

AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING UNDERGRADUATE ACCEPTANCE,  
MATRICULATION, AND SUCCESS IN MUSIC THEORY IN THE SCHOOL  
OF MUSIC AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

by

HILEN E. POWELL

DR. MARVIN LATIMER, COMMITTEE CHAIR  
DR. ANDREA CEVASCO  
DR. SUSAN FLEMING  
DR. ANNE C. WITT

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts  
in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
in the Graduate School of  
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2013

Copyright Hilan E. Powell © 2013  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to seek to identify and assess factors that contributed to undergraduate student acceptance, matriculation, and success in MUS 115, Music Theory, during the academic years of 2008-12. Data were (a) student ACT test scores, (b) SOM Audition Diagnostic Exam scores, and (c) final grades for students who registered in MUS 115 during the years 2008-12. Student gender, major, performing medium, home state and scholarship offer was also included in the analysis. Research questions were: (1) To what extent did student gender, major, performing medium, home state, diagnostic exam score, standardized test score and scholarship offer affect student acceptance to the University of Alabama School of Music (UA SOM)? (2) To what extent did student gender, major, performing medium, home state, diagnostic exam score, standardized test score and scholarship offer affect matriculation to the UA SOM? (3) To what extent did student gender, major, performing medium, home state, diagnostic exam score, scholarship offer, standardized test score and diagnostic exam score affect success in Theory I? (4) What was the mean diagnostic exam score of accepted students by performing medium and major? (5) What was the mean standardized test score of accepted students by performing medium and major? (6) What is the percentage of success in MUS 115, Music Theory, of matriculated students by performing medium and major?

Data for this study were provided as a numeric data set with student names and other identifying information removed. The database included standardized test scores, Music Audition Diagnostic Exam scores, high-school grade point average, declared major, home state, gender, and principal instrument. Results were reported as they related to changes and trends

over time. The results suggested (a) home state, performing medium, and major influenced success in Theory I, (b) diagnostic exam scores did not appear to affect acceptance, matriculation, or success in Theory I, and (c) standardized test scores influence success at the freshman level. The results gathered from this study will be helpful in better identifying students with the potential to succeed in the School of Music at the University of Alabama.

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the University of Alabama Student American Choral Directors Association in celebration of their continuous work, accomplishment, and growth over the past six years.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am pleased to have this opportunity to thank several colleagues, faculty members, and friends who have helped me with this thesis. First, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Marvin Latimer for his constant encouragement, guidance, and support throughout this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Andrea Cevasco, Dr. Susan Fleming, and Dr. Anne Witt for their time and input while serving on my committee.

I am also thankful to the faculty and staff at the University of Alabama School of Music for their assistance with the research portion of this process. Finally, I would like to thank the friends and family who have been a nonstop support system throughout my last two years and particularly throughout this thesis journey.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. METHOD .....	13
a. Data .....	13
b. Definitions.....	14
c. Statistical Tests.....	15
3. RESULTS .....	16
4. DISCUSSION .....	23
REFERENCES .....	27
APPENDIX.....	55

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Aspirant Gender and Acceptance .....	29
Table 2 Aspirant Gender and Matriculation .....	30
Table 3 Aspirant Gender and Success in Theory I .....	31
Table 4 Aspirant Declared Major and Acceptance .....	32
Table 5 Aspirant Declared Major and Matriculation .....	33
Table 6 Aspirant Declared Major and Success in Theory I .....	34
Table 7 Aspirant Performing Medium and Acceptance .....	35
Table 8 Aspirant Performing Medium and Matriculation .....	37
Table 9 Aspirant Performing Medium and Success in Theory I .....	39
Table 10 Aspirant Home State and Acceptance .....	41
Table 11 Aspirant Home State and Matriculation .....	42
Table 12 Aspirant Home State and Success in Theory I .....	43
Table 13 Aspirant Scholarship Offer and Acceptance.....	44
Table 14 Aspirant Scholarship Offer and Matriculation.....	45
Table 15 Matriculated Scholarship Aspirants and Success in Theory I ...	46
Table 16 Mean Diagnostic Exam Score by Performing Medium.....	47
Table 17 Mean Diagnostic Exam Score by Declared Major .....	49
Table 18 Mean Standardized Test Score by Performing Medium.....	50
Table 19 Percentage of Success by Performing Medium .....	52
Table 20 Percentage of Success by Declared Major.....	54



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Numerous factors may influence student success in a music program, specifically in courses such as music theory. Student success might be predicted by examining factors such as high school grade point average, primary instrument, gender, diagnostic exam score, and score on standardized tests. By identifying the factors that contribute to success, the students who are most likely to succeed in *UA SOM* can also be determined.

Ernest (1970) investigated the relationship between high school rank and test scores. He also examined college cumulative honor point and cumulative honor point in music courses in order to predict the academic success of freshman music majors. His findings showed that the best predictor of academic success was high school rank. He suggested that using this information could better identify the most capable students who might be successful at the freshman level.

Another early research study examined the relationship between certain personality traits and musical ability (Cooley, 1961). A group of 180 undergraduate music students at Michigan State University participated in a series of standardized tests including the *American Council on Education Psychological Examination* (AEPE), the *Cooperative Reading Comprehension Test* (CRCT), the *Bernreuter Personality Inventory* (BPI), and the *Seashore Measures of Musical Talents* (SMMT). The students also received ratings by their primary professors on their musicality, ability to sight-read music, and ability to perform.

Musicality was shown to be highly correlated with high intelligence and reading ability. It also provided evidence that those two factors are also correlated with ability to sight-read. Though there was no evidence of a relationship between personality traits and musicality, the results suggested that college music students have different personalities than other college students. The researcher suggested that none of the test scores showed sufficient correlation to be used in predicting the success of students.

Jones (2008) studied elements including high school class rank, composite score on the ACT, math score on the ACT, performing medium, prior music theory experience and score on a theory diagnostic exam to determine which aspects were most strongly associated with success in first year music theory. Jones concluded that high school class rank was the factor most associated with success, reinforcing the idea that successful high school students have already learned the necessary skills and motivation needed to succeed in college. Also, he found that the second element most connected to success was the ACT math score. Both high school class rank and the ACT score were more highly correlated than any of the musical components.

This study also indicated that scores on a diagnostic exam and a student's primary instrument does not relate to their success in freshman music theory. Jones recommended that the creation of a separate section of freshman theory that was divided according to ACT scores and class rank could help students who need more direction and assistance. Because vocalists seemed to perform poorly in this study, he also suggested the use of more vocal repertoire.

In contrast with previous studies, gender did not contribute significantly to success in the aural or written components of freshman theory. In examining the aural requirement for freshman theory, this study showed that the diagnostic exam is the best predictor of success. The

researcher recommended moving the aural section of freshman theory to the second semester once students acquired a better grasp of functional harmony.

Several musical aptitude tests have been developed that are also used as college entrance exams. James Aliferis (1953) developed the *Aliferis Music Achievement Test* (AMAT) in order to provide institutions with a sufficient gauge of a student's musical achievement. This test measures auditory-visual discrimination of melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic elements and idioms. Freshman theory textbooks and college music theory professors contributed to the test material.

Aliferis enforced the notion that the test is an achievement test, and that it does not measure aptitude. He suggested that only achievement is reported and that an evaluation of the student and his or her talent should not be determined by this test alone. He encouraged the use of other musical tests that examine aspects such as the ear's perceptual ability, performance evaluation in the form of an audition, and a reliable IQ test in determining the student's acceptance to a college music program.

Another early researcher used the SMMT and the AMAT to predict success in music theory (Roby, 1962). Both these tests examine differences in melody, harmony, and rhythm as well as tonal sequences in order to evaluate the musician's ear. Any student that attends a National Association of School of Music institution must take "a composite course in music theory to include the equivalent of two years of sight singing and dictation, one year each of elementary and advanced harmony, and an approach to elementary counterpoint," which is why music theory grades are so often used as a reference point for success.

Roby found that there was a strong correlation between Aliferis test scores and theory grades, but no connection between theory grades and the Seashore battery scores. The author

suggested that the Seashore exam examines the perception of the ear at the time of the test, and that this can be improved throughout a theory course. He also examined the correlations between theory grades and the *Minnesota English Entrance Test* (MEET) and *American Council on Education Psychological Examination* (ACEPE). Both of these tests also demonstrated high correlations with theory grades. He suggested that this indicated that the use of an intelligence exam can be useful in predicting success in music theory.

Harrison (1987) examined the use of the *Musical Aptitude Profile* (MAP) developed by Edwin Gordon as an entrance exam for college music students and as a predictor of success in music theory. The MAP is composed of three areas: Tonal Imagery, Rhythm Imagery, and Musical Sensitivity. This is used as an entrance exam because those components are taught and utilized in freshman theory courses.

Four separate components of the music theory grade including, written work, sight singing, ear training, and composite grade were studied. Results showed that the Musical Sensitivity section of the MAP was not a good predictor of success in any of the components of the music theory course. However, the Tonal Imagery portion was a predictor of success in all elements of music theory, and the Rhythm Imagery was a good predictor for sight singing and ear training.

Schleuter (1974) investigated the reliability and intercorrelations of three standardized music tests that are given to entering college music students. The three tests chosen were the *Aliferis Music Achievement Test* (AMAT), the *Musical Aptitude Profile* (MAP), and the *Iowa tests of Music Literacy* (ITML). The MAP and ITML were originally intended for public school students, and the results reinforced that concept with student's scores being fairly high on both examinations. Schleuter suggested that one of the discrepancies with these tests is that they

function more like a pretest for music theory than an analytical achievement test. He proposed the use of the MAP and a music achievement test with content that matches individual situations.

In another study, an experimental college version of the *Musical Aptitude Profile* was used as a predictor of music major achievement (Schleuter, 1983). This test included the three original sections, Tonal Imagery, Rhythm Imagery, and Musical Sensitivity, as well as the Test Composite. The results of this study showed that the MAP indicated a relationship with sight singing grades and ear training scores.

Pembrook (1986) used a Melodic Discrimination Test (MDT) with students at Florida State University to explore the effect of three different background variables on their scores. He examined a student's musical experience, major instrument, and class level, as well as the amount of music theory experience they have prior to their audition.

The study yielded several different results. First, students who had more musical performing experience scored higher on the MDT than those who had not and students who demonstrated experience in music theory, music history, and piano scored higher on the test. Previous training in music theory also was highly correlated with melodic discrimination skills. However, major instrument and success on the MDT did not seem to be linked.

The relationship of a student's primary instrument to their success on a musical achievement test was explored (Stecklein, 1957). He used college freshmen scores from the AMAT for this study. Major instruments were grouped into six categories: strings, woodwinds, brass, percussion, piano, and voice. Results revealed that string majors received the highest scores on the achievement test, and percussion majors received the lowest scores. All of the instrument groups averaged five or six years of pre-college private instruction.

The results of this study showed some important findings. First, 24% of the entering freshmen who took the exam had no pre-college private instruction on their major instrument. Notably, string players who did not have more pre-college experience, scored much higher on the melodic and tonal sections of the test.

Franzén (1969) studied the validity of college entrance exams in music theory. He examined the entrance exam for the Royal College of Music in Stockholm, Sweden. The test includes piano, singing, harmony, ear training, musical terms and notation, and a test of teaching ability. The results showed that success on the entrance exam was associated with final grades in classes such as music theory, music history, and piano.

The validity of high school record and standardized tests as predictors of four year college outcomes was examined in another study (Geiser, 2007). The results showed that high school grade point average was a superior indicator of college success than a standardized test score. The author credited this finding to the idea that a standardized test measures a student's performance over a short period of time, while high school grade point average is a reflection of the student's ability over an extended period of time.

Beecher (1999) investigated the relationship between high school coursework, academic ability, and college success. He studied the course credits the student received in high school, as well as high school grade point average, ACT score, and gender. The results of the study found that high school grade point average was an excellent indicator of completion of the freshman year of college. It was also found that ACT score was significantly correlated with undergraduate grade point average and completion of the freshman year. Gender was not found as a significant predictor of success at the freshman level.

One researcher used three separate approaches to predicting college grades, including a traditional regression model, high school effects model, and a hierarchical linear model (Pike, 2002). He examined ACT scores and high school class rank and their relationship to first year college grade point average. In agreement with previous research, test scores and high school performance were significantly related to freshman grade point average. He suggested that examining the student's high school atmosphere as well as their admission test scores could also give insight into success.

Belfield (2012) used data from a statewide college system to explore the validity of placement tests and high school information in predicting grades and performance in college. The placement tests in this study are given to entering college freshmen, and consist of quantitative and literacy examinations.

Belfield found that placement test scores were weakly associated with college grade point average. However, high school grade point average was strongly associated with success in college as well as with college grade point average. Interestingly, the accuracy of the placement tests was also analyzed. The results showed that three out of every ten students was assigned to the wrong placement after they were given a placement test. The author used this as evidence that high school grade point average is a better predictor of college success than placement tests.

In another study, ACT scores and high school grade point average and their relationship to college admission and acceptance were examined (Sawyer, 2010). In this study, college admission is defined as having two goals: "capitalizing on academic success and identifying applicants who would be the most successful at a particular institution."

The results of this study suggest that high school grade point average is more helpful than admission test scores with students who perform at a low to average level in college. In contrast,

for those students who perform at an average to high level in college, admission test scores are more useful than high school grade point average with students. The author suggested that the high school GPA and test scores should be used jointly in order to accurately predict college success.

Scott-Clayton (2012) analyzed the predictive validity of the COMPASS exam, a placement test that is used across the country in many college settings. She found that placement exams are more predictive of success in certain subjects such as math, and show which students are more likely to succeed at college level coursework. She recommended using placement test scores, high school achievement, and other background variables when considering a student's performance ability as opposed to basing it on an individual test score alone.

Multiple regression techniques were employed to analyze how academic ability and music experience could help predict grades in freshman theory courses (Harrison, 1990). Six factors were analyzed including, general ability shown through SAT scores, high school grade point average, musical aptitude as indicated by scores on the experimental college tests of the MAP, precollege musical experience, principal instrument, and gender. Harrison found that the best predictor of freshman academic success was the SAT score of the math portion. Primary instrument was the second best predictor of success, with vocalists and pianists having higher success rates than instrumentalists. Gender was deleted from the analysis because it appeared to have no significant effect.

Harrison reported that high school grade point average, previous years of piano study, and scores on the verbal portion of the SAT were also predictors. Performance on more than one instrument contributed to a higher success rate in freshman music theory courses. Harrison



suggested that using this information could aid in better identifying those students who need support.

In a second study, Harrison (1990) analyzed the role of academic ability, music experience and musical aptitude in predicting grades in each component of freshman theory courses. Results showed that the score on the math portion of the SAT was the best predictor of grades in the written-work and ear training components. High school grade point average was also a significant factor that contributed to the success of the students in freshman level theory.

Music experience and aptitude best predicted the grades in sight singing and keyboard-harmony components of the course. Harrison reported that instrumentalists performed at a lower level in freshman theory than vocalists or pianists. She advised that investigating student's motivation, interest in music and out of class study time should be studied further as predictors of success.

In another study, she explored the relationships of factors influencing success in a music theory course for non-music majors (Harrison, 1996). Three factors were addressed including pre-college music experience, scores on the *Advanced Measures of Music Audiation* (AMMA), and gender. Results showed that the only statistically significant predictor of success was pre-college music experience. Gender was not a significant predictor, but results showed that females scored higher on the AMMA than males.

Williams (1997) explored the relationships among scores on the SAT or ACT test, pre-college music experience, number of performing media, gender, and scores on a music aptitude test as predictors of grades in freshman music theory. SAT scores and experience with pre-college theory were the two strongest predictors of success. The SAT math score was found as

the best predictor of written theory and sight singing grades. However, the SAT verbal score was the best predictor of ear training and dictation grades.

Success in sight singing also was influenced by experience in a principal ensemble, the SAT math score, pre-college experience in music theory, and number of hours practiced per week. He suggested that the best way to predict success in freshman theory is by analyzing standardized test scores as well as previous music experience. In agreement with Harrison (1990), he suggested that study time out of class should also be studied as factor in predicting success.

Arenson (1983) studied the validity of entrance tests as predictors of grades in music theory and ear training at the Department of Music at the University of Delaware. The students were given the entrance exam from Ohio State University, which included several sections that test both written and aural skills, a rhythm tapping test, and sections of the *Music Achievement Test* (MAT).

The results of the study showed that the best correlation occurred between grades in freshman music theory and the rhythm-tapping test. The next highest correlation was with math scores on the SAT, and then with the Ohio State University entrance exam.

A study was conducted to investigate how gender can affect musical ability (Whellams, 1973). He gave two groups of women and three groups of men from the Sheffield City College of Education the *Standardized Tests of Musical Intelligence* (STMI), which included chord analysis and pitch changes. These scores were compared with scores from students at the Eastman School of Music and the Royal Marines School of Music.

The results showed that women students on average obtain higher scores than men. It was also found that this test could discriminate between students with instrumental experience and those without instrumental experience.

The purpose of this study was to seek to identify and assess factors that contributed to undergraduate student acceptance, matriculation, and success in MUS 115, Music Theory, during the academic years of 2008-12. Data were (a) student ACT test scores, (b) SOM Audition Diagnostic Exam scores, and (c) final grades for students who registered in MUS 115 during the years 2008-12. Student gender, major, performing medium, high school grade point average, and home state was also included in the analysis of contributing factors.

Research questions were:

1. To what extent did student gender, major, performing medium, home state, diagnostic exam score, standardized test score and scholarship offer affect student acceptance to the University of Alabama School of Music?
2. To what extent did student gender, major, performing medium, home state, diagnostic exam score, standardized test score and scholarship offer affect matriculation to the University of Alabama School of Music?
3. To what extent did student gender, major, performing medium, home state, diagnostic exam score, standardized test scores and scholarship offer affect success in Theory I?
4. What was the mean diagnostic exam score of accepted students by performing medium and major?
5. What was the mean standardized test score of accepted students by performing medium and major?

6. What is the percentage of success in MUS 115, Music Theory, of matriculated students by performing medium and major?

## CHAPTER 2

### METHOD

#### *Data*

When students audition for the School of Music at the University of Alabama, the School of Music Audition Officer gathers various data. Those data include name, age, high school grade point average, primary instrument, declared major, home address, standardized test score, School of Music Diagnostic Exam score, and scholarship offer. The School of Music Audition Officer created a database with this information for each year from 2008-2012. This database was stored in the School of Music Office. At the request of the researcher, data for this study were provided as a numeric data set with student names and other identifying information removed. The database included standardized test scores, Music Audition Diagnostic Exam scores, high school grade point average, declared major, home state, gender, and principal instrument.

There were some limitations to the information stored in the database. First, high school grade point average was only reported during 2008, and therefore this factor was eventually eliminated from the final database. The Audition Officer did not have audition records for 2010, so the database was supplemented through other records supplied by the Audition Officer. However, the database still did not include complete information in all categories. Therefore, because the findings of this study reflect an incomplete set of data and because those data were not obtained through random selection processes significance tests were not considered relevant and were not computed or reported. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized to another population.

## ***Definitions***

All contributing factors were given a numeric symbol to create a numeric database. Acceptance was defined as accepted into the School of Music through passing an audition, or being rejected to the School of Music by failing an audition. Diagnostic Exam Score was defined as the score on the School of Music Diagnostic Exam that aspirants take on the day of their audition. Scores are calculated on a 100-point scale. Aspirant gender was defined as male or female. Home state was defined as in the state of Alabama, or out of the state of Alabama.

Declared majors were those that the aspirants affirmed at the time of their audition. Declared aspirant majors included the following: Bachelor of Arts in Administration or General Music, Bachelor of Music in Composition, Jazz Studies, Music Therapy or Performance, and Bachelor of Science in Music Education. Matriculation was defined as aspirants who were accepted and then matriculated. Matriculation does not include aspirants who were not accepted and matriculated.

Performing medium was defined as the aspirant's primary instrument. These instruments include bassoon, cello, clarinet, euphonium, flute, guitar, harp, horn, oboe, organ, percussion, piano, saxophone, string bass, trombone, trumpet, tuba, viola, violin, and voice. Scholarship offer was defined as the aspirant being offered a scholarship to the School of Music, or an aspirant not being offered a scholarship to the School of Music. Standardized test score was defined as the aspirant score on the ACT or SAT. All SAT scores were converted to ACT scores using a conversion table provided by the ACT company. Success in Theory I was defined as achieving a 70% or higher in MUS 115, Theory I, or receiving lower than 70% in MUS 115. This study only includes those aspirants who passed Theory I the first time they took the course.

### *Statistical Tests*

The UA SOM collects audition information for all aspirants at the time of audition. However, this information is somewhat incomplete because of various unavoidable circumstances. Because the data set was incomplete and not reflective of a randomized population, significance tests were not computed. Therefore, only means, standard deviations, and ranges were examined and reported.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULTS

A total of 1000 undergraduate aspirants auditioned for the School of Music at the University of Alabama between the years 2008-2012. Five hundred and thirty four of these aspirants were male, and 466 were female. The database provided was incomplete in some areas; therefore numbers will vary across the various categories. The majors of the aspirants were as follows: 102 Music Administration and General Music majors, 16 Composition majors, 18 Jazz Studies majors, 263 Music Education majors, 99 Music Therapy majors, 172 Undecided, and 329 Performance majors. The aspirants' primary instruments included: 12 bassoon, 14 cello, 62 clarinet, 31 euphonium, 55 flute, 21 guitar, 5 harp, 39 horn, 28 oboe, 7 organ, 80 percussion, 73 piano, 54 saxophone, 13 string bass, 48 trombone, 64 trumpet, 26 tuba, 20 viola, 39 violin, and 254 voice.

During the years 2008-2012, more men than women were accepted, with 347 men accepted and 288 women accepted (Table 1). The number of men accepted over the five years ranged from 77-150, and the number of women accepted ranged from 30-87. The number of women accepted increased over five years, with the exception of 2008. The largest number of men that were accepted was 84, and the smallest number accepted was 47. The largest number of women accepted was 87, and the smallest number was 30. More men than women were accepted in every year except 2012. Interestingly, more women were rejected than men as well. 105 women were not accepted over the five-year period, and only 95 men were not accepted.



Similarly, more men than women matriculated with 249 men matriculating and only 183 women (Table 2). The number of men matriculating ranged from 29-71. The number of women matriculating ranged from 24-48. Of the 432 aspirants who matriculated, 57% were men and 42% were women. The largest number of men that matriculated was 71, and the smallest number was 29. The largest number of women that matriculated was 48, and the smallest number was 24. Similarly to Table 1, more women did not matriculate than men, with 105 women and 98 men not matriculating. The number of men trended upward with the exception of 2012 while the number of women accepted increased every year.

From 2008-2012, 165 men were successful and 138 women passed Theory I (Table 3). The largest number of men that passed Theory I was 43 in both 2010 and 2011. The smallest number of men was 23 in 2009. The largest number of women that passed Theory I was 31 in 2008, 2010 and 2011. The smallest number of women was 16 in 2009. It is interesting to note that in 2008 and 2012, more women than men succeeded in MUS 115. In 2009, both men and women had the smallest number of successful aspirants over the five-year period. There seemed to be no consistent trends from 2008-2012 in regards to gender and matriculation.

The number of aspirants accepted ranged from 14 Composition majors to 246 Performance majors from 2008-2012 (Table 4). The largest number of aspirants accepted of all six majors was 61 Performance majors in 2012. The smallest number accepted was 1 Jazz Studies major in 2009. The number of aspirants accepted increased for Music Education, Music Therapy, and Performance over the five-year period with the exception of 2009. General Music and Administration majors' acceptance also increased from 2009-2012. Both Composition and Jazz Studies seemed to have a consistent number of accepted aspirants over the five-year period.

The number of aspirants that matriculated ranged from 11 Jazz Studies majors to 145 Performance majors (Table 5). Unlike the results in Table 4, Jazz Studies represented the least number of aspirants that matriculated instead of Composition. The largest number of aspirants that matriculated occurred in 2009 with 41 Performance majors matriculating. All aspirants that were accepted with the majors of General Music and Administration, Jazz Studies, Music Therapy, and Performance matriculated in 2010. All but two Composition majors matriculated over the five-year period. The other five majors matriculated consistently from 2008-2012.

Of the six declared majors, Performance majors were the most successful and Jazz Studies majors were the least successful (Table 6). The number of successful aspirants ranged from 8-95. Music Education majors were increasingly successful from 2008-2012, with the exception of 2008. The largest number of aspirants that succeeded in a single year occurred in 2010 with 68 total aspirants. Both Composition and Jazz Studies majors were consistently successful from 2008-2012.

The number of aspirants accepted for each performing medium ranged from 4-151 (Table 7). The performing medium with the smallest number of aspirants accepted was Harp, and the performing medium with the largest number accepted was Voice. Voice majors presented a total of 151 aspirants accepted with the next largest number of aspirants playing percussion or piano with 48 aspirants accepted for both performing mediums. Organ, viola, and voice majors were the only three majors whose acceptance rate increased over time.

The number of aspirants that matriculated ranged from 0-100 (Table 8). Of the four aspirants who auditioned on harp, none of them chose to matriculate to the UA SOM. The largest number of aspirants matriculating was 100 voice aspirants. The second largest number

of matriculating aspirants was percussion majors with a total of 35. There were no consistent trends in this table, with the exception of harp majors whose matriculation decreased over time.

The number of aspirants passing MUS 115 in relation to performing medium ranged from 1-70 (Table 9). Voice majors presented the largest number with 70 out of 100 passing MUS 115. Organ majors showed the smallest number of aspirants with one out of two passing MUS 115. Piano majors were the next largest number of aspirants that were successful. Aspirants who auditioned on harp are not included in this table because none of the aspirants chose to matriculate. Several performing media were consistently successful over time, but none increased or decreased specifically.

Three hundred and fifty-one aspirants that were accepted were from the state of Alabama and 248 were from out of state (Table 10). It is interesting to note that more in state aspirants were accepted every year except 2012, in which 78 out of state aspirants were accepted, and only 55 in state aspirants were accepted. The number of out of state aspirants accepted increased every year except 2009. The largest number of in state aspirants was accepted in 2008 with 88 aspirants. The smallest number of in state and out of state aspirants was accepted in 2009 with 53 and 21 respectively.

Two hundred and seventy-nine in state aspirants matriculated and 132 out of state aspirants matriculated (Table 11). In every year, more in state aspirants matriculated than out of state aspirants. However, in 2012, almost the same number of aspirants matriculated with 32 in state aspirants and 31 out of state aspirants. All 80 of the in state aspirants who auditioned in 2010 also chose to matriculate.

Of the 279 in state aspirants that matriculated, 183 were successful in MUS 115 (Table 12). Of the 132 out of state aspirants, 107 passed MUS 115. However, less out of state aspirants

were unsuccessful than in state aspirants. Only 19 out of state aspirants did not succeed in MUS 115, and 96 in state aspirants did not pass Theory I. The success rate of out of state aspirants increased over time with the exception of 2012.

Of the 635 aspirants that were accepted, only 147 scholarships were offered (Table 13). The most scholarships were offered in 2008 with 63 offers and the least in 2012 with 24 offers. The number of scholarships offered decreased every year with the exception of 2011. Scholarship information was not available for 2010. There was a significant decrease in the number of accepted students as well as the number of scholarships offered in 2009.

One hundred and forty-seven scholarships were offered, and of those, 108 aspirants accepted the scholarships and matriculated to UA. Table 14 shows that the number who matriculated ranged from 11 in 2012 to 43 in 2008. The largest number of scholarship aspirants matriculated in 2008 and the smallest in 2012, which coincides with the number of scholarship offers in those years. In 2009 and 2011, almost all aspirants who were offered a scholarship also matriculated.

Eighty-two of the 108 scholarship aspirants succeeded from 2008-2012 (Table 15). The largest number succeeded in 2008 and the smallest number succeeded in 2012. However, the highest percentage of successful aspirants occurred in 2012 with 81% succeeding. The lowest percentage occurred in 2008 with 74% succeeding. However, the largest number of scholarships was offered in 2008 and the smallest number of scholarships was offered in 2012.

The mean diagnostic exam scores ranged from 54.8-85.7 (Table 16). Clarinet majors demonstrated the lowest mean diagnostic exam score of 54.8. Organ majors achieved the highest mean diagnostic exam score of 85.7. An organ major in 2008 with a score of 99 achieved the highest individual diagnostic exam score. The lowest individual diagnostic exam score was

achieved by one violin major in 2009 with a score of 26. There seemed to be no significant trends associated with mean diagnostic exam score and performing medium.

The mean diagnostic exam scores ranged from 61.7-78.5 (Table 17). Music Therapy majors achieved the lowest mean score of 61.7. Jazz Studies majors demonstrated the highest mean score of 78.5. Performance majors displayed the only scores that increased from 2008-2012 with the exception of 2012.

The mean standardized test scores ranged from 21.5-29.4 (Table 18). Organ majors achieved the lowest mean standardized test score of 21.5. Viola majors presented the highest mean standardized test score of 29.4. None of the performing media showed consistent trends throughout this table.

Table 19 showed percentages from 40%-100%. Five Cello majors represented the lowest percentage of success with 40%. Six Viola majors exhibited the highest percentage with 100%. The scores seemed to vary greatly for each performing medium. However, all bassoon and viola majors succeeded from 2009-2012.

The percentage of success ranged from 66%-100% (Table 20). Performance majors portrayed the lowest percentage of success and Music Therapy and Composition majors showed the highest percentage of success. Both Performance and Music Education majors' percentage of success increased from 2008-2012. There were varying rates of success for the other majors from 2008-2012.

Because the findings suggested that certain subgroups evidenced higher standardized test scores than other subgroups, mean standardized test scores were computed for (a) aspirants who were not successful in Theory I and (b) aspirants who were successful in Theory I. Results of

these computations showed a mean score for aspirants who were not successful in Theory I of 23.9 and a mean score for aspirants who were successful in Theory I of 26.4.

## CHAPTER 4

### DISCUSSION

Though the University of Alabama School of Music systematically collects and stores audition information from all students who audition, due to various “real world” circumstances, those materials are to varying degrees incomplete. Because the findings of this study reflect an incomplete set of data and because those data were not obtained through random selection processes, significance tests were not considered relevant and were not computed or reported. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized to another population.

Still, numerous findings reported in detail in the results section suggest that trends in these data tell an important story about who auditioned, who matriculated, and who found success after arriving at the school. For example, gender appeared to influence acceptance to SOM. Specifically, acceptance rates were higher for men and rejection rates were higher for women. Similar findings were reported for matriculation, though such findings could be simply a result of disproportionate acceptance rates. Such trends suggest that future investigations should look more broadly at music schools generally to investigate whether this demography is specific to this university or this region or whether there is a national trend toward more men than women in schools of music.

Gender also was positively correlated with success in Music Theory in the present investigation. Men were more successful than women in Theory I. However, because the data set spanned only five years and because the ratio between men and women was only 3:2, these findings cannot reasonably be considered to be conclusive. Furthermore, Whellams (1973)

reported that women consistently score higher on musical aptitude tests than men. Such inconsistency suggests that further research into the relative success of men and women in beginning Music Theory classes likely is warranted.

Aspirants' choice of major appeared to correlate with levels of acceptance. For instance, Composition and Jazz Studies majors were more likely to be accepted than others, with only one Composition aspirant being rejected and only two Jazz Studies aspirants being rejected during the years of this study. Additionally, Music Therapy seemed to increase in popularity over the five years, with the largest number of aspirants auditioning in 2012. Music Education and Music Performance evidenced the largest numbers auditioning every year. But these numbers were not necessarily reflected in the numbers of the students who actually matriculated to SOM. More research is needed to investigate whether there are any consistent trends that would suggest that specific choices of major correlate with the likelihood that a student would matriculate.

Analyses of aspirants' success in Music Theory yielded some of the more interesting findings of this study. The results indicated that General Music or Music Administration majors were the most successful while Performance majors were the least successful. Music Education majors were consistently somewhere in the middle. Choice of instrument also appeared to correlate positively with success in Music Theory. For example, all bassoon and viola majors were successful from 2009-2012. Such findings agree with Harrison (1990), who concluded certain factors could predict success in freshman music theory. However, Harrison reported that vocalists and pianists tended to experience higher success rates than instrumentalists. Such was not the case in the present study.

Mean diagnostic exam score also provided some insights that were to some extent unexpected. Organ aspirants achieved the highest mean diagnostic exam score for the five-year



period while violin aspirants achieved the lowest mean diagnostic exam score. Of the declared majors, Jazz Studies evidenced the highest mean diagnostic exam score and Music Therapy majors evidenced the lowest mean diagnostic exam score. Interestingly, however, diagnostic exam scores did not correlate positively with success in Theory I in the present study. Such findings agree with Jones (2008) who concluded that a diagnostic exam scores are not significant predictors of student success.

Scholarship offer seemed to have some influence on matriculation and success in Music Theory. Of the 147 scholarship aspirants who were offered a scholarship, 73% of them matriculated. Interestingly, 76% of those aspirants were also successful in MUS 115.

Perhaps the most robust finding of this study was the positive correlation between aspirants standardized test scores and success in Music Theory. Specifically, students' whose majors and performing media demonstrated the highest overall standardized test scores tended to be the most successful in Theory I. Such findings agree with Jones (2008) who reported that ACT math score was a predictor of success in Theory I. These conclusions also support the findings of Beecher (1990) who reported that ACT score was significantly correlated with completion of the freshman year and undergraduate grade point average.

When the mean standardized test scores were calculated for those aspirants who succeeded in Theory I, as well as those aspirants who did not succeed, the scores provided further evidence that standardized test scores are accurate predictors of success. Aspirants who were not successful in Theory I achieved a mean standardized test score of 23.9. In contrast, those aspirants who were successful in Theory I demonstrated a mean standardized test score of 26.4. Because standardized test scores are so readily available to schools of music and because funding limitations should encourage more predictive audition methods, future investigations

should continue to focus on standardized test scores as an effective predictor of music students' potential for success.

In summation, this investigation suggests several salient factors as the best predictors of student success. For example, home state, performing medium, and major were significant factors in success at the freshman level. Still, the notion that UA SOM officials should consider quotas in these areas in order to maximize potential is likely an impractical solution and one not recommended at this time. However, this study also suggests that the score on the diagnostic exam that aspirants are given on the day of their audition should not heavily influence decisions about acceptance to the UA SOM. These results more support the notion that standardized test score tends to be the best indicator of freshman success. Arguably, by utilizing the findings of this study, and other similar investigations, the University of Alabama School of Music could make better acceptance decisions that could more successfully predict success overall.

## REFERENCES

- Aliferis, J. (1953). The development of a college entrance test in music achievement. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 1*, 83-96.
- Arenson, M. (1983). The validity of certain entrance tests as predictors of grades in music theory and ear training. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 75*, 33-39.
- Beecher, M. (1999). High school courses and scores as predictors of college success. *Journal of College Admission, 163*, 4-9.
- Belfield, C. (2012). *Predicting success in college: the importance of placement tests and high school transcripts*. (CCRC Working Paper No. 42). New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- "Compare ACT & SAT scores." *Compare ACT and SAT Scores*. N.p., n.d. Web. 12 Jan. 2013.
- Cooley, J. (1961). A study of the relation between certain mental and personality traits and ratings of musical abilities. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 9*, 108-117.
- Ernest, D. J. (1970). The prediction of academic success of college music majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 18*, 273-276.
- Franzén, B. (1969). Entrance test validity. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 17*, 62-68.
- Geiser, S. (2007). Validity of high school grades in predicting student success beyond the freshman year: high school record vs. standardized tests as indicators of four-year college outcomes. *Center for Studies in Higher Education, 1-35*.
- Harrison, C. S. (1990). Predicting music theory grades: the relative efficiency of academic ability, music experience, and musical aptitude. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 38*, 124-137.
- Harrison, C. S. (1990). Relationships between grades in the components of freshman music theory and selected background variables. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 38*, 175-186.
- Harrison, C. S. (1996). Relationships between grades in music theory for nonmusic majors and selected background variables. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 44*, 341-352.

- Harrison, C. S. (1987). The validity of the musical aptitude profile for predicting grades in music theory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47, 477-482.
- Jones, M. R. (2008). Elements associated with success in the first-year music theory and aural-skills curriculum. *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy*, 22, 93-116.
- Pembroke, R. (1986). Relationships between scores on a melodic discrimination test and the background variables of prospective college music students. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 88, 1-21.
- Pike, G. (2002). Does high school matter? an analysis of three methods of predicting first-year grades. *Research in Higher Education*, 43, 187-207.
- Roby, A. (1962). A study in the correlation of music theory grades with the “seashore measures of musical talents” and the “aliferis music achievement test.” *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 10, 137-142.
- Sawyer, R. (2010). *Usefulness of high school average and ACT scores in making college admission decisions*. (ACT Research Report Series). Iowa City, Iowa: American College Test Research Report Series.
- Schleuter, S. L. (1983). A predictive study of an experimental college version of the musical aptitude profile with certain music achievement of college music majors. *Psychology of Music*, 11, 32-36.
- Schleuter, S. L. (1974). Use of standardized tests of musical aptitude with university freshmen music majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 22, 258-269.
- Scott-Clayton, J. (2012). *Do high-stakes placement exams predict college success?* (CCRC Working Paper No. 41). New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.
- Stecklein, J. E. (1957). The relationship of instrument to music achievement test scores. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 5, 3-15.
- Whellams, F. (1973). Musical abilities and sex differences in the analysis or aural-musical capacities. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 21, 30-39.
- Williams, B. (1997). Relationships among music aptitude, general academic ability, selected music background variables, and grades in the components of freshman music theory. *Texas Music Education Research: Reports of Research in Music Education*, 17-24.

Table 1  
*Aspirant Gender and Acceptance to UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Accepted	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Total	143	30	77	33	130	51	135	50	150	36	635	200
Men	74	11	47	13	79	27	84	28	63	16	347	95
Women	69	19	30	20	51	24	51	22	87	20	288	105

*Note.* The data is incomplete and therefore some aspirant's acceptance status is unknown and therefore not reported in this table. Y = accepted, N = not accepted.

Table 2

*Aspirant Gender and Matriculation to UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Matriculated	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Total	86	57	64	13	119	11	100	35	63	87	432	203
Men	47	27	40	7	71	8	62	22	29	34	249	98
Women	39	30	24	6	48	3	38	13	34	53	183	105

*Note.* Matriculated refers to those aspirants who were accepted and then matriculated to UA SOM. Aspirants who matriculated but were not accepted are not included in this study. Y = matriculated, N = did not matriculate.

Table 3

*Aspirant Gender and Success in Theory I*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Total	61	25	39	25	74	45	74	26	55	8	303	129
Men	30	17	23	17	43	28	43	19	26	4	165	84
Women	31	8	16	8	31	17	31	7	29	5	138	45

*Note.* Y = passed Theory I with 70% or higher, N = failed Theory I with 69% or lower

Table 4

*Aspirant Declared Major and Acceptance to UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Accepted	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
General Music/Admin.	12	2	9	6	11	4	13	8	15	4	60	24
Composition	2	0	2	0	8	1	0	0	2	0	14	1
Jazz Studies	6	0	1	0	2	0	2	2	5	0	16	2
Therapy	14	7	5	2	15	4	16	7	21	6	71	26
Performance	60	7	30	12	41	14	54	13	61	11	246	57
Music Ed.	49	14	19	2	28	6	37	20	46	15	179	57

*Note.* Some majors of the aspirants are unknown and therefore not reported in this table. Y = accepted, N = not accepted. General Music/Administration = Bachelor of Arts; Composition, Jazz Studies, Music Therapy, and Performance = Bachelor of Music; Music Education = Bachelor of Science.



Table 5

*Aspirant Declared Major and Matriculation to UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Matriculated	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
General Music/Admin.	8	4	8	1	11	0	13	0	9	6	49	11
Composition	1	1	2	0	7	1	0	0	2	0	12	2
Jazz Studies	5	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	3	11	6
Music Therapy	9	5	5	0	15	0	13	3	12	3	54	11
Performance	33	27	20	10	41	0	36	18	15	15	145	70
Music Education	28	21	18	1	26	2	24	13	23	23	119	60

*Note.* Y = matriculated, N = did not matriculate. General Music/Administration = Bachelor of Arts; Composition, Jazz Studies, Music Therapy, and Performance = Bachelor of Music; Music Education = Bachelor of Science.

Table 6

*Aspirant Declared Major and Success in Theory I at UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Pass	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
General Music/Admin.	7	1	6	2	7	4	11	2	8	1	39	10
Composition	1	0	1	1	5	2	0	0	2	0	9	3
Jazz Studies	4	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	8	3
Music Therapy	5	4	4	1	12	3	12	1	10	2	43	11
Performance	22	11	10	10	26	15	25	11	12	3	95	48
Music Ed.	20	8	14	4	17	9	18	6	23	0	92	27

*Note.* Pass = Passing MUS 115 with 70% or higher, Fail = Failing MUS 115 with 69% or lower. General Music/Administration = Bachelor of Arts; Composition, Jazz Studies, Music Therapy, and Performance = Bachelor of Music; Music Education = Bachelor of Science.

Table 7

*Aspirant Performing Medium and Acceptance to UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Accepted	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Bassoon	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	8	0
Cello	1	0	1	2	2	1	3	0	1	0	8	3
Clarinet	8	2	6	3	8	1	11	7	7	1	40	14
Euphonium	7	2	4	0	3	2	2	2	4	0	20	6
Flute	9	3	5	1	5	2	8	4	8	3	35	13
Guitar	0	0	2	0	7	1	3	1	2	0	14	2
Harp	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	4	1
Horn	10	0	3	1	8	0	6	0	5	0	32	0
Oboe	4	1	1	0	4	2	6	1	6	0	21	4
Organ	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	7	0
Percussion	13	0	3	2	10	2	9	9	13	5	48	18
Piano	8	0	4	4	13	5	12	3	11	0	48	12
Saxophone	7	0	6	0	10	3	6	1	8	3	37	7
String Bass	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	0	9	2
Trombone	9	0	3	1	7	4	5	1	7	2	31	8
Trumpet	10	3	5	3	6	6	5	6	10	3	36	21
Tuba	4	0	4	2	3	0	4	0	1	4	16	6
Viola	2	0	1	0	2	1	4	2	5	0	14	3

Violin	6	0	2	3	2	1	4	0	16	0	30	4
Voice	36	19	20	11	28	17	31	13	36	13	151	73

---

*Note.* Some performing media of the accepted aspirants are unknown and therefore not reported in this table.

Table 8

*Aspirant Performing Medium and Matriculation to UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Matriculated	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Bassoon	2	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	7	1
Cello	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	1	5	3
Clarinet	6	2	5	1	7	1	9	2	3	4	30	10
Euphonium	3	4	4	0	1	2	2	0	2	2	12	8
Flute	6	3	5	0	5	0	7	1	4	4	27	8
Guitar	0	0	2	0	7	0	3	0	1	1	13	1
Harp	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4
Horn	6	4	3	0	8	0	5	1	3	2	25	7
Oboe	2	2	1	0	3	1	4	2	3	3	13	8
Organ	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	4
Percussion	10	3	2	1	10	0	7	2	6	7	35	13
Piano	5	3	3	1	11	2	8	4	7	4	34	14
Saxophone	4	3	5	1	10	0	4	2	4	4	27	10
String Bass	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	4	5
Trombone	5	4	2	1	7	0	4	1	3	4	21	10
Trumpet	7	3	4	1	6	0	3	2	6	4	26	10
Tuba	3	1	3	1	3	0	1	3	1	0	11	5
Viola	0	2	1	0	2	0	1	3	2	3	6	8
Violin	2	4	1	1	2	0	2	2	2	14	9	21

---

Voice	22	14	16	4	24	4	27	4	11	25	100	51
-------	----	----	----	---	----	---	----	---	----	----	-----	----

---

*Note.* Some performing media of aspirants that matriculated are unknown and therefore not reported in this table.

Table 9

*Aspirant Performing Medium and Success in Theory I*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Pass	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Bassoon	0	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	5	2
Cello	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	3
Clarinet	6	20	3	2	5	2	7	2	3	0	24	6
Euphonium	2	1	3	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	7	5
Flute	4	2	4	1	4	1	7	0	4	0	23	4
Guitar	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	0	1	0	9	4
Harp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Horn	4	2	2	1	6	2	3	2	2	1	17	9
Oboe	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	3	0	8	5
Organ	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Percussion	7	3	1	1	4	6	7	0	4	2	23	12
Piano	4	1	3	0	6	5	5	3	7	0	25	9
Saxophone	3	1	3	2	9	1	2	2	3	1	20	7
String Bass	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	1
Trombone	2	3	1	1	5	2	4	0	3	0	15	6
Trumpet	6	1	2	2	5	1	3	0	6	0	22	4
Tuba	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	8	3
Viola	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	6	0
Violin	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	2	6	3

---

Voice	17	5	8	8	15	9	21	6	9	2	70	30
-------	----	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	----	----

*Note.* Pass = Passing MUS 115 with 70% or higher, Fail = Failing MUS 115 with 69% or lower.



Table 10

*Aspirant Home State and Acceptance to UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Accepted	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
In	88	20	53	15	80	32	75	30	55	18	351	115
Out	49	10	21	11	43	24	57	20	78	14	248	79

*Note.* Some aspirant's acceptance status is unknown and therefore not reported in this table. In = in the state of Alabama. Out= out of the state of Alabama.

Table 11

*Aspirant Home State and Matriculation to UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Matriculated	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
In	64	24	45	8	80	0	58	17	32	23	279	72
Out	20	10	17	3	25	18	39	18	31	47	132	96

*Note.* Some aspirant's matriculated status is unknown and therefore not reported in this table. In= in the state of Alabama. Out= out of the state of Alabama.

Table 12

*Aspirant Home State and Success in Theory I at UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
Pass	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
In	38	26	28	17	49	31	36	22	32	0	183	96
Out	16	4	12	5	19	6	34	5	26	5	107	19

*Note.* Pass = Passing MUS 115 with 70% or higher, Fail = Failing MUS 115 with 69% or lower.  
 In = in the state of Alabama. Out= out of the state of Alabama.

Table 13

*Aspirant Scholarship Offer and Acceptance to UA SOM*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Accepted	143	77	130	135	150	635
Scholarships	63	26	N/A	34	24	147

*Note.* Scholarship information was not available for 2010.

Table 14

*Aspirant Scholarship Offer and Matriculation to UA SOM*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Scholarships	63	26	N/A	34	24	147
Matriculated	43	21	N/A	33	11	108

*Note.* Scholarship information was not available for 2010.

Table 15

*Matriculated Scholarship Aspirants and Success in Theory I at UA SOM*

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Matriculated	43	21	N/A	33	11	108
Succeeded	32	16	N/A	25	9	82

*Note.* Scholarship information was not available for 2010.

Table 16

*Accepted Aspirants Mean Diagnostic Exam Score by Performing Medium*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>
Bassoon	3	68.6	2	71.5	2	86	2	90.5	1	69	10	77.1
Cello	1	94	1	54	2	54.5	2	62	1	94	7	71.7
Clarinet	7	61.8	6	51.3	6	54.6	8	53.1	7	53.4	34	54.8
Euphonium	6	57.5	4	87.5	2	93.5	2	57	4	76.2	18	74.3
Flute	7	77.5	5	68.8	5	72	7	67.5	8	72.1	32	71.6
Guitar	0	N/A	0	N/A	4	81.7	1	43	2	88	7	70.9
Harp	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	75	2	84.5	3	79.7
Horn	9	44.7	2	79.5	6	58	6	67	5	55	28	60.8
Oboe	4	70.7	1	43	2	69	4	87.5	6	71	17	68.2
Organ	1	99	0	N/A	0	N/A	2	71.5	3	86.6	6	85.7
Percussion	9	56.8	2	68	7	56.1	5	66.2	13	70.1	36	63.4
Piano	8	55.6	4	68.7	8	71.3	11	83.7	11	78.1	42	71.5
Saxophone	6	47	6	64.5	12	71.5	6	76.5	8	69.2	38	65.7
String Bass	4	62	0	N/A	0	N/A	2	67	3	80.3	9	69.7
Trombone	8	63.6	1	28	5	63.2	3	81	7	70.2	24	61.2
Trumpet	7	64.8	4	71.5	5	77.2	4	73.7	10	63	30	70.1
Tuba	3	75.6	1	89	1	74	3	70	1	95	9	80.7
Viola	2	77	1	82	2	69	4	77.5	5	72.4	14	75.5
Violin	5	40.6	1	26	2	39	4	82	16	73.3	28	52.1

---

Voice	27	63.6	11	62.8	15	53.1	25	53.4	35	62.1	113	59.1
-------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	-----	------

---

*Note.* Some diagnostic exam scores of the aspirants are unknown and therefore not reported in this table.  $N$  = number of aspirants,  $M$  = mean.



Table 17

*Accepted Aspirants Mean Diagnostic Exam Score by Declared Major*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>
General												
Music/Admin.	7	68.4	6	50.1	5	57.2	5	78.2	15	65.6	38	63.9
Composition	1	85	1	40	4	95	0	N/A	2	68.5	8	72.1
Jazz Studies	4	67.2	1	88	2	78.5	1	89	5	70.2	13	78.5
Therapy	10	48.7	4	72	9	53.5	14	65.1	20	69.6	57	61.7
Performance	52	64.5	21	65.7	32	68.4	47	73.4	61	70.1	213	68.4
Music Ed.	40	56.9	16	68.6	22	58.9	35	59.1	46	68.6	159	62.4

*Note.* Some diagnostic exam scores of the aspirants are unknown and therefore not reported in this table. *N* = number of aspirants, *M* = mean.

Table 18

*Mean Standardized Test Score of Accepted Aspirants by Performing Medium*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>
Bassoon	3	24	2	31	2	30.5	1	29	1	22	9	27.3
Cello	1	30	1	21	1	19	3	22	0	N/A	6	23
Clarinet	8	24.2	6	25	7	24.8	10	26.7	5	26.4	36	25.4
Euphonium	7	25.7	4	26.7	1	22	2	26.5	2	30	16	26.1
Flute	9	25.7	4	28.2	5	24.6	6	27.5	5	25.2	29	26.2
Guitar	0	N/A	2	23.5	6	29.1	3	25.6	1	32	12	25.5
Harp	1	25	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	25
Horn	10	24.1	2	27	6	26.3	5	29.6	4	23.2	27	26.1
Oboe	5	26.6	1	27	3	28.6	4	27.2	5	28.8	18	27.6
Organ	1	20	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	23	2	21.5
Percussion	13	23.4	3	22.6	9	23.8	7	24.1	8	25.6	40	23.9
Piano	8	24.5	4	29.7	8	27.2	9	25.4	9	26.6	38	26.6
Saxophone	7	24.1	6	24.5	9	24.7	5	28.2	7	25	34	25.3
String Bass	4	21	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	25	2	30	7	25.3
Trombone	8	24.6	3	22.3	6	24.8	4	29.7	6	26.1	27	25.5
Trumpet	10	27	4	26.5	5	24.4	4	27	9	27.4	32	26.4
Tuba	4	22.2	4	21.2	3	22	2	30	1	28	14	25.5
Viola	2	26	0	N/A	1	32	1	34	4	25.7	8	29.4
Violin	6	24.3	0	N/A	2	28	2	28	9	26.2	19	26.6

---

Voice	36	25.9	18	25.9	21	24.7	26	24.8	22	25.3	65	25.3
-------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------

---

*Note.* Some diagnostic exam scores of the aspirants are unknown and therefore not reported in this table.  $N$  = number of aspirants,  $M$  = mean.

Table 19

*Matriculated Aspirants and Percentage of Success in MUS 115, Theory I at UA SOM*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>
Bassoon	2	0	1	100	2	100	1	100	1	100	7	71
Cello	0	N/A	1	100	1	0	3	33	0	N/A	5	40
Clarinet	6	83	5	60	7	71	9	66	3	100	30	80
Euphonium	3	66	4	75	1	0	2	50	2	100	12	58
Flute	6	66	5	80	5	80	7	86	4	100	27	85
Guitar	0	N/A	2	50	7	57	3	100	1	100	13	69
Harp	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Horn	6	66	3	50	8	75	5	60	3	66	25	65
Oboe	2	50	1	0	3	33	4	75	3	100	13	62
Organ	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	0	0	N/A	2	100	3	66
Percussion	10	70	2	50	10	40	7	71	6	66	35	65
Piano	5	80	3	100	11	45	8	62	7	100	34	73
Saxophone	4	75	5	60	10	90	4	50	4	75	27	74
String Bass	2	50	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	2	100	4	75
Trombone	5	40	2	50	7	71	4	100	3	100	21	71
Trumpet	7	86	4	50	6	83	3	66	6	100	26	85
Tuba	3	66	3	66	3	66	1	100	1	100	11	73
Viola	0	N/A	1	100	2	100	1	100	2	100	6	100
Violin	2	100	1	50	2	100	2	50	2	0	9	66

---

Voice	22	45	16	50	24	62	27	59	11	72	100	70
-------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	----

---

*Note.* Some theory grades are unknown and therefore not reported in this study.  $N$  = number of matriculated aspirants,  $P$  = percentage of success.

Table 20

*Matriculated Aspirants and Percentage of Success in MUS 115, Theory I at UA SOM by Major*

	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		Total	
	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P</i>
B.A.	7	71	6	66	5	100	5	75	15	93	38	80
Composition (B.M.)	1	100	1	100	4	100	0	N/A	2	100	8	100
Jazz Studies (B.M.)	4	75	1	0	2	50	1	100	5	40	13	73
Music Therapy (B.M.)	10	40	4	75	9	66	14	86	20	85	57	80
Performance (B.M.)	52	77	21	43	32	50	47	68	61	97	213	66
Music Education (B.S.)	40	70	16	56	22	59	35	74	46	91	159	77

*Note.* Some theory grades are unknown and therefore not reported in this study. *N* = number of matriculated aspirants, *P* = percentage of success.

APPENDIX

October 25, 2012

Office for Research  
Institutional Review Board for the  
Protection of Human Subjects

Hilen Powell  
Dept. of Music Education  
College of Education  
Box 870366

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**ALABAMA**  
RESEARCH

Re: IRB # EX-12-CM-064, "An Analysis of Factors Influencing Undergraduate Acceptance and Matriculation to the School of Music at The University of Alabama"

Dear Ms. Powell:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your protocol has been given exempt approval according to 45 CFR part 46.101(b)(4) as outlined below:

*(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.*

Your application will expire on October 24, 2013. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of Continuing Review and Closure Form. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of FORM: Continuing Review and Closure.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.