UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CAREER DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES OF GRADUATE PIANO STUDENTS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

HECTOR LANDA TOSTADO
Norman, Oklahoma
2013

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CAREER DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES OF GRADUATE PIANO STUDENTS

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE SCHOOL OF MUSIC

BY

_____
Dr. Jane Magrath, Chair

_____
Dr. Charles Ciorba, Co-Chair

_____
Dr. Edward Gates

_____
Dr. Sarah Ellis

_____
Dr. Lawrence Baines

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Jane Magrath for her continuous support throughout my Ph.D. study. You are a true role model and the best mentor I could have wished for. My sincerest thanks go to Dr. Charles Ciorba for his expertise and shared enthusiasm in my research topic. I offer thanks to Dr. Ed Gates for stepping in without hesitation on such short notice. I would also like to thank Dr. Sarah Ellis and Dr. Lawrence Baines for serving on my dissertation committee. Your encouragement, insightful comments, and constructive criticism were indispensable for the completion of this research project. I offer thanks to my wife, Erica. I could not have done any of this without your love, support, and patience. To my son Mario. Your arrival brought immense joy and gave a new direction to my life.

I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Esperanza and Hector.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if discernible profiles regarding musical background, career decision-making dimensions, and vocational identity existed among students pursuing a graduate degree in (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. Participants (N = 69) were graduate piano students enrolled at universities located in 20 states. No significant differences were found between each subgroup with respect to the twelve dimensions representing the *Career Decision-Making Profile* or the composite scores derived from the *Vocational Identity Scale*. An analysis of data comprising the *Career Decision-Making Profile* indicated that as whole, participants were quite thorough when collecting and organizing information. Participants consulted with others during different stages of the decision-making process, although they took personal responsibility for their decisions, rather than asking others to make the decision for them. They tended not to delay the decision-making process, but devoted an appropriate amount of time and mental effort into making their final decision. In terms of vocational identity, participants indicated they had a relatively clear and stable picture of their goals, interests, and talents. Discernible profiles were found among the three subgroups in regards to future career plans and factors influencing choice of university and degree program. Piano performance and piano pedagogy

majors indicated a desire to teach full-time after graduation, while collaborative piano students planned to coach singers, work as a staff accompanist, and perform regularly in a chamber music ensemble. Both piano performance and piano pedagogy majors indicated the reputation of the piano faculty played a strong influence when choosing a college, whereas collaborative piano students were mostly influenced by the availability of scholarships and assistantships. When asked what influenced their choice of degree program, piano performance and collaborative piano majors indicated a love of playing. Piano pedagogy majors were mostly influenced by a love of teaching.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2010, it was reported that 2,402 students were enrolled in graduate piano programs throughout the United States (HEADS, 2011). From this group (a) 119 (4.96%) were pursuing a master's degree in collaborative piano, (b) 246 (10.24%) were pursuing a master's degree in piano pedagogy, (c) 964 (40.13%) were pursuing a master's degree in piano performance, (d) 89 (3.71%) were pursuing a doctorate in collaborative piano, and (e) 984 (40.97%) were pursuing a doctoral degree in piano performance with or without pedagogy. During the application process, each student needed to consider which degree program he or she wished to pursue, with the three main choices being (a) solo piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. For some, the final decision may have been the result of casual or circumstantial factors. For others, the final decision may have been the result of careful thought and a clearly defined career strategy. In any case, the choice of a particular degree program will determine the professional options a student will have access to upon graduation.

With 10 to 15 years of specialized training, it would seem logical that a student choosing a particular graduate piano program would be making a conscious and informed decision, especially when considering the high

financial and personal investment that such an endeavor entails. Nevertheless, research has shown that very few young musicians seriously examine their occupational choice and make a conscious commitment to a musical career (Nagel, 1987). As such, a need exists to examine the factors that might influence the decision a student makes when committing to a particular piano degree program. Holloway (1984) indicated that a priori identification of these influential factors might enhance the recruitment and retention of graduate students. Holloway further suggested that the most important reasons to consider a study of this nature include the (a) soaring educational costs, (b) high attrition rate of graduate students, and (c) hesitation to leave the workforce to enter a terminal degree program.

The research literature targeting piano students has focused predominantly on pre-college populations (Comeau, 2009). However, it is the college-age population who chose to become the next generation of specialists. As the number of years of training increases, aspiring piano professionals are required to exhibit higher levels of persistence in the profession. Likewise, research has indicated that professional pianists confront significant occupational concerns during their productive lives. Such examples include (a) a meager job market (Alper & Wassall, 2000), (b) economic instability (Hill, 1985), (c) an unstable life style (Hill, 1985; Rice-See, 2003), (d) irregular employment patterns (Bennett, 2005; L'Roy, 1983; Nagel, 1987; Poklemba, 1995; Scalfari 1999), (e) conflicts of role

identification (Harris, 1992; Wirtanen, 2004; Baxter, 1977; Gray, 1998, Weller, 2004), (f) the need to hold multiple part-time jobs (Alper & Wassall, 2000; Mills, 2006), and (g) difficulties balancing the demands of a faculty job and private life (Rice-See, 2003). Given these occupational concerns, it is critical that piano majors make adequately informed and intentional career decisions.

In addition to pointing out the need for students to be more conscious of their vocational decisions, Nagel (1988) also recognized the responsibility that music educators have to provide talented young people with the best possible training. University music departments have the difficult responsibility of preparing students for an occupation in which competition is fierce and jobs are scarce. Doing so while sustaining a healthy enrollment and maintaining an established standard of quality is a substantial challenge. Accepting a larger number of unqualified students would help to secure a sizeable student body, but would run the risk of graduating poorly prepared musicians into a job market where there are so few career opportunities. Rogers (1988) considered this practice harmful and unethical.

Although educational researchers have studied the career decision-making process of undergraduate music majors (Jones, 1964; Baxter, 1977; Bernstein, 1986; Nagel, 1988) and music education majors (Burgstahler, 1966; Bates, 1997; Gillespie & Hamann, 1999; Bright, 2006; Neuhaus, 2008; Russell, 2008; Thornton & Bergee, 2008; Rickels et al., 2010; Weiss & Kiel,

2010), the corresponding case of the graduate piano major remains to be examined. Young pianists need to become cognizant of the challenges and opportunities put before them when selecting a major area for graduate piano study. In return, piano faculty and school administrators need to assess methodically the vocational strengths and weaknesses of the population they serve.

Research has shown that career development professionals can increase the quality of the services provided to college students in the arts by investigating their specific career decision-making process (Cooley, 2007; Luftig et al., 2003). The career planning needs of artists can be very different from those addressed by standard counselors or career advisors (Piirto, 1998; Eikleberry, 1999). For example, researchers have stressed the importance for music students to make career decisions very early in life (Jones, 1964; Baxter, 1977; L'Roy, 1983). To achieve their professional goals, young pianists often have to revise and adjust their career decisions over a long period of time.

The Measurement of Vocational Variables Among Musicians

Vocational psychology has quickly developed as a specialized area of study. In the past few decades, numerous measurement instruments have been developed and tested across a variety of fields. However, as noted above, the study of music is considerably different than that of more

conventional careers, such as law, medicine, or engineering. For that reason, researchers conducting studies on music students have relied more often upon self-designed questionnaires and surveys. The present study will utilize three instruments: (a) the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ), designed by the researcher (see Appendix A), (b) the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP), by Gati, Landman, Davidovitch, Asulin-Peretz, and Gadassi (2009) (see Appendix B), and (c) the *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS), by Holland, Daiger, and Power (1980) (see Appendix C).

The *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ)

For pianists, the process of making career decisions is atypical in that it takes place over a longer period of time and is influenced by different factors at different points on the continuum. The most common reasons for which a child or adolescent begins and maintains interest in piano lessons are (a) love for music, (b) parental influence, and (c) the feeling of being special (Burland, 2000 & 2005). In addition, the decision to pursue music as a career is affected by different factors, which may include (a) parental influence, (b) teacher influence, (c) ego-satisfaction, (d) confidence in talent, (e) interest, (f) status, (g) past experience in music, and (h) economic consideration (Jones, 1964). It should also be noted that as a student matures, the influence of parents logically declines as the college student

becomes more independent (Jones, 1964; Zdzinski, 1992, Davidson, Howe, Moore, & Sloboda, 1996).

A piano student's decision to pursue a specialized graduate degree in piano performance, piano pedagogy, or collaborative piano entails a further commitment to a particular area of the profession. The manner in which a student comes to this decision and the factors that affect the process can vary considerably as a result of one's musical background and life experiences. In order to examine these important variables, the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ) (see Appendix A), designed by the researcher, was administered to collect information regarding (a) demographics, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university choice, (e) factors influencing program choice, (f) miscellaneous information, and (g) future career plans.

The *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP)

According to Phillips and Pazienza (1988), previous research regarding the career decision-making process has focused more on the outcome of the decisions rather than the process by which they are made. This approach is currently considered simplistic and outdated by many vocational psychologists. Gati, Landman, Davidovitch, Asulin-Peretz, and Gadassi (2009) asserted that each individual has a unique method of making career decisions, which is influenced by one's personality and life situation. Consequently, these authors created and proposed the use of the

Career Decision-Making Profile (CDMP) (see Appendix B), which is a multidimensional profile characterization of individuals' career decision-making processes based on the simultaneous consideration of 12 dimensions (see Figure 1).

Dimensions for the *Career Decision-Making Profile*		
1) Information gathering	The degree to which individuals are meticulous and thorough in collecting and organizing information.	comprehensive vs. minimal
2) Information processing	The degree to which individuals analyze information into its components and process the information according to these components.	analytic vs. holistic
3) Locus of control	The degree to which individuals believe they control their occupational future and feel their decisions affect their career opportunities.	internal vs. external
4) Effort invested in the process	The amount of time and mental effort the individual invests in the decision-making process.	much vs. little
5) Procrastination	The degree to which the individual avoids or delays beginning and advancing through the career decision-making process.	high vs. low
6) Speed of making the final decision	The length of time individuals need to make their final decision once the information has been collected and compiled.	fast vs. slow
7) Consulting with others	The extent to which the individual consults with others during the different stages of the decision process.	frequent vs. rare
8) Dependence on others	The degree to which individuals accept full responsibility for making their decision (even if they consult with others), as opposed to expecting others to make the decision for them.	high vs. low
9) Desire to please others	The degree to which the individual attempts to satisfy the expectations of significant others (e.g., parents, partner, friends).	high vs. low
10) Aspiration for an "ideal occupation"	The extent to which individuals strive for an occupation that is perfect for them.	high vs. low
11) Willingness to compromise	The extent to which individuals are willing to be flexible about their preferred alternative when they encounter difficulties in actualizing it.	high vs. low
12) Use of intuition	The degree to which individuals rely on internal (gut) feelings when making a decision.	little vs. much

Figure 1. Dimensions for the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (Gati et al. 2010)

Gati et al. (2010) expanded on the assumptions upon which this measure was developed:

- Individuals differ in their approach to making career decisions and thus in their career decision-making profile characteristic
- An individual's career decision-making process can be better described by a multidimensional profile rather than by a single dominant characteristic
- Each dimension describes a continuum between two extreme poles, along which the individual can be characterized
- Although the dimensions are not independent, each has a unique contribution
- Like personality-related measures (and unlike career decision-making difficulties) the dimensions cannot be combined to produce a single total score
- Depending on the dimension, one pole is often more adaptive for decision making than the other
- Whereas some dimensions are mainly personality-related and more consistent across situations, others are more situational and may depend on the specific decision-task the individual is facing or the stage of the decision-making process the individual is at (p. 278-279)

Each dimension comprising the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP) has a separate body of research literature. To gain an appropriate understanding of these dimensions, the most relevant studies are presented.

Information gathering.

Individuals prepare themselves to make a career decision by collecting and organizing information about themselves and the anticipated situation (Harren, 1979). More sources and larger amounts of information have been associated with more conscientious final decisions (Gati et al. 2010). An individual who possesses strong information-gathering skills is a systematic (Johnson, 1978) and active planner (Jepsen, 1974). According to Johnson (1978), individuals with a systematic approach to gathering information present the following characteristics: (a) collective reaction to events, (b) cautious psychological commitment, and (c) methodical goal orientation. Malmberg (1996) reported differences of gender in the school environment regarding information gathering, with girls scoring higher than boys. The author also indicated that the most used sources of knowledge among participating students were (a) home, (b) peers, and (c) school friends. The least used sources were (a) mass media and (b) formal education. Harren (1979) suggested that individuals with an intuitive decision-making style tend to collect little information regarding possible

alternatives, whereas individuals with a rational style tend to collect greater amounts of information.

Information processing.

Leonard et al. (1999) indicated that the manner in which individuals process information and arrive at conclusions based on observations has an effect on the career decision-making process. The authors asserted that information processing, also known as cognitive style, is considered a relatively stable construct, which allows the comparison between decision-making behaviors. An individual with strong information-processing skills is rational (Harren, 1979; Krumboltz et al., 1979), logical (Arroba, 1977; Watts & Elsom, 1974), and requires accurate information about the situation to make decisions deliberately and logically.

Locus of control.

According to Lease (2009), locus of control refers to an individual's attribution of the outcome of an event to forces within or outside the individual itself. An individual with a more internal locus of control perceives to have personal control over a particular event. Conversely, an individual with a more external locus of control is fatalistic and accepting (Krumboltz et al., 1979). Gati et al. (2011) associated external locus of control with higher levels of emotional and personality-related career decision-making difficulties. According to Gati et al., a person with a higher external locus of control is less advanced in the career decision-making process.

Conversely, McClun and Merrell (1998) reported that adolescents who perceived their parents as authoritative had a more internal locus of control orientation than those adolescents who perceived their parents as permissive.

Effort invested in the process.

Effort-based decision making requires an integration of action and goal values (Kurniawan, et al., 2011). An individual expends effort to obtain a desired reward. The higher the level of effort an individual invests in the process, the more that individual is perceived as involved and committed. Research has shown that, if the decision-making process is considered an effort-based action, then the expectation of a reward translates into a more effortful process (Kurniawan, et al., 2011). According to Duckworth et al. (2007), in daily life, individuals seemed indifferent to the need to expend additional effort to achieve a desired goal. However, Kool et al. (2010) indicated that if the measure of a reward is held constant, a high-effort task tends to be avoided. It appears that the higher the amount of effort, the lower the preference for an action. As a result, the individual develops a high sensitivity to the amount of effort required to make a decision (Kurniawan, et al., 2011).

Procrastination.

Avoiding or delaying decision-making processes can considerably affect career choices. According to Scott and Bruce (1995), high levels of

procrastination may be a consequence of lack of confidence in one's decision-making ability. Ferrari and Dovidio (2000) pointed out that people with high levels of decisional procrastination are not necessarily distracted in their information searches, but rather systematic and strategic. According to the researchers, higher levels of procrastination may cause people to search for more specific information regarding chosen alternatives. Scott and Bruce (1995) reported a negative correlation between rational and avoidant decision-making styles, concluding that rational decision makers tend to approach, rather than avoid, problems. Scott and Bruce (1995) also suggested that dependent decision makers were more likely to avoid making decisions.

Speed of making the final decision.

Decision making requires the evaluation of different alternatives over a given period of time. According to Klapproth (2008), time can affect decision making at different levels: (a) the duration of the options, (b) temporal decision making, (c) the time between having made a decision and experiencing the consequences of that decision, (d) the temporal perspective of decision makers, and (e) the duration of the decision process. Time-sensitive decisions require a quicker response, and based on the speed of making a final decision, an individual can be situated in a continuum that ranges from hesitant to impulsive (Gati et al., 2010).

Johnson (1978) stated that individuals who tend to make fast decisions have a spontaneous decision-making style, which is characterized by (a) a holistic reaction to events, (b) quick psychological commitment, and (c) a flexible goal orientation. Scott and Bruce (1995) reported that quick decision makers tend to be guided by an internal hunch rather than rational deliberation. Gati et al. (2010) reported that men scored higher than women in the speed it takes to make a final decision. In addition, a correlation was discovered between procrastination and speed of making the final decision, concluding that individuals who tend to delay entering the decision-making process may also tend to delay making the final decision.

Consulting with others.

From the perspective of consulting with others, individuals making decisions range from help seeker (highest level) to individualist (lowest level). Walsh (1985) associated higher levels of consulting with others with extroversion, whereas Johnson (1978) described individuals at the low part of the scale as internal processors, or those who prefer to think about something before talking about it. Gati et al. (2010) referred to this group as individualists.

Sagiv (1999) indicated that consulting with others does not necessarily presuppose an individual is asking for answers. An individual may consult with others in search for tools that can aid in making a better decision. In addition, studies have supported the idea that consulting with

others leads to more progress in the decision-making process, and to fewer career decision-making-related difficulties (Gati, Gadassi, Rolnik, & Dayan, 2010). Cultural differences may also affect the decision-making approach from the perspective of consulting with others. For example, Brew, Hesketh, and Taylor (2001) reported differences between adolescents from the United States (individualist) and China (collectivist).

Dependence on others.

Dependent individuals expect others to make decisions for them (Harren, 1979; Krumboltz et aI., 1979; Scott & Bruce, 1995). According to Sagiv (1999), a dependent individual consults with others by asking for answers and not for tools to facilitate the decision-making process. Not accepting full responsibility for making their own decisions has been associated with less progress in the process (Gati, Gadassi, Rolnik, & Dayan, 2010) and with more career decision-making-related difficulties (Gati, 2010). Gati et al. (2010) indicated that the dimensions of consulting with others, desire to please others, and dependence on others are not independent. However, these dimensions address different aspects of the possible impact of significant others on the individual decision-making process.

Desire to please others.

This particular dimension refers to the attempt individuals make to satisfy the expectations of significant others (Gati et al., 2010). Significant

others become authority figures, adopting the position of the decider. As an example, Mor (1996) asserted that athletes are continually evaluated, and their status depends on public approval. Consequently, they may exhibit an extremely high desire to constantly please others. The desire to please others, along with dependence on others, has been associated less with progress in the decision-making process (Gati, Gadassi, Rolnik, & Dayan, 2010) and more with career decision-making-related difficulties (Gati, 2010).

Aspiration for an "ideal occupation."

Artists tend to be perfectionists, and perfectionism can create a need to attain an idealized occupation. However, Ellis (1999) indicated that modifying idealized career expectations is a necessary part of adapting to adult life. Musicians aspiring to solo careers often learn to accept occupational limitations, which can cause a temporary or permanent loss of career idealism.

Holloway (1984) reported that students enrolled in doctoral music programs often aspired to be college professors rather than professional performers. Redefining and adjusting the aspiration for an ideal occupation might be expected from an individual who progresses into higher levels of professional activity. Nagel (1987) indicated the more a student idealizes a career in music, the stronger his or her potential for future career alienation and abandonment.

Willingness to compromise.

Uncontrollable circumstances often force the modification of career goals. In such situations, an individual has the choice to compromise. Compromise is an essential aspect of the largely irreversible process of occupational choice (Ginzberg, Ginsburg, Axelrad, & Herma 1951). Ellis (1999) asserted that students willing to follow a career in music must build and sustain commitment even when the profession offers uncertain rewards not commensurate with the effort of training. The commitment escalates as the student (a) reaches higher levels of education and (b) stays devoted to the career.

Gottfredson (1981) proposed three principles governing the compromise process: (a) some aspects of self-concept are more central than others and will take priority when compromising occupational goals; (b) exploration of job options ends with the implementation of a satisfactory choice, not necessarily the optimal potential choice; and (c) people accommodate psychologically to the compromises they make.

Use of intuition.

Thinking involves the logical process of connecting ideas, whereas intuition is an indirect method of becoming aware of meanings and relationships beyond the input from the senses (Jung, 1923). According to Walsh (1985), intuitive decision makers accept responsibility for their decisions, but use fantasy and emotional self-awareness. Harren (1979)

reported that an individual with an intuitive decision style collects little information about possible alternatives and commits relatively quickly to a course of action. In addition, the intuitive decision maker often cannot explain clearly how he or she made the final decision. Miller-Tiedeman (1989) suggested that individuals should rely on and be guided by intuition when making career decisions. Intuition and readiness to use one's imagination to solve problems are also central attributes of Holland's Artistic type (Holland, 1997).

The *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS)

Holland, Johnston, and Asama (1993) defined vocational identity as "the possession of a clear and stable picture of one's goals, interests, and talents" (p. 1). Tinsley, Bowman, and York (1989) suggested that despite the different labels used by their authors, there is a conceptual similarity between the constructs of vocational identity, vocational self-concept, and vocational certainty. Vocational identity has been a reliable predictor of career persistence and educational satisfaction. It has also been one of the few vocational variables tested among music students, allowing for the comparison between different classifications of music majors (Allen, 2003).

Vocational identity has been measured using the *Vocational Identity Scale* (see Appendix C), which serves as part of *My Vocational Situation* (Holland, Daiger, & Power, 1980). The scale is composed of 18 true-false items. Results have shown that high scorers are more assertive in their

career decision-making process, are interpersonally competent, and have a clear sense of identity. According to Tinsley, Bowman, and York (1989), the *Vocational Identity Scale* also appeared to measure clarity. Holland, Johnston, and Asama (1993) reported that the *Vocational Identity Scale* was used in more than 50 investigations between 1980 and 1993. It has also been administered as part of freshman orientation to identify students in greatest need of vocational assistance. Given the success exhibited by the previous research on vocational identity, the *Vocational Identity Scale* could help determine the degree of clarity graduate piano students have of their career goals, and allow for a comparison among degree programs.

Need for the Study

Researchers have investigated the factors that influence one's decision to pursue music as a career (Jones, 1964; Baxter, 1977; Russell, 2008; Gillespie & Hamann, 1999; Nagel, 1988; Burland, 2000), to pursue a career as a professional performer (Burland, 2005), and to pursue a career in music education (Gillespie & Hamann, 1999; Russell, 2008; Rickels et al., 2010; Neuhaus, 2008; Bates, 1997; Burgstahler, 1966; Thornton & Bergee, 2008; Cox, 1994; Bright, 2006). However, comparable research on the topic as related to graduate piano students and their career decision-making process has not been yet conducted. In fact, research literature specifically devoted to graduate students in music is extremely limited (Holloway, 1984;

Sample, 1992; Ross, 1997). Therefore, a need exists to investigate the career decision-making process of piano majors, and particularly of those pursuing specialized graduate degrees.

The career planning needs of artists are unique (Piirto, 1998; Eikleberry, 1999) in that most make their career decisions quite early in life (Jones, 1964; Baxter, 1977; L'Roy, 1983). If students truly aspire to become successful musicians, they may have to examine and modify their career decisions over a long period of time (Nagel, 1987; Manturzewska, 1990).

Researchers have studied the musical background of future professionals with the purpose of developing a more precise means to understand and assist this particular population. Studies of this nature have focused on the factors that influence the decision to begin piano lessons (Burland, 2000 & 2005) and to pursue music as a career (Jones, 1964). Parental influence has been identified to be one of the strongest factors, but research has also shown that parental influence tends to decline as children develop into college students (Jones, 1964; Zdzinski, 1992, Davison, Howe, Moore, & Sloboda, 1996). These music-related factors may have an influence on one's academic training and career choice. As such, the variables of (a) demographics, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university choice, (e) factors influencing program choice, (f) miscellaneous information, and (g) future career plans were measured using the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ).

Each individual has a unique approach to making career decisions. To gain a better understanding of these vocational processes, Gati, Landman, Davidovitch, Asulin-Peretz, and Gadassi (2009) created the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP), which is a multidimensional profile characterization based on the consideration of 12 interrelated but discrete dimensions. When compared to earlier measures (Harren, 1979; Johnson, 1978; Arroba, 1977; Scott & Bruce, 1995), the 12 dimensions representing the CDMP can provide a more detailed depiction of an individual's career decision-making profile.

The vocational identity of college students has been associated with their level of assertiveness in career decision-making processes (Holland, Johnston, & Asama, 1993). The measurement of vocational identity has helped to recognize students' need for vocational assistance, and it has allowed the comparison between different classifications of music majors (Allen, 2003). For the purpose of this study, vocational identity was measured as a single construct using the *Vocational Identity Scale*, which has been successfully used in previous research (Holland, Daiger, & Power, 1980).

It is hoped the results derived from the present study can aid academic advisors in developing specific interventions towards increasing the probability of long term student career satisfaction, while university administrators may find it useful to better understand the population they

serve. Furthermore, collegiate piano faculty could use the information derived from this study to (a) better define their educational goals, (b) design responsible recruitment and retention programs, (c) assist students at different stages of their career decision-making process, and (d) methodically assess the vocational strengths and weaknesses of their graduate students. With the help of faculty and administrative personnel, it is hoped these results can ultimately provide college piano students with valuable information that may help them make conscious and thoughtful vocational decisions.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to determine if discernible profiles regarding musical background, career decision-making dimensions, and vocational identity exist among students pursuing a graduate degree in (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. The *Graduate Student Piano Questionnaire* (GSPQ) was used to measure the following dimensions among each group: a) demographics, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university and program choice, and (e) future career plans of graduate piano students. The *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP) was used to measure the following 12 dimensions among each group: (a) information gathering, (b) information processing, (c) locus of control, (d) effort invested in the

process, (e) procrastination, (f) speed of making the final decision, (g) consulting with others, (h) dependence on others, (i) desire to please others, (j) aspiration for an "ideal occupation," (k) willingness to compromise, and (l) use of intuition. The *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS) was used to measure vocational identity.

Research Questions

1. What are the (a) demographics, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university choice, (e) factors influencing program choice, (f) miscellaneous information, and (g) future career plans of graduate piano students as reported by the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ)?
2. Do significant differences exist between choice of graduate piano major and the following dimensions representing the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP): (a) information gathering, (b) information processing, (c) locus of control, (d) effort invested in the process, (e) procrastination, (f) speed of making the final decision, (g) consulting with others, (h) dependence on others, (i) desire to please others, (j) aspiration for an "ideal occupation," (k) willingness to compromise, and (l) use of intuition?
3. Does a significant difference exist between choice of piano major and vocational identity?

4. Do discernible profiles exist among each group as represented by the (a) *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ), (b) *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP), and (c) *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS)?

Delimitations

The intention of this study was to collect data from the largest sample possible. However, participation was voluntary, and only the data from the students who choose to participate was included. All the institutions accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) that offer at least two of the three identified subspecialty programs: (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano were considered for the present study (see Appendix D). The nomenclature of piano programs can be very diverse and sometimes ambiguous. To avoid any possible confusion, only the programs listed on the NASM website and that include the terms *collaborative*, *accompanying*, *chamber music*, *coaching*, or *ensemble* in their titles were considered collaborative piano programs. Likewise, all the programs that include the term *pedagogy* in their title were included in the category of piano pedagogy programs (see Appendix E).

Definitions

Career Decision Making - The process an individual engages in when identifying and pursuing an occupation of interest (Cooley, 2007).

Factor - Any area of influence that can be isolated and identified as having positive or negative influence on career decisions (Jones, 1964).

Collaborative Piano - A term coined by Samuel Sanders and now widely used in the North American musical world to identify a variety of activities performed by pianists, such as accompanying, chamber music, coaching, and performing in ensemble (Lee, 2009).

Vocational Identity - The possession of a clear and stable picture of one's goals, interests, personality, and talents (Holland, Daiger, & Power, 1980).

National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) - A professional organization that regulates accreditation policies and procedures of music departments in colleges and universities (Branscome, 2010).

Piano Pedagogy - Teacher training in the area of piano, the art of teaching piano (Milliman, 1992).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to determine if discernible profiles regarding musical background, career decision-making dimensions, and vocational identity existed among students pursuing a graduate degree in (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy or (c) collaborative piano. To gain a better understanding of this complex process, it was necessary to review the most relevant research that focused on several closely related topics. This chapter begins with a review of the most prominent theories of vocational choice, followed by a review of how these theories impact the career choice of musicians. The next section examines what factors influence the career choice of different groups of musicians, in addition to the development of vocational identities of musicians. The chapter concludes with a summary, which revisits the key elements identified in the extant literature to introduce and contextualize the proposed study.

Theories of Vocational Choice

The research literature concerning vocational choice is abundant, spanning over a century. Parsons (1909), often considered the pioneer career theorist, presented the first known list of factors that influence vocational decisions:

In the wise choice of a vocation there are three broad factors:

> (1) A clear understanding of yourself, your aptitudes, abilities, interests, ambitions, resources, limitations and their causes
>
> (2) A knowledge of the requirements and conditions of success, advantages and disadvantages, compensation, opportunities and prospects in different lines of work
>
> (3) The true reasoning on the relations of these two groups of facts (Parsons 1909, p.5)

Parsons stated that people should not rely on chance when choosing their vocation, but actively engage in a deliberate, conscientious process. The author proposed to match a person's unique pattern of attributes to the factors a given occupation entails. The closer the match is, the greater the likelihood for successful job performance and satisfaction. Parsons's work provided the basis for what would be known as the trait-factor approach of career development. This model continued to be developed into the late 1940s (Hof, 1999).

The study of vocational decisions attracted an increasing number of psychologists and social scientists during the second half of the twentieth century. Interest in this new field of study gained momentum with the arrival of dedicated publications such as the *Journal of Vocational Behavior* and the *Journal of Career Assessment*. At the same time, two authors, John

Holland and Donald Super, became the most preeminent figures of vocational psychology (Borgen, 1991).

Holland (1959, 1966b, 1968, 1985) formulated a theory based on Parsons's trait-and-factor approach, but as an alternative to objectively measuring people's abilities, their self-perceptions were used to match them and their environments. Holland identified six vocational personalities corresponding to the same number of work environments: (a) Realistic, (b) Investigative, (c) Artistic, (d) Social, (e) Enterprising, and (f) Conventional. Taken together, Holland referred to these personalities as occupational themes and used the abbreviation RIASEC. To measure the extent to which an individual fits into each theme, the researcher developed the following instruments: (a) *Vocational Preference Inventory* and (b) *Self Directed Search*. Considering that everyone fits to some degree in more than one occupational theme, Holland ranked each theme and paid special attention to the top three. Combining the first letter of each of the top three themes makes up what is now known as the Holland code (e.g., ASI: Artistic + Social + Investigative).

Almost three decades later, in a subsequent revision of his influential theory, Holland identified additional factors that influence vocational choice. The most important were the relative accuracy and the temporality of people's self-perception. According to Holland (1985), "most interest inventories rest heavily on the assumption that people perceive occupations

and their associated activities accurately and that these perceptions remain the same over long periods of time" (p. 9).

Ginzberg, Ginsburg, Axelrad, and Herma (1951) also analyzed the manner in which individuals make decisions in relation to their occupations and noted that occupational choice appeared to involve a series of decisions. The group of researchers articulated a theory that outlined three predictable stages of the vocational decision-making process: (a) fantasy (the process of choosing is conducted without attention to rational considerations), (b) tentative (characterized by advances in self-knowledge, time perspective, and reality orientation), and (c) realistic (both subjective considerations and greater awareness of external reality serve as the basis for choice).

Super (1953) introduced the concept of vocational development, becoming one of the first researchers to suggest that vocational choice was not a single decision but a group of related decisions made over a period of time. According to Super, more emphasis should be placed on how a career decision is made as opposed to the likely outcome of such a decision.

Super, Savickas, and Super (1996) suggested that the development of self-concept has a strong influence on career choice. The researchers indicated that people refine their self-concept over time as the result of personal experience, and consequently choose occupations that are

consistent with their self-concept. Super distinguishes two levels of self-concept: (a) objective, which is also known as vocational identity and can be assessed with interest inventories; and (b) subjective, also known as occupational self-concept, which involves the personal meaning an individual attributes to his or her traits.

Super distinguishes five life and career development stages, each of which poses specific challenges to the individual making a vocational decision:

- Growth Stage (Birth-14), in which the individual develops self-concept and attitudes, and fantasy dominates
- Exploration Stage (ages 15-24), in which tentative choices take place
- Establishment Stage (ages 25-44), in which the individual makes an effort to achieve permanency
- Maintenance Stage (ages 45-64), in which there is a process to continue and improve along already established lines
- Decline Stage (ages 65-on), in which there is a preparation for retirement.

In perhaps the most relevant addition to his theory, Super (1980) defined nine major roles that a person plays in life in approximate chronological order: (a) child, (b) student, (c) leisurite, (d) citizen, (e) worker, (f) spouse, (g) homemaker, (h) parent, and (i) pensioner. He also illustrated

what he called his “life-span, life-space approach to career development,” with a life-career rainbow (p. 282).

Other vocational researchers followed the same path as Super, and a generalized attempt to analyze the actual decision-making process took precedent over being simply concerned with the content of the choice:

> There has been clearly more emphasis on the content and outcome of a decision -on the question of what to choose- than on the process by which the decision is made, and, consequently, the focus of the assessment efforts has been on the nature of the decider and his or her alternatives, with the goal of achieving a maximally congruent match between person and occupation. (Phillips & Pazienza, in Walsh & Osipow, 1988, p. 3)

The development of an increasingly sophisticated field made vocational psychologists consider additional influences that affect the career choice process. For instance, the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) (Lent, Brown, & Hackett’s, 1994) proposed that career choices might be better predicted by relating an individual’s self-efficacy to his or her outcome expectations and personal goals. According to the SCCT, an individual develops beliefs through (a) personal performance accomplishments, (b) vicarious learning, (c) social persuasion, and (d) physiological states and reactions. Combined, these factors affect the individual’s gradual development of an expertise for a particular endeavor. This process is

further reinforced by the self-efficacy of the individual, who is more likely to develop goals involving that particular occupation. The extent to which this occupation offers valued compensation and the influence of contextual factors on the individual's perception of the probability of success are of the utmost interest to this theory. The SCCT has a dynamic nature that addresses issues of culture, genetic endowment, gender, social context, and unexpected life events.

Researchers continued to examine the complexity of the career decision-making process from several perspectives: (a) difficulties encountered (Taylor & Betz, 1983), (b) changes in the process (Krumboltz, 1993), (c) changes in the influences (Super, 1996), (d) changes in the interventions by counselors (Savickas, 1997), and (e) changes in perceptions of career and life (Miller & Tiedeman, 1989).

Present-day researchers agree that career decision-making, or CDM, is a dynamic construct that requires the development of a more sophisticated methodology. According to Albion and Fogarty (2002):

> As changes in the workplace force us to revamp our concepts of long-term, stable patterns of jobs and careers, CDM is increasingly being seen as an ongoing part of one's involvement in the world of work. These changes require us to ascertain how well a construct that was originally defined and measured in the context of young people making career entry-level choices relates to the CDM

> behaviour of older workers faced with mid-career choice opportunities or dilemmas. […] The notion of CDM has evolved from its original representation as a static, onetime event to its current conceptualisation [sic] as a dynamic construct incorporating both readiness and outcome variables. (p. 91)

One of the most recent models, which attempted to understand the CDM process, came from Gati, Landman, Davidovitch, Asulin-Peretz, and Gadassi (2009). The researchers considered limiting the prevalent method of classifying individuals based on the most dominant trait of their approach to the decision process. Instead, Gati et al. proposed conceptualizing the manner in which individuals make career decisions in terms of a profile, suggesting that both an individual's personality and situation influence their decision-making behavior. The profile contains 12 dimensions: (a) information gathering, (b) information processing, (c) locus of control, (d) effort invested in the process, (e) procrastination, (f) speed of making the final decision, (g) consulting with others, (h) dependence on others, (i) desire to please others, (j) aspiration for an "ideal occupation," (k) willingness to compromise, and (l) use of intuition. Researchers can investigate the relationships between two or more dimensions and compare them to other personality and career-related variables in a more refined manner. Gati et al. recommended these 12 *Career Decision-Making Profile*

dimensions as a trustworthy manner of knowing how students make career decisions.

In only a few decades, researchers substantially changed the manner in which they approached the study of vocational decisions. What was once considered a relatively static and isolated event in the lifetime of an individual became a dynamic sequence of influences, decisions, changes, and adjustments that took place over a much longer period of time.

The Particular Case of the Musician

Special Characteristics of the Musical Profession

Much of the research regarding career decision making (CDM) has represented the construct as a developmental task of adolescence (Albion & Fogarty 2002). For this reason, researchers, educational psychologists, and career counselors have mainly focused on pre-college and college students to create and test their instruments to measure vocational variables (Weis & Hubbard 1973; Tinsley et al., 1989; Allen, 1989; Allen, 2003; Albion & Fogarty, 2002; Gati et al., 2009; Chartrand et al., 1990; Gati et al. 2011). However, Nagel (1987) drew attention to the fact that musicians cannot wait to make a career decision in the arts until adolescence and young adulthood, which is when career decisions are typically made. On the contrary, when compared to other professionals, musicians tend to begin serious study at a much younger age. Jones (1964) noted that, in order for

musicians to be successful, such decisions must be evaluated and adjusted over a long period of time.

The committed study of music at such a young age, even if not with the full intent of adopting it as a profession, has important consequences in the professional life of an individual. The period of productive activity is typically longer than that of other professionals, which in return demands an increased and sustained level of personal investment.

Parental involvement also becomes critical during the early stages of the future musician. Researchers have recognized the fundamental role that family plays in the career decision-making process of high school students: (a) Bergee (1992) noted that family members were sources of both positive and negative messages, (b) Bernstein (1986) found a high correlation between musical activity of family members and the development of musical ability, and (c) Burgstahler (1966) found that family musical interest was an important factor that influenced a young person's decision to pursue a career in music education. However, other studies seemed to contradict this idea. As Gillespie and Hamann (1999) reported, a sample of high school music students indicated family members did not influence their participation in music. Only 1.1% of participants identified family influence as a factor in choosing string teaching as a career. It seems that the extent to which parental influence influences the career decision-making process of adolescents could change. Consequently, future research is needed to

determine if students are independent of parental influence regarding their career choices

Studies attempting to examine accurately the professional development of pianists must factor in various characteristics and idiosyncrasies. For example, pianists embrace and commit to music earlier than individuals in other occupations. As a result, their productive lives are longer, and parental involvement becomes critical for the appropriate development of young musicians. Since pianists can engage in professional activities before graduation, they often experience a vague transition between school and the workplace. In addition, the working conditions of pianists include irregular hours and multiple temporary jobs, which frequently lead to career alienation.

Factors that Influence the Career Decision-Making Process of Musicians

Research addressing factors that influence career decision-making processes is extensive. However, studies focusing specifically on musicians are sparse. In preparation for the present investigation, the previous research was reviewed at three levels: (1) research that has addressed university students in general, (2) research that has investigated the choice of music as a career, and (3) research that has targeted a specific area of musical study (e.g. music education majors or performance majors).

One of the most thorough studies that addressed the university student in general was conducted by Hof (1999), who explored (a) the main influences on career decision making, (b) perceptions of career meaning, (c) the process of making career decisions, and (d) the life plans of twelve undergraduate students majoring in education, psychology, and the sciences. According to Hof, career decision making among college students is not always equivalent to choice of a college major.

After two interviews, a total of 33 themes emerged, which were grouped into the following categories: (a) influential people, (b) common character traits of the influential people, and (c) additional aspects that added insight into the decision-making process. One of Hof's key findings coincides with Ellis (1994) and Ginzberg (1984), who stated that junior and senior undergraduate students were likely to be in the process of making their first substantial career decisions. The sample was selected among non-musicians. However, looking at these findings from the perspective of music students, it is clear that making significant vocational decisions early in life can create an internal conflict in young musicians.

Cooley (2007) explored the career decision-making experiences of eight students majoring in the visual arts. Using a phenomenological perspective, the author conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews with an equal number of entering and graduating students for the purpose of comparing both ends of the college experience. The researcher coded the

information based on specific experiences, difficulties and challenges, and perceived benefits associated with their career decision making. Cooley identified the nine factors that were most likely to affect the CDM process of visual arts students: (a) childhood artistic/creative development, (b) teachers and mentors, (c) being part of a creative community, (d) considering a career path without art, (e) parental influence, (f) support/resources, (g) congruence with identity, (h) motivated by challenges, and (i) making a contribution. One of the most important implications derived from this study was the need to continue this type of research in related areas. Such research could lead to the design and implementation of career services specifically tailored for college students in the arts.

The second level of research involves studies that have investigated the factors that influence the choice of music as a career. Jones (1964) conducted one of the earliest studies, which focused on the developmental factors of the career decision-making process. Instead of surveying students directly, Jones drew the following list from the literature: (a) parental influence, (b) teacher influence, (c) ego-satisfaction, (d) confidence in talent, (e) interest, (f) status, (g) past experience in music, and (h) economic consideration. From this list, the author constructed a questionnaire to survey two groups of participants (music and non-music oriented) divided into six subgroups (grades 6, 9, 12, sophomore, senior, and graduates) with the purpose of quantifying the level of influence and

comparing mean differences between groups using *t*-tests. In addition, Jones used the *Gaston Test of Musicality* to determine the students' potential in music. These scores allowed for a comparison between students who chose music as a career with those who showed music potential but were planning a career in a non-music field. In a second phase, Jones also interviewed a selected number of participants to confirm possible longitudinal and cross-sectional relationships between factors.

Results indicated that music-oriented participants scored significantly higher in ego-satisfaction, confidence in talent, and interest than those representing the non-music oriented group. There were no significant differences found among status, past experience in music, and economic consideration. Parental influence was the single most important factor when considering music as a career choice. Teacher influence was relatively high for both groups. Although parental and teacher influences toward majoring in music were very strong during students' middle and high school years, ego satisfaction, status, and confidence in talent became more meaningful in the late high school years and through college.

A similar study conducted by Bernstein (1986) investigated the influences of music as a career choice and the level of job satisfaction among a group of orchestra musicians. The author sought to determine to what extent enjoyment of performing influenced their main career choice. The survey questionnaire included statements pertaining to the following

factors: (a) home musical environment, (b) modeling influence of family, (c) nature of choice in beginning musical activity, (d) early music experience, and (d) relationships with teachers. Results indicated that 71.4% of the participants reported to have chosen a music career for the enjoyment of performing. The main positive factors determining this enjoyment were (a) choice of career for intrinsic rewards, (b) enjoyment of practice and concerts, (c) inner-directed choice of initial musical experience, and (d) self-expression through music. The main negative factors included (a) the choice of career for extrinsic rewards, (b) non-supportive first teacher, and (c) perception of own musical success as externally determined.

The third level of research on career decision-making addressed specific groups of musicians. The vast majority of studies in this category have focused on the music education major. One of the earliest examples was by Burgstahler (1966), who investigated the interactions that influenced the choice and pursuance of music education as a vocation. The author designed a multiple-case study that consisted of interviews with five male and five female music education students, their parents, school administrators, ministers, siblings, and friends. Burgstahler also searched for distinctive patterns of personality using the *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule* and the analyses of a counselor and a counseling psychologist.

Participants reported that their senior year in high school was crucial in their vocational decision. The most commonly reported influences on

their career choice were musical performance, peer recognition, and personal satisfaction. According to participants, the persons that most influenced their career decisions were their high school music teachers and private music teachers. Participants reported that vocational testing and counseling were either completely lacking or inadequately used. Nevertheless, most of them felt satisfied with their career choice.

Even when the researcher did not find patterns of personality, some commonalities in the participants' backgrounds emerged:

- Most homes had a piano, radio, and phonograph
- More parents were unmusical than musical
- The mother was the dominant parent
- Poor musical backgrounds in the school seemed to promote a drive within the subjects to become better teachers
- Feelings of inferiority prevailed among the subjects concerning their current teaching and knowledge of music
- Most of the participants had problems in disciplining their students

Research by Gillespie and Hamann (1999) focused on music education majors, specifically those pursuing a career as string teachers. Students from 17 universities were asked to describe their background, reasons for choosing teaching, and recommendations for further recruitment of string teachers. The researchers identified and ranked the main factors influencing students' decision to major in string music education: (1) liked

teaching as profession and considered it rewarding work, (2) enjoyment and love of music, (3) desire to enrich and share joy of music with others, (4) love of children, people, working with groups, (5) influence of school orchestra teacher, (6) job market security because string teachers are needed, (7) performing and desire to keep involved with music, (8) enjoyment of teaching experiences, (9) desire to be a role model for children and positively influence them, (10) desire to promote a noble image of strings in the schools, (11) influence of private teacher, and (12) love of the sound of stringed instruments.

Students suggested that educators could better recruit novice teachers by acting as role models for their students, by showing their love for music and teaching, and by relating positively to students. It was also discovered that the majority of participants were female undergraduate students and that they believed job market for string teachers was secure.

In one of the most recent studies on the selection of music as a career, Rickels et al. (2010) surveyed prospective undergraduate music education majors from four institutions to learn what motivated them to decide on a career in music education. Results indicated that school music teachers and private lesson teachers were highly influential in the decision-making process.

At the time of their college audition, participants reported their most frequent teaching experiences as (a) rehearsing sectionals (67.5%), (b)

tutoring individuals in music (56.1%), (c) rehearsing the entire group (48.2%), (d) giving private lessons (43.4%), and (e) conducting performing groups (39.0%). More than 50% of the respondents reported that the main motivation to become a teacher was a desire to share their enjoyment of music. The majority of respondents decided to become music majors by their sophomore year of high school, but it was only until their junior and senior years that they decided to become music teachers.

Very few researchers have expressed an interest in studying the vocational decisions of music performance majors. Burland (2005) made perhaps the most important effort with a study of the career transitions of undergraduate music students (*N* = 32). The researcher sought to identify the main factors that determined whether or not participants pursued a career as professional performers. This two-year longitudinal study consisted of eight interviews with each participant and a subsequent analysis of the information using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. Burland found that psychological changes occurring between adolescence and young adulthood had a strong impact on a musician's development. The most important factors influencing participants' career choice were (a) motivation, (b) musical identity, (c) learning styles, and (d) coping strategies. To explain the complex process one experiences when becoming a professional or amateur musician in adulthood, Burland

proposed a Dynamic Model of Musical Identity Formation and Career Choice.

Considering the aforementioned characteristics of the musical profession, it becomes apparent that the life of a pianist demands not one but a string of vocational decisions (see Figure 2).

Decision	Main Influences
To take on piano lessons during childhood	Parents' influence
To maintain sustained progress through adolescence	Love for music, being special, extraordinary
To major in music	High school teacher, private instructor
To commit to the profession	Peer support, prestige of the institution, performing opportunities, competitions
To pursue a graduate degree	Unemployment, aspirations to teach or promotion
Job mobility/transition/abandonment	Vocational identity, economic rewards, status

Figure 2. Major Vocational Decisions in the Life of a Pianist

Personality

As mentioned earlier, the practice of matching certain personality traits to a specific choice of career remains popular among certain researchers. For example, Hotchkiss (1974) surveyed college students (*N* = 154) using the *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule* to determine if

significant personality differences existed between (a) genders, and (b) performance and music education majors. The most relevant differences indicated that male music education majors scored higher on deference and abasement than performance majors, suggesting that the second group should possess more self-confidence to succeed in a highly competitive area. Female keyboard players scored significantly higher than female voice students in the need for order, whereas male music education majors scored significantly higher than females in the areas of autonomy, dominance, and aggression. Finally, female music education majors scored significantly higher than female performance majors on nurturance, but significantly lower on autonomy and aggression.

Given the significant differences found between music education and performance majors and between male and female music education majors, Hotchkiss recommended additional studies to determine if (a) there is a discernible music education major personality profile, (b) the roles of male and female music teachers are significantly different to warrant different training, and (c) a personality measuring instrument be devised to help predict success in applied music and music education.

Vuust et al. (2010) conducted one of the most recent studies attempting to relate sensation seeking to the choice of a specific career path. Using the *Zuckerman Sensation Seeking Scale* and the *Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*, Vuust et al. compared data from classical and

rhythmic students at the music academies in Denmark. In several European institutions, the term *rhythmic* is used to define the study and performance of contemporary, improvisational musical genres. Results indicated that scores for sensation seeking of *rhythmic* students were significantly higher than those of classical students, suggesting that personality is associated with musical career choice. Classical students showed significantly higher levels of stage anxiety, which the authors attributed to the differences in rehearsal and performance practices of the two music styles.

Vocational Identity

The construct of vocational identity has become central to the study of vocational choice. Holland (1985) and Nauta (2010) reported that vocational identity is closely related to occupational commitment, life satisfaction, well-being, and adjustment. It is not exclusive for college-age individuals to develop a vocational identity, but this particular population has attracted a great deal of attention in this area of research.

Allen (1989, 2003) was one of the few researchers who studied the vocational identity of musicians. In 1989, he investigated the relationship of vocational identity, congruence, consistency, and differentiation, to the academic achievement and educational satisfaction of undergraduate music majors. Allen quantified these variables using the following measures: (a) *Vocational Preference Inventory*, (b) *My Vocational Situation*, and (c) *Music Major Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Allen administered the measures to

undergraduate music majors (*N* = 100), and grouped the results according to gender and degree major. Congruence and identity were significantly related to academic achievement and educational satisfaction, whereas consistency and differentiation were significantly related to academic achievement. The identity construct was found to be the best predictor of both educational satisfaction and academic achievement scores.

Allen indicated that no single theory could explain all dimensions of variability in achievement among college music majors. Therefore, to arrive at a comprehensive model of achievement, it is necessary to utilize the constructs of several theories. The most important finding specified that Holland's classification system could distinguish performance majors from music education majors, particularly on the social dimension of their vocational personalities.

Using *My Vocational Situation* (Holland, Daiger, & Power, 1980), Allen (2003) measured the vocational identity of music education and music performance majors over a three-year period. Results indicated that the scores of music education majors became increasingly higher, whereas those of performance majors dropped consistently throughout the study period. Allen speculated that performance majors' confidence in their career choice may have been negatively affected by the increasingly realistic awareness of employment opportunities as a performer, and an increasingly realistic view of their performing ability when compared to others pursuing a

similar career. The author emphasized the exploratory nature of the study, which included a limited number of participants (*N* = 30) and recommended its replication with a larger sample. It is also interesting to note that Allen's study did not include students in their senior year.

In one of the earliest studies of its kind, Kadushin (1969) investigated the acquisition of professional self-concept among music students at the Juilliard School of Music and the Manhattan School of Music. The author asserted that music institutions are both schools for students and arenas for performers. Consequently, sociologists find them especially appropriate when studying the theory of adult socialization. Kadushin concluded that self-concept is developed to a great extent through the acquisition of musical skills and the involvement in actual professional activities while still in school.

L'Roy (1983) investigated the development of occupational identity in undergraduate music education majors, and in particular, their level of commitment to certain career skills and to music education in general. L'Roy surveyed participants (*N* = 165) and conducted a round of 38 interviews with the intention of comparing selected variables by major area and class year. Participants who had had limited opportunities to play the role of educator showed little commitment to occupational norms and values. As a consequence, they experienced a delay in their development of an occupational identity. Conversely, students with teaching experience

expressed a stronger commitment and perception of themselves as music educators. The author also noted that role development is the result of the interaction among students, faculty, and an adequate training environment.

In a study limited to first-semester university music students, Burland and Pitts (2007) analyzed participants' level of musical identity and preparedness for university learning. Using questionnaires, diaries, and in-class tasks, the researchers found that the students' focus on performing was challenged by academic work and anxieties concerning workload and assessment. Students beginning a music degree experienced a considerable change in learning strategies and musical identity. Results further indicated that participants needed to redefine what it means to be musically successful and the centrality of performance in their musical lives.

Persistence

According to Super (1942) and Bordm (1943), vocational decisions are dynamic by nature. They can evolve and change considerably over time. Even after an individual has made a relatively firm decision to embrace music as a professional career, psychological, environmental, social, and economic factors can make the student reconsider the decision and potentially deviate from the intended path. As a result, vocational researchers began to factor in the effects of persistence on career decision-making.

With the purpose of measuring persistence throughout a degree program, Brown and Alley (1983) investigated the interaction among selected variables in a group of undergraduate music education majors (*N* = 201). Participants entering a school of music were asked to take the *Aliferis-Stecklein Music Achievement Test* (1962) and to provide (a) enrollment status, (b) college grade point average (GPA), (c) high school GPA, and (d) jury grade at the end of one year of applied study on the principal instrument. Students were retested at the end of the semester. A series of multiple regression analyses indicated that cumulative GPA was the most significant predictor of student persistence followed by participants' applied music grade at the end of the first year.

In a study that centered on the ethnography of a music conservatory, Ellis (1999) examined the social construction of career commitment under trial and hardship. The researcher studied how conservatory students learn to form the notion of a career and sustain their professional ambition while training for an activity in which there is limited opportunity for career success. This investigation revealed that the study of music undergoes specific stages of committed action. At an early stage, the commitment to the performance of classical music is primarily influenced by the love for the chosen instrument. Other important influences are music teachers, parents, and a sense of being different from most other teens through the possession of a special talent. Ellis also pointed out that the absence of some of these

influences might partially explain why those who wish to commit to such a career after puberty are already in most instances too late.

Ellis identified two additional stages of committed action in students reaching the conservatory level. During the first two years, students embark on intense technical training in which they adopt vital mechanisms of social and self-control. During the second phase, preparation for solo recitals at the junior and senior levels provides students with the opportunity to become even further committed to performance. Ellis' notion of *escalation of commitment* deviates from the findings of a subsequent study conducted by Allen (2003), who observed that the levels of vocational commitment actually decreased as students came closer to graduation.

Several studies, which addressed the career persistence of musicians, have approached the construct as an opposition to career alienation and change. Donohue (2007) used Holland and Gottfredson's *Career Attitudes and Strategies Inventory* (CASI) to identify predictors of career persistence and change. Career changers were defined as participants who expressed intent to change careers. Career persisters were those with an expressed intent to remain in their current career. The scales comprising the CASI are (a) job satisfaction, (b) work involvement, (c) skill development, (d) geographical barriers, (e) dominant style, (f) career worries, (g) interpersonal abuse, (h) family commitment, and (i) risk-taking style. Results indicated that changers were more likely to take risks and

were more motivated towards skill development, while persisters were more satisfied in their jobs and reported greater career concerns.

Nagel (1987) indicated that music professionals, as well as aspiring musicians, are susceptible to experiencing high levels of alienation from the profession. To remain committed is not easy, and it is not always a student's conscious decision whether to continue or abandon his or her career. Nagel examined the influence of identity formation on career alienation and abandonment of musicians. Participants pursuing a degree in music (N = 82) were classified as performers, ex-performers, or non-performers, and were administered *Marcia's Identity Status Interview* (ISI) and four personality inventories: (a) performance anxiety inventory, (b) fear of success, (c) self-handicapping scale, and (d) locus of control. Marcia's instrument identifies four identity statuses: (a) identity achievement (individuals who have experienced a crisis and have made decisions on their own terms); (b) identity foreclosure (individuals who have experienced no crisis, but are committed); (c) identity moratorium (individuals who have vague commitments but are currently struggling to resolve parental wishes, societal demands, and personal capabilities); and (d) identity diffused (individuals who lack commitment and who may or may not have experienced a crisis). Nagel found differences among performance groups and among the four identity status populations, which resulted in the following pairings: achieved and foreclosed vs. moratorium and diffused.

Results from the locus of control measure indicated ex-performers were found to be the most internal, followed by performers and non-performers. One of Nagel's most striking findings specified that only 40% of musicians have seriously examined their occupational choice and made a commitment to a musical career.

Summary of Related Research

A review of the most relevant theories of vocational choice revealed an increasing awareness of the complexity regarding the career decision-making process. From the relatively simple method of matching a person with an occupation (Parsons, 1909; Holland, 1959), to the inclusion of multiple social, psychological, environmental, and economic factors (Ginzberg, Ginsburg, Axelrad, & Herma, 1951; Super, 1953; Albion & Fogarty, 2002; Gati et al., 2009; Weiss & Kiel, 2010), the study of how and why a person chooses a specific career path at a certain moment in life has proven to be a dynamic endeavor.

To attempt an examination of the career decision making of professional musicians, and particularly of pianists, one must consider a few unique characteristics of this profession. Musicians are atypical in their vocational choices because the desire to perform at a high level emerges early in life (Jones, 1964). When most pre-college students and even students in the first years of college can still be undecided in their choice of

a major, aspiring music majors have been already active for many years and for them the choice of a major is just the next logic step towards professionalization.

A career in music is usually longer than most others. A professional musician goes through more years of formal training, enters the job market earlier, in many cases before graduation, and retires at a more advanced age than average (Nagel, 1987). The life of a professional musician often requires irregular working hours, and holding multiple temporary positions (Alper & Wassall, 2000).

Pianists do not make one but a series of vocational decisions during their lifetime. Although there are no studies addressing the influences pianists experience over these decisions, researchers have found that, among other types of musicians, the most common influences are love for music, parental and peer support, feeling unique, and the role model of the music high school teacher or private instructor (Bergee, 1992; Bernstein, 1986; Burgstahler, 1966; Gillespie & Hamann, 1999).

Some researchers still attempt to match certain personality traits to the selection of a musical instrument or music subspecialty (Kemp, 1981). Others have turned to the constructs of vocational identity (L'Roy, 1983; Nagel, 1987; Hargreaves et al., 2002; Wirtanen, 2004; Burland, 2005) and persistence (Nygard, 1963; Ellis, 1999; Allen, 2003; Siebert, 2007) when

trying to better understand various aspects of the career decision-making process of musicians.

The present study was the first attempt to determine if discernible profiles regarding musical background, career decision-making dimensions, and vocational identity existed among current students pursuing a graduate degree in solo piano performance, piano pedagogy, or collaborative piano. A demographic questionnaire helped to determine the main factors that influenced the decision of students. To investigate the process that resulted in that particular decision, this study used (a) the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ) developed by the researcher, (b) the 12 dimensions of the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP) (Gati et al., 2010) and (c) the construct of vocational identity (Holland, Johnston, & Asama, 1993). The operational and logistic details will be presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to determine if discernible profiles regarding musical background, career decision-making dimensions, and vocational identity exist among students pursuing a graduate degree in (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy or (c) collaborative piano. The following chapter outlines the necessary instrumentation, procedures, and analysis used to carry out this study.

Instrumentation

Three measures were used in the data collection phase of the present study: (a) the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ), designed by the researcher; (b) the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP), by Gati, Landman, Davidovitch, Asulin-Peretz, and Gadassi (2009); and (c) the *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS), by Holland, Daiger, and Power (1980). The GPSQ was designed to gather the following information from the participants: (a) demographics, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university choice, (e) factors influencing program choice, (f) miscellaneous information, and (c) future career plans. The CDMP generated a profile characterization of individuals' career decision-making processes based on the simultaneous consideration of 12

dimensions. The VIS has a long successful history in studies of this nature, and is considered to be a reliable predictor of educational satisfaction and academic achievement. Cronbach's alpha was utilized in the present study to determine the internal reliability of the CDMP and the VIS. The reliability coefficients for all the dimensions of the CDMP ranged from .70 to .87. The VIS exhibited a reliability coefficient of .85.

***Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ)**

The *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ) was comprised of 55 items organized into seven sections: 21 closed-ended questions; 8 multiple-choice questions; one statement that utilized the following set of Likert-type response anchors: (a) *not at all satisfied*, (b) *slightly satisfied*, (c) *moderately satisfied*, (d) *very satisfied*, and (e) *extremely satisfied*; 8 statements that utilized the following set of Likert-type response anchors: (a) *not at all influential,* (b) *slightly influential,* (c) *somewhat influential,* (d) *very influential, and* (e) e*xtremely influential*; and 17 statements that utilized the following set of Likert-type response anchors: (a) *extremely unlikely*, (b) *unlikely*, (c) *neutral*, (d) *likely*, and (e) *extremely likely* (see Appendix A).

Once the research proposal was approved, the GPSQ was piloted to a group of graduate piano majors. In addition to completing the measure, students were asked to (a) provide input on the appropriateness and wording of each item and (b) suggest additional items for inclusion. No

additional suggestions were made, although it was determined that the measures could be completed in approximately 20 minutes.

Career Decision-Making Profile **(CDMP)**

The *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP) emerged from an initial pool of 97 items, of which 76 were approved to be included in the original measure. Based on the responses of 1,045 participants among three pilot tests, the authors generated the final version of the CDMP, which now consists of 39 items (see Appendix B).

Participants responded to each item using a semantic differential scale ranging from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 7 (*completely agree*). The following 12 dimensions comprise the CDMP: (1) information gathering, (2) information processing, (3) locus of control, (4) effort invested in the process, (5) procrastination, (6) speed of making the final decision, (7) consulting with others, (8) dependence on others, (9) desire to please others, (10) aspiration for an "ideal occupation," (11) willingness to compromise, and (12) use of intuition. Previous research indicated the reliability coefficients for each dimension ranged from .70 to .89 (Gati et al. 2010, p. 284). Correlations among the 12 dimensions were generally low, reflecting the relative independence of each dimension.

In a follow-up study, the multidimensional structure of the CDMP was tested using Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) procedures. Two groups of participants responded to Internet versions of the questionnaire in Hebrew

(*N* = 431) and English (*N* = 208). The multidimensional structure and the cross-cultural equivalence of the CDMP were confirmed on both the Hebrew and English versions, indicating each group of statements represented fairly independent dimensions. Gati et al. (2010) administered the CDMP to five additional samples (*N* = 2,764) to further refine the measure. Permission to use CDMP was granted by Gati (see Appendix F).

Vocational Identity Scale (VIS)

My Vocational Situation (MVS) (Holland, Daiger, & Power, 1980) is a measure, which consists of three scales: (a) vocational identity, (b) occupational information, and (c) barriers. For the purpose of this study, the *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS) was used to measure the variable of vocational identity (see Appendix C). The VIS is comprised of 18 *true-false* items. Composite scores can range from 0 to 18. A score of 18 indicates the highest level of vocational identity. Previous research indicated that the measure is internally consistent (*r* = 0.89) (Holland et al., 1980). Since its publication, the VIS has been used in more than 50 investigations.

Locating the MVS measure and securing permission to use it in the present study proved difficult. Holland, who was the primary author of the instrument, passed away in November of 2008 (Nauta 2010, p.11). The publisher was contacted and the researcher was told (a) the measure was out of print and (b) there was no way of contacting the secondary author. The secondary author married and changed her name, which caused

confusion regarding the bibliographic records of her publications. Slaney reported the problem and made public the name change (Slaney p. 53 in Walsh & Osipow 1988). The researcher also tried to establish contact with Allen, who used the MVS in two previous studies (1989, 2003). Unfortunately, Allen passed away in August of 2010 ("Obituaries Michael Allen," 2010). After an extensive online search, the second author, Gottfredson, was found and reached by email. Upon request, Gottfredson granted permission to use the MVS, from which the VIS is derived (see Appendix G).

Procedures

The selection of institutions was based on the following criteria: (a) the university must be an accredited member of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) at the date of the beginning of the study, (b) the institution must offer a graduate degree program in piano pedagogy or collaborative piano, and (c) only master's and doctoral degrees were considered. Programs that included the terms collaborative, accompanying, chamber music, coaching, or ensemble in their titles were considered collaborative piano programs. Likewise, programs that included the term pedagogy in their title qualified as piano pedagogy programs. According to the NASM website, 103 institutions fulfilled the aforementioned criteria (see Appendix D).

The department chair for each university was contacted by email. This email provided a detailed description of the study and a request for participation. Once the department chair responded positively, he or she received a second email message to be forwarded to all potential participants. This email message included a detailed description of the study and a link, which directed participants to the Internet site SurveyMonkey.com. Participants consented to participate by clicking on the survey link. Participants were informed that their participation was completely voluntary and their responses would remain anonymous. SSL encryption technology was used to ensure that participants' responses remained secure during transmission. Two weeks after the initial email request was sent to potential participants, the researcher sent a follow-up email to the area chair as a reminder to encourage their students to participate. The survey link remained open for the entire semester.

The identification of individual participants or institutions was not relevant to the goals of the present study. Any information provided by the participants that might have resulted in such identification was properly handled as confidential in compliance with the regulations required by the University of Oklahoma Institutional Review Board (see Appendix H).

In order to maximize the response rate, the following aspects were considered:

- Data collection commenced early in the fall 2012 semester.

- Participants were informed that all three measures could be completed in approximately 20 minutes
- A reminder email was sent to the department chair two weeks after initial contact was made with potential participants.
- The online survey link remained open for the entire semester.

Participants

The intention of the study was to collect data from the largest sample possible. For that reason, every attempt was made to solicit participation from all students who were enrolled in a graduate piano program at the qualifying institutions. Results indicated 69 graduate piano students responded to the invitation to participate, 64 of which (92.8%) completed all three instruments and five (7.2%) completed only the GPSQ. Participants were born in 14 countries and were attending schools in 20 states. The Internet site SurveyMonkey.com provides information regarding the time each participant began and ended the survey process. Upon reviewing this information, it was determined that participants spent approximately 16 minutes completing the survey information.

Data Analysis and Reporting

Data were collected in an anonymous fashion using the Internet site SurveyMonkey.com. SPSS 20.0 was used for the final data analysis. Data

from the three instruments used in this study were used in this study were scored, reported, and interpreted separately, according to the characteristics of each instrument

***Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ)**

The GPSQ was designed to gather information regarding participants' (a) demographics, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university choice, (e) factors influencing program choice, (f) miscellaneous information, and (g) future career plans. The 55 items that comprised the GPSQ included a combination of closed-ended, multiple choice, and Likert-type statements. Data were analyzed and interpreted using frequencies and descriptive procedures.

***Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP)**

The main author of the CDMP provided a scoring manual, which was used to analyze the results derived from the present study. The 39 items that comprise the instrument are aligned with a seven-point semantic differential scale. Each of the 12 dimensions that comprise the CDMP is represented by three items. In addition, one warm-up item (statement 1) and two validity items (statements 14 and 27) were added. According to the manual, the two validity items were added to ensure that individuals accurately read each individual statement. For instance, item 14 was expected to get a high score (>3) and item 27 was expected to get a low score (<5). For the purpose of the present study, if these two preconditions

were not met, the data set for that participant was not included in the analysis.

Once reliability analyses were conducted and descriptive statistics were analyzed, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if significant differences existed between participants' choice of graduate piano major and the following dimensions representing the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP): (a) information gathering, (b) information processing, (c) locus of control, (d) effort invested in the process, (e) procrastination, (f) speed of making the final decision, (g) consulting with others, (h) dependence on others, (i) desire to please others, (j) aspiration for an "ideal occupation," (k) willingness to compromise, and (l) use of intuition.

***Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS).**

The *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS) is comprised of 18 true-false statements (0 = false, 1 = true). Upon completion of the data collection process, composite scores were calculated for each participant. Once reliability analyses were conducted and descriptive statistics were analyzed, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if a significant difference existed between choice of piano major and vocational identity.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine if discernible profiles regarding musical background, career decision-making dimensions, and vocational identity exist among students pursuing a graduate degree in (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. Data were collected and analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the (a) demographics, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university and program choice, and (e) future career plans of graduate piano students as reported by the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ)?
2. Do significant differences exist between choice of graduate piano major and the following dimensions representing the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP): (a) information gathering, (b) information processing, (c) locus of control, (d) effort invested in the process, (e) procrastination, (f) speed of making the final decision, (g) consulting with others, (h) dependence on others, (i) desire to please others, (j) aspiration for an "ideal occupation," (k) willingness to compromise, and (l) use of intuition?
3. Does a significant difference exist between choice of piano major and vocational identity?

4. Do discernible profiles exist among each group as represented by the (a) *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ), (b) *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP), and (c) *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS)?

Results

Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire (GPSQ)

In order to answer the first research question, frequencies and descriptive statistics were used to analyze the following sections comprising the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ): (a) demographic information, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university choice, (e) factors influencing program choice, (f) miscellaneous information, and (g) future career plans. Data relative to the areas of demographics, academic history, and early musical background were analyzed as one unit. For the remaining sections, sample data were separated and analyzed by the following degree emphases: (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano.

Demographic information.

Results indicated 64 participants (92.8%) completed all three instruments, and five participants (7.2%) completed only the GPSQ. The gender distribution was 68.1% female (n = 47) and 31.9% male (n = 22). Participants' ages ranged from 22 to 39 with a mean age of 26.6.

Participants (*N* = 69) were enrolled in institutions located in twenty states. The state with the largest representation was Oklahoma (17.3%), followed by Illinois (10.1%), Maryland (8.7%), South Carolina (7.2%), Texas (7.2%), and Colorado (7.2%) (see Table 4.1).

Information regarding participants' ethnicity revealed the majority of the sample was Caucasian (71.01%), followed by Latino American 8.7%, Asian American (7.25%), and African American (1.45%). One participant chose not to respond (see Table 4.2).

The sample was comprised of participants representing 14 countries (see Table 4.3). The majority of participants (68.1%) were born in the United States, followed by China (5.8%), Brazil (4.3%), Mexico (2.9%), and Taiwan 2.9%. From the data, it was determined the majority of participants was female, Caucasian, and born in the United States.

Academic history.

When analyzing participants' current degree status, it was determined MM students (59.4%), and DMA students (30.4%) comprised the majority of the sample. The remainder of the sample (10.2%) was comprised of students pursuing MME, PhD, DA, DM, and GPD (Graduate Performance Diploma) degrees (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.1

Distribution of Participants by Current State of Residence

State	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Alabama	1	1.4	1.4
Colorado	5	7.2	8.6
Connecticut	1	1.4	10.1
District of Columbia	4	5.8	15.9
Florida	3	4.3	20.2
Illinois	7	10.1	30.4
Indiana	1	1.4	31.8
Massachusetts	1	1.4	33.3
Maryland	6	8.7	42.0
Missouri	3	4.3	46.3
Nebraska	2	2.9	49.2
New Jersey	2	2.9	52.1
New York	4	5.8	57.9
Ohio	1	1.4	59.4
Oklahoma	12	17.3	76.8
South Carolina	5	7.2	84.0
Tennessee	1	1.4	85.5
Texas	5	7.2	92.7
Utah	2	2.9	95.6
Wisconsin	3	4.3	100.0

Note. $N = 69$.

Table 4.2

Distribution of Participants by Ethnicity

State	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Caucasian	49	71.01	71.01
African American	1	1.45	72.46
Asian American	5	7.25	79.71
Latino American	6	8.70	88.40
Other	7	10.14	98.55
No Response	1	1.45	100.0

Note. *N* = 69.

Table 4.3

Distribution of Participants by Country of Origin

Country	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Armenia	1	1.4	1.4
Brazil	3	4.3	5.7
Canada	1	1.4	7.2
China	4	5.8	13.0
Costa Rica	1	1.4	14.4
Czech Republic	1	1.4	15.9
Malaysia	1	1.4	17.3
Mexico	2	2.9	20.2
South Africa	1	1.4	21.7
Sri Lanka	1	1.4	23.1
Taiwan	2	2.9	26.0
Thailand	1	1.4	27.5
Ukraine	1	1.4	28.9
United States	47	68.1	97.1
No Response	2	2.9	100.0

Note. *N* = 69.

Table 4.4

Distribution of Participants by Current Degree Program

Degree Program	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
MM	41	59.4	59.4
MME	2	2.9	62.3
DMA	21	30.4	92.7
PhD	2	2.9	95.6
DA	1	1.4	97.1
DM	1	1.4	98.5
GPD[a]	1	1.4	100.0

Note. *N* = 69.
[a]GPD stands for Graduate Performance Diploma

Participants were then distributed according to their current degree program: (a) piano performance (*n* = 25), (b) piano pedagogy (*n* = 33), and (c) collaborative piano (*n* = 11) (see Table 4.5). As stated in Chapter I, degree programs that included the terms *collaborative*, *accompanying*, *chamber music*, *coaching*, or *ensemble* in their titles were considered collaborative piano programs. Programs that included the term *pedagogy* in their title have been included in the category of piano pedagogy programs (see Appendix E).

When examining the status of those enrolled in a master's degree program, results indicated that 22 participants (50%) were enrolled in their

Table 4.5

Distribution of Participants by Degree Category

Degree Category	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Piano Performance	25	36.2	36.2
Piano Pedagogy	33	47.8	84.0
Collaborative Piano	11	15.9	100.0

Note. *N* = 69.

first year of study, 21 (47.73%) in their second year of study, and one (2.27%) in his or her third year of study. As for the doctoral students, the majority (60% combined) were enrolled in either their first or third year of study. The number of participants enrolled in doctoral programs tended to decrease as their year of enrollment increased. Seven first year students (28%), four second year students (16%), eight third year students (32%), two fourth year students (8%), three fifth year students (12%), and one sixth year student (4%) participated. A detailed distribution of participants by current enrollment status is presented in Table 4.6.

Piano performance was the most common degree type obtained by participants prior to enrolling in their current degree program. This includes 72.46% of those who had only completed a bachelor degree and 84% of those who had also completed a master's degree. Other degrees included a

Table 4.6

Distribution of Participants by Current Enrollment Status

Level	Year	Degree	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Master's	1	MM	19	27.5	27.5
	1	MME	2	2.9	30.4
	1	GPD	1	1.4	31.8
	2	MM	21	30.4	62.3
	3	MM	1	1.4	63.7
Doctorate	1	DMA	7	10.1	73.9
	2	DMA	3	4.3	78.2
	2	PhD	1	1.4	79.7
	3	DMA	6	8.7	88.4
	3	DA	1	1.4	89.8
	3	DM	1	1.4	91.3
	4	DMA	2	2.9	94.2
	5	DMA	2	2.9	97.1
	5	PhD	1	1.4	98.5
	6	DMA	1	1.4	100.0

Note. *N* = 69

combination of performance and pedagogy, music education, interdepartmental studies-health sciences, music and psychology, humanities, German, music theory and history, exercise and sport studies, vocal music education, and physics.

Early musical background.

When asked to indicate who provided the greatest influence when beginning piano lessons, participants' number one response was their mother (47.83%), followed by their own personal decision (36.23%). In contrast, the influence exhibited by other family members was considerably lower: (a) father (5.8%), sister (1.45%), and (c) grandmother (1.45%) (see Table 4.7).

Prior to beginning their undergraduate degree, participants reported to have engaged in private piano study for an average of 9.81 (*SD* = 3.37) years. In addition, only 13 participants (18.84%) reported at least one member of their immediate family having received professional training in music. Family members who did receive professional training included the (a) mother (8.6%), (b) brother (7.2%), (c) father (5.7%), and (d) sister (2.8%). It is worth noting that 81.16% of participants reported not having a professional musician among their close relatives.

Factors influencing choice of university or college.

Participants were asked to rate the following factors, which influenced their choice of university or college: (a) reputation of the university, (b)

Table 4.7

Distribution of Participants by the Person who Encouraged Them to Start Piano Lessons

Influential Person	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Mother	33	47.83	47.83
Father	4	5.80	53.63
Both parents	4	5.80	59.42
Myself	25	36.23	95.66
Sister	1	1.45	97.11
Grandmother	1	1.45	98.55
Teacher	1	1.45	100.00

Note. *N* = 69.

reputation of the music program, (c) reputation of the piano faculty, (d) convenient location, (d) cost of living, (e) affordable tuition, (f) scholarship/assistantship, and (g) availability of performance opportunities. Participants responded to each factor using the following Likert-type response anchors: (a) *not at all influential*, (b) *slightly influential*, (c) *somewhat influential*, (d) *very influential*, and (e) *extremely influential*. Means and standard deviations for each factor are presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8

Factors Influencing Participants' Choice of University or College

	Performance		Pedagogy		Collaborative	
Factor	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
The reputation of the university	2.79	0.93	3.15	1.03	3.45	1.21
The reputation of the music program	3.42	1.21	3.76	1.15	3.73	1.10
The reputation of the piano faculty	4.17	1.09	4.18	1.19	3.91	1.04
Convenient location	2.88	1.42	2.61	1.23	3.09	1.58
Cost of living	2.83	1.37	2.36	1.22	2.36	1.21
Affordable tuition	3.46	1.44	2.78	1.45	2.45	1.37
Scholarship/Assistantship	3.96	1.46	3.97	1.36	4.00	1.34
Availability of performance opportunities	3.08	1.32	2.69	1.06	3.36	0.81

Note. *N* = 69.

- Highest rated factors influencing choice of college as reported by piano performance students
    1. Reputation of the piano faculty (*M* = 4.17, *SD* = 1.09)
    2. Scholarship/assistantship (*M* = 3.96, *SD* = 1.46)
    3. Affordable tuition (*M* = 3.46, *SD* = 1.44)
- Highest rated factors influencing choice of college as reported by piano pedagogy students
    1. Reputation of the piano faculty (*M* = 4.18, *SD* = 1.19)
    2. Scholarship/assistantship (*M* = 3.97, *SD* = 1.36)
    3. Reputation of the music program (*M* = 3.76, *SD* = 1.15)
- Highest rated factors influencing choice of college as reported by collaborative piano students
    1. Scholarship/assistantship (*M* = 4.00, *SD* = 1.34)
    2. Reputation of the piano faculty (*M* = 3.91, *SD* = 1.04)
    3. Reputation of the music program (*M* = 3.73, *SD* = 1.10)

Factors influencing choice of current degree program.

Participants responded to 13 closed-ended questions concerning the factors that influenced their choice of current degree program. The possible answers were *yes* and *no,* and each positive answer was assigned a numeric value of 1. Table 4.9 presents frequency and percentage values for each of the three subsamples.

Table 4.9

Factors Influencing Participants' Choice of Current Degree Program

	Performance (*N* = 25)		Pedagogy (*N* = 33)		Collaborative (*N* = 11)	
Factor	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
A family member encouraged me	9	36.00	8	24.24	4	36.36
Suggestion from applied piano teacher	15	60.00	19	57.58	5	45.45
Love of teaching	14	56.00	30	90.91	6	54.44
Love of playing	23	92.00	29	87.88	11	100.00
It provides the best fit for my future career plans	19	76.00	30	90.91	10	90.91
I enjoy making music in groups	16	64.00	15	45.45	10	90.91
It will allow me to earn more money	11	44.00	13	39.39	5	45.45
It will make me a more successful musician	20	80.00	28	84.85	9	81.82
It will make me more marketable	14	56.00	26	78.79	8	72.73
I want to have a stable job	14	56.00	29	87.88	7	63.64
It is the only activity I am good at	2	8.00	5	15.15	0	0.00
I have been in music too long to change	5	20.00	5	15.15	1	9.09
It was the only program I was accepted into	6	24.00	6	18.18	2	18.18

Note. *N* = 69.

- Highest rated factors influencing choice of degree program as reported by piano performance students
    1. Love of playing (92%)
    2. It will make me a more successful musician (80%)
    3. It provides the best fit for my future career plans (76%)
    4. Suggestion from applied piano teacher (60%)
- Highest rated factors influencing choice of degree program as reported by piano pedagogy students
    1. Love of teaching (90.91%)
    2. It provides de best fit for my future career plans (90.91%)
    3. Love of playing (87.88%)
    4. I want to have a stable job (87.88%)
- Highest rated factors influencing choice of degree program as reported by collaborative piano students
    1. Love of playing (100%)
    2. It provides the best fit for my future career plans (90.91%)
    3. I enjoy making music in groups (90.91%)
    4. It will make me a more successful musician (81.82%)

Miscellaneous information.

Overall, the average number of institutions to which participants applied for graduate school was 3.62, with a mean of 3.0 for the

performance subsample, 3.31 for the pedagogy subsample, and 4.55 for the collaborative piano subsample.

All performance majors indicated to have applied exclusively to a graduate piano performance program. Only 9.09% of collaborative piano students applied to a piano performance program in addition to a collaborative piano program, whereas 30.30% of piano pedagogy students applied to piano performance alternatives in addition to their current program, and 24.24% of piano pedagogy students applied to more than one combination of pedagogy and performance degree option. Only one student in the piano pedagogy subsample reported to have applied to a degree program outside of music.

Results indicated 32% of piano performance students, 36.36% of piano pedagogy students, and 27.27% of collaborative piano students reported having seriously considered enrolling in at least one and as many as six alternative degree programs just prior to starting their current program. The alternative degree programs mentioned were (a) medicine, (b) piano pedagogy, (c) K-12 music education, (d) doctorate in education, (e) writing, (f) piano performance, (g) business, (h) religious studies, (i) arts administration, (j) architecture, (k) law, (l) photography, (m) engineering, (n) ESL teaching, (o) musicology, (p) private school education, (q) banking, (r) physics, (s) church music, (t) film making, and (u) environmental sciences.

More than half of all participants reported to have seriously considered a profession other than music at one point in their lives: (a) 64% of piano performance students, (b) 60.61% of piano pedagogy students, and (c) 54.55% of collaborative piano students. The most commonly mentioned profession, with nine occurrences, was medicine. Professions mentioned four times were (a) psychology, (b) law, and (c) English teaching. Public school teaching was mentioned three times. Those mentioned two times were (a) engineering, (b) business, and (c) writing. Professions mentioned one time were (a) translator, (b) nutrition, (c) architecture, (d) accounting, (e) ESL teaching, (f) real state, (g) biology, (h) library sciences, (i) environmental sciences, (j) history, (k) meteorology, (l) computer programming, (m) mass communication, (n) management, (o) sports coach, (p) international relations, (q) explorer, and (r) physics.

Participants were also asked to rate their satisfaction with the current degree program by responding to a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at all satisfied*) to 5 (*extremely satisfied*). The mean scores for each area were (a) $M = 4.04$ for piano performance, (b) $M = 4.15$ for piano pedagogy, and (c) $M = 4.09$ for collaborative piano.

Future career plans.

Participants responded to 17 statements regarding future career plans using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*extremely unlikely*) to 5

(*extremely likely*). Means and standard deviations for each subsample are presented in Table 4.10.

- The highest rated future career plans as reported by piano performance students
    1. Teach full-time at a university or college (*M* = 4.00, *SD* = 1.22)
    2. Teach as an adjunct at a university or college (*M* = 3.96, *SD* = 1.04)
    3. Teach in a music school (*M* = 3.96, *SD* = 0.95)
    4. Open an independent piano studio (*M* = 3.92, *SD* = 1.02)
- The highest rated future career plans as reported by piano pedagogy students
    1. Open an independent piano studio (*M* = 4.18, *SD* = 1.01)
    2. Teach in a music school (*M* = 4.03, *SD* = 1.07)
    3. Teach full-time at a university or college (*M* = 3.70, *SD* = 0.98)
    4. Work as a church musician (*M* = 3.48, *SD* = 1.50).
- The highest rated future career plans as reported by collaborative piano students
    1. Coach singers (*M* = 4.36, *SD* = 0.92)
    2. Work as a staff accompanist (*M* = 4.18, *SD* = 0.98)

3. Perform regularly in a chamber music ensemble (*M* = 4.09, *SD* = 0.70)
4. Teach as an adjunct at a university or college (*M* = 3.91, *SD* = 1.14).

***Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP)**

In order to answer the second research question, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if significant differences existed between choice of graduate piano major and the twelve dimensions representing the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP). No significant differences were found among the three subgroups on the dependent variables (see Table 4.11). As a result, the researcher was unable to reject the null hypothesis.

***Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS)**

In order to answer the third research question, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if a significant difference existed between each subgroup according to vocational identity. The independent variable, choice of graduate piano major, had three levels: (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. The dependent variable of vocational identity had a composite value ranging from 0 to 18. The results of the ANOVA indicated no significant differences existed between each subgroup according to vocational identity (see Table 4.12).

Table 4.10

Future Career Plans (How likely after graduation will you do the following?

	Performance (*N* = 24)		Pedagogy (*N* = 33)		Collaborative (*N* = 11)	
Career Plan	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Freelance as a concert pianist	3.29	1.04	1.79	1.27	2.00	1.55
Secure management and tour as a concert pianist	2.67	1.24	1.48	0.76	1.55	0.93
Open an independent piano studio	3.92	1.02	4.18	1.01	3.82	0.98
Teaching in a music school	3.96	0.95	4.03	1.07	3.91	0.70
Teach full-time at a university or college	4.00	1.22	3.70	0.98	2.91	0.94
Teach as an adjunct at a university or college	3.96	1.04	3.52	1.09	3.91	1.14
Work as a staff accompanist	3.46	1.02	3.06	1.27	4.18	0.98
Perform regularly in a chamber music ensemble	3.79	0.93	3.00	1.06	4.09	0.70
Coach singers	2.38	1.10	1.97	0.98	4.36	0.92
Work as an orchestral pianist	2.79	1.06	1.97	0.88	3.45	1.21
Perform regularly in a pop band	1.92	1.14	1.64	0.78	1.82	0.87
Perform regularly in a jazz ensemble	1.83	1.05	1.79	0.93	1.64	1.21
Work as a church musician	3.25	1.42	3.48	1.50	3.09	1.45
Continue studies in music	3.75	1.45	3.55	1.09	3.64	0.81
Take some time off and get a job outside of music	2.29	1.40	1.88	0.99	2.27	1.49
Keep music as a hobby and enroll in a non-music degree	1.96	1.27	1.42	0.66	1.73	1.19
Continue studies in an area different than music	2.00	1.25	1.70	0.77	2.00	1.34

Note. *N* = 69.

Table 4.11

MANOVA Results for the Career Decision-Making Profile (CDMP)

Effect	Value (Wilk's Λ)	*F*	Hypothesis *df*	Error *df*	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Choice of Graduate Piano Major	.626	1.098	24	100	.361	.208

Note. Computed using alpha = .05

Table 4.12

ANOVA Results for Vocational Identity

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Choice of Graduate Piano Major	2.907	2	1.454	.087	.917	.003

Note. Computed using alpha = .05

Establishment of Discernible Profiles

Data derived from the instruments were further synthesized to answer the fourth research question "Do discernible profiles exist among each group as represented by the (a) *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ), (b) *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP), and (c) *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS)?"

Piano performance.

The piano performance subsample was the only group to be gender balanced (52% female and 48% male). No one from this group applied concurrently to a piano pedagogy or a collaborative piano degree program. The most influential factor regarding their choice of university or college was the reputation of the piano faculty, and the lowest rated factor was the reputation of the university. The highest rated factor, which influenced students' choice of current degree program, was love of playing. In terms of future career plans, the most common choices were: (a) teach full-time at a university or college, (b) teach as an adjunct at a university or college, and (c) teach in a music school.

Piano pedagogy.

Participants in the piano pedagogy subsample were 69.69% female and 30.30% male. Participants from this subsample were more likely to apply concurrently to alternate degree programs than participants representing the other two subsamples: (a) 30.30% also applied to a piano performance degree and (b) 24.24% applied to a combination of piano pedagogy and performance. The highest rated factor influencing their choice of university or college was the reputation of the piano faculty, and the lowest rated factor was cost of living. The two highest factors influencing their choice of current degree program were a love of teaching and a belief that their current degree was the best fit for their future career

plans. Piano pedagogy students indicated their most common career plans were: (a) open an independent piano studio, (b) teach in a music school, and (c) teach full-time at a college or university.

Collaborative piano.

All participants belonging to the collaborative piano subsample were female. Only 9.09% of these students applied to alternate degree programs. The highest rated factor influencing their choice of university or college was scholarship/assistantship and the lowest rated factor was cost of living. The highest rated factor that influenced their choice of current degree program was a love of playing. The most common career plans were (a) coach singers, (b) work as a staff accompanist, and (c) perform regularly in a chamber music ensemble.

Commonalities between groups.

Given that the three subsamples appeared to be rather homogeneous with respect to the results derived from the CDMP (see Table 4.13) and VIS (see Table 4.14), an additional step was taken in the data analysis to trace the commonalities between groups. Means and standard deviations were calculated for the entire sample as a single unit on the VIS (M = 13.26, SD = 4.26) and each dimension of the CDMP (see Table 4.15). This allowed the researcher to gain a better understanding of the aspects of

Table 4.13

Descriptive Statistics for the Career Decision-Making Profile (CDMP) by Subsample

	Performance (*N* = 23)		Pedagogy (*N* = 30)		Collaborative (*N* = 11)	
Dimension	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
Information Gathering	5.55	1.30	5.83	0.95	5.45	0.95
Information Processing	5.77	1.32	5.97	0.97	5.15	1.29
Locus of Control	4.93	1.40	4.84	1.29	4.82	0.95
Effort Invested in the Process	5.28	1.04	5.47	1.17	5.24	1.18
Procrastination	3.03	1.61	2.91	1.51	2.88	1.36
Speed of Making the Final Decision	4.13	1.67	4.00	1.54	4.30	1.91
Consulting with Others	5.06	1.34	5.80	0.89	5.24	0.90
Dependence on Others	2.54	1.38	3.04	1.69	2.24	1.01
Desire to Please Others	2.64	1.61	2.86	1.55	1.97	1.01
Aspiration for an “ideal occupation”	4.97	1.71	5.06	1.23	4.61	1.37
Willingness to Compromise	4.00	1.30	4.72	1.30	4.33	1.45
Use of Intuition	4.03	1.33	4.33	1.40	4.52	1.26

Note. *N* = 64.

Table 4.14

Vocational Identity by Degree Subsample

Degree Subsample	Mean	*SD*
Piano Performance	13.04	3.71
Piano Pedagogy	13.10	3.98
Collaborative Piano	13.64	5.09

Note. *N* = 64.

the career decision-making process and vocational identity of the graduate piano students in general.

When looking at the entire sample as one unit, participants scored the highest in the following areas of the CDMP:

- Information processing (*M* = 5.63, *SD* = 1.19)
- Information gathering (*M* = 5.61, *SD* = 1.06)
- Consulting with others (*M* = 5.37, *SD* = 1.04)
- Effort invested in the process (M = 5.33, *SD* = 1.13).

Conversely, the lowest rated dimensions were:

- Procrastination (*M* = 2.94, *SD* = 1.49)
- Dependence on others (*M* = 2.61, *SD* = 1.36)
- Desire to please others (*M* = 2.49, *SD* = 1.39).

Table 4.15

Descriptive Statistics of the Career Decision-Making Profile (CDMP) for the Entire Sample

Dimension	Mean	*SD*
Information Processing	5.63	1.19
Information Gathering	5.61	1.06
Consulting with Others	5.37	1.04
Effort Invested in the Process	5.33	1.13
Aspiration for an “ideal occupation”	4.88	1.43
Locus of Control	4.86	1.21
Willingness to Compromise	4.35	1.35
Use of Intuition	4.29	1.33
Speed of Making the Final Decision	4.14	1.70
Procrastination	2.94	1.49
Dependence on Others	2.61	1.36
Desire to Please Others	2.49	1.39

Note. $N = 64$.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if discernible profiles regarding musical background, career decision-making dimensions, and vocational identity exist among students pursuing a graduate degree in (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. Considering the high financial and personal investment that a graduate degree in piano entails, it becomes critical that students make informed and conscious decisions regarding their professional careers.

A list of 103 qualifying institutions was compiled based on information gathered from the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) website. From this list, piano department chairs were contacted via their email addresses. If the appropriate area chair was not clearly identified on the website, a senior researcher in the area of piano pedagogy provided assistance with the selection process. In instances where the email address of the area chair could not be found, the researcher requested it by phone.

Department chairs were sent an initial email (see Appendix I) that included a description of the study and a request for participation. A follow-up email (see Appendix J) was sent two weeks later to encourage those who had not responded to the first request. Department chairs who agreed

to participate received a final email (see Appendix K), which was then forwarded to all potential participants.

Several faculty members expressed their enthusiasm for the study. A faculty member representing a large school in the Northeast stated, “This is an important topic. Great idea for the dissertation as well as what the results may yield for all of us.” Another faculty member from the Southwest asserted, “Thanks for your interest in this important topic for our students!”

The final sample was comprised of graduate piano students (*N* = 69) who were enrolled in degree programs at institutions located in twenty states. Participants were enrolled in one of the following graduate degree programs: (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. Once contacted, participants were asked to complete the following instruments online: (a) *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ), (b) *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP), and (c) *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS). Data collection ended six weeks after the initial contact with participants. All data were organized and entered into SPSS 20.0 for statistical analysis.

The *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ) was comprised of 55 items organized into the following seven sections: (a) demographic information, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university choice, (e) factors influencing program choice, (f)

miscellaneous information, and (g) future career plans. Items included a combination of closed-ended, multiple choice, and Likert-type statements.

The *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP) manual was used to analyze the data relative to each of the following dimensions: (a) information gathering, (b) information processing, (c) locus of control, (d) effort invested in the process, (e) procrastination, (f) speed of making the final decision, (g) consulting with others, (h) dependence on others, (i) desire to please others, (j) aspiration for an "ideal occupation," (k) willingness to compromise, and (l) use of intuition. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if significant differences existed between participants' choice of major and the dimensions representing the CDMP. No significant differences were found, confirming that participants representing all three groups exhibited similar profiles when engaging in the career decision-making process.

To analyze the data relative to the *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS), a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if a significant difference exists between choice of piano major and vocational identity. Once again, no significant differences were found, confirming that participants representing all three groups exhibited comparable levels in terms of vocational identity.

Discussion and Conclusions

The first research question stated, “What are the (a) demographics, (b) academic history, (c) early musical background, (d) factors influencing university and program choice, and (e) future career plans of graduate piano students as reported by the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ)?” Based on the results, several conclusions can be made from the data analysis. Results indicated that the number of female participants (68.1%) was more than double the number of male participants (31.9%). The mean age was 26.6 and the majority (71.01%) of participants reported being Caucasian. Additional demographic information indicated participants were born in 14 countries and were attending schools in 20 states.

Based on the academic history reported by participants, the sample was divided into (a) 36.2% piano performance, (b) 47.8% piano pedagogy, and (c) 15.9% collaborative piano students. The small proportion of collaborative piano students is in agreement with official reports (HEADS, 2011), although a larger number of piano performance students was expected. It may be safe to assume that, given their professional interest, piano pedagogy students were more inclined to take part in a study of this nature than piano performance students.

The person most likely to encourage participants to start piano lessons at a young age was the mother (47.83%). In 36.23% of the cases, participants themselves requested piano lessons. The percentage of other

people who encouraged participants to begin piano was considerably lower: (a) father (5.80%), (b) sister (1.45%), (c) grandmother (1.45%), and (d) teacher (1.45%). The influence of the mother to pursue or to continue the musical training of her child has been documented in prior research (Burgstahler, 1966; Hof, 1999; Cox, 1994).

Results indicated different levels of influence upon the three groups of participants concerning their choice of university or college. The reputation of the piano faculty exerted the strongest influence on the choices of both performance and pedagogy students. For collaborative piano students, the reputation of the piano faculty ranked second, slightly under the availability of scholarship/assistantship. Overall, the reputation of the music program was reported to be more important than the reputation of the university as a whole. Convenience of location, cost of living, and affordable tuition did not rank highly in participants' choice of school. It seems logical that financial concerns would be minimized if students secured adequate financial aid and possible tuition assistance. Results also indicated that availability of performance opportunities was more important for collaborative piano students than it was for performance students and pedagogy students. These results were consistent with previous research by Locke (1982), who reported similar rankings among graduate music students in regards to their choice of university.

When asked what factors most influenced their choice of degree program, collaborative piano students indicated they enjoyed making music in groups, while piano pedagogy students were more likely to specify a love for teaching. Of all three groups, piano pedagogy students indicated they were the least influenced by a family member when enrolling in their current program. It is interesting to note that piano pedagogy students ranked future job stability as the highest factor for degree choice, while piano performance students rated this factor as the lowest. The majority of students from all three groups expected to become more successful musicians after completing their current degree program, although fewer than half of the students from each group reported that earning more money as a result of their degree motivated them to enroll in their current program.

Performance students applied exclusively to performance programs, while 9.09% of collaborative piano students and 30.3% of piano pedagogy students also applied to piano performance programs. From this perspective, piano performance students exhibited a higher level of persistence and attachment to their occupational identities. Conversely, piano pedagogy students exhibited a higher level of flexibility in their vocational decisions. The higher level of persistence exhibited by piano performance students is congruent with Ellis' (1999) concept of *escalation of commitment.* According to Ellis, as students reach higher levels of education and remain devoted to the career, their commitment escalates,

even when the profession offers uncertain rewards not commensurate with the effort of training.

When asked if they ever considered a profession other than music, 64% of piano performance majors responded positively, while 32% continued to consider an alternative career just prior to applying to graduate school. Nevertheless, all piano performance majors applied exclusively to performance degree programs. When interpreting the responses of piano pedagogy students, it was discovered that 60.61% considered an alternative career path, 36.36% continued this consideration prior to applying to graduate school, and 24.24% actually applied to more than one combination of pedagogy and performance degrees. For collaborative piano students, 54.55% considered an alternative career path, 27.27% continued this consideration prior to applying to graduate school, and 9.09% actually applied to a degree other than collaborative piano. The most frequently mentioned alternative careers were: (a) medicine, (b) psychology, (c) law, and (d) English teaching. Bergee (1992) found similar results when investigating a sample of undergraduate music education majors, who considered pursuing the following careers: (a) teaching in another subject area, (b) engineering, (c) medicine, (d) law, (e) accounting, and (f) business. Further analysis indicated that half of those who considered an alternative career continued to do so just prior to the application process. Percentages

understandably decreased as students moved from a vague consideration into a factual decision.

After graduation, piano performance students saw themselves primarily teaching at a university or opening an independent piano studio. When compared to students in the other two subgroups, piano performance majors reported to be more likely to secure management and tour as a concert pianist or freelance as a concert pianist. The fact that piano performance students revealed a slightly stronger interest in teaching over performing, suggests that they have fairly realistic career plans. On the other hand, piano pedagogy students saw themselves opening an independent piano studio, teaching at a music school, or working as a church musician. Collaborative piano students expected to coach singers, work as a staff accompanist, or perform regularly in a chamber music ensemble. Participants in this subgroup indicated the lowest interest in teaching when compared to the other two subgroups. In general, these results reinforce the projected occupational role of each group. Piano performance majors planned to teach and perform, piano pedagogy majors planned to teach, and collaborative piano students planned to interact and perform with other musicians.

The second research question sought to determine if significant differences existed between choice of graduate piano major and the dimensions representing the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP). No

significant differences were found among the three groups on any of the dimensions. These results suggest that even though graduate students were cultivating different areas of specialization, they shared similar tendencies when making career decisions. Taken as one group, participants rated the highest on the following dimensions: (a) information processing, (b) information gathering, (c) consulting with others, and (d) effort invested in the process. Conversely, the lowest rated dimensions were (a) procrastination, (b) dependence on others, and (c) desire to please others.

Participants enrolled in all three piano degree types indicated they were quite thorough when collecting and organizing information. They were also inclined to make analytical decisions, processing the available information in a methodical manner. The majority of participants frequently consulted with others during different stages of their decision-making process, although they took personal responsibility for their decisions, rather than asking others to make the decision for them. They tended not to delay the decision-making process, but devoted an appropriate amount of time and mental effort into making their final decision. In addition, participants tended not to satisfy the expectations of significant others when making their decision.

The four highest and the three lowest-ranked dimensions corresponded very closely with results observed by Gati (2010). In Gati's

study, the highest-ranked dimensions were, in order: (a) information processing, (b) locus of control, (c) information gathering, (d) effort invested in the process, and (e) consulting with others. The lowest were (a) procrastination, (b) desire to please others, and (c) dependence on others. Except for their field of study, participants representing both samples exhibited similar career decision-making profiles. Gati's sample consisted of American college students between the ages of 18 and 50, with 11 or more years of education, and mean age of 28.2. The only dimension that differed considerably between studies was locus of control, which was ranked second in the Gati study and sixth in the present study. Consequently, the scores obtained by graduate piano students were similar to those of a comparable group of non-musicians. The similarities between groups seem to suggest that graduate piano students may not be too different from students in other fields with respect to their career decision-making profiles. The relative discrepancy in the ranking of the locus of control dimension suggests that graduate piano students may believe they have slightly less control over their occupational future than the average college student.

The third research question asked whether significant differences existed between choice of piano major and vocational identity. The three groups appeared to be homogeneous with respect to their vocational identity. Most participants had a relatively clear and stable picture of their goals, interests, and talents. Furthermore, most participants were satisfied

with their current degree program, which confirmed the connection between vocational identity and career satisfaction.

The fourth research question sought to determine if discernible vocational profiles existed among the three groups of piano students. Results revealed more commonalities than differences. Taken as one group, graduate piano students exhibited high levels of vocational identity. They also scored highly on the following dimensions of the *Career Decision-Making Profile* (CDMP): (a) information processing, (b) information gathering, (c) consulting with others, and (d) effort invested in the process. Conversely, the majority of participants scored low on (a) procrastination, (b) dependence on others, and (c) desire to please others.

Discernible differences were also found between groups as represented by the *Graduate Piano Student Questionnaire* (GPSQ). The piano performance subsample was gender balanced. In addition, all participants within this group applied exclusively to their current degree type and most planned to teach at the university level. Piano performance students were primarily attracted to their current university or college by the reputation of the piano faculty. Their choice of current degree program was most influenced by their love of playing and suggestions from their applied piano teacher. They also believed their degree would make them more successful musicians, and that it was the best fit for their future career plans.

The piano pedagogy subsample was predominantly female, and it included the largest number of students who applied to alternate degree programs. Most piano pedagogy students selected their current degree program because they loved to teach, loved to play, and wanted to secure a stable job. They also ranked the reputation of the piano faculty as the strongest influence when selecting their present institution. The future career plans of most piano pedagogy students included opening an independent piano studio or teaching at a university or in a music school, followed by working as a church musician.

The collaborative piano subsample was exclusively female. A small number of students in this group also applied to a piano performance degree option. The majority selected their current degree program because they loved to play and because they enjoyed making music in groups. Their choice of university or college was primarily influenced by the offer of a scholarship or an assistantship. The most frequently reported career plans were coaching singers, working as a staff accompanist, and becoming a member of a chamber music ensemble. In comparison to the other two subgroups, teaching appeared to be a secondary career plan.

Limitations

The population of graduate piano students is wide spread throughout the United States. As a result, the data collection process utilized for this

study was quite complex. To maximize the chances of obtaining the largest number of possible participants, the following measures were taken: (a) the scope of the study was the largest practicable, including all the qualifying institutions in the country, (b) a special effort was made to keep detailed records of the communication with each faculty member, (c) a follow-up email was sent two weeks after establishing initial contact to encourage faculty members who had not responded to the first request, and (d) participants were assured their identity would be kept anonymous. Even with these precautions, the final sample was relatively small, and as a result, these findings should be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, the sample represented a fairly diverse group that included participants who were attending schools from 20 states.

The population of international students enrolled in graduate piano programs throughout the United States is significant. However, participation from this group of students was modest. It may be the case that international students did not wish to take part in the study due to the level of English required to complete the measures.

Implications

The results of this investigation have significant implications for academic advisors, piano faculty, school administrators, and college piano students. Academic advisors may utilize these results to provide more

relevant career assistance. For instance, the findings suggest that graduate piano students are independent thinkers who are well aware of their career aspirations and take personal responsibility for making career decisions in a timely manner. On the other hand, participants believed they have slightly less control over their occupational future than college students in other areas. This may be due to the difficulty music graduates may experience when trying to secure full-time, stable employment (Bennett, 2005; L'Roy, 1983; Nagel, 1987; Poklemba, 1995; Scalfari 1999). Academic advisors can play a crucial role in preparing students for the professional world by helping them to establish positive professional reputations and develop valuable networking skills. By doing so, students may gain more control over their occupational future with the hopes of achieving their true career aspirations.

Results further indicated that applied teachers often exert a strong influence on piano performance majors who made the decision to enroll in their current programs. The personalized nature of piano instruction often results in a close relationship between teacher and student in which the teacher acts as a mentor and role model. It is recommended that applied teachers communicate with other faculty members and administrators to help students make the most appropriate career decisions, increasing the potential of career satisfaction.

Most participants exhibited high levels of vocational identity. Allen (1989, 2003) reported that vocational identity was closely related to

educational satisfaction. As such, the *Vocational Identity Scale* (VIS) may allow faculty to observe variations in the vocational identity of their students. Administration of the VIS throughout the duration of a student's program may prove useful in monitoring long-term student career satisfaction. For instance, applied teachers and academic advisors may encounter piano majors who after a long history of musical training decide to abandon music and enroll in a non-music degree. Arriving at that decision is often difficult and frustrating. By monitoring students' vocational identity using the VIS, applied teachers and academic advisors may be better prepared to suggest alternative career choices and ease the process of transition. Furthermore, it might be reasonable to recommend these students continue less demanding musical training in the form of elective courses or as a minor in music in parallel to other studies.

Participants indicated the reputation of the faculty to have a significant influence on their choice of college or university. Music administrators would be advised to take this information into account when making hiring decisions. Recruiting faculty members with a strong professional presence and properly advertising their background and achievements may increase the possibilities of recruiting a larger number of talented students.

The availability of scholarships and assistantships was one of the most influential factors among collaborative piano students when selecting a

graduate school. Administrators may consider raising the necessary funds to offer substantial financial aid packages and advertising the availability of these resources to attract the best-qualified collaborative piano students.

The results of this investigation have significant implications for graduate piano students. Given the commonalities found among students in all three groups, it may be beneficial for students to expand the scope of their own degree type and become proficient in skills from other piano disciplines, such as piano pedagogy and collaborative piano. Versatility, as a result of a well-rounded musical education, may contribute to increasing student access to job opportunities.

Most pedagogy and performance students reported teaching as their main career goal. In this regard, it is recommended that performance majors consider enrolling in elective pedagogy courses to be better equipped for their career plans. Collaborative piano majors were particularly attracted by the availability of performance opportunities. As such, collaborative piano faculty would be advised to secure, promote, and advertise performance venues and ensemble opportunities for prospective students.

The results of this investigation indicated a graduate piano student's decision to enroll in his or her current degree program was thoughtful and informed. These results contradict findings from previous research by Nagel (1987), who indicated that very few young musicians seriously examined

their occupational choice and made a conscious commitment to a musical career. Perhaps students nowadays are facing different circumstances in an ever-changing job market, and feel it necessary to make thoughtful and informed decisions when preparing for a career in music.

Recommendations for Further Research

Additional research may be conducted to deepen our understanding of the topic. It is recommended that future research compare career decision-making profiles and vocational identity among domestic and international graduate piano students enrolled in the same institution to determine if cultural differences influence the decision-making process. It is also recommended that a similar study be conducted to compare the career decision-making profiles of undergraduate and graduate piano students within a limited geographical area to determine if both groups exhibit equally homogeneous profiles. It would also be informative to conduct a longitudinal study that monitors changes in the vocational identities of a selected number of college piano students during the length of their graduate programs. Future research could also include a multiple case study that explores the personal and professional experiences of selected piano students, recent graduates, and established music professionals.

This was the first effort to analyze the career decision-making process and vocational identity of graduate piano students. It is hoped the

results of the present study provided the basis for future research geared towards gaining a deeper understanding of the career decision-making process of graduate piano students.

REFERENCES

Albion, M. J., & Fogarty, G. J. (2002). Factors influencing career decision making in adolescents and adults. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 10, 91-126. doi:10.1177/1069072702010001006

Aliferis, J., & Stecklein, J. (1962). *Aliferis-Stecklein music achievement test*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Allen, M. L. (1989). *An investigation of Holland's theory of vocational personalities and work environments as applied to undergraduate music majors* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9005308)

Allen, M. L. (2003). A longitudinal study of vocational commitment among undergraduate music majors. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *12*(2), 12-17. doi:10.1177/10570837030120020103

Alper, N., & Wassall, G. (2000). *More than once in a blue moon: Multiple job holdings by American artists*. Santa Anna: Seven Locks Press.

Arroba, T. (1977). Styles of decision making and their use: An empirical study. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 5, 149-158.

Bates, M. J. (1997). *Factors involved in the selection of music teaching as a career choice by 11th- and 12th-grade African-American students* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9822832)

Baxter, S. G. (1977). *The relationship of self concept and career choice among university music students* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 7815728)

Bennett, D. E. (2005). *Classical instrumental musicians: Educating for sustainable professional practice*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Western Australia, Crawley, Australia). Retrieved from https://repository.uwa.edu.au/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=6765&local_base=GEN01-INS01

Bergee, M. J. (1992). Certain attitudes toward occupational status held by music education majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *40*(2), 104-113. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3345560

Bernstein, C. M. (1986). *Experiential factors influencing choice of career for orchestra musicians: An exploratory study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8618922)

Bordm, E. S. (1943). A theory of vocational interests as dynamic phenomena. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 3(1), 49-65.

Borgen, F. H. (1991). Megatrends and milestones in vocational behavior: A 20-year counseling psychology retrospective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, 263-290. doi:10.1016/0001-8791(91)90037-M

Branscome, E. E. (2010). *Music career opportunities and career compatibility. Interviews with university music faculty members and professional musicians* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3417736)

Brew, F. P., Hesketh, B., & Taylor, A (2001). Individualist-collectivist differences in adolescent decision making and decision styles with Chinese and Anglos. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 1-19.

Bright, J. (2006). Factors influencing outstanding band students' choice of music education as a career. *Contributions to Music Education*, 33(2), 73-88.

Brown, A., & Alley, J. M. (1983). Multivariate analysis of degree persistence of undergraduate music education majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education1*, *31*(4), 271-281. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3344630

Burgstahler, E. E. (1966). *Factors influencing the choice and pursuance of a career in music education: A survey and case study approach* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 6700340)

Burland, K. (2000). *Training the Talented: An investigation of personal, social, and musical influences on the careers and lives of young adults labelled as talented musicians in early childhood* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.

Burland, K. (2005). *Becoming a musician : a longitudinal study investigating the career transitions of undergraduate music students* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. U199310)

Burland, K., & Pitts, S. (2007). Becoming a music student investigating the skills and attitudes of students beginning a music degree. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, *6*(3), 289-308.

Chartrand, J. M., Robbins, S. B., Morrill, W. H., & Boggs, K. (1990). Development and validation of the career factors inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 491-501. doi:10.1037/00220167.37.4.491

Comeau, G. (2009). *Piano pedagogy. A research and information guide*. New York: Routledge.

Cooley, J. A. (2007). *The career decision making experiences of college students in the visual arts* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3282592)

Cox, P. J. H. (1994). *The professional socialization of Arkansas music teachers as musicians and educators: The role of influential persons from childhood to post-college years* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9517608)

Davidson, J. W., Howe, M. J. A., Moore, D. G., & Sloboda, J. A. (1996). The role of parental influences in the development of musical performance. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 14(4), 399-412. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.1996.tb00714.x

Donohue, R. (2007). Examining career persistence and career change intent using the career attitudes and strategies inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *70*(2), 259-276. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.12.002

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 92, 1087–1101.

Eikleberry, C. (1999). *The career guide for creative and unconventional people*. Berkeley: Ten Speed Press.

Ellis, H. M. (1999). *The escalation of commitment: How conservatory students form the notion of a career and sustain the pursuit of their professional ambition in the face of career uncertainty* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9953275)

Ferrari, J. R., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). Examining behavioral processes in indecision: Decisional procrastination and decision-making style. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 34(1), 127-137. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1999.2247

Gati, I. (2010). *The associations between career decision-making patterns and career decision-making difficulties*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel.

Gati, I., Gadassi, R., Rolnik, H., & Dayan, A. (2010). *The dimensions of career decision-making profiles: Personality traits or situational factor?* Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel.

Gati, I., Gadassi, R., Saka, N., Hadadi, Y., Ansenberg, N., Friedmann, R., & Asulin-Peretz, L. (2011). Emotional and personality-related aspects of career decision-making difficulties: Facets of career indecisiveness. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *19*(1), 3-20. doi:10.1177/1069072710382525

Gati, I., Landman, S., Davidovitch, S., Asulin-Peretz, L., & Gadassi, R. (2009). From career decision-making styles to career decision-making profiles: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *76*(2), 277-291. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2009.11.001

Gillespie, R., & Hamann, D. L. (1999). Career choice among string music education students in American colleges and universities. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *47*(3), 266-278. doi:10.2307/3345784

Ginzberg, E. (1984). Career development. In D. Brown, L. Brooks, & Associates (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (pp. 169-191). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Ginzberg, E., Ginsburg, S. W., Axelrad, S., & Herma, J. L. (1951). *Occupational choice: An approach to a general theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1981). Circumscription and compromise: A developmental theory of occupational aspirations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology Monograph*, 28, 545-579.

Gray, M. E. (1998). *Teacher or Performer: Role Identification Among Piano Majors* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9828792)

Hargreaves, D. J., Miell, D., & MacDonald, R. A. R. (2002). What are musical identities, and why are they important? In R. A. R. MacDonald, D. J. Hargreaves, & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical Identities* (pp. 2-20). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harren, V. A. (1979). A model of career decision making for college students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 119-133.

Harris, R. D. (1992). *Musician and teacher: The relationship between role identification and intrinsic career satisfaction of the music faculty at doctoral degree granting institutions*. University of North Texas. Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/pqdweb?did=744384871&sid=24&Fmt=2&clientId=41954&RQT=309&VName=PQD

HEADS. (2011). *Music data summaries. Higher education arts data services*. Reston, VA: National Association of Schools of Music.

Hill, D. R. (1985). *An investigation of the career realities and occupational concerns of selected professional performing musicians* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8525569)

Hof, D. D. (1999). *Student's perceptions of the influences on their process of making career decisions* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9946694)

Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 6, 35-45. doi:10.1037/h0040767

Holland, J. L. (1966b). *The psychology of vocational choice: A theory of personality type and model environments*. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell.

Holland, J. L. (1968). Explorations of a theory of vocational choice: VI. A longitudinal study using a sample of typical college students. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52, 1–37.

Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Holland, J. L., Daiger, D. C., & Power, P. G. (1980). *My vocational situation*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Holland, J. L., Johnston, J. A., & Asama, N. F. (1993). The Vocational Identity Scale: A diagnostic and treatment tool. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 1(1), 1-12. doi:10.1177/106907279300100102

Holloway, A. J. (1984). *A descriptive analysis of musical experiences, employment patterns, career aspirations, curricular content, and attitudes of doctoral aspirants in music* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8427306)

Hotchkiss, S. M. (1974). A study of personality in relationship to sex, applied music major, and choice of degree program among college music students. *Contributions to Music Education*, *3*, 90-96.

Jepsen, D. A (1974). Vocational decision making strategy types: An exploratory study. *The Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 23, 17-24.

Johnson, R. (1978). Individual styles of decision making: A theoretical model of counseling. *Personnel & Guidance Journal*, 56, 530-536.

Jones, M. (1964). *Factors influencing students in the choice of music as a career* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 6500332)

Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kadushin, C. (1969). The professional self-concept of music students. *American Journal of Sociology*, *75*(3), 389-404.

Kemp, A. E. (1981). The personality structure of the musician: Identifying a profile of traits for the performer. *Psychology of Music*, 9, 3-14. doi:10.1177/03057356810090010201

Klapproth, F. (2008). Time and decision making in humans. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 8(4), 509-524. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19033245

Kool, W., McGuire, J. T., Rosen, Z. B., and Botvinick, M. M. (2010). Decision making and the avoidance of cognitive demand. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General.* 139, 665–682.

Krumboltz, J. D. (1993). Integrating career personal counseling. *The Career Development Quarterly*. 43. 143-148.

Krumboltz, J. D., Scherba, D. S., Hamel, D. A, Mitchell, L., Rude, S., & Kinnier, R. (1979). *The effect of alternate career decision making strategies on the quality of resulting decision* (Final report). Stanford, CA: Stanford University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 195824).

Kurniawan, I. T., Guitart-Masip, M., & Dolan, R. J. (2011). Dopamine and effort-based decision making. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 5, 1-10. doi:10.3389/fnins.2011.00081

L'Roy, D. (1983). *The development of occupational identity in undergraduate music education majors* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8327044)

Lease, S. H., & Dahlbeck, D. T. (2009). Parental influences, career decision-making attributions, and self-efficacy: Differences for men and women? *Journal of Career Development*, 36(2), 95-113. doi:10.1177/0894845309340794

Lee, P.-S. (2009). *The collaborative pianist: Balancing roles in partnership* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3415684)

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45, 79-122. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027

Leonard, N. H., Scholl, R. W., & Kowalski, K. B. (1999). Information processing style and decision making. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(3), 407-420. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199905)20:3<407::AID-JOB891>3.3.CO;2-V

Locke, J. R. (1982). *Influences on the college choice of freshman music majors in Illinois* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8218512)

Luftig, R. L., Donovan, M. J., Farnbaugh, C. L., Kennedy, E. E., Filicko, T., & Wyszomirski, M. J. (2003). So what are you doing after college ? An investigation of individuals studying the arts at the post-secondary level, their job aspirations and levels of realism. *Studies in Art Education*, *45*(1), 5-19. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1321105

Malmberg, L. E. (1996). How do Finnish students prepare for their future in three school types? The relation between content of plans, information gathering and self-evaluations. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(4), 457-469.

Manturzewska, M. (1990). A biographical study of the life-span development of professional musicians. *Psychology of Music*, 18, 112-139. doi:10.1177/0305735690182002

Marcia, J. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *3*(5), 551-558.

McClun, L. A., & Merrell, K. W. (1998). Relationship of perceived parenting styles, locus of control orientation, and self-concept among junior high age students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(4), 381-390. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(199810)35:4<381::AID-PITS9>3.3.CO;2-J

Miller-Tiedeman, A. (1989). *How not to make it--and succeed*. Vista, CA: Lifecareer Foundation.

Milliman, A. L. (1992). *A survey of graduate piano pedagogy core course offerings* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9223057)

Mills, J. (2006). Working in music: The pianist. *Music Education Research*, *8*(2), 251-265.

Mor, S. (1996). *Life after performance: The subjective experience of musicians who undergo career transition* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. NN14648)

Nagel, J. J. (1987). *An examination of commitment to careers in music: Implications for alienation from vocational choice* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8712181)

Nagel, J. J. (1988). In pursuit of perfection: Career choice and performance anxiety in musicians. *Medical Problems of Performing Artists*, 3(4), 140-145. Retrieved from http://www.sciandmed.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/mppa/journalviewer.aspx?issue=1142&article=1428&action=1

Nauta, M. M. (2010). The development, evolution, and status of Holland's theory of vocational personalities: Reflections and future directions for counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *57*(1), 11-22.

Neuhaus, D. (2008). *Perspektive Musiklehrer-in der Berufswahlprozess von Lehramtsstudierenden mit dem Unterrichtsfach Musik* (Doctoral dissertation, Hochschule für Music, Köln, Germany)

Nygard, C. H. (1963). *Identity, commitment, and involvement in music as an occupation: An exploratory inquiry* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.

Obituaries Michael Allen. (2010, August). *Tallahassee Democrat*. Retrieved from http://www.legacy.com/obituaries/tallahassee/obituary-preview.aspx?n=michaelallen&pid=144961859&referrer=1025

Parsons, F. (1909). *Choosing a vocation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Phillips, S. D., & Pazienza, N. J. (1988). History and theory of the assessment of career development and decision making. In Walsh, W. B., & Osipow, S. H. (Eds.), *Career Decision Making* (pp. 1-31). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Piirto, J. (1998). *Understanding those who create* (2nd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gifted Psychology Press.

Poklemba, J. L. (1995). *Career education: An integral part of the education of the undergraduate music performance student?* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1381820)

Rice-See, L. (2003). A delicate balance: A study of the professional lives of piano faculty in higher education. *American Music Teacher*, 53(1), 30-36.

Rickels, D. A., Councill, K. H., Fredrickson, W. E., Hairston, M. J., Porter, A. M., & Schmidt, M. (2010). Influences on career choice among music education audition candidates. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *57*(4), 292-307. doi:10.1177/0022429409350779

Rogers, G. L. (1988). The Bachelor of Music degree and the marketplace. *College Music Symposium*, *28*, 106-116. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40374591

Ross, R. D. (1997). The status of graduate music studies in the United States. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 134, 43-60. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40318879

Russell, J. (2008). A discriminate analysis of the factors associated with the career plans of string music educators. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56, 204-219. doi:10.1177/0022429408326762

Sagiv, L. (1999). Searching for tools versus asking for answers: A taxonomy of counselee behavioral styles during career counseling. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 7, 19-34.

Sample, D. (1992). Frequently cited studies as indicators of music education research interests. 1963-1989. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 40, 153-157. doi:10.2307/3345564

Savickas, M. L. (1997). Career adaptability: an integrative construct for life-span, life-space theory. *Career Development Quarterly*, 45(3), 247–259.

Scalfari, S. C. (1999). *The bachelor of music degree in performance: An analysis of degree purpose, curriculum structure, and practicality for orchestral instrumentalist in the classical field* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9955549)

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55, 818-831.

Siebert, J. J. (2007). *Why music teachers remain in the profession: Conversations with career music educators* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3295324)

Slaney, R. B. (1988). The assessment of career decision making. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.). *Career decision making* (pp. 33-76). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Super, D. E. (1942). *Dynamics of vocational adjustment*. New York: Harper Publishing Co.

Super, D. E. (1953). A theory of vocational development. *American Psychologist*, 8, 185-190. doi:10.1037/h0056046

Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16, 282-298. doi:10.1016/0001-8791(80)90056-1

Super, D., Savickas, M., & Super, C. (1996). The life-span, life-space approach to careers. In D.Brown, L. Brooks, & Associates (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (3rd ed., pp. 121-178). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, K. M., & Betz, N. E. (1983). Applications of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and treatment of career indecision. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 22, 63-81. doi:10.1016/0001-8791(83)90006-4

Thornton, L., & Bergee, M. (2008). Career choice influence among music education students at major schools of music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 177, 7-17.

Tinsley, H. E., Bowman, S. L., & York, D. C. (1989). Career decision scale, my vocational situation, vocational rating scale, and decisional rating scale: Do they measure the same constructs? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 115-120. doi:10.1037/0022- 0167.36.1.115

Vuust, P., Gebauer, L., Hansen, N. C., Jørgensen, S. R., Møller, A., & Linnet, J. (2010). Personality influences career choice: sensation seeking in professional musicians. *Music Education Research*, 12(2), 219-230. doi:10.1080/14613801003746584

Walsh, D. J. (1985). *The construction and validation of a vocational decision making style measure* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8521284).

Walsh, W. B., & Osipow, S. H. (Eds.). (1988). *Career decision making*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Watts, A G., & Elsom, D. (1974). *Deciding*. Cambridge: CRAC.

Weis, S. F., & Hubbard, C. F. (1973). The vocational commitment index. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 2(2), 105-111. doi:10.1177/1077727X7300200203

Weiß, S., & Kiel, E. (2010). Berufswunsch Musiklehrer/in – Motive und Selbstbild. *Beiträge empirischer Musikpädagogik*, *1*(2), 2-18.

Weller, J. (2004). The whole musician: Journey to authentic vocation. *Proceedings of the Seminar of the Commission for the Education of the Professional Musician* (pp. 245-256). Barcelona, Spain: Escola Superior de Música de Catalunya.

Wirtanen, S., & Littleton, K. (2004). Collaboration, conflict, and the musical identity work of solo students: The significance of the student-teacher relationship. In D. Miell & K. Littleton (Eds.), *Collaborative creativity* (pp. 26-39). London: Free Association Press.

Zdzinski, S. F. (1992). Relationships among parental involvement, music aptitude, and musical achievement of instrumental music students. Journal of Research in Music Education, 40(2), 114-125.

APPENDIX A

GRADUATE PIANO STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (GPSQ)

GRADUATE PIANO STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (GPSQ)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Gender: Male _____ Female _____ Prefer not to answer _____

2. Age: _____

3. In what state do you currently study? _____

4. What is your ethnicity?

   _____ Caucasian _____ African American _____ Asian American

   _____ Latino American _____ Native American _____ Other

5. In what country were you born? _____

ACADEMIC HISTORY

6. In which degree program are you currently enrolled?

   MM____ MA____ MME____ DMA____ PhD____ Other (*please specify*) _____

7. What is the title of your degree program (e.g., performance and pedagogy, collaborative piano, etc.)?

   _____

8. How many semesters/trimesters (including the present one) have you been enrolled in your current program?

   _____ Semesters _____ Trimesters

9. Please circle your previous degree(s) and indicate your major(s)? (*please check all that apply*)

   BA _____ BM _____ BME _____

   MA _____ MM _____ MME _____

   Artist Certificate _____

10. Are you currently a double major?

    No _____ Yes _____, *please specify second major*: _____

EARLY MUSICAL BACKGROUND

11. Who encouraged you to start piano lessons?

    Mother _____
    Father _____
    Myself _____
    Other. _____ *Please specify*: _____

12. How many years did you take private piano lessons prior to beginning your undergraduate degree?

    _____ years

13. Do any members of your immediate family have professional training in music?

    No _____ Yes _____, *please specify*: _____

FACTORS INFLUENCING UNIVERSITY AND PROGRAM CHOICE

Please indicate the level of influence the following factors had on your **choice of <u>university or college</u>**

	Not at all influential	Slightly influential	Somewhat influential	Very influential	Extremely influential
14. The reputation of the university	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. The reputation of the music program	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. The reputation of the piano faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. Convenient location	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. Cost of living	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
19. Affordable tuition	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
20. Scholarship/Assistantship	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
21. Availability of performance opportunities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Why did you select your current **<u>degree program</u>**? (*Please check all that apply*)

22. A family member encouraged me	No _____ Yes _____
23. Suggestion from applied piano teacher	No _____ Yes _____
24. Love of teaching	No _____ Yes _____
25. Love of playing	No _____ Yes _____
26. It provides the best fit for my future career plans	No _____ Yes _____
27. I enjoy making music in groups	No _____ Yes _____
28. It will allow me to earn more money	No _____ Yes _____
29. It will make me a more successful musician	No _____ Yes _____
30. It will make me more marketable	No _____ Yes _____
31. I want to have a stable job	No _____ Yes _____
32. It is the only activity I am good at	No _____ Yes _____
33. I have been in music too long to change	No _____ Yes _____
34. It was the only program I was accepted into	No _____ Yes _____

35. How many institutions did you apply to for graduate school including your present one?

    _____ institutions

    If you applied to more than one institution, what were the specific degree programs?

    _____

36. Did you consider other career options before entering your present institution?

    No _____ Yes _____. *If yes, please specify:* _____

37. Have you ever considered a profession other than music?

    No _____ Yes _____. *If yes, please specify:* _____

38. How satisfied are you so far with your choice of degree program?

Not at all satisfied Slightly satisfied Moderately satisfied Very satisfied Extremely satisfied

FUTURE CAREER PLANS

How likely after graduation will you do the following?

	Extremely unlikely	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Extremely likely
39. Freelance as a concert pianist?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
40. Secure management and tour as a concert pianist?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
41. Open an independent piano studio?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
42. Teach in a music school?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
43. Teach full-time at a university or college?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
44. Teach as an adjunct at a university or college?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
45. Work as a staff accompanist?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
46. Perform regularly in a chamber music ensemble?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
47. Coach singers?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
48. Work as an orchestral pianist?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
49. Perform regularly in a pop band?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
50. Perform regularly in a jazz ensemble?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
51. Work as a church musician?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
52. Continue studies in music?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
53. Take some time off and get a job outside of music?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
54. Keep music as a hobby and enroll in a non-music degree?	____	_____	_____	_____	_____
55. Continue studies in an area different than music?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX B

CAREER DECISION-MAKING PROFILE (CDMP)

Career Decision-Making Profile questionnaire (CDMP E-39-j)

You will be presented with 39 statements referring to different facets of the career decision-making process. For each statement please mark to what extent you agree with it (7 – Completely agree, 1 – *Do not agree at all*).

Please circle the number that corresponds to the degree to which you agree with each statement.

1. I am concerned about choosing a major or an occupation.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

2. I am usually thorough in gathering information, and do not merely make do with whatever is easily accessible.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

3. After collecting the necessary information about the various alternatives, I analyze the characteristics of each one.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

4. I am not solely responsible for the results of my decisions; fate and luck will affect my future career.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

5. I invest a lot of effort in the decision-making process.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

6. I tend to postpone my career decision.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

7. Even after I have all of the necessary information, I need a long time to make a decision.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

8. I usually consider my choices and make my decisions **without** consulting others.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

CDMP e-39-f.doc

9. For difficult decisions, such as career decisions, it would make it easier if someone else made the decision for me.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

10. I consider it important to choose the option that will satisfy my family and close friends.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

11. I believe that I can find a perfect occupation that will satisfy all my desires and expectations.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

12. If I am not accepted for my first-choice major or training program, I will compromise and opt for my second choice.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

13. When I make a decision, I rely mainly on my intuition.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

14. I try to choose the option that is best for me.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

15. I prefer to make decisions **after** having thoroughly examined all possible alternatives.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

16. I usually make my decisions after comparing several characteristics of the alternatives.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

17. Factors outside of my control (like fate) will greatly influence my career choice and its outcomes.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

18. I immerse myself entirely in the decision-making process.

Do not agree at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Completely agree*

19. I tend to put off my career decision making.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

20. Even after I have collected the relevant information, it takes me a lot of time to make my final decision.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

21. I **do not** need to consult with others to make the right decision.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

22. I do not want to make the decision alone; I want to share the responsibility with others.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

23. I will eventually choose one of the options that will please the people closest to me.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

24. I am striving to find the occupation that will satisfy all my preferences.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

25. If I can't realize my first choice, I will be willing to compromise.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

26. When I need to make a choice, I tend to trust my instincts.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

27. It makes no difference to me what career I will have in the future.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

28. I try to collect **all** the available information about the occupations I am considering.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

29. I usually compare the alternatives by considering their advantages and disadvantages.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

30. It really doesn't matter what I choose; destiny will influence my future career anyway.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

31. When I need to make a decision I invest a lot of time and effort in it.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

32. I tend to postpone the decision-making process as much as I can.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

33. When I get to the final stage of making a decision, I hesitate quite a bit.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

34. I usually **do not** consult with other people when making my decision.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

35. I prefer that other people share the responsibility for my decision.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

36. The expectations of those closest to me are the most important factor in my decision.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

37. I believe that there is an occupation that will satisfy all my preferences and aspirations.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

38. If I am not able to enter a degree program in my chosen field, I will compromise and look for another one that is right for me.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

39. At the point of decision, I am usually guided by my gut feeling.

Do not agree at all *1 2 3 4 5 6 7* *Completely agree*

APPENDIX C

MY VOCATIONAL SITUATION: *VOCATIONAL IDENTITY SCALE* (VIS)

My Vocational Situation

Vocational Identity Scale (VIS)

Try to answer each of the following statements as mostly TRUE or mostly FALSE. Circle the answer that best represents your present opinion.

In thinking about your present job or in planning for an occupation or career:

1.	I need reassurance that I have made the right choice of occupation.	T	F
2.	I am concerned that my present interests may change over the years.	T	F
3.	I am uncertain about the occupations I could perform well.	T	F
4.	I don't know what my major strengths and weaknesses are.	T	F
5.	The jobs I *can do* may not pay enough to live the kind of life I want.	T	F
6.	If I had to make an occupational choice right now, I'm afraid I would make a bad choice.	T	F
7.	I need to find out what kind of career I should follow.	T	F
8.	Making up my mind about a career has been a long and difficult problem for me.	T	F
9.	I am confused about the whole problem of deciding on a career.	T	F
10.	I am not sure that my present occupational choice or job is right for me.	T	F
11.	I don't know enough about what workers do in various occupations.	T	F
12.	No single occupation appeals strongly to me.	T	F
13.	I am uncertain about which occupation I would enjoy.	T	F
14.	I would like to increase the number of occupations I could consider.	T	F
15.	My estimates of my abilities and talents vary a lot from year to year.	T	F
16.	I am not sure of myself in many areas of life.	T	F
17.	I have known what occupation I want to follow for less than one year.	T	F
18.	I can't understand how some people can be so set about what they want to do.	T	F

Developed by John L. Holland, Denise C. Daiger, and Paul G. Power.

This form is available at the University of Maryland, Department of Counseling and Personnel Services Web site: http://www.education.umd.edu/EDCP/staff_details.cfm?bio_id=205250124040820082

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT OFFER GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS IN COLLABORATIVE PIANO AND/OR PIANO PEDAGOGY

INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT OFFER GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS IN COLLABORATIVE PIANO AND/OR PIANO PEDAGOGY

Arizona State University

Ball State University

Baylor University

Bob Jones University

Boston University

California State University Fullerton

Campbellsville University

Catholic University of America

Central Michigan University

City University of New York - Grad Center

Cleveland Institute of Music

East Carolina University

Eastern Michigan University

Eastman School of Music

Five Towns College

Florida State University

Georgia State University

Holy Names University

Houghton College

Illinois State University

James Madison University

Longy School of Music

Louisiana State University

Manhattan School of Music

Mannes College

Michigan State University

New England Conservatory

North Dakota State University

Northern Arizona University

Northwestern University

Ohio University

Oklahoma State University

Peabody Conservatory of Music

Penn State University-University Park

Reinhardt University

Rutgers University

University of New Jersey-New Brunswick

Samford University

San Diego State University

San Francisco Conservatory of Music

Shenandoah Conservatory

Southern Illinois University-Carbondale

Southern Methodist University

St Cloud State University

State University of New York-Stony Brook

Temple University

Tennessee State University

Texas Christian University

Texas Tech University

The Juilliard School

University of Akron

University of Alabama

University of Arizona

University of California-Irvine

University of California-LA

University of California-Santa Barbara

University of Cincinnati

University of Colorado-Boulder

University of Connecticut

University of Denver

University of Georgia

University of Hartford

University of Hawaii-Manoa

University of Houston

University of Idaho

University of Illinois

University of Kansas

University of Kentucky-Lexington

University of Louisiana-Lafayette

University of Maryland

University of Massachusetts Amherst

University of Memphis

University of Miami

University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

University of Missouri

University of Missouri-Kansas City

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

University of Nevada-Las Vegas

University of New Mexico

University of North Carolina-Greensboro

University of North Texas

University of Northern Colorado

University of Northern Iowa

University of Oklahoma

University of Oregon

University of South Carolina-Columbia

University of Southern California

University of Southern Mississippi

University of Tennessee-Knoxville

University of Texas-Austin

University of Texas-San Antonio

University of Utah

University of Washington

University of Wisconsin-Madison

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

University or Illinois

West Chester University

West Virginia University

Western Illinois University

Westminster Choir College

Yale University

APPENDIX E

TITLES OF DEGREE PROGRAMS IN THE AREAS OF COLLABORATIVE PIANO AND PIANO PEDAGOGY

TITLES OF DEGREE PROGRAMS IN THE AREAS OF COLLABORATIVE PIANO AND PIANO PEDAGOGY

Collaborative Piano Area

MA in Collaborative Piano/Instrumental or Vocal

MFA in Collaborative Piano

MM in Accompanying

MM in Accompanying and Chamber Music

MM in Chamber Music (Piano)

MM in Collaborative Keyboard

MM in Collaborative Performance

MM in Collaborative Piano

MM in Collaborative Piano Performance

MM in Collaborative Piano/Coaching

MM in Dance Accompanying

MM in Piano Accompanying

MM in Piano Accompanying and Chamber Music

MM in Piano Accompanying and Coaching

MM in Piano Ensemble Arts

MM in Piano performance and Collaborative Arts

MM in Vocal Accompanying

MM in Vocal Accompanying and Coaching

DM in Piano Performance and Collaborative Arts

DMA in Accompanying and Chamber Music

DMA in Chamber Music

DMA in Collaborative Piano Performance

DMA in Collaborative Piano/Coaching

DMA in Piano Accompanying and Chamber Music

DMA in Vocal Accompanying

DMA in Vocal Accompanying and Coaching

Piano Pedagogy Area

MA in Piano Pedagogy

MM in Keyboard Performance and Pedagogy

MM in Music Education and Piano Pedagogy

MM in Pedagogy and Performance

MM in Performance and Pedagogy

MM in Performance Pedagogy

MM in Piano Pedagogy

MM in Piano Pedagogy and Performance

MM in Piano Performance and Pedagogy

MM in Suzuki Piano Pedagogy

DM in Piano Performance and Pedagogy

DMA in Keyboard Performance and Pedagogy

DMA in Performance and Pedagogy

DMA in Piano Pedagogy

DMA Piano Pedagogy and Performance

APPENDIX F

PERMISSION TO USE *CAREER DECISION-MAKING PROFILE* (CDMP)

CDMP-39-per.doc

Itamar Gati, Ph.D.
School of Education, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, ISRAEL

e-mail: itamar.gati@huji.ac.il Fax: (+972)-2-5882084

Permission to use the Career Decision-Making Patterns (*CDMP*) questionnaire

If you agree to the following conditions, please sign the attached statement, indicate the number of copies you desire to reproduce for your research, and mail 2 copies to me at the above address. When I receive the signed copies I will send you a copy of the ***CDMP*** along with your copy of the signed permission slip that will allow you to reproduce the instrument. Please limit requests to no more than 1000 at a time. If you need more, please let me know. Permission expires one year after it is granted.

Note: The instrument must be reproduced in its entirety. Permission to reproduce separate items is not granted.

1. I agree to reproduce the instrument in its entirety with no changes in content of format.
2. I agree to include the copyright statement shown on the instrument. Please add that it has been reproduced with the permission of the author.
3. I will share the results of my research with Gati and provide specific data for secondary analysis with the understanding that appropriate credit will be cited.
4. This permission to reproduce is limited to this occasion; permission expires in one year from the date of the permission letter; permission is limited to 1000 copies; future reproduction requests must be specifically and separately requested.
5. Foreign translations must be back translated into English and approved by Gati.

I agree to the above conditions:

Name Hector Landa Tostado Date: 9/7/11 e-mail: hector@ou.edu

Signature [signature] Fax: N/A Tel: +1 (405) 905-9095

Address 500 West Boyd Street, Room 138

Norman, OK 73019 USA

Permission Approved,

[signature]
Itamar Gati, Ph.D.

Permission is not granted without the signature of Itamar Gati in this space.

CDMP\cdmp-per.doc

APPENDIX G

PERMISSION TO USE *MY VOCATIONAL SITUATION*: *VOCATIONAL IDENTITY SCALE* (VIS)

Denise Gottfredson [DGOTTFREDSON@crim.umd.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 10:50 AM
To: Landa, Hector H.
Attachments: MyVocSit.pdf (49 KB)

Hello Landa,

You may have permission to use My Vocational Situation for the stated purpose. A copy is attached. Please make sure the copyright notice is included on your printed copies.

Attention: My e-mail address is changing to gott@umd.edu
This new address is active and can be used instead of dgottfredson@crim.umd.edu

Denise C. Gottfredson
Professor
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
2220 LeFrak Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, MD. 20742
301, 405-4717 (phone)
301, 405-4733 (fax)

APPENDIX H

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

The UNIVERSITY of OKLAHOMA

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Approval of Initial Submission – Exempt from IRB Review – AP01

Date: October 22, 2012 **IRB#:** 1216

Principal Investigator: Hector Landa **Approval Date:** 10/17/2012

Exempt Category: 2 - Observation public behavior

Study Title: An Investigation of the Career Decision-Making Process of Graduate Piano Students

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed the above-referenced research study and determined that it meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review. To view the documents approved for this submission, open this study from the *My Studies* option, go to *Submission History*, go to *Completed Submissions* tab and then click the *Details* icon.

As principal investigator of this research study, you are responsible to:

- Conduct the research study in a manner consistent with the requirements of the IRB and federal regulations 45 CFR 46.
- Request approval from the IRB prior to implementing any/all modifications as changes could affect the exempt status determination.
- Maintain accurate and complete study records for evaluation by the HRPP Quality Improvement Program and, if applicable, inspection by regulatory agencies and/or the study sponsor.
- Notify the IRB at the completion of the project.

If you have questions about this notification or using iRIS, contact the IRB @ 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

Cordially,

Lara Mayeux

Lara Mayeux, Ph.D.

Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX I

RECRUITMENT EMAIL TO THE KEYBOARD AREA CHAIR

Recruitment Email to the Keyboard Area Chair

Dear [insert keyboard area chair's name],

My name is Hector Landa and I am a Ph.D. candidate in music education, emphasis in piano pedagogy, at the University of Oklahoma. For my dissertation, I am investigating the career decision-making process of graduate piano students. I am specifically looking to determine if discernible vocational profiles exist among students pursuing a graduate degree in (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. Qualifying potential participants in this study are all the students enrolled in a graduate degree piano program at an institution accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). I would like to request your generous assistance to collect data from students enrolled in your institution.

If you are willing to assist me, please respond to this email letting me know your decision. You would then promptly receive a second email to forward to all graduate piano students enrolled at your institution along with a recommendation to take part in this study. The email will contain a brief description of the study, a consent form, and a web link that will direct students to the Internet site SurveyMonkey.com. Their participation will take approximately 20 minutes and all responses from the graduate piano students will be anonymous and confidential. Since the study does not seek to identify individuals nor institutions, students will never be contacted directly.

Your kind assistance will most likely increase overall participation and allow more information to be collected. Likewise, if you believe another faculty member is in the position of replying to this request, please forward these materials to him or her. If you have any questions, please feel free to email me or call me. I am happy to discuss any aspect of the study with you.

Thank you for your help,

Hector Landa
Doctoral Candidate, School of Music
University of Oklahoma
hector@ou.edu
(405) 905-9095

This study was approved by the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus IRB on October 17, 2012 with the IRB #: 1216

APPENDIX J

FOLLOW-UP EMAIL TO THE KEYBOARD AREA CHAIR

Follow-Up Email to the Keyboard Area Chair

Dear [insert keyboard area chair's name],

I contacted you two weeks ago to request your assistance in collecting data for my dissertation research from students enrolled in your institution. This is a nation-wide study and the data generated by the students is extremely important. Attached you will find the University of Oklahoma IRB approval granted to conduct research with human subjects. Should you have any questions or comments, please feel free to email me or call me. I am happy to discuss any aspect of the study with you.

Would you please let me know if you are willing to help me? If that is the case, I will promptly send you one last email to be forwarded to graduate piano students and they would do the rest. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Hector Landa
Doctoral Candidate, School of Music
University of Oklahoma
hector@ou.edu
(405) 905-9095

This study was approved by the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus IRB on October 17, 2012 with the IRB #: 1216

APPENDIX K

RECRUITMENT EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS

Recruitment Email to Potential Participants

Dear graduate piano student,

I am a Ph.D. candidate in music education, emphasis in piano pedagogy, at the University of Oklahoma. For my dissertation, I am investigating the career decision-making process of graduate piano students. Specifically, I am looking to determine if discernible vocational profiles exist among students pursuing a graduate degree in (a) piano performance, (b) piano pedagogy, and (c) collaborative piano. You were selected as a possible participant because you are enrolled in a graduate piano program at an institution accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). I hope that you will kindly accept this invitation to complete three online questionnaires, which altogether will take about 20 minutes. Your participation in this study is anonymous, voluntary and you can withdraw at any time. If you agree to participate, please click the link below and answer the questions in the website.

o I agree to participate: (https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/NW5FCNP)

o I decline

If you have any question, please feel free to contact me at hector@ou.edu.

Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

Hector Landa
Doctoral Candidate, School of Music
University of Oklahoma
hector@ou.edu
(405) 905-9095

This study was approved by the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus IRB on October 17, 2012 with the IRB #: 1216