases. The argument then turns in favor of music being taken up by the well-organized collegiate institutions, so that, freed from monetary considerations, they may see that the subject is given full justice.[3]

Hence, the arguments for introducing performance into the curriculum were stronger than those keeping it out.

---

[1]Sleeper, p. 46.

[2]Sleeper, p. 47.

[3]Sleeper, p. 47.

Colleges would begin to educate musicians when administrators recognized the need for well qualified musicians on their own faculties. That high school students interested in music as a career had to choose between a general and professional education, and in some cases, had to terminate high school studies to do so, would eventually compel college officials to offer performance study on a footing equal to that of other studies.

Although only eight colleges gave credit for performance study, all responded to the five questions in the servey which dealt specifically with aspects of performance study:

1) Should a specified grade of proficiency be required for individual performance courses?

2) How much credit should vocal or instrumental instruction receive?

3) Is class instruction superior to private teaching?

4) Should courses in theory be taken in conjunction with performance study?

5) Should performance study in college presuppose a certain level of proficiency in previous instruction?[1]

To all but one of these questions, opinions were too divergent to warrant any consensus. Only with regard to the concurrent study of theory and performance did a "very large majority" agree that no credit should be given to performance

---

[1]Sleeper, pp. 53-54.

without some accompanying study of theory.[1]

Eastern Educational Conference Study, 1907. "'Education in Music' has ceased to be a theory, and is rapidly becoming an accomplished fact."[2] So wrote the chairman of a study on the status of music completed by the Eastern Educational Conference[3] in 1907.

The study committee of the Eastern Educational Conference sent its questionnaire on the status of entrance and course credit in music toward the baccalaureate degree to all the colleges and universities in the New England and Middle Atlantic states as well as to a select number of institutions in the remainder of the country. Replies from 123 institutions indicated that fifty-eight colleges and universities granted entrance or course credit in music. Of these, sixteen allowed credit in both areas; thirty-nine others gave course credit in music and three, entrance credit. Fifty-eight of the remaining sixty-five institutions had no music department; the final seven schools had a music department but granted no credit for courses in music. Thus, McWhood concluded that if this sampling were accepted as representative of the nation, nearly one-half of the colleges in the country valued music sufficiently to grant credit for its

---

[1]Sleeper, p. 51.

[2]Leonard B. McWhood, "The Present Status of Music in Colleges," MTNA Proceedings (New York, 1907), p. 40.

[3]An organization founded in 1905 by musicians in eastern colleges and high schools to promote musical instruction in the schools of the New England and Middle Atlantic states.

study. Even more significant was the fact that one-half of the colleges granting credit toward a degree had adopted this policy since 1900.[1]

With regard to specific music courses receiving credit toward the bachelor's degree in the fifty-eight colleges, forty-two gave credit for music appreciation, forty-seven for harmony, and twenty-one for vocal and instrumental instruction. A comparison of results of the MTNA survey in 1907 with this study showed considerable variance in the percentage of schools granting credit for performance. Whereas only 16 per cent of the colleges surveyed by the MTNA gave credit for performance, 36 per cent of the schools in this survey granting credit for music gave it for performance study. This fact was doubly significant since this credit was awarded toward the Bachelor of Arts degree in schools located primarily in the eastern and mid-Atlantic states.

Harvard University, one of the most influential of the eastern institutions, was not among the fifty-eight granting entrance or course credit for performance study. By 1903, however, Harvard was awarding both entrance and course credit for the study of harmony and counterpoint. Eugene Russell, principal of Classical High School in Lynn, Massachusetts, at the National Education Association meeting in 1903, pointed to the consequence of such an action:

> The significance of this act is great. It is a proclamation to the educational world that the study of music,

---

[1]McWhood, p. 43.

> at least of harmony and counterpoint, may well occupy the attention, not only of the few who wish to specialize, but of the many who seek culture and self-mastery.[1]

Russell argued that instrumental or vocal proficiency was the foundation on which to build a college music education. Hence, Harvard officials would have acted more wisely had they granted entrance credit for performance rather than theoretical study. Private instrumental study, not courses in theory, was the most common form of music study among high school students. Since these students were apt to continue private lessons regardless of the entrance credit they would or would not receive, Harvard and colleges of similar prestige were advised to award credit for performance study rather than overload the high school curriculum with theoretical subjects which, by their very nature, presupposed some measure of keyboard facility. In conclusion, Russell stated:

> I believe that the cultivation of music should be fostered in every way consistent with sound educational principles, and I think that boys and girls of great musical promise should not be compelled, as they are now, to choose between music . . . and letters and science . . . , but should find it possible, until they reach the professional stage of their education, to carry along the three side by side.[2]

The truth of Russell's statement that Harvard's acceptance of harmony and counterpoint was a proclamation to higher education that the study of theory was cultural and

---

[1]"Music as a Subject to be Counted for Admission to College," NEA Proceedings (Boston, Mass., 1903), p. 709.

[2]Russell, 710.

disciplinary was borne out by the facts of the 1907 study. Of fifty-five schools granting graduation credit in music, forty-two gave credit in music appreciation, forty-seven in harmony, and thirty-three in composition. On the basis of this data McWhood stated, "There is a wide-spread feeling that collegiate study of music should be, primarily, cultural, rather than professional."[1] That the study of theory was regarded by the respondents as a cultural course was noteworthy. Only ten years earlier, colleges such as Harvard had been criticized for fostering specialism by offering courses in theory and composition.[2]

The Eastern Educational Conference Study was limited to the consideration of music credit in the Bachelor of Arts degree. It was to be expected that the results would point to the importance of music as a cultural study. However, in 1908 McWhood stated at the annual meeting of the MTNA that, however important the cultural aim of music in college might be, the need for professional study should be recognized and provided for.[3] The future of music in the United States demanded that the colleges and universities provide suitable liberal and professional education for the music student.

Music Education in the United States, 1908. The

---

[1]McWhood, p. 44.

[2]See Chapter Two: pp. 44-45.

[3]Leonard B. McWhood, "The Mission of Music in Colleges," MTNA Proceedings (Washington, D.C., 1908), p. 113.

first comprehensive national study on the status of music in higher education was undertaken by the United States Bureau of Education upon recommendation of the MTNA in 1906. The report, prepared by Arthur Manchester, was published by the Bureau of Education in 1908.

Manchester was among the first to state that the study of music would only be placed on an equal footing with other subjects in the curriculum when departments and schools of music achieved some measure of uniformity and coordination with regard to curricula and standards:

> To define the status of music education in the United States has been practically impossible. The utter lack of systematic courses of instruction, the widely varying standards of merit, and the absence of cooperation upon the part of those engaged in music teaching not only have made impossible any accurate computation of the results which have accrued from music education, but are serious obstacles in the way of future development.[1]

The study used data from 269 institutions: 151 colleges and universities, 57 women's colleges, and 61 independent conservatories. The statistics collected, like those included in the state histories of higher education in the government circulars between 1887 and 1903, indicated a wide interest in musical instruction among college students. In 1907, the Commissioner of Education reported a total enrollment of 149,700 students in colleges and universities throughout the nation. In 208 of these institutions--colleges with music departments responding to this questionnaire--the total

---

[1]Arthur L. Manchester, Music Education in the United States, U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1908, No. 4 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1908), p. 7.

enrollment of music students was 26,743, slightly more than 17 per cent of the total college population. In addition, another 17,122 students were enrolled in the 61 independent conservatories.

The scope of the curricular offerings in the 269 institutions varied with the "resources and seriousness of purpose of the institutions offering them."[1] In many music schools, the courses were thorough and comprehensive. Unfortunately, in a "greater number of institutions of all classes" this was not true.[2] The technical mastery of an instrument was the goal toward which the entire course of study was aimed.

Despite the differences, Manchester found that the overwhelming majority of college conservatories were comparable to the independent conservatories in administrative organization and curricular offerings:

> The subjects taught are the same as in independent schools of music. Instruction is given in practical music, theoretical subjects, history of music, and esthetics. While each is organically connected with its college or university, educationally the tie binding them in the majority of cases is elastic, and they are managed as independent music schools, with the same musical aims and ideas.[3]

In contrast, however, in universities and colleges referred to by Manchester as institutions of the highest grade, that is, those whose policies influenced other colleges, only theoretical subjects and music appreciation courses were

---

[1]Manchester, p. 20. [2]Manchester, p. 20.

[3]Manchester, pp. 18-19.

included in the music curriculum.

College administrators would continue to have little regard for music in the college curriculum until musicians themselves agreed upon the essential elements of an education in music. Thus, Manchester pleaded for the working out of a standardized course of study in which professional training would be balanced by general studies. As an example of the efforts some institutions were making to "properly coordinate the various branches of musical instruction into a comprehensive educational scheme,"[1] Manchester included in his report specific curricula from institutions throughout the country as evidence that a movement toward greater uniformity of standards had begun. The curricula of two independent conservatories were included: a metropolitan school with a large endowment and an institution in a smaller city dependent solely on tuition fees for support. Curricula of two universities represented an institution which gave instruction only in theoretical courses and another which included a complete school of music as one unit of the university. Finally, the music curricula of two women's colleges were included. Both granted graduation credit for performance study.[2]

Another encouraging sign of the acceptance of all aspects of music study in the college curriculum was the adoption of a grading system for music courses. The lack of such a system had been regarded as a decided obstacle in the

---

[1]Manchester, p. 21. [2]Manchester, pp. 21-40.

granting of academic credit for music courses, particularly performance study. Statistics revealed that musical performance was subject to examination, for in 55 per cent of the independent conservatories, 50 per cent of the women's colleges, and 20 per cent of the colleges and universities performance tests were required. Manchester concluded:

> From the per cent of schools giving actual performance tests, it would appear that the opinion that a sufficiently accurate and systematic grading of work in practical music cannot be done is losing ground, and encouragement is given that there may develop a system of grading in practical music that will satisfy educators and remove one of the great obstacles to the admission of applied music to general educational courses.[1]

As a result of the findings of this study, Manchester placed the blame for the "complete separation of music from general educational thought" squarely on the members of the musical profession themselves.[2] Although the earliest founders of conservatories maintained high educational ideals and fashioned well-coordinated curricula, others soon thwarted these standards, and music teaching "rapidly became imbued with false ideals, and, in time, the affected virtuoso . . . flourished . . . and the purpose of music education steadily narrowed."[3] The training of virtuosi and the absence of established standards were at the root of the emphasis on technical display. Too many music schools had become technical training schools. Furthermore, those affiliated with colleges and universities had their own peculiar difficulties:

---

[1]Manchester, p. 42.

[2]Manchester, p. 79.

[3]Manchester, p. 77.

> The status of music in universities and colleges was also unsatisfactory, on account of the reason for its installation being in doubt, some holding that it should be for the purpose of supplying a music education on a somewhat higher level than that furnished by the primary grades, others seeking to secure for it recognition as a professional specialty in common with other specialities of the university system, while the college authorities themselves looked upon it as a good thing for the treasury but of little or no moment in the general scheme of education.[1]

Manchester cited still another reason why musicians themselves were to blame for the divorce of music from general educational thought. The disdain which professional musicians accorded music teachers in the public schools hindered the building of a coordinated course of study from the lower schools to the university. Administrators, cognizant of this lack of rapport and respect, gave no higher valuation to certain aspects of music study than did musicians themselves. The epitome of the cleavage of music from other areas of study was summed up in the question a school principal addressed to a prospective student, "Did you come here to study, or to take music?"[2]

In addition to citing defects in musical instruction, Manchester also noted hopeful signs regarding music study in higher education. One was an expression among certain musicians in public schools, conservatories, and colleges to unite in establishing standards in music study from the earliest grades through the highest level of proficiency. Progress, however, toward standardization would necessarily be slow since many teachers were too satisfied with existing methods

---

[1]Manchester, p. 79. [2]Manchester, p. 80.

and procedures to make the effort to improve them.

Another hopeful sign noted in the study was the "marked change" in the attitude of college and university officials toward music:

> While music is still made to feel that it is only tolerated in some institutions, there has come to pass what may rightfully be esteemed a remarkable change of heart upon the part of many institutions of the highest grade and influence. It is clear that the separation between music and general educational thought is not only being rapidly lessened, but that it will completely disappear in a much shorter time than past conditions would warrant one in predicting.[1]

In conclusion, Manchester stated that the status of formal music education in the United States in 1908 was one of transition. Although many conservatories and colleges offered a quality education in music, no thoroughly organized system of education existed throughout the country. Furthermore, Manchester firmly believed that colleges and universities had the duty to provide for the education of the professional musician. Music was in need of the system and orderliness that characterized college work which, without placing restrictions on the artistic attributes of music, would "bring to it system in classification and thoroughness and accuracy in the coordination of its elements."[2] The results of the study gave a basis for belief that colleges and universities would eventually provide for a full musical education.

At the MTNA meeting in 1908, Manchester reiterated the conclusions made in the government report. In addition, he recommended that the MTNA provide the authority for organized

---

[1]Manchester, p. 81. [2]Manchester, p. 83.

efforts toward standardization in music study. There was a force at work in other subject areas for a "systematic and logically constructed scheme of education" extending from the college to the lower schools.[1] The same could be true of music in education if college musicians took the initiative. Manchester argued:

> The position now occupied by music in institutions of higher education, the number of students pursuing music-courses in them, the extent to which it is cultivated by them, will give authority to any concerted movement emanating from them which has for its object the application to music education of similar methods of unification.[2]

Status and Value of Music in Education, 1916. The separation of music from the general stream of American education spoken of by Manchester in the 1908 government report was the impetus for the research undertaken by Rose Yont at the University of Nebraska in the 1910's. Yont, in her thesis, Status and Value of Music in Education, deplored the injustice experienced by the musically talented student who, unable to secure an adequate education in the American educational system, was forced to go elsewhere. As a result, intellectual and artistic education became separate. This separation did not result in a balanced education. What American educators in 1916 needed to do was to formulate a curriculum making intellectual and artistic education available in the

---

[1]Arthur L. Manchester, "A Conclusion Drawn from the Inquiry into the Status of Music Education in Secondary Schools, Colleges and Universities," MTNA Proceedings (Washington, D. C., 1908), p. 197.

[2]Manchester, p. 197.

American educational system from the elementary through the university level.[1]

The scope of Yont's work was enormous. Through questionnaire, correspondence, and an examination of college and university catalogs, the character and strength of music study in organized education and private instruction was scrutinized. The examination of music in schools was nation wide in character; the examination of private study was restricted to the state of Nebraska.

The overview of the status of music in higher education was based on information gathered from available printed catalogs and from correspondence with school officials. The 206 catalogs studied included bulletins of all state colleges and universities and as many private colleges as were available. A comparison of data from Manchester's report with information from the catalogs and correspondence indicated a "remarkable" and "unexpected" growth in college music programs since 1908.[2] This was particularly true of institutions in the Midwest and West. In 1908, the greatest activity was evidenced in the North Atlantic states; in 1916, institutions in states west of the Allegheny Mountains were the ones reporting an "emphatic approval" of music in colleges.[3] Furthermore, the musical

---

[1]Rose Yont, Status and Value of Music in Education (Lincoln, Nebraska: The Woodruff Press, 1916), pp. 1-2.

[2]Yont, p. 68.

[3]Yont, p. 69. States specifically mentioned included Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California.

activity engendered in the older communities by local orchestras and May festivals was, in the newer, being supplied by the "advent of music upon the university curriculum."[1]

The importance of music departments in state-supported institutions in the Midwest and West was reflected in the evaluation of music curricula given by Yont. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1

STANDARDS ASSIGNED TO MUSIC CURRICULA IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION[2]

Standard:	None	Slight	Medium	Excellent
Total number of institutions:	39	39	77	51
State-supported institutions:	8	6	11	14
Location of state-supported schools:				
East	2	0	0	1
South	4	4	2	3
Midwest	1	1	3	6
West	1	1	6	4

According to this analysis, considerable growth had occurred in music departments of midwestern and western institutions. Twenty-four of the fifty-one music departments with an "excellent" rating offered a Bachelor of Music degree. Seven of these degrees could be obtained in state universities in the Midwest and West.

The growing acceptance of performance as a part of music study in higher education can be seen by comparing

---

[1]Yont, p. 69. [2]Yont, p. 206.

departments offering theory and performance with those offering only theory. (See Table 2.) Ten of the twenty-seven colleges offering only theory were large eastern colleges. Yont noted that artist-teachers in nearby vicinities were easily available to students in these colleges. Since the institutions could not afford to hire artists, such arrangements were practicable. Yont failed to note whether students received credit from the college for this outside study. The prediction was made, however, that the future development of music departments in major institutions would mean the "employment of the leading artist." This innovation was viewed as highly desirable both for the "artist and the serious college musician."[1]

TABLE 2

PERFORMANCE AND THEORETICAL STUDY IN MUSIC CURRICULA IN HIGHER EDUCATION[2]

	Theory and Performance	Theory Only	Performance Only
Total number of institutions:	120	27	17 (none offering a degree in music)
State-supported institutions:	20	7	--
Location of state-supported schools:			
East	0	2	--
South	5	0	--
Midwest	7	3	--
West	8	2	--

The music department or school connected with a

[1]Yont, p. 207.

[2]Yont, p. 206.

college or university, such as located in the Midwest and West, was but one type of conservatory cited in the study. Yont, like Manchester in 1908, blamed the more common type of conservatory,--"those which are private and exist as a financial investment,"--for causing the professional performer to be stigmatized as a technical virtuoso devoid of musical depth.[1] The conservatory stressing "finger dexterity and vocal gymnastics" was flooding the country with superficial musicians.[2] It was this quality of musical instruction which led to a degradation of musical degrees. Thus, the Bachelor of Music degree represented no definite standard. It could symbolize anything from two years in an inadequate conservatory to complete professional training in the university.

Yont, however, went one step beyond Manchester's criticism of commercial conservatories. Not only was the emphasis on technical display deplored. The "let alone" policy toward music in the American college and university was as responsible for the "merchants of music" as the poor standards of the conservatory.[3] True, this policy was a reaction against the undue emphasis in conservatory training on the acquisition of technical facility. College officials were aware of the misgivings educators voiced against the introduction of music courses into the college curriculum. Surely, it was such misgivings that prompted officials to

---

[1]Yont, p. 266.

[2]Yont, p. 267.

[3]Yont, p. 278.

add to statements that, in instances where academic credit was granted to music courses, great efforts were being made to make the work "truly educative."[1] Despite the reaction of educators, Yont maintained that the source of the difficulties lay in the perspective of educafors and in the manner in which music was being taught, not in the art itself.

In her suggestions for improvement, Yont outlined a comprehensive but somewhat idealistic plan for music education from the elementary school through the university. If a carefully worked out plan of music was begun in the elementary grades and carried on through high school, "specialization of the highest type" would be possible at the university level.[2] For talented performers this included instruction from recognized artists. Specialization, however, did not mean an education entirely devoted to music. The overall educational plan included a balance of general and professional studies. This was the ideal. Unfortunately, in 1916 the college and university could not place the study of music on a par with other subjects, nor could they offer specialization of the highest degree. Music studies at the elementary and secondary level were inadequate; the music student entering college had to make up for instruction he should have had earlier. As long as colleges continued to accept music students with an insufficient musical background, the college music curriculum could not be placed on a par with

---

[1]Yont, p. 122.

[2]Yont, p. 308.

that of other departments.

In her summary statement, Yont wrote:

> The need is for more people who are concerned in the whole of music, its appreciative, its creative and its interpretative aspects, and who appreciate it both as a cultural and a professional study.[1]

The American educational system had a way to go before this need was fulfilled in its schools.

Present Status of Music Instruction in Colleges and Schools, 1919-1920. The second government study on music in higher education was completed in 1921. Under the chairmanship of Osbourne McConathy, a committee sponsored by the NEA, the MTNA, and the Music Supervisors National Conference (MSNC), compiled the report: Present Status of Music Instruction in Colleges and High Schools, 1919-1920.

Data on college music was gathered from 419 nation wide colleges and universities which included music in the curriculum. Forty-six per cent of the colleges (194) granted entrance credit for music study in the high school. Theoretical subjects were recognized by 190 colleges, music appreciation courses by 154 colleges, and performance study by 76 colleges. McConathy noted that the granting of entrance credit for performance study was "a matter of interest particularly because recognition of applied music is a matter of very recent development."[2] Moreover, over fifty per cent of

---

[1]Yont, p. 314.

[2]Osbourne McConathy, chairman, Present Status of Music Instruction in Colleges and High Schools, 1919-1920, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1921, No. 9 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), p. 5.

the colleges (232) granted credit toward a degree for music courses. This included a total of 112 colleges granting credit in performance study toward a Bachelor of Arts degree. Nearly ninety per cent (203 colleges) awarded a Bachelor of Music degree (77) or a diploma in music (126).

This report confirmed a trend noted by Yont: the increasing number of music schools in midwestern colleges and universities granting credit for the study of theory, performance, and history of music. Four of the six states with the highest number of colleges granting credit toward an academic degree for these aspects of music study in 1921 were: Illinois, Ohio, Iowa, and Kansas.[1]

A detailed tabulation of the institutions and their music curricula was included in the study so that music educators and college personnel could make comparative studies of institutions. Furthermore, the information could be used in advising high school students who were looking for a particular course of study in college music.

McConathy concluded on an optimistic note. The results of the study indicated that American colleges and universities would increasingly recognize and incorporate music programs of a professional as well as of a cultural nature:

> The results of this questionnaire justify the conclusion that the colleges and universities of the United States are taking an ever-increasing interest in the

---

[1]McConathy, p. 12. The two remaining states were New York and Pennsylvania.

development of music as a social, cultural, and professional subject.[1]

MTNA Survey of College Entrance in Music, 1923. The survey undertaken by the MTNA in 1923 to ascertain the status of music as an entrance subject into college revealed attitudes of college and university administrators toward musical performance. Karl Eschman, who recorded the results for the MTNA, pointed out the differences that existed in the regard shown performance study in institutions throughout the country.

First, wide variances existed in the practice of accepting any high school music credits as college entrance units. Second, few "strong" institutions granted credit for non-theoretical music study unless "safeguarded by additional work in theory."[2] Eastern colleges were reluctant to grant entrance credit for music until the committee examining the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) policy had reached an agreement on which high school music studies should be accepted for college entrance credits.[3]

---

[1]McConathy, p. 6.

[2]Karl H. Eschman, "A Survey of College Entrance Credits in Music," MTNA Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1923), p. 152.

[3]Between 1907 and 1920 the CEEB provided music examinations in appreciation, harmony, counterpoint, piano, voice, and violin. All required written examinations. In addition, the latter three called for performance tests which were conducted under the auspices of the colleges selected by students. In 1922, the music faculty of Harvard University requested that the CEEB readopt music which it had dropped from its examination schedule. A CEEB committee headed by Archibald Davison from Harvard recommended a two-part

Although colleges tended to imitate policies of eastern schools, institutions in the Midwest, West, and South generally accepted all high school musical studies for college entrance credit. The musical subjects accepted by the non-eastern colleges were included as satisfactory courses in any one of three general classifications: (1) subjects required by all; (2) subjects accepted to make up the total number of units; (3) subjects labeled "vocational" from which a limited number could be included.[1] Musical studies most often fell into the second and third categories.

Of the 132 institutions in the Midwest, West, and South which accepted music as an entrance credit, thirty-nine specifically listed performance study as worthy of credit. Twenty-one included theory alone as meriting entrance credit. In the majority of schools, a listing of the specific musical subjects awarded credit was not given, and Eschman concluded that this indicated that any credits in music were acceptable for college entrance credit.[2]

---

examination: (1) in theory and ear-training, and (2) in appreciation and history. In its recommendations, the committee specifically rejected an examination in performance study since such study was of itself unsuitable for college credit. As a result of protests from institutions favoring performance study, the CEEB, early in 1923, appointed a committee to reexamine the total question of music as a college entrance subject. It was the recommendations of this committee that eastern colleges were waiting for at the time of this MTNA study. See: George Coleman Gow, "College Entrance Credits in Music in the East," MTNA Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1923), pp. 162-166.

[1]Eschman, p. 151.

[2]Eschman, pp. 151-152.

In his conclusions, Eschman encouraged college and university personnel to work toward some positive statement regarding the acceptance of all high school music courses for college entrance credit. Many high schools were offering quality work in music which was worthy of recognition in its entirety by colleges. Furthermore, it was foolhardy for colleges to offer courses in music while refusing to recognize for entrance credit the preparation of those students interested in pursuing further musical study.

Views on Performance as an Integral Part of Higher Education: 1900-1925

Continuing deprecation of musical performance. Perhaps one of the main reasons why educators continued to disregard performance study as a necessary part of a musical education was the deprecation of the performer. Throughout the first quarter of the twentieth century performers suffered from an accusation heard earlier, namely that those most sensitive to music were, "like other artists, disqualified for the greatest intellectual and volitional achievements."[1] What society needed was great thinkers, scholars, and venturers, men who were concerned about the "harder problems of life," not men who spent their time making music.[2]

To educated men, the "frenzied applause" accorded

---

[1]Austin Bierbower, "Are We Making Too Much of Music?" Education, XXVIII (February 1905), 361.

[2]Bierbower, p. 363.

musical performance was proof enough that there surely must be something "perverse in the very nature of music that moves it often to act as a distraction from serious concerns."[1] Even someone as broad as Henry James felt the necessity to offset the pleasure experienced at hearing beautiful music with some immediate act of kindness. Only in this way would one's will power not suffer from the hypnotizing spell cast by the music.[2] Consequently, it was not surprising that the art of music was "considered and treated by many thoughtful persons as only one of the minor accomplishments of small minds."[3] As summarized by Bierbower: "Those who are refined in matters generally do not most enjoy music, nor is it enjoyed in proportion to men's proficiency in it; so that much musical training is without value."[4]

As a result, the body of professional musicians were ranked below scholars in other professions--"men who create."[5] Skill in performance was not thought to demand any intellectual ability: "They scarcely need think. They play well when they play automatically."[6] In addition, the private

---

[1]Edward Dickinson, Music and the Higher Education (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), p. 83.

[2]Related by Dickinson, p. 83.

[3]Henry Hanchett, "College and University Work in Music," Education, XXV (February 1905), 350.

[4]Bierbower, p. 363.

[5]Luther L. Fentress, "The Worth of Music in Education," Education, XXVIII (June 1908), 650.

[6]Fentress, p. 650.

music teacher was singled out as one with little general education or intellectual ambition.[1] The work of the music teacher in the public school system was also hindered by the general disregard for musicians. One state superintendent of schools, when questioned whether the music program in his state should be expanded, stated:

> Music does not need strengthening. It has a very lively body of constituents, most of whom have no perspective. They regard music as quite as important as the three R's, or character, or agriculture. They are not self-repressive, and are never noted for reflective ability.[2]

Unfortunately, musicians themselves had to agree that these judgments, although biased, had partial basis in fact. "Truth compels us to say . . . that nearly all our musical instruction . . . fails to induct the student into the real art of music."[3] The stress on acquiring technical virtuosity promoted the view that professional musicians, as a class, were socially and intellectually inferior to men in other professions.[4] Nor was the reputation of the profession enhanced by music students who considered themselves among the virtuosos after completing a conservatory course of study in a matter of weeks.[5] Finally, the overstress on

---

[1]Rossetter G. Cole, "Musical Degrees in American Colleges," MTNA Proceedings (New York, 1907), p. 35.

[2]Quoted in Yont, p. 58.

[3]W. S. B. Mathews, "An Annual Stock-taking of American Musical Progress," Music, XXI (December 1902), 257.

[4]J. Lawrence Erb, "The Musician and the Community," MTNA Proceedings (New York, 1916), p. 10.

[5]Louis Arthur Russell, "A Defect in American Musicianship," The Musician, XIX (January 1914), 19.

virtuosic attainment had created among performers themselves a cult of pharisaism, "an attitude of holier-than-thou, an aristocratic point of view," in which some professional musicians were content to live, oblivious of the rest of society.[1] This attitude damaged the profession as a whole, and would disappear only when a musical career was looked upon by students as one contributing to the good of all the people.[2] The evils attributed to this defect in the education of the performer were clearly summarized by Marshall Bartholomew in 1922:

> The academic result of this over-emphasis on virtuosity has been an unfortunate tendency . . . to encourage the extraordinary talent at the expense of the average talent, to specialize music out of everyday life and make it exclusive, high-brow, intellectual--a thing for the elite and the aristocratic. They forget that music is a vital human need, that music is for everybody and that above all, the music which means most to people is that which they make themselves.[3]

The stress on virtuosic achievement was the most common, but not the only reason given as an explanation for the deprecating attitude toward performers. Karl Gehrkens in 1918 pointed out that the educational world at large and not the conservatory alone was to blame for the prevailing opinion that the musician was intellectually inferior

---

[1]J. Lawrence Erb, "Music Teaching: A Trade or a Profession?" MTNA Proceedings (Chicago, Ill., 1920), p. 105.

[2]Erb, p. 107.

[3]"The Cart Before the Horse in Music Education," The Musician, XXVII (July 1922), 3-4.

to other professional men. Music was unlike other professions in that the aspiring performer had to begin study at a very early age. Since music was not part of the high school curriculum much before 1918, the serious music student had been forced to choose between academic work and music study. For this reason, Gehrkens argued, musicians as a class had the reputation of being "narrow-minded and one-sided."[1]

The high proportion of women studying music was cited as still another reason why music did not enjoy the prestige given to other professions. That more women than men studied music was proof enough to many of the "essential effeminancy" of the art.[2] The problem, however, was not unsolvable. Harold Randolph suggested that when public schools began to hire as many men as it did women for music positions, the misconception that music was a feminine study would disappear.[3]

Still further reasons were cited for keeping the musical profession from being considered an equal among other professions. The popular use of music for recreation and amusement hindered the art from being considered an

---

[1]Karl W. Gehrkens, "Report of the Committee on Public School Music," MTNA Proceedings (New Orleans 1918), p. 83. See also: Ray G. Edwards, "Specializing for Efficiency," The Musician, XXII (August 1917), 573.

[2]Dickinson, p. 42.

[3]"The Feminization of Music," MTNA Proceedings (New York, 1922), p. 200.

intellectually profitable activity demanding serious mental application.[1] To the ordinary business man and college administrator alike, serious musical endeavors constituted a "sad waste of good time and energy."[2] Although musical study might be worthy of some "superficial scrutiny" by the "abnormally curious" in higher education, it was not to be taken seriously by the ordinary college student.[3] Furthermore, the awe of the printed page,--the notion that anyone who was not engaged with learning from books was not intellectually employed,--was a stumbling block to many college educators when it came to respecting musical performance as more than mere digital display.[4]

Deficiencies of the ordinary college conservatory. Manchester, in the 1908 government report on music in education, stated that a decided obstacle preventing the full acceptance of music study in higher education was the lack of agreement among musicians themselves as to what constituded an ideal college or university education in music.[5]

Early in the 1900's, W. S. B. Mathews, editor of

---

[1]Frederic B. Stiven, "The Contribution of a University School of Music to the State and University," The Musical Quarterly, IX (July 1923), 396.

[2]Percy Goetschius, "A Sober Definition of Music," The Musician, X (August 1905), 308.

[3]Goetschius, p. 309.

[4]William J. Leonard, "The Place of Art in the American College," Education, XXXII (June 1912), 603.

[5]Manchester, Music Education in the United States, p. 7.

Music, outlined an ideal plan for music study in the college or university. First, the institution was obliged to offer courses designed to increase a "cultivated intelligence" toward music among ordinary college students. Secondly, the institution was to establish an "advanced school of Music" for the education of composers and performers.[1] To this advanced school would come graduates of conservatories of "good standing" or students who would have achieved a comparable education under private teachers.[2] A talented and trained clientele was of primary importance for each student was to receive a comprehensive musical education extending over three to four years. In this way, music study in higher education would embody a "complete professional training for a first class composer or performing artist."[3]

This plan was the ideal, and Mathews used it as a standard against which to measure music study in higher education in his own day. According to Mathews, the most glaring defect of college music study in 1900 was the tolerance of commercial conservatory standards in the college. All too frequently the college conservatory, like the commercial conservatory, admitted students--the majority of them young women--with little previous education in music.

---

[1][Editorial], Music, XXII (November 1902), 233.

[2]W. S. B. Mathews, "Productive Fields for Public Musical Endowments," Music, XIX (March 1901), 457.

[3]Mathews, p. 457.

Furthermore, few came with the intention of acquiring a complete education in music. Mathews described the situation thus:

> All of our so-called musical colleges are intermediate and elementary schools--all of them. Students are admitted without regard to attainments or talent; they are too often graduated without having received what the diploma demands in the shape of a thorough education in music either as art or science.[1]

Mathews' evaluation of the ordinary college conservatory in 1900 was confirmed by facts obtained in music studies completed in 1908 and 1916. Although conservatories of the highest grade existed in the United States, both Manchester and Yont found that a greater number gave little thought to a well coordinated plan of instruction. These schools were more concerned with financial gain than with educational benefits due students.[2]

Professor Albert Stanley of the University of Michigan, a college professor whose work in music Mathews had often praised, agreed with the editor's general plan for music study in higher education. Stanley's views, however, were tempered by practical experience in a midwestern university. In a letter to the editor of Music, Stanley stated that the relative proportion of the two areas of music study--"technical and inspirational"--would, in individual cases, necessarily be determined by the "specific needs of

---

[1]W. S. B. Mathews, [Editorial], Music, XVIII (August 1900), 390.

[2]See: Manchester, pp. 77-79; Yont, pp. 266-267.

the institution, the character of the students, and often, most unfortunately, by financial considerations."[1]

With regard to the needs of institutions and the type of student enrolled, Stanley viewed the music school as it had to be; Mathews as he wished it to be. According to data collected in the 1906 MTNA Study, conservatories at colleges and universities were bound to offer music courses of an elementary nature since in many parts of the country students interested in music had absolutely no opportunity to acquire the background necessary for advanced work.[2] If the college conservatories did not offer these courses in music, who would?

Otto Kinkeldey was among those who criticized the college conservatory precisely because it responded to the needs of the less adequately prepared music student. Kinkeldey wrote off the typical music department of the midwestern and western university or college as "simply a school for piano-playing and singing, with a little theory."[3]

With regard to the emphasis given to financial considerations--an unfortunate development according to Stanley--, college administrators were known to encourage the conservatory to enroll as many students as possible in order to bring funds into the treasury: "The director is expected to show

---

[1]"University Music from the Professor's Standpoint," Music, XIX (February 1901), 398-399.

[2]Sleeper, "Music as a College Study," p. 44.

[3]"Music in the Universities of Europe and America," MTNA Proceedings (Buffalo, N. Y., 1915), p. 80.

a profit in his department and to be prepared to do sufficient work to obtain that profit."[1] This view was borne out by data in the 1908 government study. Manchester emphatically stated that the monetary value of the conservatory--"a good thing for the treasury"--was of far greater importance to college officials than educational considerations.[2] Manchester, as late as 1922, was still censuring college administrators for allowing the desire for financial gain to govern the educational policies of their conservatories:

> In the majority of such institutions [small colleges] the music department is considered to be the money-making branch of the college business economy and is organized and managed with that purpose in view. . . . Their ability to turn out performers, their own degree of specialization and their promise of attracting pupils who will increase the revenues of the department, to the enrichment of the college treasury, are more seriously estimated, and more publicly exploited, than is their possible possession of progressive educational ideals and their ability to put these ideals into practical application with the student body as a whole.[3]

Performance outside the goal of a college education. In 1907, seventeen per cent of the total college population in the United States was enrolled in the conservatories affiliated with colleges and universities.[4] According to Willard Kimball, these music schools were categorized thus:

---

[1]"The College Music Teacher," The Musician, XV (May 1910), 312.

[2]Manchester, p. 79.

[3]Arthur L. Manchester, "The Small College as a Factor in the Development of a Musical Nation," MQ, VIII (October 1922), 599.

[4]Manchester, Music Education in the United States, p. 19.

(1) schools maintained by private enterprise, but affiliated with a college or university; (2) independent, endowed conservatories affiliated with a college or university; and (3) music schools maintained by universities.[1] Ten years later, Rose Yont made distinctions between the privately owned conservatory affiliated with an educational institution and the music school owned and controlled by the college or university itself.[2] Although conservatories were categorized thus, all were included when criticisms on the type and quality of musical instruction therein appeared. All alike were accused of a misplaced emphasis on performance study. In particular, conservatories associated with colleges were accused of introducing into the academic setting an element foreign to the overall college goal.

Although musicians such as Waldo Selden Pratt and Henry Hanchett advocated a professional school of music as one unit of the American university, both severely criticized the college conservatory of their day. Pratt stated:

> Colleges have brought into their systems an alien element. Instead of organically extending their pedagogical methods to include music, a technical or professional school has been arbitrarily attached, having methods and designs diverse from those of the college as a whole.[3]

The college aim--to prepare students for life, not for an occupation--was thwarted. The difficulty, however, lay not

---

[1]"The School of Music as a Place for Study," MTNA Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), pp. 37-42.

[2]Yont, p. 266.

[3]"New Ideals in Music Education," The Atlantic Monthly, LXXXVI (December 1900), 828.

in the art itself, but in the manner in which it was taught. Too many musicians, among them teachers in college conservatories, "so exalt the technical work of playing, singing, and composing as to make people generally suppose that music cannot be studied otherwise."[1] As a result, students enrolled in the college conservatories acquired "perverted ideas" about music, considered "digital or vocal gymnastics" of primary importance, and displayed "entire incompetence" in applying any scholarly interpretation to musical works.[2]

Hanchett was in agreement with Pratt: "The object of all college study should be intellectual training."[3] To give a systematic understanding of the meaning, value, and beauty of the language and literature of music; to educate connoisseurs and patrons of music; to create an atmosphere favorable to music: these were elements comprising intellectual training in music.[4] Surely the ability to perform was a "most valuable adjunct," but it was not what was considered by some musicians as the study of music itself.[5] If to play or sing were considered important in speaking the language, such a proficiency should be required as an entrance requirement. Furthermore, Hanchett pointed out that mechanical facilities for reproducing musical works had been so

---

[1]Pratt, p. 828.

[2]Pratt, p. 828.

[3]Hanchett, "College and University Work in Music," p. 347.

[4]Hanchett, p. 353.

[5]Hamilton C. Macdougall, "The Value of Music Study," The Musician, X (April 1905), 145.

perfected that the "most important things" could be accomplished without requiring any performance ability on the part of the student.[1]

Hanchett equated the study of music in college conservatories with training given in a trade school. The "mere mechanical arts of playing and singing" were the rule.[2] This situation was bound to prevail until (1) students came to college with an adequate background in music; (2) musicians recognized the importance of the intellectual aspects of music study; and (3) college officials recognized the value of the art of music in the lives of all students.[3]

Oscar Sonneck considered himself as only an interested bystander when it came to viewing the confusing status of music in American colleges and universities in the 1910's.[4] Nonetheless, Sonneck was willing to back educators who extolled music study in college as primarily cultural rather than support those who worked for the inclusion of music in its entirety in higher education. The United States needed fewer performers and more appreciators. The future of American musical culture needed, in particular, greater numbers of college men to whom the art of music was a cultural value to be sought rather than an "effeminate pastime" to be avoided.[5]

---

[1]Hanchett, pp. 351-352. [2]Hanchett, p. 346.

[3]Hanchett, p. 346.

[4]Suum Cuique (New York: G. Schirmer, 1916), p. 124.

[5]Sonneck, p. 125.

Certainly one of the most outspoken exponents for college music as a cultural, not a professional study, was Roy Dickinson Welch, professor of music at Smith College. Welch unequivocally stated: "It is the study of music as music, and not as a vehicle of performance, that merits the interest of the educated man."[1] Unfortunately, the "necessary intervention of performers in musical experience" was the reason why music was thought to belong to the select few.[2] The stress put upon technical facility in the study of music was perplexing to educators who believed that music's right to academic standing should be based upon its ability to conform to accepted academic traditions. Welch stated:

> The gravest question of all is, of course, whether the study of an instrument or of the voice is, in its nature, more than a highly specialized form of reflex adaptations, and whether it has, essentially, great intellectual value than learning to operate a typewriter or to enunciate intelligibly.[3]

Certainly, to produce music was "illuminating," but according to Welch, under no circumstances was this aspect of music study the responsibility of the American college.[4] The only legitimate purpose of college music study was to foster an appreciation of the art. This was accomplished primarily through the study of music literature. Thus, the college trained musician would be musically informed, "whether or not he be technically trained."[5]

---

[1]The Study of Music in the American College (Northampton, Mass.: Smith College, 1925), p. 27.

[2]Welch, p. 27

[3]Welch, p. 45.

[4]Welch, p. 27.

[5]Welch, p. 57.

Welch, however, was willing to concede that theoretical courses could add to the legitimate purpose of music study in college. He cited Harvard and Yale as examples of schools in which theory courses had been introduced with "eminent success" into the college curriculum.[1]

To men like Welch, Pratt, and Hanchett, the musically educated college student responded to music; he did not make music. The performer was a specialist, and the scope of musical instruction in the college did not extend to the specialist: "The College . . . is the school devoted, not to the specialist, but to the man who wishes a broad foundation for culture, a liberal education."[2]

Some wished to prohibit the study of musical performance in colleges because it did not conform to traditional goals. Others, on the other hand, wanted to keep performance out precisely because the academic atmosphere would hamper artistic growth. The creative artist would only be stifled in an academic setting.[3] Music professors, directors of music schools, and perhaps even conductors could be adequately educated in music schools attached to colleges and universities, but students whose main interest was performance would only flourish in a national conservatory especially designed

---

[1]Welch, p. 59.

[2]Hamilton Macdougall, "The Development of Musical Power in the College Student," MTNA Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), p. 64.

[3]Harlow Gale, "Musical Education," MQ, VIII (January 1922), 102.

for talented performers.[1]

Performance study a response to the needs of the people. Although some educators argued vehemently that musical performance had no place in colleges and universities since it played no part in preparing students for life, others stated that the vital force music had become in the daily lives of Americans was precisely the reason why it was worthy of recognition in all systems of education. If college educators were serious about preparing students to be "fairly well grounded in certain subjects which in later years touch life continually," they would by necessity include musical performance among their courses since "practical music is the one form of music expression that touches life most intimately and comprehensively."[2] Furthermore, to Americans the very concept of musician implied that of performance:

> The American people . . . do not take seriously one who styles himself a musician and simply talks or writes about music but cannot "make" it. . . . He may be never so intelligent, never so well-informed in matters involving great research, but from the American point of view he is not a musician, but rather a historian or essayist.[3]

Why performance study continued to be denied a place in the

---

[1]Stiven, "The Contribution of a University School of Music to the State and University," pp. 399-400. See also: Edward Dent, "Music in University Education," MQ, III (October 1917), 610.

[2]Arthur L. Manchester, "Music in Academic Courses," MTNA Proceedings (Philadelphia, Pa., 1919), pp. 40-41.

[3]J. Lawrence Erb, "Music in the American University," MQ, III (January 1917), 30.

curriculum, while subjects unrelated to the daily lives of people--Latin and Greek, for instance--retained their status, was hard to comprehend:

> That a subject of such universal cultivation, whose influence upon life is undeniable should be given so little consideration in the preparing of higher educational curricula by those whose minds should be quick to sense just such values as music is displaying, is surprising. . . . [C]ertainly a subject which has so definitely and broadly proved its worth as an element of the complete life as has practical music, should not be treated so indifferently in the making of educational curricula in our colleges.[1]

To those who stated that the study of music meant the study of the literature of music, others answered that this limited education resulted in talk about music, not the grasp of music itself: "It is one thing to know about music, but it is quite another thing to know music;"[2] and "Music, per se, is a tonal and not a verbal art."[3]

To know music, therefore, presupposed performance ability: "Music, to be vital, must be heard, and to be heard must be performed, and performance of importance in music requires a highly developed technique."[4] In many cases, the college musician could talk about music and musicians but could rarely perform a musical composition with

---

[1]Arthur L. Manchester, "Practical Music and the College Curriculum," MQ, VII (April 1921), 253-254.

[2]W. W. Boyd, "Music in a Liberal Arts Course," MTNA Proceedings (Dayton, Ohio, 1925), p. 39.

[3]Otto W. G. Pfefferkorn, "A Musical Education," The Musician, XVIII (April 1913), 231.

[4]H. H. Bellamann, "Notes on the Problems of Music Teaching in Colleges," MTNA Proceedings (Dayton, Ohio, 1925), p. 60.

"artistic certainty." The conservatory graduate, on the other hand, possessed a wide repertoire but could not articulate about music.[1] The ideal college graduate in music was one who could both perform music artistically and speak about music intelligently. Our nation had too long endured the "vexing pretenses of the mere musicologist and . . . the flighty furries of arrogant artistry."[2] In addition, the only way for the ordinary college student to secure an appreciation of music was through actual musical performance. Thus, if college administrators were serious about the value of music in the lives of graduates, they would not exclude performance study from the curriculum. Bellamann stated it thus:

> The most enthusiastic and intelligent appreciators of music that I know are men and women who have actually played or sung. The most superficial and captious and pretentious have been those who have had a four-year course of lectures and analysis.[3]

J. Lawrence Erb, in a paper delivered at the MTNA meeting in 1912,[4] argued that the college conservatory could not afford to confine musical instruction solely to courses in theory and appreciation. In many areas of the nation, the best musical instruction available was that given in the college conservatory. Practically speaking, it would be folly for these music departments to confine their courses to

---

[1]Bellamann, p. 60.

[2]Pfefferkorn, p. 231.

[3]Bellamann, p. 61.

[4]"The College Conservatory of Music," MTNA Proceedings Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 1912), pp. 60-69.

theory and appreciation when students demanded vocal and instrumental instruction. Unfortunately, the quality of instruction was not always the best, and criticisms directed against performance as such often pertained more specifically to the quality of instruction given. Those college conservatories which were "well manned, well organized, and well conducted," deserved a rightful place in higher education in the United States.[1] Erb, in his remarks, echoed a statement made earlier by Peter Lutkin, professor of music at Northwestern University. The country was too vast and educational conditions were too varied for quick decisions on what was the proper work for music schools in general, and any one department in particular.[2]

Those supporting the study of music in its entirety in colleges and universities could not understand how great institutions of learning could provide professional schools in law and medicine and yet continue to neglect the needs of the aspiring musician. "What the universities have done for law, medicine, engineering, and other professional work, it is their duty to do for music. They must recognize it as worthy of study."[3] In 1900, Stanley had said:

A scheme of instruction in which the importance of

---

[1]Erb, p. 65.

[2]"The School of Music in the University," MTNA Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), p. 35.

[3]Irving M. Glen, "College Preparation for Teachers of Music in Secondary Schools," NEA Proceedings (Oakland, California, 1915), p. 861.

> technical study is ignored, or even minimized, is entirely unworthy of the university and is fundamentally opposed [to] the university idea.[1]

A partial cause for the slowness with which music, particularly musical performance, was granted credit in colleges and universities, even though the "constituency of the universities--the people--desire the work,"[2] was due to the curricular policies of well respected eastern universities. Although prestigious universities had been urged to assume leadership in both the "interpretative and appreciative" aspects of music study, few had done so.[3] Newer institutions, striving to acquire high academic standards, imitated the curricular policies of the eastern schools and "very stupidly threw music overboard, as a kind of scholastic Jonah."[4]

To grant or not to grant credit for musical performance was one question. Whether performance study should be granted the university's highest degree was another. In 1906, Stanley was willing to admit that an original composition was worthy of the university's highest degree. He found it difficult to concede, however, that the "artistic performance of a program demanding unusual powers of

---

[1]Stanley, "University Music from the Professor's Standpoint," p. 399.

[2]Glen, p. 860.

[3]Dickinson, Music and the Higher Education, p. 133.

[4]James F. Cooke, "Plans for the Presser Foundation for Aiding Students in Music in American Colleges," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, VII (April 1921), 104.

interpretation" was worthy of a similar degree.[1] Furthermore, Stanley was unable to foresee the university music school as ever becoming a center for educating "epoch-making performers."[2]

In 1920, Edward Dickinson, in an analysis of music as one area of study in higher education,[3] upheld Stanley's recommendation for music study in higher education--"well-defined courses in research, in creative work, possibly in interpretation"--as the model for the American university.[4] Dickinson, however, did not have the reservations toward performance that Stanley voiced. By 1920, there was a certain amount of agreement among educators as to what constituted the ideal for music study in the American university. This was so because educators believed that the university's goal--the advancement of knowledge through research--had, through developments in universities in the Midwest and West, been expanded to include the "application of knowledge to actual life and the disciplining of special faculties for definite vocational ends."[5] A few years earlier, Erb had

---

[1]Albert Stanley, "Music in the University," MTNA Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), p. 24.

[2]Stanley, p. 28.

[3]"The Teaching of Music," in College Teaching, ed. by Paul Klapper (New York: World Book Company, 1920), pp. 457-474.

[4]Stanley, MTNA Proceedings, 1906, p. 27, quoted by Dickinson, p. 465.

[5]Dickinson, p. 464.

stated how musical performance came to be included under this expanded educational goal:

> It is the policy of the American university to offer all courses, after matriculation, which are accepted toward the degree. . . . Therefore, since Applied Music is a necessary part of the equipment of the music student it is a necessary part of the curriculum of any university offering serious music courses.[1]

To understand, therefore, the development of musical study in the American university one had to distinguish between curricular offerings in two types of universities: the older institutions located primarily in the East and the newer universities in the Midwest and West. The eastern colleges which had expanded into universities allowed primarily for the theoretical and historical study of music. The newer institutions gave equal prominence to both the artistic and scholarly aspects of music. Both advertised quality education in music:

> Here we have a definite line of cleavage, a different point of view between two sets of institutions of equal seriousness of purpose, and in the case of the best of either type, equally eager for the highest educational ideals and equally thorough in their training of the students. The question seems to be, which of these represents the American point of view and meets the American need.[2]

By 1917, however, some of the older universities were beginning to grant credit for performance study, not because the institutions were engaging instructors to teach vocal and instrumental music, but rather because students were permitted to receive credit for study with an

---

[1]Erb, "Music in the American University," pp. 31-32.

[2]Erb, p. 28.

instructor outside the institution. To musicians in the mid-western and western universities this was inexcusable. If the university regarded performance study as worthy of academic credit, it was obliged to provide the instruction in the university at no extra cost to the student. To require students to go outside the institution for first-rate vocal or instrumental instruction was definitely disapproved of by administrators in schools west of the Allegheny Mountains as well as by a considerable number in the East.[1]

Furthermore, large universities were the institutions which were able to provide adequate facilities necessary to educate artists of the highest rank. State universities in particular were singled out as institutions which could afford to bring as teachers into their music schools the outstanding musical leaders and performers of the day.[2] State universities, also, were in a position to abolish all special music fees and thus make possible the professional education of the musician at a cost comparable to that of students in other professions.[3]

Music students and teachers alike suffered from the policy of extracting special fees for music lessons. It was unjust and unfair to provide a free education in some

---

[1]Erb, p. 31.

[2]Arthur Foote, "Music in the College," NEA Proceedings (San Francisco, Cal., 1911), p. 805.

[3]Philip Greeley Clapp, "The Place of the State University in the American Scheme of Musical Education," MTNA Proceedings (Detroit, Mich., 1921), p. 62.

areas but not in others:

> It is ridiculous that music education should be made to cost more than other education. It is unfair to music. It is unfair to music teachers. It is unfair to thousands of good students of music. It is unfair to the schools at large that we drive music into isolation.[1]

All too often music instructors in colleges and universities were hired on a commission basis, rather than on a salary basis. The weekly number of lessons--thirty to forty not being an "exceptional assignment"--determined the salary. This was unjust for in no other department were the instructors required to "pay their own salaries and provide a sizable surplus as well."[2]

Growing Insistence on Standardization in Music Study

As a result of the 1908 study on music, Arthur Manchester concluded that the most urgent need of music in American education was the development of a logically constructed plan of music education from the elementary grades through the university level.[3] In 1909, Mrs. Frances Clark spelled out for NEA members the necessity for systematized music study: "We have no uniform gradation in the grades,

---

[1]John R. Kirk, "Music on an Accredited Basis," NEA Proceedings (Denver, Colorado, 1909), p. 697.

[2]Manchester, "The Small College as a Factor in the Development of a Musical Nation," p. 600. See also: "The College Music Teacher," The Musician, XV (May 1910), 312.

[3]Manchester, "A Conclusion Drawn from the Inquiry into the Status of Music Education in Secondary Schools, Colleges and Universities," p. 197.

absolutely none in our high schools, no connection or relation with the college, and still less, if that were possible, with the conservatory."[1] In 1910, Elmer Brown, the United States Commissioner of Education, was quoted as saying:

> Lack of organization, the inability to "hold together," these are the reasons which a perfectly fair and very capable judge of things educational adduces for the present unsatisfactory state of music in this country.[2]

Establishing a comprehensive plan of music study at the college and university level meant working for the acceptance of all aspects of music study in these institutions. This included artistic as well as scholarly aspects of music study. Acceptance implied credit. To grant credit for a course was the accepted way for an institution to recognize college work satisfactorily completed. Musical performance needed this type of approval:

> This [granting credit for performance] means that the institution is willing to grant its credit for work, not because it lends itself to exact measurement of ordinary credit work, but because the work itself is valuable and needs the encouragement and stimulation that the credit system gives it.[3]

From 1910 on, an important aspect of the discussions on musical performance in higher education included suggestions on how to evaluate performance and how to determine the

---

[1]"The Status of Music in the United States," NEA Proceedings (Denver, Colorado, 1909), p. 678.

[2]Quoted by Helena Maguire, "Organization Needed in Music," The Musician, XV (February 1910), 95.

[3]Charles H. Farnsworth, "Music on an Accredited Basis in Colleges and Universities," NEA Proceedings (Denver, Colorado, 1909), p. 684.

number of credits to be given it. If instruction in any one area of music study was singled out as haphazard or incomplete, it was musical performance. One reason why performance found a difficult entry into higher education was just because the quality and substance of instruction in performance varied so greatly from teacher to teacher and school to school.[1] In addition, credit was denied performance study because the instruction given was of an elementary nature: "We are asking college credits for grammar school work."[2]

Surely the situation was not helped by the lack of coordinated effort between professional musicians, college and university musicians, and music teachers in the elementary and secondary schools. The amount of good will between musicians in the public schools and the colleges was so little that neither was aware of the work achieved by the other:

> This lack of co-operation is not because there is nothing musical in the lower schools to co-operate with but because of a lack of breadth of view on the part of musicians.[3]

The problem was not easily solved. Manchester described it thus in 1919: Each university had become a law unto itself. The university worked out its programs without regard for work in the college. Colleges outlined their courses oblivious of work in other colleges or of the need to relate to

---

[1]Cole, "Musical Degrees in American Colleges, p. 33.

[2]H. H. Bellamann, "The Relation of College Music to the Educational System of the Country," MTNA Proceedings (Chicago, 1920), p. 222.

[3]Samuel Winkley Cole, "Conditions in American Musical Education," The Musician, XVI (October 1911), 654.

the lower schools.[1]

Educators seeking a solution to this problem were convinced that steps toward cooperation and coordination between educational units had to be initiated by personnel in colleges and universities.[2] Little chance of growth in any coordinated plan of musical instruction was possible until leaders in the profession recognized the work of music teachers in the public schools.[3] Indeed, one educator flatly stated that no work in any area of school study could progress until adequately recognized by college administrators.[4]

Perhaps the most common obstacle to be overcome before academic credit would be given for performance study was the notion that performance did not require intellectual ability. "Practical music, to a college authority, is a matter of mechanical training with little, or no, mental participation."[5] To counteract such thinking, Stanley wanted to go on record as stating that in his experience at the University of Michigan he had found that the performing student was more intellectually gifted than the ordinary student. The credits he earned were the result of long hours of concentrated intellectual activity.[6] Similarly, the dean of

---

[1]Manchester, "Music in Academic Courses," p. 45.

[2]Bellamann, p. 222. [3]Cole, p. 654.

[4]Leonard, "The Place of Art in the American College," p. 63.

[5]Manchester, "Music in Academic Courses," p. 40.

[6]Stanley, "Music in the University," p. 30.

the School of Music at DePauw University informed the editor of The Musician that four of the twelve students honored for scholastic achievement by election into Phi Beta Kappa in 1914 were students in the music school.[1]

According to Earl Moore, the topic of how to standardize music courses as well as how to evaluate them was a recurring theme of the MTNA after 1914.[2] College musicians came to national meetings with suggestions on how to evaluate and credit performance study. Exact number of credit hours and grades were calculated to the wonder of some and the dismay of others.

Granted, the evaluation of the artistic study of music was not as easily adjusted to college policies as the scholarly study of music. However, since musicians were looking to the college for proper recognition of music study, it was up to the musician to adjust to the policies of the college: "He should learn to speak their language and to think their thoughts."[3] This meant allotting a certain number of credit hours to the weekly lesson and its corresponding hours of practice. It also meant assigning a particular letter grade to those hours at the end of the

---

[1]"University Students and Music," The Musician, XIX (July 1914), 445.

[2]"Standardizing Theory Courses in Universities," MTNA Proceedings (St. Louis, Missouri, 1924), p. 225.

[3]J. Lawrence Erb., "The Problems of the Music Teacher," MTNA Proceedings (New Orleans, La., 1918), p. 15.

semester.[1] To those who insisted that it was impossible to assign a letter grade for performance study, a university professor of music answered:

> I question whether there are very many serious music teachers who do not either consciously or unconsciously measure up a student's technical, intellectual, and artistic capacity at each lesson.[2]

From the 1910's on, musicians encouraged officials of the MTNA to assume leadership in providing a general statement regarding the number of credit hours for performance study, theoretical courses, and academic work feasible for a degree in music. Some flexible plan for evaluating performance study was another frequent request.[3]

In 1924 Moore stated that as far as music study in higher education was concerned, reasonable success had been attained in setting up standards by which credit for musical performance was given and progress noted.[4] However, minimum standards for courses of study in music at the college level had not as yet been established. In fact, agreement on the

---

[1]R. G. McCutchan, "Regulations Governing the Grading and Passing of Students," MTNA Proceedings (Philadelphia, 1919), pp. 126-127.

[2]Fredrik Holmberg, "Standardizing Music Degrees," MTNA Proceedings (Pittsburgh, 1923), p. 143.

[3]James T. Quarles, "The Standardization of Theoretical Courses in Schools and Colleges," MTNA Proceedings (St. Louis, Missouri, 1924), pp. 238-241. See also: Arthur L. Manchester, [Discussion], MTNA Proceedings (New Orleans, 1917), pp. 215-216; Manchester, "Report of Committee: Conference of Music in the College," MTNA Proceedings (Philadelphia, 1919), p. 113; H. H. Bellamann, "Outline of a Progressive Policy for a College Music Department," The Musician, XXV (March 1920), 13; Holmberg, pp. 141-148.

[4]Moore, p. 224.

value of minimum standards had not as yet been reached. Moore believed that the attempt "to standardize the content or length of courses on a national basis" was not as yet a practical plan for music study in the United States.[1] Others, on the other hand, disagreed with him. Holmberg unequivocally stated:

> With such a regulation in force music degrees would begin to mean the same thing everywhere and perhaps would receive proper respect from the educational world in general.[2]

---

[1]Moore, p. 226. [2]Holmberg, p. 142.

CHAPTER IV

MUSICAL PERFORMANCE IN BACCALAUREATE AND GRADUATE DEGREES IN MUSIC: 1925-1951

Beginning in 1924, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) worked to establish minimum requirements for baccalaureate and graduate degrees in music. The cry raised by those who refused to recognize performance as an essential part of music study was dimmed but not silenced by the authority of such an organization of reputable schools and departments of music across the nation. Studies undertaken in music indicated that despite the unremitting criticisms of some, the study of music performance was solidly established in American colleges and universities, and academic credit granted for its study toward both the arts and the professional degrees.

NASM: Minimum Standards for Baccalaureate Degrees in Music

The establishment of the NASM. In June, 1924, Burnet Tuthill of the Cincinnati Conservatory of Music invited directors of schools of music to meet in order to discuss mutual concerns. Kenneth M. Bradley, one of the seven persons present for this meeting and subsequent president of the NASM, had, prior to 1924, spent considerable time traveling from

one music school to another trying to stir interest among directors to meet and discuss problems common to all, and in particular, to work for some mutual agreement on standards within specific courses of study. Bradley met with little success, for too many administrators viewed any movement toward standardization as the establishment of "dictatorial, cut and dried patterns for musical education" rather than as a cooperative venture toward establishing minimum standards in music study.[1]

It was significant then that the directors who had met in June, 1924, were able to form the nucleus of a larger group representing thirty-three schools which, with the aid of a grant from the Carnegie Foundation and the advisory help of members of the Central Association of Colleges, drew up the constitution for the National Association of Schools of Music and Allied Arts. As stated in the constitution, the object of the organization was:

> To establish closer relationship between schools of music and allied arts, and between them and the state boards or commissions and also to cooperate with the various educational associations which may directly or indirectly affect the cause of music and allied arts.[2]

Earl V. Moore and Howard Hanson were among the founding members of the NASM. According to Moore, the chief goals of the new organization were to establish standards for courses

---

[1]"Lest We Forget," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 29 (April 1950), p. 19.

[2]Constitution and By-Laws, (National Association of Schools of Music and Allied Arts, n. d.), p. 5.

of study in music and to recognize schools on the basis of these standards.[1] The earliest advance toward achieving the goals was the "bringing to a common conference table the problems of the independent school on the one hand and the fully endowed or state supported school on the other."[2] Hanson recounted that the "more than mildly chaotic" conditions existing in professional music education at the time were the impetus for the founding of the NASM:

> The basic professional degree, the Bachelor of Music, . . . had almost lost any academic significance. In certain institutions the degree represented five, or even six years of professional study beyond high school graduation. In other schools, it might be granted without even the mildest academic pre-requisite of high school graduation, or might be granted while the student was still in high school.[3]

Thus, the desire to save the Bachelor of Music degree from academic extinction by raising standards in the education of the professional musician was the main goal of the NASM.

Until schools could be measured against established standards, the NASM was comprised of individual musicians rather than of schools of music. For representatives of independent conservatories and schools of music affiliated with colleges and universities to come to some agreement on basic tenets regarding professional education was not an easy process.

---

[1]"The Growth and Changing Status of Independent Schools of Music Since 1876," MTNA Proceedings (Cleveland, Ohio, 1928), p. 231.

[2]Moore, p. 231.

[3]"Professional Music Education in the United States 1925-54," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 40 (April 1955), p. 5.

Harold L. Butler, who became president of the NASM in 1928, described the earliest meetings thus:

> I remember as if it were yesterday the preliminary meetings held three or four times a year with their "knock-down and drag-out" discussions, their resentments and reconciliations, the heated arguments, the necessary and wise compromises that resulted in our first programs sent out to many other schools in the form of printed statements.[1]

Depite the difficulties, the Commission on Curricula within the association under the direction of Howard Hanson worked during the first four years to establish minimum requirements for the Bachelor of Music degree.

Minimum standards for the Bachelor of Music degree. During the earliest years of its existence, the NASM looked upon itself primarily as an organization for the establishment of standards in the baccalaureate degree as well as the instrument for measuring these standards in schools requesting a formal examination. The bulk of this work--setting up standards for the B. M. degree and outlining curricula to achieve these standards--fell to the Commission on Curricula. Under the leadership of Howard Hanson, chairman for the first nine years, the committee presented the association with a set of minimum requirements. Like Butler--president of the NASM when its statement on basic requirements was issued in 1929--Hanson, in retrospect, admitted that coming to a mutual agreement among members was the most difficult aspect of the committee's task. How could the committee fulfil its work when it had to

---

[1]"A Message from Butler," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 29 (April 1950), p. 21.

respond, on the one hand, to the needs of the "independent conservatory completely unsullied by academic procedure," and, on the other, the "conservative college departments of music which looked askance at the idea of granting academic credit for the manipulation of the keys of a pianoforte."[1] To build mutual trust between musicians from independent conservatories, university schools of music, and college music departments, demanded a "maximum of tact and diplomacy."[2]

In 1927, midway through the deliberations of the Commission, Hanson presented to the MTNA members what turned out to be a progress report on the agreements reached by the committee on the education of the professional musician.[3] The first recommendation was that the NASM demand a high school diploma of all students entering a degree program in music schools. Second, the commission agreed that four years was to be considered the normal span of study for the Bachelor of Music degree.

In order to qualm misgivings that the commission's efforts to establish minimum standards meant fixing curricula into one pattern, Hanson stated that its considerations were aimed at answering one question, not setting down hard and fast rules. That question was: What can be expected of a

---

[1]"Foreward," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 19 (July 1944), p. 2.

[2]"Foreward," p. 2.

[3]Howard Hanson, "A Discussion of the Curricula of Schools of Music," MTNA Proceedings (Minneapolis, Minn., 1927), pp. 55-63.

graduate in a professional music course?[1] As of 1927, the commission had agreed upon five basic proficiencies for the music graduate: (1) the ability to perform "in an acceptable fashion for the specific work" intended; (2) a facility on the keyboard--if a non-keyboard major; (3) a certain expertise in the areas of sight singing and ear training; (4) a working knowledge of the basic theoretical and historical subjects in music; (5) an introduction into literature and other allied studies.[2]

In 1929 the NASM published its statement on minimum entrance and course requirements for the Bachelor of Music degree. Harold Butler, president of the NASM, explicitly stated the importance of the minimum standards in the education of the musical performer in an essay that comprised one section of a 1930 volume dedicated to the whole of American higher education.[3] Since music could not exist without "fine technical performance," American colleges and universities were bound to share in this aspect of music study.[4] As a foundation for attaining professional education in music, students entering music departments were required to present a high school diploma comprising fifteen units of work--twelve in academic subjects, three in electives. In addition, the student was required to demonstrate understanding of the

---

[1]Hanson, pp. 58-59.

[2]Hanson, p. 59.

[3]"The Fine Arts: Music, Art, and Architecture," in Higher Education in America (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1930), pp. 243-261.

[4]Butler, p. 244.

rudiments of music and proficiency in one area of performance.

With regard to course requirements leading to the professional degree, a total of 78 to 92 of the 120 credits was given over to music studies. Of these, 32 to 50 credit hours were assigned to the study of performance. Thus, this element of professional study comprised 30 to 41.5 per cent of the total credit hours needed for graduation. In addition, a method for computing credit hours for performance study according to the amount of practice required was provided: six hours of practice merited two semester hours of credit. Finally, candidates for the B. M. degree in performance were required to give a senior recital of at least forty minutes in length.

Butler reported that by the end of 1929 a total of thirty-eight schools had agreed to accept the degree requirements and to conform to them within a period of two years.[1] Not only were individual schools of music throughout the country looking to the NASM for sanction of their programs, but a regional accrediting body, the Southern Collegiate Association (SCA), had in December, 1929, asked the NASM to act as its accrediting agency for music departments in colleges under its jurisdiction. Colleges in the SCA were given three years to meet the requirements established by the NASM or lose the power to grant the Bachelor of Music degree.[2]

With regard to the teachers of performance in colleges

---

[1]Harold Butler, "Articulation of High School and College Curricula," MSNC Yearbook (Chicago, Ill., 1930), p. 108.

[2]Butler, p. 108.

granting the B. M. degree, the NASM in 1935 made three recommendations: first, that the instructor be an artist-teacher with a wide range of repertoire; second, that he have had previous teaching experience; and third, that he himself have earned a Bachelor of Music degree or its equivalent in addition to one or more years of subsequent study under recognized performers.[1]

Harold Butler undertook a major share of responsibility for the examination of the first schools requesting accreditation from the NASM and traveled from his home in Syracuse, N. Y., to many parts of the country to visit these institutions. Despite discrepancies in institutional policies, Butler reported to the MTNA that the NASM had succeeded in bringing under one fold a variety of institutions engaged in professional music education: endowed and non-endowed independent conservatories; independent conservatories affiliated with colleges; departments and schools of music in colleges and universities from whom a profit was demanded and those operating under college endowment.[2] The differences in institutions served to underscore the good accomplished by the NASM for professional music study in American higher education, namely, the insuring of certain minimum standards in all schools and the gaining of

---

[1]Donald M. Swarthout, "Report of the Committee on Minimum Requirements for Teacher Qualification," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 5 (January 1936), p. 10.

[2]"Observations on the Examination of the Schools in the National Association of Schools of Music," MTNA Proceedings (Detroit, Mich., 1931), p. 65.

respect for the Bachelor of Music degree among professional educators.

The good that the NASM was accomplishing for professional music education was reflected in the growth of the number of NASM approved institutions offering the B. M. degree. In 1928, the NASM numbered 38 member institutions. By 1934, full membership included 52 schools; in 1945, the number had increased to 126. In 1934, 31 per cent of the music schools were those affiliated with state universities; 22 per cent with private colleges and universities. The remaining 27 per cent were independent conservatories. By 1945, the percentages had shifted. Only 15 per cent of the full members were independent conservatories. Fifty-six per cent were affiliated with private colleges or universities; 29 per cent with state supported schools. By 1945, 104 member institutions awarded the professional baccalaureate degree in performance. These included not only 33 of the 36 state supported institutions, but 34 of the 50 private colleges as well.

Minimum standards for the Bachelor of Arts degree in music. Interestingly enough, the list of NASM members in 1945 indicated that, not only did 34 of the 50 arts colleges grant the Bachelor of Music degree in performance, but 37 awarded a Bachelor of Arts degree in musical performance as well. This is all the more interesting since the belief that music study in college should be for cultural reasons alone was still very much alive among musicians.

Despite differences of opinion regarding the goals of college music study, the NASM Commission on Curricula in 1933 issued a statement on minimum requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in music with a major in performance.[1] A minimum of 40 of the 120 credits needed for graduation comprised the music curriculum. Of these, 16 credits or 40 per cent of the credits allotted to music were given over to performance study. According to the committee, the degree was not to be considered a professional degree. Performance proficiency required of the candidate for the B. A. degree in music was to be the equivalent of the proficiency of a student having completed a second year in the B. M. degree program.[2]

To have the national accrediting agency for music solidly approve of and set minimum requirements for a course of study leading to a B. A. degree with an emphasis in performance was a significant step for music study in American higher education. Certainly the last outburst denouncing performance as a study worthy of academic credit had not been sounded. In fact, less than years before the NASM's statement, Archibald Davison vehemently attacked the practice of granting credit for performance study in the college:

> We take an academic degree which . . . has long stood for general cultivation, mental training, and the requirement of logic in its operation, and include in the preparation for it subjects like swimming, cheerleading, singing, and

---

[1]Burnet C. Tuthill, "The Tenth Annual Meeting," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 1 (January 1934), pp. 1-2.

[2]Tuthill, p. 2.

trombone-playing.[1]

In no way could performance study come up to academic standards since it was little more than "glorified typewriting"[2] or the "tracing of designs through tissue paper."[3]

Davison exhibited a narrow viewpoint not uncommon in former times but, judging from the consensus reached by the NASM committee with regard to performance in a B. A. degree, one not held by persons influential in the formation of curricular policies in a majority of institutions of higher education. Glen Haydon probably presented a truer picture of the attitude toward music study in higher education in 1935 when he stated that, although the goals for music study in the liberal arts colleges were cultural and in the conservatory, professional, there existed in both institutions a middle ground which was very nearly the same. In fact, the fundamental objective--to give a solid musical education--was identical. The differences that existed were differences in degree.[4]

Some years later an instructor in a liberal arts college explained that the middle ground between the two types of school existed in the area of performance. In fact, the end result in performance study in the arts could compare

---

[1]Music Education in America (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1926), p. 17.

[2]Davison, p. 129. [3]Davison, p. 131.

[4]"Aims and Objectives of the College and Conservatory Curricula in Music," MENC Yearbook (Chicago, Ill., 1935), pp. 384-386.

"favorably with the standard of the professional degree."[1]

Performance Study after 1925: Data from Studies; Opinions of Educators

MTNA Studies 1927-1934. Between 1927 and 1934 the MTNA completed three studies on the policies of colleges and universities toward entrance credits in music in institutions represented by members of the association.[2] In so doing, the committee sought to determine attitudes toward performance study in colleges and universities represented by its members.

In each of the three studies, approximately one-third of the institutions represented were state supported and two-thirds, privately controlled. An average of 73 per cent of the schools included in the studies awarded entrance credit for performance study in high school.

The number of entrance credits accepted in music varied from one to four units in 1927 to one to eight units in 1934. Two units was the norm in all three studies. With regard to accepting performance study for entrance credit, Erb concluded that if the high school itself had accepted performance study for graduation, the college generally accepted it as an

---

[1]Thomas W. Williams, "The Place of the Bachelor of Arts Degree in Music," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 41 (January 1956), p. 13.

[2]See: J. Lawrence Erb, "Report of the Committee on Colleges and Universities," MTNA Proceedings (Minneapolis, Minn., 1927), pp. 215-220; (Cleveland, Ohio, 1928), pp. 298-305; (Detroit, Mich., 1931), pp. 152-157; (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1934), pp. 269-271.

entrance unit.[1] Furthermore, statistics revealed that state supported institutions were the most liberal in accepting performance study as an entrance unit. This Erb attributed in large measure to the close integration which existed between the public schools and the state universities.[2]

One area of constant discussion regarding college music in the 1920's and 30's was that of evaluating performance study. One question in the 1927-28 study was concerned with methods of testing performance study at the college level. Data indicated that much emphasis was being laid on examinations in performance. First of all, nearly all of the fifty-five institutions responding furnished copies of printed curricula as evidence of specific grade level achievements that were being required in technique and repertoire in performance courses. In addition, senior recitals and junior recitals as well provided a type of comprehensive examination. Although in some institutions the evaluation of students in specific performance courses was determined solely by the instructor, in others the jury system of examination was "widely popular."[3]

The MTNA committee applauded the efforts of music faculties to grade performance study. If instrumental or vocal study were to become universally accepted by college authorities, it would have to be done in conjunction with, rather

---

[1]Erb, 1928, p. 300. [2]Erb, 1931, p. 153.

[3]Erb, 1928, p. 302.

than in opposition to accepted educational policies.[1] The use of examinations was one such accepted policy.

The 1927-28 study did not set out to elicit responses on the merits or demerits of the "widely popular" jury system of evaluating performance. The NASM, however, actively sought to promote among its members the acceptance of a system whereby several teachers would aid in evaluating individual performance. The teacher was often too close to the student to realize an objective appraisal. Furthermore, as long as performance teachers continued to be hired on a commission basis, some to whom assigning grades was an individual task might give grades higher than deserved in order not to lose students, and hence, income. Finally, the realization that one's work was to be judged by others was an incentive to both student and teacher.[2]

In each of the three studies, Erb returned to one specific point. The variety exhibited in the type and amount of music entrance credits accepted by colleges and universities was a sign of a "normal and healthy situation."[3] Certainly one had to have faith that each school wanted the best for its students. The fact that schools varied considerably on policies with regard to music was proof enough that all students could not fit into any one "snug little formula."[4] It is difficult to surmise what lay behind Erb's conviction.

---

[1] Erb, 1928, p. 304.

[2] D. M. Swarthout, "Grading of Applied Music," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 16 (March 1942), p. 11.

[3] Erb, 1934, p. 23.

[4] Erb, 1928, p. 303.

Running through all the studies was the belief that although set minimum standards were generally good for schools, the needs of all students could not be cared for through such a policy: "It would seem an advantage--in fact, a necessary condition for real education--if each institution were to work out its own conditions for carrying on its activities."[1]

Studies on music in the liberal arts college: 1928-1935. The Association of American Colleges (AAC) was also sponsoring studies on the place of music in higher education, specifically, music in the liberal arts college, during the same years in which the MTNA was investigating college entrance credits in music. In 1928, Thomas W. Surette was asked to submit a chapter on the ideal music program for the liberal arts college as one chapter in a volume on selected phases of arts colleges.[2]

Surette's program for the liberal arts college encompassed music as a means of cultural enrichment, as a preparation for teachers, and as a special course for the composition student. It was not new to hear that the main reason for the inclusion of music in the arts was for the cultural benefit of the entire student body. This was to be accomplished through the study of music literature by listening to live or recorded performances, or better still, by actual participation in

---

[1]Erb, 1931, p. 156.

[2]"Music in the Liberal College," in The Effective College (New York: Association of American Colleges, 1928), pp. 171-180.

music-making. "For the person who makes music in some form or other is the one who understands it best."[1] Surette suggested singing in a choral group as one of the best ways to make music. A select chorus such as Archibald Davidson had organized at Harvard was cited as a vital element in an ideal college music program.

The ideal college music program would also allow for some instruction in instrumental music, particularly piano study. However, no one would be allowed instruction unless he could demonstrate considerable technical facility. The beginner could not acquire the necessary technical facility quickly enough in order to profit from his own music-making. Surette stated:

> Allowing all the advantages of being able to play the piano, it still remains true that, unless it is pursued seriously, competently and with a definite educational objective it has no place as a part of a college curriculum.[2]

If only competent students were admitted into performance courses, many of the difficulties music departments faced would be solved. For instance, by being more selective in admissions, colleges would avoid unnecessary expense in space and facilities. Also, fewer faculty would be needed not only in performance study but also for the theory courses needed by performance students in order to grasp the essentials of music. "For credit, so called, is not given for pianoforte playing alone; every student must take theory or 'appreciation' along

---

[1]Surette, p. 175. [2]Surette, p. 178.

with it."[1]

Although Surette made allowance for the performer with a certain amount of proficiency, this instruction in no way constituted professional training. On the other hand, however, Surette specifically included provisions for the education of the aspiring composer. In fact, in order that the composition student would have the educational opportunities necessary for his artistic growth, "every possible freedom and facility" was to be granted him. In no way were academic restrictions to be allowed to "clog the artistic."[2]

Although Surette hinted that performance study would need to be accompanied by theoretical courses in order to be educationally sound, he did not denounce performance study *per se* in the college as had Roy Dickinson Welch in 1925 or Archibald Davison in 1926. However, if Surette's limited plan had been accepted by the 400 some colleges that the AAC represented in 1928, music education in the United States would have been in dire straits. From the earliest years of the century, musicians had pointed out that the best musical education available for many students in this country was that given in college and university departments and schools.[3] Augustus Zanzig, who like Davison took upon himself the task of presenting a comprehensive view of things musical in the United States in the 1930's, stated:

---

[1]Surette, p. 178. [2]Surette, p. 179.

[3]See Chapter II, pp. 43-44.

> In most of the states, the college or university is evidently the only agency through which musical education worthy of the attention of talented music students is being, or could be, given.[1]

Another student of the American musical scene in the 1930's, Eric Clarke, under commission of the Carnegie Foundation, presented a critique on conditions in the nation. True, there were deficiencies in both the conservatory and the college music department. Nonetheless, Clarke insisted that students with an interest in either the artistic or the scholarly aspects of music needed to be educated in schools where both were considered of equal value. Clarke reasoned thus:

> Singing and playing cannot be taught properly where music history and theory are ignored, nor can scholarship in music nor indeed any deep understanding be imparted to those who have not the means of sounding what they see. The functions of conservatory and college music departments are therefore essentially the same.[2]

The major problem in 1935 was not what to limit in a college music program but where to find artist-teachers to staff the schools.[3]

John Erskine, another spokesman for the AAC, recognized the burden colleges would assume in establishing first-rate conservatories. Despite difficulties, colleges were obliged to provide full instruction in music. How incongruous to introduce children to music in the lower schools as if we

---

[1]Music in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932), p. 355.

[2]Music in Everyday Life (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1935), p. 71.

[3]Clarke, pp. 144-145.

believed in both the theory and the practice of the art and then refuse, in higher education, to make provisions for or to grant a degree in the practice of the art.[1]

In 1932, the AAC, funded by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, initiated a study on all aspects of music in thirty selected colleges and universities in the nation. The study was restricted to a consideration of music as it involved students working for the liberal arts degree regardless of whether the department or school of music was associated with a college or university. Ernest Wilkins, president of Oberlin College, headed the sponsoring committee made up of eighteen prominent educators. Among the eighteen were three men actively involved in the workings of the NASM: Harold L. Butler, immediate past president; Howard Hanson, chairman of the Commission on Curricula; and Burnet C. Tuthill, secretary of the association.

The essential purpose of the study, as described by Wilkins, was to formulate, on the basis of data obtained from the schools, recommendations for music programs in all the colleges in the AAC.[2] The director of the study chosen to visit the schools and write the report was Randall Thompson.

In 1935, the report, College Music: An Investigation for the Association of American Colleges, was published. The

---

[1]"Music in the Curriculum," Bulletin of the AAC, XVII (March 1931), 67-71.

[2]Ernest Wilkins, "A Survey of the Study of Music in Colleges," MSNC Yearbook (Cleveland, Ohio, 1932), p. 201.

document was divided into a discussion of current music practices in the schools and suggestions for future development. Thompson's critique was built upon the basic acceptance of music as a college subject: "Nothing in my visits bespoke a need for further defence of Music as a subject for academic consideration."[1]

The major aim of music study in liberal arts programs as described by musicians and administrators in the thirty schools was the fostering of a musical consciousness among the American people through an increased knowledge of music.[2] Second in importance was a fostering of musical scholarship and composition. With regard to the relationship of performance study to these avowed goals, Thompson stated:

> Most colleges recognize a distinction between Applied Music and other branches of musical study which is not matched by a distinction between the history and the literature, history and theory, or literature and theory. There is a tacit agreement that Applied Music is a special case, and the balance between it and other Music courses has generally been regulated by the establishment of a maximum proportion of credit which may be earned toward a Liberal Arts degree in Music by taking music lessons.[3]

Although a major portion of the report was devoted to policies regarding musical performance, evaluations were also made on the study of theory and literature. Forty-seven introductory courses in music literature were offered in the thirty institutions; a graded sequence of courses in the history and literature of music in twelve schools. In contrast, nearly

---

[1]Randall Thompson, College Music (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), p. xv.

[2]Thompson, p. 13.

[3]Thompson, p. 12.

240 courses were offered in music theory, composition, and analysis. As far as instruction in these courses was concerned, Thompson noted a real need for improvement in teaching. Students acquired little familiarity with masterworks since instructors themselves demonstrated inadequate knowledge of music literature. All too many of the theoretical courses were regarded by Thompson as courses auxiliary to the study of theory proper, as for example, sight singing, ear training, and keyboard harmony. Colleges were granting credits for the acquisition of skills which should have been acquired in the lower schools.

Thompson's evaluation of performance study is clearly stated in the last sentence of a lengthy discussion on performance practices in the thirty colleges: "Everything in my experience leads me to condemn Applied Music as a subject for college credit."[1] The findings that led to this conclusion Thompson spelled out in great detail. First of all, the identical purpose for which performance was esteemed in one school caused it to be rejected in another. The lack of agreement on what was to be included in the curriculum led to a variety of practices concerning performance study in the colleges: (1) not offered; (2) offered without credit; (3) offered with credit but with qualifying stipulations--completion of certain courses, accompanied by ensemble participation; (4) offered with credit, but optional for the music major; (5)

---

[1]Thompson, p. 97.

offered with credit, and required of the music major; (6) offered with credit for all without restrictions.[1]

A similar lack of agreement accompanied grading policies in performance study. In some schools, a student's grade was determined by the teacher; in others, by a jury and teacher; and in still others, by the jury alone. Determinants in grading as noted by performance faculty included ability, accomplishment, repertoire, effort, initiative, interpretation, technique, sight singing ability, public performances.[2] Thompson regarded the policy of granting salaries to performance teachers as a problem related to grading. In only thirteen schools was the performance faculty paid on a salary basis. In the remaining schools where the teacher's stipend depended on the number of students or the amount of fees paid by the student, the temptation existed to give a high grade, whether or not it was earned, in order to secure the student for another term.

Thompson looked upon the inclusion of a large number of performance teachers as a distinct disadvantage for the college. The balance in any kind of decision making among the music faculty could easily be upset by the heavy proportion of instrumental and vocal teachers. Since these persons were usually hired for their ability to teach an instrument and not for their "general educational sagacity," the concentration of the "governmental function" in their hands constituted

---

[1]Thompson, p. 48.

[2]Thompson, p. 62.

a real danger to the school.[1]

The lack of unified policies in so many areas of performance study convinced Thompson that the subject should not be included in the curriculum:

> This sliding scale of acceptability suggests that Applied Music is not as other college subjects are; that it is not intrinsically a sound college study. It throws grave doubt upon the general educational value of Applied Music in the Liberal Arts program, and tends to lower the academic standing of the whole study of Music.[2]

Teachers in the schools had supplied reasons approving the granting of credit for performance study. The student of theory and history needed performance skill for his studies. If laboratory work in the sciences was worthy of credit, so was instrumental and vocal study with its required hours of practice. Moreover, if students could not carry performance study for credit, they would not have sufficient time for its study outside of class hours. All these arguments Thompson disregarded and concluded that the student genuinely interested in performance needed no credit to be convinced of the value of its study:

> If Applied Music cannot get around the campus without credit for a crutch, it is too infirm to play the college game at all. Taking away credit will not affect seriously the behavior of students with a genuine interest in music; and those who are taking lessons with credit as their primary inducement would be better off doing something else.[3]

Furthermore, Thompson explicitly stated his own belief in the intrinsic value of performance study:

---

[1]Thompson, p. 89.

[2]Thompson, p. 90.

[3]Thompson, p. 88.

> Performing ability in music is not in itself a musical education, nor even an essential part of a musical education; it is a useful tool in the shaping of an education; a source of pleasure, certainly; and a welcome social grace.[1]

Eight of the eighteen members of the sponsoring committee, under the leadership of Howard Hanson, submitted for publication in the report a statement which presented a view opposite to that taken by Thompson on performance. The subcommittee strongly believed that distinctions had to be made first of all between criticisms of the college field in general and music instruction in particular, and second, between criticisms of performance study per se and performance courses poorly taught.[2]

Since the credit system applied to all subjects, not just to music, the system's defects presented a "hazard which all accredited college subjects face with equanimity."[3] Every subject predicated the use of the credit crutch. To criticize music in terms of semester credits was a censure of the crutch, not the subject. The subcommittee agreed that as long as the credit served as the "academic time-clock"[4] for all courses in the curriculum, performance courses needed to share in this system in order to gain a daily allotment of the student's time and effort. Many students still suffering from past days

---

[1]Thompson, p. 92.

[2]Howard Hanson, Harold L. Butler, and Paul J. Weaver, "Supplementary Statement I: The Accrediting of Individual Instruction in Applied Music," in College Music, p. 98.

[3]Hanson, Butler, and Weaver, p. 98.

[4]Hanson, Butler, and Weaver, p. 99.

of economic difficulties had little extracurricular time to devote to activities not in the daily schedule.

The subcommittee asked that criticisms on the quality of performance instruction not be confused with statements on the intrinsic merit of the art itself. The aim of the liberal arts music program had never included the training of the professional. However, the scope of performance study was broader than acquiring virtuosic technique. Performance, for the non-composer, remained the closest approach to the creation of music. The re-creation involved the intense concentration of sensitive minds and trained fingers. The subcommittee reasoned:

> It is difficult to understand why the studying <u>about Music</u> should be considered work justifying college credit while the adequate interpretation of the <u>music itself</u> in performance should be considered unworthy.[1]

It was not surprising that criticism was leveled against the general educational background of the average instrumental or vocal teacher in the college. Since the accrediting of performance study was a relatively recent innovation in higher education, few instructors would have had an opportunity of college or university schooling. To exclude them from the college faculty for this reason was unjust. Furthermore, by refusing to include performance teachers on the faculty, the college was neglecting its responsibility toward a portion of its student body. Not every community with a college in its neighborhood had excellent private

---

[1]Hanson, Butler, and Weaver, p. 101.

music teachers to whom students could go for private instruction. Surely any cultural benefits resulting from the study of music in the liberal arts college would accrue only from music as a living art embodying theoretical, historical, and practical aspects.

To prove that their viewpoint was not untenable in American higher education, the subcommittee did a little study of its own. It chose forty-four institutions--independent universities, state universities, coeducational colleges, and women's colleges--and examined their policies with regard to performance study. Thirty-seven of the forty-four offered instruction in musical performance. Of these, thirty-seven or 89 per cent awarded credit for such study. This data was evidence enough to the eight men who disagreed with Thompson that:

> The great majority of institutions which offer a well-rounded Music curriculum embracing all of the branches of Music--theoretical, historical, and applied--are committed to the policy of accrediting practical as well as theoretical and historical study. They are apparently confirmed in the belief that Music, if adequately presented, cannot be divided into self-contained compartments but must be presented in its full and splendid vitality as a living art.[1]

In his concluding comments, Thompson outlines suggestions for the development of music programs in the liberal arts college which would be compatible with the cultural study of music. The two years of interviewing administration, faculty and students, visiting classes and rehearsals, and examining courses of study confirmed the thesis that:

---

[1]Hanson, Butler, and Weaver, p. 105.

> It is the study of Music itself . . . and not the practice of musical performance, that should be the basis of undergraduate and graduate work for academic degrees in American colleges and universities.[1]

Thompson recommended that college administrators seriously consider including in their music programs recommendations of this study. Gradually, academic subjects could be strengthened, and after some time, credit for performance study might seem superfluous or injurious, and colleges could then withdraw private instruction for credit. The added emphasis on theoretical and historical aspects of music study would be productive in graduating students who knew "a good deal of music and a good deal about it."[2]

Theodore Finney used the MTNA platform to give a response to Thompson's report of one college musician teaching music history and appreciation courses. No matter what the goals of music in college study, be they to enhance a liberal education or to provide the basis of further specialization, these aims "all depend on the acquisition, by somebody, of considerable skill in applied music."[3] Practically speaking, if academic credit were denied performance study, music departments could not exist in the majority of colleges. Neither the student who wished to concentrate in music nor the one who desired performance as an elective could do so when carrying a full credit load in other studies. Furthermore,

---

[1]Thompson, p. 131.

[2]Thompson, p. 135.

[3]"The American College and University as a Center of Musical Activity," MTNA Proceedings (Philadelphia, Pa., 1935), p. 48.

if the college were concerned at all about becoming a musical center for the community it served, it would have to become vitally involved with musical performance.[1]

Finney was one reactor to Thompson's report. Nearly thirty years later, Thomas Gorton, president of the NASM, praised those who had strongly opposed Thompson's position on performance study in college. That the report seriously affected few institutions of higher education was due precisely to the men who spoke out against its recommendations:

> The Thompson report might be said to have had the effect of deep-freezing the status quo in his own university and its satellites, but thanks to the vigorous counter-reaction of leading music educators it was not able to lay a dead hand on the development of a sound, well-balanced program of music in higher education generally in the United States.[2]

MSNC-NBAM Study, 1930. The most comprehensive survey on music in higher education undertaken during the time when the NASM was working to establish minimum requirements for baccalaureate degrees in music was that completed by the Music Supervisors National Conference (MSNC) in cooperation with the National Bureau for the Advancement of Music (NBAM) in 1930. By presenting accurate information on the status of the two areas of college music credit--entrance and course--the committee in charge of the study, the Research Council of the MSNC, hoped to accomplish two goals: (1) to assist the college bound music

---

[1]Finney, p. 48.

[2]"President's Report," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 51 (February 1963), p. 11.

student in choosing a college to suit his needs; and (2) to present colleges and universities themselves with accurate information on existing practices in music in higher education. The committee believed that if those institutions which still withheld academic approval from any one area of music were made aware of music programs in other colleges, they would arrange for similar programs. For the published report, Survey of College Entrance Credits and College Courses in Music, did indeed indicate a wide acceptance of all areas of music study in institutions of higher education.

Information from questionnaire responses of 594 nation wide colleges and universities revealed a "remarkable amount of agreement" on the two fundamental questions.[1] Eight out of ten colleges accepted high school music work for college credit; nine out of ten colleges granted music credit toward a degree.[2]

Many variations, however, existed among schools within the general area of agreement. The amount of entrance credit accepted varied from one-half to seven units. A geographical comparison of institutions granting entrance credit indicated an average of three credits per state in the Midwest and West. Eastern and southern states averaged less than one credit per

---

[1]Peter W. Dykema, "The Attitude of Colleges Toward Music," in Survey of College Entrance Credits and College Courses in Music (New York: National Bureau for the Advancement of Music, 1930), p. 2.

[2]Dykema, pp. 31-32.

state. Of the 452 institutions accepting music for entrance credit, 360 included performance study as well as theoretical courses among the acceptable units.

Of the 475 institutions offering instruction in music, 465--78 per cent of all institutions responding--granted academic credit for music courses. The Bachelor of Music degree was awarded in 149 schools; the Bachelor of Arts degree in music in 170 schools. The amount of credit for music courses permitted toward a major in music in the B. M. and the B. A. degrees varied from 30 to 100 per cent. On the average, the student majoring in music in a B. A. degree program was allowed up to 25 per cent of his credits in music; the student in the B. M. program up to 50 or more per cent of his total number of credits required for graduation. Percentages in the number of credits allowed for music courses in the degree programs varied from college to college.

In order to compare policies toward music study in private colleges with those in state institutions, the committee examined music programs in fifty representative private colleges with those in a corresponding number of prominent state institutions. State colleges emerged as more liberal in all areas of comparison. For example, forty-four state schools accepted entrance credits in music as compared with thirty-four private colleges. All but two of the "outstanding"[1] private colleges were located in the East. Furthermore, the

---

[1]Dykema, p. 11.

state colleges accepted entrance credits from accredited high schools by certificate. Nineteen private colleges recognized high school music by certificate. The remaining schools required further proof of attainment through certificate and/or examination. Finally, forty-eight state colleges and forty-one private colleges granted credit for music courses toward any degree. Twelve state and eight private schools had programs leading to the B. M. degree; seventeen state and twenty private schools in programs leading to the B. A. degree in music.

A supplementary questionnaire was issued to the 142 institutions not accepting or offering music in their programs in order to determine the reasons for such a policy. Most of the sixty institutions that replied were in the East where the "traditions of restricted credit recognition" were deeply rooted.[1] Responses to the questions indicated that the study of music could produce worthwhile educational benefits. However, the importance of the traditional college preparatory curriculum and the complaint that music was poorly taught in the high school militated against music for entrance or course credit in college. Dykema stated:

> At present those college administrators who fail to give entrance credit for music either believe that music is inconsistent with the fundamentals of that preparation which is needed for college work, or that at present it is not sufficiently well taught to obtain the same recognition as is given to the subjects of long-established standing.[2]

---

[1] Dykema, p. 22.

[2] Dykema, p. 30.

In his summary statement, Dykema concluded that the colleges not granting music entrance or course credit would do so when they became aware of the practice in the majority of American colleges. The sixteen prominent private colleges denying entrance credit in music were alluded to as among the minority that would soon unite with the "majority of colleges of their own caliber" in giving recognition to music.[1] Dykema used the opportunity to admonish colleges not supporting music to recognize the growing importance and improvement of the high school music curriculum. Unless institutions of higher education supported the fine music programs in the high schools, the work of the lower schools could not be completely successful.

In 1935, the results of the MSNC-NBAM study were cited as proof enough of the "firmness" with which the totality of music study was established in American institutions of higher learning, and in particular, in the liberal arts colleges.[2] With regard to musical performance, the study had shown that the policy of granting credits for performance would grow. Regardless of the disagreements among college faculties concerning the intellectual versus the technical merits of performance study, the fact remained that musical performance was steadily becoming more and more a part of American life. "That the colleges should share in this movement and contribute

---

[1]Dykema, p. 29.

[2]Frederick C. Ferry, "The Progress of the American College in Two Decades: In Artistic Appreciation," Bulletin of the AAC, XXI (March 1935), 36.

to it is at should be."[1]

NASM: Graduate Degrees in Music

In 1933, the NASM, in conjunction with the MTNA, established a committee to study music programs leading to graduate degrees in American universities. By this time, the NASM had established minimum requirements for the B. M. degree and the B. A. degree in musical performance. If some agreement could be reached on basic requirements for the liberal arts and professional degrees at the undergraduate level, could not similar agreement be reached for degrees at the graduate level.

German universities held to a clear-cut separation of the scholarly as opposed to the professional education of the musician. If the American universities accepted the German model and offered graduate degrees only in the scholarly study of music, where would administrators of American institutions who were exhibiting a "fondness for advanced degrees"[2] in their faculties find qualified instructors in all the areas of study then included in the music schools of universities?

Among the men who comprised the initial Commission on Graduate Study in Music of the NASM were Howard Hanson, Otto Kinkeldey, Oliver Strunk, Karl Gehrkens, Earl V. Moore, and

---

[1]Ferry, p. 40.

[2]Howard Hanson, "Some Suggestions Concerning Graduate Study in Music in the United States," MTNA Proceedings (Lincoln, Neb., 1933), p. 102.

Philip Greeley Clapp. Not only did the men represent various areas of music study, but also varying viewpoints on music study at the graduate level. Hanson, chairman of the committee, firmly believed in the need to establish basic standards for all types of music degrees in the university. "There is little doubt that the whole trend in professional education in music is toward the inclusion of schools of music within the general framework of the university."[1] Kinkeldey believed just as strongly in the separation of scholarly and professional education of the musician at the level of advanced study:

> I do not believe that the university, without a radical change in its whole outlook upon human studies and intellectual activity, can ever successfully accomplish for us the education of the higher type of professional artist-musician.[2]

For the first two years the committee confined its deliberations to graduate study leading to the Master of Arts and Master of Music degrees by studying graduate programs in 165 American institutions. The first definitive report of the committee included a statement on the distinct difference between the two degrees:

> The Master of Music degree should be considered a professional degree involving greater concentration in the field of music. The Master of Arts degree, on the other hand, should, in the opinion of the committee, involve a broader

---

[1]Howard Hanson, President's Message , Bulletin of the NASM, No. 7 (January 1937), p. 2.

[2]Otto Kinkeldey, "American Higher Education Compared with That in Europe," MTNA Proceedings (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1934), p. 27.

general background.[1]

The 1938 report also included recommendations for admission and graduate requirements in four areas of graduate study leading to the master's degree: M. A. in musicology; M. A. or M. M. in composition; M. M. in instrumental or vocal music; and the master's degree in music education (Master of Music in Music Education, Master of Arts in Music Education, or Master of Science in Music Education).[2]

By 1943, ten years after it had been organized, the committee, having devoted considerable time to the discussion of "appropriate fields for graduate study," approved of eight areas of music study leading to the master's degree: performance, composition, theory, musicology, historical and critical research, music education, psychology of music, and church music.[3] At the same time, the committee recommended approval of graduate study in music at the master's level in thirty-two institutions: ten independent conservatories and twenty-two colleges and universities. Approval was made of 121 individual degree programs. Twenty-seven of the thirty-two institutions included a program for the Master of Music degree in performance.[4]

---

[1]Howard Hanson, "Report of the Committee on Graduate Study in Music," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 9 (July 1938), p. 3.

[2]Hanson, pp. 5-9.

[3]Howard Hanson, "Report of the Graduate Committee," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 17 (March 1943), p. 4.

[4]Hanson, pp. 5-7. Other degree programs included: twenty-eight in composition; nine in theory; thirty-one in music education; six in musicology; two in psychology of music;

In commenting on the committee's work during its first years, Hanson indicated that only those on the committee had any awareness of the "countless hours of study and debate" that transpired before any agreement on basic requirements was reached.[1] However, Hanson concluded that the "soundness of the committee's judgment" was evidenced by the fact that, over the years, the recommendations made served as the "guidebook for the organization of graduate curricula in music in the United States."[2]

The move to establish a professional doctorate in music was not a hasty decision of the NASM. In fact, the initial questioning of the "wisdom of a professional doctorate in music" dated from a session of the graduate commission in 1936.[3]

The 1938 report which established minimum requirements for the master's degree in music also included general requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in music. Although the report included general recommendations for the Ph. D. degree in the areas of musicology, composition, and music education, not all of the committee members agreed that the degree should be awarded for composition.[4]

---

two in church music; and sixteen in historical and critical research.

[1]Howard Hanson, "Recommendations of the Graduate Commission," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 35 (April 1952), p. 3.

[2]Hanson, p. 3.

[3]Hanson, "Professional Music Education in the United States," p. 6.

[4]Hanson, "Recommendations of the Graduate Commission," p. 5.

With the growing insistence among administrators for advanced degrees and the unwise practice of requiring talented performers to convert into indifferent musicologists in order to obtain such degrees, the NASM began a "long and serious" study of the advisability of developing a professional doctorate in performance.[1] The steps toward implementing this new degree in American universities were taken very slowly. Only in 1944 did the committee discuss reviving the Doctor of Music degree as one "to be granted in course."[2] The degree was at that time an honorary one awarded by institutions for outstanding achievements in the field of music. Interest in the proposed degree came from a new quarter when in 1948 the committee reported that the North Central Association was in favor of an advanced degree "suitable for performers."[3]

Finally, at the 1951 meeting of the NASM the Graduate Commission recommended the establishment of a terminal, professional doctorate in music to follow in course the B. M. and the M. M. degrees.[4] Member schools who desired to initiate a curriculum leading to such a degree were asked to seek the prior approval of the Graduate Commission. A motion on this

---

[1]Howard Hanson, "Report of the Graduate Commission," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 52 (February 1964), p. 51.

[2]Howard Hanson, "Graduate Commission," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 23 (February 1946), p. 13.

[3]Howard Hanson, "Graduate Commission," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 26 (March 1948), p. 11.

[4]Howard Hanson, "The Doctorate in Music," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 34 (February 1952), p. 18.

recommendation was made and passed and two universities applying for approval to establish the degree were approved: the University of Southern California and Florida State University.[1]

At the association's meeting in 1953, the title Doctor of Musical Arts was suggested in place of Doctor of Music in order to avoid confusion as to whether the degree was honorary or earned. By the end of 1953, six universities had won the approval of the NASM for establishing a program for the degree Doctor of Musical Arts.

Although progress in the establishment of the degree was made only after great deliberation and careful spelling out as to the exact purpose of the degree,--to educate the artist-teacher "whose ability as a performer, teacher, and musician will be of value to the American college and university"[2]--the proposal did not meet with wholehearted approval. One forceful critic of the new degree was Paul Henry Lang. In a letter to the editor of the New York Times, Lang referred to the whole procedure as a farce.[3] The university stood for study and research. For it to train performers was a contradiction in terms. To award a doctorate to performers provided a "back-door degree for those who cannot face the rigors of

---

[1]Hanson, p. 20.

[2]Howard Hanson, "Report of the Graduate Commission," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 51 (February 1963), p. 70.

[3] Letter to the Editor , New York Times, November 1, 1953, II, p. 9.

the real thing."[1] Lang continued:

> Now we are to have doctors of playing or singing. I can very well see what this will mean: an earnest violinist who spends all his time on improving his art and consequently won't have the time to seek "a doctorate," will be left behind by some erstaz fiddler who, by obtaining a questionable degree, will be acceptable to some august college in preference to the more accomplished artist. When the conservatories feel the pinch of competition thus created for their graduates, they too will establish a degree factory and turn out doctors of piccolo playing or duo pianism.[2]

What America certainly did not need, according to Lang, was substandard degrees granted to persons not qualified to compete with scholars who had come by their status the hard way.

Howard Hanson answered Lang's criticisms. Lang, evidently, was ignoring the facts. This was the United States, not Europe. Music schools giving excellent training to the performer already existed in many universities. These schools had been an integral part of academic institutions for many years. For them to establish the advanced degree for the performer did not involve an entirely new process.

Furthermore, a "large number of distinguished musicologists" would disagree with Lang's insinuation that the D. M. A. was a substandard degree.[3] In fact, as early as 1940, Otto Kinkeldey, who had been unable to approve of the university's role in educating artists, admitted that the establishment of advanced degrees for artists as distinguished from those of scholars would lead to "satisfactory stable results" in American

---

[1]Lang, p. 9. [2]Lang, p. 9.

[3] Letter to the Editor , New York Times, November 8, 1953, II, p. 7.

music education.[1]

The Doctor of Musical Arts degree has been firmly established in American higher education. Its value in the total scheme of higher education in music has been succinctly stated by Howard Hanson, who more than any one other person has been responsible for making possible this advanced degree for the performer: "Dichotomy between scholarly research on the one hand and creation and performance on the other . . . no longer exists in a large number of American universities."[2] The musicology and theory student work closely with the composition and performing student. Moreover, faculty members from one area have occasion to collaborate with members from other areas. In some instances, an individual teacher may be a member of more than one department within the school. Finally, the professional doctorate assures the artist-teacher of equal consideration with the musical scholar in the "practicalities of appointment, rank, and tenure."[3]

---

[1]"The Artist and the Scholar," MTNA Proceedings (Cleveland, Ohio, 1940), p. 76.

[2]"The Doctorate in Music: A Progress Report," Bulletin of the NASM, No. 44 (February 1958), p. 5.

[3]Hanson, p. 5.

SUMMARY

In 1877, John S. Dwight proposed that the American university establish under its auspices a professional school for the complete education of the musician. In 1951, with the NASM approval of the Doctor of Musical Arts degree in two American universities, the final step in the realization of Dwight's dream had been taken. The American university was granting its highest degree in music to both the scholar and the artist.

Perhaps Henry Sleeper's analysis of the plight of musical performance in higher education in 1906 was closer to the truth than he realized. Let a subject be well taught at the college level and prejudices keeping it out of the curriculum would disappear. Many prejudices that have plagued the performer have disappeared. Unfortunately, it is the stereotypes that die hard. When the musical scholar stops being characterized as someone who reads a score in preference to hearing it, or when the performer ceases to be thought of as the technical expert interested more in how than in what he is performing, then the scholar and the artist will benefit from their mutual association in the university.

Professional music organizations, the MTNA and the NASM in particular, deserve great praise for the part they

have played in securing for musical performance the place it now holds in American higher education. The MTNA provided an open forum for the discussion of music in higher education since the 1890's. The data from studies conducted by the organization as well as the personal opinions expressed by musicians helped mold policies toward music study in colleges and universities. The NASM is to be commended for its work over the part forty-five years in achieving minimum standards for degrees in music ranging from the baccalaureate through the doctoral level.

In a very real sense, the American university as such has become a center for the education of the artist-teacher despite the fact that some universities continue to exclude musical performance from their course of studies. Whatever the future holds for music study in higher education, we can be certain that a major institution for the education of the performer in this country will continue to be the music school of the university.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Benson, Norman A. The Itinerant Dancing and Music Masters of Eighteenth Century America. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1963.

Butterfield, L. H., ed. Diary and Autobiography of John Adams. 4 vols. Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1961.

Clarke, Eric. Music in Everyday Life. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1935.

Davison, Archibald. Music Education in America. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1926.

Dennis, Lawrence E., and Jacob, Renate M., eds. The Arts in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1968.

Dickinson, Edward. Music and the Higher Education. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.

Dykema, Peter, ed. Survey of College Entrance Credits in Music. New York: National Bureau for the Advancement of Music, 1930.

Hill, Thomas. Integral Education. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1859.

Historical Sketch of Vassar College. New York: S. W. Green, Printer, 1876.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

Howard, John Tasker. Our American Music. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1946.

Howe, Granville L. A Hundred Years of Music in America. Chicago: G. L. Howe, 1889.

Hubbard, W. L., ed. The American History and Encyclopedia of Music. 12 vols. New York: Irving Squire, 1910.

Jeffers, Edmund V. Music for the General College Student. New York: King's Crown Press, 1944.

Kelly, Robert Lincoln, ed. The Effective College. New York: Association of American Colleges, 1928.

Kent, Raymond A., ed. Higher Education in America. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1930.

Klapper, Paul, ed. College Teaching. New York: World Book Company, 1920.

Lowens, Irving. Music and Musicians in Early America. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1964.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. Three Centuries of Harvard. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1946.

New England's First Fruits, 1643. Reprinted in Old South Leaflets. Vol. III, No. 51. Boston: Directors of the Old South Work, n. d.

Pratt, Waldo Selden, ed. Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians. American Supplement, Vol. VI. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.

Raymond, John H. Vassar College: Its Foundation, Aims, Resources, and Course of Study. New York: S. W. Green, 1873.

Ritter, Frederic Louis. Music in America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883.

Rourke, Constance. The Roots of American Culture. Port Washington, N. Y.: Kennikat Press, Inc., 1942.

Sonneck, Oscar G. Early Concert-Life in America (1731-1800). Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1907.

_____. Suum Cuique. New York: G. Schirmer, 1916.

Taylor, James M., and Haight, Elizabeth H. Vassar. New York: Oxford University Press, 1915.

Thompson, Randall. College Music: An Investigation for the Association of American Colleges. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.

Welch, Roy D. The Study of Music in the American College. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College, 1925.

Yont, Rose. Status and Value of Music in Education. Lincoln, Nebraska: The Woodruff Press, 1916.

Zanzig, Augustus D. Music in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932.

Government Reports

Blackmar, Frank W. Higher Education in Kansas. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1900. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900.

Bush, George Gary. History of Higher Education in Massachusetts. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information 1891, No. 6. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1891.

Caldwell, Howard W. Education in Nebraska. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 3, 1902. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902.

Greer, John N. The History of Education in Minnesota. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1902. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902.

Jones, Charles Edgeworth. Education in Georgia. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 4, 1888. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889.

Mayes, Edward. History of Education in Mississippi. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1899. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899.

McConanthy, Osbourne, chairman. Present Status of Music Instruction in Colleges and High Schools, 1919-1920. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin 1921, No. 9. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1921.

Manchester, Arthur L. Music Education in the United States. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin 1908, No. 4. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1908.

Meriwether, Colyer. History of Higher Education in South Carolina. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 3, 1888. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889.

Parker, Leonard F. Higher Education in Iowa. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 6, 1893. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893.

Smith, Charles Lee. The History of Education in North Carolina. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1888. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1888.

Snow, Marshall A., ed. Higher Education in Missouri. U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1898. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898.

Official Publications of Institutions and Organizations

Boston University Year Book. Vol. I. Edited by the University Council. Boston: H. O. Haughton & Co., 1874.

Boston University Year Book. Vol. X. Edited by the University Council. Boston: University Offices, 1883.

Boston University Year Book. Vol. XIX. Edited by the University Council, 1893.

Calendar, New England Conservatory of Music and College of Music of Boston University. Boston: Deland and Hart, 1881.

Constitution and By-Laws. National Association of Schools of Music and Allied Arts, n.d.

General Catalogue of Boston University 1872-73. Riverside Press, 1873.

The Origin and Progress of Boston University: Report of the President, 1893. Boston: University Offices, 1893.

Articles

"A National Conservatorio," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXIII (Sept. 6, 1873), 84-85.

"An Open Letter to Educators," The Etude, VI (December 1888), 193.

Atkinson, W. P. "Liberal Education of the Nineteenth Century," National Education Association Proceedings (Elmira, N. Y., 1873), pp. 141-163.

Ayres, E. E. "Woman as a Musician," The Etude (November 1888), 166.

Bartholomew, Marshall. "The Cart Before the Horse in Music Education," The Musician, XXVII (July 1922), 3-4.

Bellamann, H. H. "Outline of a Progressive Policy for a College Music Department," The Musician, XXV (March 1920), 13.

_____. "The Relation of College Music to the Educational System of the Country," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Chicago, Ill., 1920), pp. 220-225.

_____. "Notes on the Problems of Music Teaching in Colleges," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Dayton, Ohio, 1925), pp. 59-63.

Bierbower, Austin. "Are We Making Too Much of Music?" Education, XXVIII (February 1905), 361-363.

Boyd, W. W. "Music in a Liberal Arts Course," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Dayton, Ohio, 1925), pp. 33-40.

Bradley, Kenneth M. "Lest We Forget," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 29 (April 1950), pp. 17-20.

Brown, Elmer Ellsworth, et al. "The Length of the Baccalaureate Course and Preparation for the Professional Schools," National Education Association Proceedings (Boston, Mass., 1903), pp. 489-516.

Butler, Harold L. "A Message from Butler," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 29 (April 1950), p. 21.

_____. "Articulation of High School and College Curricula," Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook (Chicago, Ill., 1930), pp. 107-111.

_____. "Observations on the Examination of the Schools in the National Association of Schools of Music," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Detroit, Michigan, 1931), pp. 58-65.

Chapin, A. L. "Report of Committee on Higher Education: Higher Institutions Required," National Education Association Proceedings (Topeka, Kansas, 1886), pp. 285-292.

Clapp, Philip G. "The Place of the State University in the American Scheme of Musical Education," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Detroit, Michigan, 1921), pp. 57-63.

Clark, Mrs. Frances E. "The Status of Music in the United States," National Education Association Proceedings (Denver, Colorado, 1909), pp. 675-681.

Cole, Rossetter G. "Musical Degrees in American Colleges," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (New York, N. Y., 1907), pp. 31-39.

Cole, Samuel Winkley. "Conditions in American Musical Education," The Musician, XVI (October 1911), 654-655.

"The College Man in Music," The Musician, XX (January 1915), 87, 134.

"The College Music Teacher," The Musician, XV (May 1910), 312.

"Concert by the Pupils of the Conservatory of Music," Dwight's Journal of Music, I (May 15, 1952), 44.

"The Conservatory of Music," Dwight's Journal of Music, I (April 24, 1852), 19-20.

Cooke, James F. "Plans of the Presser Foundation for Aiding Students in Music in American Colleges," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, VII (April 1921), 102-105.

Dana, William H. "The Beginnings of the M.T.N.A.," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1914), pp. 179-182.

Dent, Edward J. "Music in University Education," The Musical Quarterly, III (October 1917), 605-619.

Dickinson, Edward. "The Music Teacher and the Demand of the Times," The Etude, XI (March 1893), 57.

_____. "The Place of Music in a Liberal Education: I," The Etude, IX (January 1891), 6.

_____. "The Place of Music in a Liberal Education: II," The Etude, IX (February 1891), 281.

[Dwight, John S.] "A Musical Professorship at Harvard: I," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXV (Aug. 21, 1875), 78.

_____. "Apropos of 'Mus. Doc.'," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXIV (Sept. 3, 1864), 302-303.

_____. "Fashion Versus Music," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXIV (June 25, 1864), 258.

_____. "Musical Education: I," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXII (Aug. 23, 1873), 78-79.

_____. "Music in Universities," Dwight's Journal of Music, V (July 29, 1854), 133.

_____. "Who Will Endow Music in the University? I," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXVII (Aug. 18, 1877), 78.

_____. "Who Will Endow Music in the University? II," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXVII (Sept. 29, 1877), 102.

_____. "Who Will Endow Music in the University? III," Dwight's Journal of Music, XXXVII (Oct. 13, 1877), 110-111.

Edwards, Ray G. "Specializing for Efficiency," The Musician, XXII (August 1917), 573.

Erb, J. Lawrence. "The College Conservatory of Music," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 1912), pp. 60-69.

_____. "The Musician and the Community," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (New York, N. Y., 1916), pp. 9-20.

_____. "Music in the American University," The Musical Quarterly, III (January 1917), 28-33.

_____. "Music Teaching: A Trade or a Profession?" Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Chicago, Ill., 1920), pp. 102-108.

_____. "The Problems of the Music Teacher," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (New Orleans, La., 1918), pp. 9-18.

_____. "Report of the Committee on Colleges and Universities," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1927), pp. 215-220.

_____. "Report of Committee on Colleges and Universities," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Cleveland, Ohio, 1928), pp. 298-305.

_____. "Report of the Committee on Colleges and Universities," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Detroit, Michigan, 1931), pp. 152-157.

_____. "Report of the Committee on Colleges and Universities," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1934), pp. 269-271.

Erskine, John. "Music in the Curriculum," Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, XVII (March 1931), 66-73.

Eschman, Karl H. "A Survey of College Entrance Credits in Music," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1923), pp. 149-161.

"The Estimation of the Musical Profession by College Presidents," The Etude, VII (February 1889), 24.

Evans, M. "Reply to Open Letter," The Etude, VII (April 1889), 52-53.

Farnsworth, Charles Hubert. "Music on an Accredited Basis in Colleges and Universities," National Education Association Proceedings (Denver, Colorado, 1909), pp. 681-687.

Fentress, Luther L. "The Worth of Music in Education," Education, XXVIII (June 1908), 646-650.

Ferry, Frederick C. "The Progress of the American College in Two Decades: In Artistic Appreciation," Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, XXI (March 1935), 35-40.

Fillmore, John Comfort. "How Shall We Increase the Respect of Educated Men for Music and Musicians?" The Etude, VIII (January 1890), 204-205.

_____. "Music in Pomona College," Music, X (May 1896), 67-68.

Finney, Theodore M. "The American College and University as a Center of Musical Activity," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Philadelphia, Pa., 1935), pp. 46-52.

Foote, Arthur. "Music in the College," National Education Association Proceedings (San Francisco, California, 1911), pp. 803-806.

Gale, Harlow. "Musical Education," The Musical Quarterly, VIII (January 1922), 96-107.

Gehrkens, Karl W. "Report of the Committee on Public School Music," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (New Orleans, La., 1918), pp. 82-87.

Glen, Irving M. "College Preparation for Teachers of Music in Secondary Schools," National Education Association Proceedings (Oakland, California, 1915), pp. 858-861.

Goetschius, Percy. "A Sober Definition of Music," The Musician, X (August 1905), 308-309.

Gorton, Thomas. "President's Report," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 51 (February 1963), pp. 9-15.

Gow, George Colman. "College Entrance Credits in Music in the East," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1923), pp. 162-166.

_____. "Music in Vassar College," Music, X (June 1896), 105-111.

Hanchett, Henry. "College and University Work in Music," Education, XXV (February 1905), 345-353.

_____. "University Work in Music," Music, X (August 1896), 360-369.

Hanson, Howard. "A Discussion of the Curricula of Schools of Music," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1927), pp. 55-63.

_____. "The Doctorate in Music," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 34 (February 1952), pp. 18-19.

_____. "The Doctorate in Music: A Progress Report," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 44 (February 1958), pp. 4-7.

_____. "Foreward," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 19 (July 1944), pp. 1-3.

_____. "Graduate Commission," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 23 (June 1946), p. 13.

_____. "Graduate Commission," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 26 (March 1948), p. 11.

_____. Letter to the Editor. New York Times, November 8, 1953, Section II, p. 7.

_____. President's Message , The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 7 (January 1937), pp. 1-3.

_____. "Professional Music Education in the United States," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 40 (April 1955), pp. 4-7.

_____. "Recommendations of the Graduate Commission," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 35 (April 1952), pp. 1-5.

_____. "Report of the Committee on Graduate Study in Music," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 9 (July 1938), pp. 1-12.

_____. "Report of the Graduate Commission," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 51 (February 1963), pp. 68-71.

_____. "Report of the Graduate Commission," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 52 (February 1964), pp. 50-55.

_____. "Report of the Graduate Committee," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 17 (March 1943), pp. 4-7.

_____. "Some Suggestions Concerning Graduate Study in Music in the United States," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1933), pp. 99-104.

Hayden, P. C. "Music as an Educator," Music, XI (November 1896), 41-46.

Haydon, Glen. "Aims and Objectives of the College and Conservatory Curricula in Music," Music Educators National Conference Yearbook (Chicago, Illinois, 1935), pp. 384-386.

Holmberg, Fredrik. "Standardizing Music Degrees," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1923), pp. 141-148.

Housewright, Wiley L. "Music in Higher Education," Music Educators Journal, LIV (October 1967), 39-41, 107-109.

Kimball, Willard. "The School of Music as a Place for Study," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), pp. 37-42.

Kinkeldey, Otto. "American Higher Music Education Compared with That in Europe," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1934), pp. 20-28.

_____. "The Artist and the Scholar," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Cleveland, Ohio, 1940), pp. 67-69.

_____. "Music in the Universities of Europe and America," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Buffalo, N. Y., 1915), pp. 79-91.

Kirk, John R. "Music on an Accredited Basis," National Education Association Proceedings (Denver, Colorado, 1909), pp. 696-699.

Koos, Leonard V., and Crawford, C. C. "College Aims Past and Present," School and Society, XIV (Dec. 3, 1921), 499-509.

Krehbiel, H. E. "Music in Columbia College--What the New Department Ought to Be," Music, X (June 1896), 205-209.

Lang, Paul Henry. Letter to the Editor. New York Times, November 1, 1953, Section II, p. 9.

Leonard, William J. "The Place of Art in the American College," Education, XXXII (June 1912), 597-607.

Lewis, Leo R. "Music in Tufts College," Music, X (July 1896), 253-254.

Lincoln, N. "Music--A Somewhat Practical View," Dwight's Journal of Music, XL (March 13, 1880), 41.

Lutkin, P. C. "Music in Northwestern University," Music, X (July 1896), 236-238.

_____. "The School of Music in the University," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), pp. 32-36.

McCutchan, R. G. "Regulations Governing the Grading and Passing of Students," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Philadelphia, Pa., 1919), pp. 124-129.

Macdougall, Hamilton C. "The Development of Musical Power in the College Student," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), pp. 61-65.

_____. "The Value of Music Study," The Musician, X (April 1905), 145.

MacDowell, Edward A. "Music at Columbia," Columbia University Bulletin, XV (December 1896), 13-16.

McWhood, Leonard B. "The Mission of Music in Colleges," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Washington, D. C., 1908), pp. 110-117.

_____. "The Present Status of Music in Colleges," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (New York, N. Y., 1907), pp. 40-45.

Maguire, Helena. "Organization Needed in Music," The Musician, XV (February 1910), 95.

Manchester, Arthur L. "A Conclusion Drawn from the Inquiry into the Status of Music Education in Secondary Schools, Colleges and Universities," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Washington, D. C., 1908), pp. 191-198.

_____. [Discussion], Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (New Orleans, La., 1917), pp. 215-216.

_____. "Music in Academic Courses," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Philadelphia, Pa., 1919), pp. 39-46.

_____. "Music in American Colleges: An Open Letter," Music, I (April 1892), 554-556.

_____. "The Policy of the M.T.N.A. from 1900 to 1902," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1914), pp. 183-188.

_____. "Practical Music and the College Curriculum," The Musical Quarterly, VII (April 1921), 252-260.

_____. "Report of Committee: Conference of Music in the College," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Philadelphia, Pa., 1919), p. 113.

_____. "The Small College as a Factor in the Development of a Musical Nation," The Musical Quarterly, VIII (October 1922), 596-604.

Mathews, John Lathrop. "In Harvard University," Music, IX (April 1896), 644-649.

_____. "Music and the University," Music, VI (September 1894), 550-554.

Mathews, W. S. B. "An Annual Stock-taking of American Musical Progress," Music, XXI (December 1902), 254-263.

_____. [Editorial], Music, IX (April 1896), 653-656.

_____. [Editorial], Music, XVIII (August 1900), 375-391.

_____. [Editorial], Music, XXII (November 1902), 232-237.

_____. "Music as Discipline and Culture," Music, VI (July 1894), 349-365.

_____. "Music in American Universities," Music, IX (April 1896), 643-644.

_____. "Productive Fields for Public Musical Endowment," Music, XIX (March 1901), 449-459.

Moore, Earl V. "The Growth and Changing Status of Independent Schools of Music Since 1876," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Cleveland, Ohio, 1928), pp. 227-233.

_____. "Standardizing Theory Courses in Universities," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (St. Louis, Missouri, 1924), pp. 225-231.

Mowry, William A. "The College Curriculum," National Education Association Proceedings (Topeka, Kansas, 1886), pp. 359-366.

[Musical Correspondence], Dwight's Journal of Music, I (July 10, 1852), 111.

[Musical Correspondence], Dwight's Journal of Music, XXVI (Nov. 24, 1866), 352.

"Music in Universities," Dwight's Journal of Music, XI (August 29, 1857), 170.

"Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education," American Journal of Science, XV (January 1829), 297-351.

Parker, Horatio W. "Music in Yale University," Music, X (June 1896), 181-185.

Pfefferkorn, Otto W. G. "A Musical Education," The Musician, XVIII (April 1913), 231.

Pratt, Waldo Selden. "Music as a University Study," Music, VI (August 1894), 413-432.

_____. "New Ideals in Music Education," The Atlantic Monthly, LXXXVI (December 1900), 826-832.

Quarles, James T. "The Standardization of Theoretical Courses in Schools and Colleges," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (St. Louis, Missouri, 1924), pp. 232-243.

Randolph, Harold. "The Feminization of Music," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (New York, N. Y., 1922), pp. 194-200.

Rice, Fenelon B. "Music in Oberlin College," Music, X (May 1896), 69-70.

Russell, Eugene D. "Music as a Subject to be Counted for Admission to College," National Education Association Proceedings (Boston, Mass., 1903), pp. 708-713.

Russell, Louis Arthur. "A Defect in American Musicianship," The Musician, XIX (January 1914), 19.

Schmidt, George P. "Intellectual Crosscurrents in American Colleges, 1828-1855," The American Historical Review, XLII (October 1936), 46-67.

Sleeper, Henry D. "Music as a College Study," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), pp. 43-54.

Smith, E. A. "How Can the Individuality of the Musical Profession Be Raised to a Higher Level?" The Etude, VIII (May 1890), 76.

Stanley, Albert A. "Music in the University," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Oberlin, Ohio, 1906), pp. 21-31.

_____. "University of Michigan," Music, IX (April 1896), 649-652.

_____. "University Music From the Professor's Standpoint," Music, XIX (February 1901), 398-401.

Stiven, Frederic B. "The Contribution of a University School of Music to the State and University," The Musical Quarterly, IX (July 1923), 395-400.

Swarthout, Donald M. "Grading of Applied Music," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 16 (March 1942), p. 11.

_____. "Report of the Committee on Minimum Requirements for Teacher Qualification," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 5 (January 1936), pp. 9-10.

Tarbell, H. S. "Co-Education," Education, IV (March 1884), 427-434.

Taylor, James M. "Address of Welcome," Music Teachers National Association Proceedings (Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 1912), pp. 7-9.

Thwing, Charles F. "American Universities," in Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1903. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905), pp. 293-317.

Tuthill, Bernet C. "The Tenth Annual Meeting," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 1 (January 1934), pp. 1-3.

"University Students and Music," The Musician, XIX (July 1914), 445.

Van Cleve, John S. "The Dignity of Music," Music, I (November 1891), 7-16.

Wilkins, Ernest. "A Survey of the Study of Music in Colleges," Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook (Cleveland, Ohio, 1932), pp. 200-202.

Williams, Thomas W. "The Place of the Bachelor of Arts Degree in Music," The Bulletin of the National Association of Schools of Music, No. 41 (January 1956), pp. 13-14.