all 38,000 music educators of the MENC be questioned on "what basic philosophies and attitudes music educators should hold." Before marching over the precipice of that objective, Mr. Johnson should learn that sampling procedures are designed expressly to avoid having to deal with entire populations and that you can't discover what music educators *should* believe by finding out what they *do* believe. One can only hope that this dissertation is not typical of music education doctoral studies.

ARTHUR DANIELS is assistant professor of music at Oakland University.

Josiah Darnell

An Evaluation of the Bachelor of Music Education Curriculum at Murray State College through an Analysis of the Opinions of its Teaching Graduates

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 64-2257), 1963. (Indiana University, Ed.D.)

James McKinnon

This dissertation is an evaluation of a particular curriculum, and logically enough the author begins by explaining why one undertakes an educational evaluation. He does so by quoting what various authorities have to say on the subject. For example, Troyer and Pace write:

> What are some of the purposes and values of evaluation? Why do we evaluate? One very clear reason is in order to judge the effectiveness of an educational program.[1]

And Leonhard informs us that:

> Evaluation enables the teacher to ascertain the effect of the learning experiences of his students and the validity of his teaching methods.[2]

Thus we learn that the purpose of evaluation is evaluation, and in case the lesson is not grasped it is repeated later in a paragraph which defines educational evaluation:

> . . . the process of judging the effectiveness of educational experience. It includes gathering and summarizing evidence on the extent to which educational values

[1]Maurice E. Troyer and C. Robert Pace, *Evaluation in Teacher Education*, Washington, D.C. 1944, p. 2.

[2]Charles Leonhard, "Evaluation in Music Education," *Basic Concepts in Music Education*, Fifty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, Chicago 1958, p. 313.

are being attained. Such evaluation seeks to answer the question: "What success is our educational program?"

One cannot argue with the truth of these statements; after all one does evaluate in order to evaluate. Yet certainly they are so obvious as to be meaningless. While written in language which gives the impression of saying something serious, they are without content. In all fairness, however, it should be pointed out that the first authority went on to present another reason for evaluation:

> We undertake to evaluate the program because we hope thereby to improve it. By knowing its strengths and weaknesses we are enabled to plan more intelligently for its improvements.

But how much does this add? Do we really need to be told in formal language that we evaluate something so that we can improve it? Perhaps there is a danger that the layman, unless informed by expert opinion, will think that one undertakes an evaluation of something in order to make it worse.

One turns to the body of this study with the hope that it is more substantial than its platitudinous introduction. The idea behind it is certainly sound. Mr. Darnell proposed to evaluate the Bachelor of Music Education curriculum at Murray State College, Kentucky, where he is a faculty member. His first step was to draw up a list of what he calls competencies, that is, any skills, proficiencies, or knowledge a music teacher ought to bring to his work, such as, the ability to conduct with a baton or a familiarity with easy music for chorus. A list of 222 "competencies" was compiled and sent to all graduates of Murray from 1947 to 1959 who were actively engaged in teaching music. The graduates were to evaluate each "competency" (1) as to its importance in actual teaching and (2) as to the effectiveness of the Murray State teacher-training curriculum in inculcating it. The task of the author was then to compare the first of these evaluations with the second and draw the proper conclusions about the improvement of the Murray State curriculum. An example of the finished product is that the "competency" to develop music reading ability in the elementary grades was rated 2.8 (on a scale of 0.0 to 3.0) as to its importance and 2.0 as to the effectiveness of the Murray State preparation. The implication is that Murray State must improve its program in this respect.

Mr. Darnell has done an effective and orderly job in the preparation of this questionnaire and the tabulation of its results. His idea of making the opinion of the graduates the basis of his results strikes me as particularly sound. Moreover, the subject of the survey is an important one, and the replies present a wealth of raw material for music educators to ponder. Unfortunately, his interpretation of the data is singularly lacking in penetration, and the formalistic character which marks the introduction prevails throughout the entire project. Mr. Darnell does not really interpret the data at all. He first presents it in approximately 100 pages of tables, and then in nearly 200 pages of commentary he simply summarizes verbally what appears in the tables graphically. Certainly with his experience as an educator he must have interesting and relevant reactions to the statistics he presents, but he never expresses them. Particularly disappointing is what he offers under the heading "Some implications of the findings." He does no more than compare

the importance rating with the effectiveness rating; and if the latter does not measure up to the former, he concludes that improvement is indicated. Anyone could simply glance at his columns of figures and draw similar conclusions.

That this passivity in the face of statistics is inadequate and that the insight of an active interpreter is necessary can be seen in the following examples. "The techniques and attitudes necessary for successful work with" "parents of your students," "local townspeople," and "music merchants" were given importance ratings of 2.9, 2.8, and 2.6, respectively, while the effectiveness ratings were much lower—2.2, 2.2, and 2.1. The author concludes that "the difference . . . between the importance and effectiveness scores would seem sufficient cause for focusing more attention on this area of teacher training at Murray." This example, which can be parallelled by dozens of others, constitutes a *reductio ad absurdum* of his method. The fallacy involved becomes clear when one takes the *reductio* a step further and invents a fictitious example. If "the ability to find one's classroom in the morning" were listed as a "competence," it would have to be given the top rating of 3.0 because it is utterly essential that a teacher reach the classroom. Yet Murray's effectiveness rating might be quite low, say 1.1, since it neglected this item in the curriculum. The implication would be that Murray must improve its training in this respect. What is wrong with my example, is that it deals with a skill which, while essential, is not amenable to treatment in a college curriculum. If a teacher does not have a knack for finding his classroom in the morning, even graduate work in the subject would probably be wasted. This is, admittedly, an outrageous example, one for which Mr. Darnell is in no way responsible. Yet the fallacy it illustrates is present to a greater or lesser degree in his own example of "the techniques and attitudes necessary for successful work with music merchants" and in literally dozens of others, such as, "arranging for the stage lighting of public performances," or the "ability to select band uniforms."

Another question which cries out for discussion concerns value judgments. What would strike many people as trivia are treated with great solemnity. Mr. Darnell writes:

> The sharp contrast between the importance and effectiveness scores of 2.5 and 1.4 for 'drum majoring classes' suggest a definite need for more attention to this phase of the training at Murray State College.

Indeed the graduates give significantly higher importance ratings to "the ability to select and evaluate football show materials" and "the ability to organize and teach baton twirling classes" than to "understanding of and familiarity with" the music of the Romantic, Classic, and Baroque periods. The implication is that baton twirling is more important than the music of Mozart and Bach. More important also are "the business aspects of music teaching" and "costuming casts for public performances," not to speak of the ability to deal successfully with music merchants. I cannot understand how Mr. Darnell accepts these implications at face value. It would seem to me that he should call upon his insight and judgment as an educator to question these patent absurdities instead of simply bowing to the statistics before him. There are any number of questions that should be asked. Foremost among them is whether the statistical results really reflect the teachers' value judg-

ments. If questioned directly would they actually say that selecting band uniforms is more important than familiarity with Mozart's music? Or is it possible that the typical Murray graduate in the field has no notion of influencing public taste but rather looks upon his task as one of conformity to popular standards? Perhaps this is so. Perhaps he values conformity above all else as evidenced by the extremely high importance rating of 2.9 he gives to "the techniques and attitudes necessary for successful work with your administrators." I would hope not, but what is Mr. Darnell's opinion? Unfortunately, we have no way of sharing his thoughts on this and on many other interesting questions raised by his survey.

JAMES MCKINNON is assistant professor of music at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Peter Meyer
Béla Bartók's Ady-Lieder, Op. 16

Winterthur: Verlag P. G. Keller, 1965. (95p., price not given; University of Zürich diss.)

Halsey Stevens

In this country dissertations dealing with music of the 20th century are still relatively infrequent, and when they appear at all, are likely to take a life-and-works form or to deal with a substantial segment of a composer's work. Not so with that of Peter Meyer, who chose for examination the Ady songs of Béla Bartók, offering a restricted view of the composer's achievements.

The songs composed by Bartók play a rather minor part in his catalogue. Aside from a number of songs from his student years composed to German texts (Heine, Siebel, Rückert) and a few more in Hungarian (Pósa, Peres, Havas, Stankó), there are only two sets of "composed" songs: Opus 15 (1915-16) on unidentified Hungarian texts and Opus 16 (February-April, 1916) on texts by Endre Ady.[1] By far the greater contribution of Bartók to song literature is the large number of folksong transcriptions, ranging from the relatively literal harmonizations of 1906 to the highly imaginative settings of 1929.

In his preface Dr. Meyer (working under the supervision of Dr. Kurt von Fischer at the University of Zürich) considers the place of the song in Bartók's creative work, dealing first of all with folksong itself and folksong transcription and briefly cataloguing the "original" songs. In this context he points out that one must not confuse the German words *original* and *originell* as often happens, though they are not equivalent.

[1]Dr. Meyer lists the *Liebeslieder* of 1900 "for two-part chorus (with piano accompaniment?)." These *Liebeslieder*, on poems by Rückert, are for solo voice with piano; they have been published in *Der junge Bartók* (1962).