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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate how drama programs at state colleges and universities in the United States are financed. A secondary purpose of the study was to discover the extensiveness of these drama programs. Answers from a survey-questionnaire serve as the basis for the information and conclusions. In an attempt to limit the scope of the study, only the state supported schools were chosen.

One reason for conducting this study is the writer's interest in theatre business management. She has served as drama business manager at MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Illinois, and at South Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota, for a total of four years. Through this experience, the importance of fund management for drama programs has become apparent. In both colleges there has been an attempt to augment funds through re-allocation in order to meet necessary expenses.

A second reason for undertaking this study is the paucity of available information about business management. Through research in the literature of dramatic production, little information concerning theatre business management has been found. John E. Dietrich, Director of Theatre at Ohio State University has stated, "Much of the writing in the areas of theatre organization is either inadequate or badly dated."1

A third reason for this study is that the problem of financing

---

seems to be important as evidenced by the following comment, representative of statements made in texts discussing theatre organization: "One of the first considerations in planning a program for the season is the budget. Careful attention must be given to the cost of overhead expenses, royalties, scenery, costumes, properties, and equipment."²

A fourth reason for this study is the response and apparent interest received from personnel at state colleges and universities. Through a preliminary survey of 349 institutions, 269 answered and 211 were willing to give information on their drama programs. The 58 schools unwilling to give information included 53 which did not have drama programs. And of the 53 not having drama programs 19 wanted copies of the results of the study. Only three institutions willing to give information did not want copies.

The following comment, similar to others received, suggests interest in this study: From Dr. Curtis L. Pope, East Texas State College, Commerce, Texas: "Please let me have the results. I am very much interested in your study."

A fifth reason for this study is its possible use by the speech departments at South Dakota State College and other colleges and universities. For example, personnel in the speech and/or drama department of an institution will be able to compare their budget with those in other institutions having a similar drama program.

Therefore, this study seems justified for the following five reasons: (1) the writer's interest, (2) the paucity of available information in theatre business management, (3) the importance of financing, (4) the response from personnel contacted, and (5) the possible use of the results.

The first step in conducting this study was to send out a preliminary letter to discover if college personnel would be willing to give the information needed. Their responses were affirmative. A questionnaire was then designed, utilizing advice and suggestions from the South Dakota State College speech department and personnel from drama departments at other colleges. Copies of this questionnaire were then sent to those institutions which had indicated their willingness to answer questions regarding the financing of their drama programs. Answers from the questionnaire were then tabulated to obtain information and to arrive at conclusions.

It is hoped that this study will be of interest and help to persons concerned with the financing of drama programs at state colleges and universities. For example, because the data are arranged in relation to college enrollment and geographical location, personnel of a given institution should be able to compare the financing of their drama program with that of an institution of like enrollment within the same or a different geographical area.
CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

This chapter will discuss the procedures and the materials used in conducting the study on the financing of drama programs. The process consisted of three parts: (1) the preliminary survey, (2) the questionnaire, and (3) the tabulations.

Preliminary Survey

In order to discover whether information regarding the financing of college and university drama programs would be available, a letter with return postcard was sent to 319 state colleges and universities in the United States. The list of state schools was compiled from the 1951 edition of Webster's New World Dictionary, supplemented by The 1956 College Bluebook. To increase the percentage of returns each institution was sent two letters: one was addressed to the general business manager, the other was addressed to the head of the speech department. Copies of the preliminary letter can be found on pages 142 and 143 and of the return postcard on page 144.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed to include questions in the areas of (1) general data about the institution, (2) budgeting of drama program, and (3) extensiveness of drama program. Copies of the questionnaire, accompanied by a letter, were then sent to members of the South Dakota State College speech department and to speech departments at twenty other
colleges. They were asked to evaluate the questionnaire with regards to three criteria: (1) clarity of questions, (2) ease of answering, and (3) suitability of the questionnaire for both large and small institutions.

A list of the personnel who were asked to evaluate the questionnaire is found on page 46, and a copy of the accompanying letter is on page 47.

The returns from the evaluators, suggested the addition of question III-1-4 to the original questionnaire. The final questionnaire was then mimeographed and sent to the 211 state colleges and universities which had indicated their willingness, through the preliminary survey, to answer questions about the financing of their drama programs. Pages 49 and 50 contain copies of the final questionnaire and page 51 shows a copy of the letter which accompanied the questionnaire.

After approximately two weeks, those institutions which had not returned the questionnaire were sent a follow-up letter, a copy of which may be found on page 52.

Of the 211 institutions which were sent questionnaires, 162 institutions completed and returned their questionnaires, giving a 76.6 percentage of returns. A list of these 162 institutions is located on pages 53 to 64, arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Tabulations

As the questionnaires were returned, each was coded and the tabulating of answers was begun. Two methods were used to facilitate comparison. First, the material was arranged into two major divisions: (1) enrollment of institutions and (2) geographical location of institutions.
The enrollment division was subdivided into the following categories:

(a) under 1,000, (b) 1,000 to 4,999, (c) 5,000 to 10,000, and (d) over 10,000. This subdivision seemed logical because of the number of institutions falling into each category. For the same reason, the geographical location division was subdivided into (a) East, (b) South, (c) Central, and (d) West. The number of institutions in each category is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Division</th>
<th>Geographical Location Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000 ..........36 institutions</td>
<td>East ........27 institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999 .......89 institutions</td>
<td>South .......53 institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000 ......25 institutions</td>
<td>Central .......52 institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000 ..........12 institutions</td>
<td>West ........30 institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, the tables (exclusive of those dealing with percentages) give the smallest, largest, mean, and median numbers.

In a few instances two questionnaires from the same institutions were received. If the answers were not in agreement, the average of the two was used in the tabulations.

In most cases, the percentage of institutions which answered each question was high (over 93%). The percentage of institutions which answered each question is found in the appendices on page 66. In cases where there was a low percentage of answers, mention of this is made in the text.
CHAPTER III
FINANCING DRAMA PROGRAMS

This chapter presents the results of the questionnaire in regard to the financing of the drama program. Items under II, "Budgeting of Drama Program," on the questionnaire will be discussed. Included are the following areas: income, production costs, admission charges, sufficiency of income, and need for expansion.

Income

Question II-A asked for the approximate total income per year for the drama program with a breakdown into four possibilities: (1) student fees, (2) gate receipts (hereinafter referred to as box office receipts), (3) state or school allotment, and (4) other sources. The mean total income for the schools surveyed was found to be $1,314. The smallest income listed was $100 and the largest was $60,000. The median was found to be $1,950. Table I shows the approximate total income per year, including arrangement of data into enrollment and geographical location divisions.

The breakdown of income sources into student fees, box office receipts, state or school allotment, and other sources is shown in Tables II to V. The percentages of institutions listing income under the various sources are as follows: 56.2% listed income under student fees, 18.4% listed income under box office receipts, 33.3% listed income under state or school allotment, and 14.2% listed income under other sources.

Table II shows that the smallest amount of student fee income
## Table I. Total Income Per Year for Drama Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No. a</th>
<th>Smallest Income</th>
<th>Largest Income</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $1,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$895</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $4,999</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to $10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>23,447</td>
<td>19,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52,206</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>6,896</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aIn this and the following tables, the numbers under the column headed by "No. " indicate the number of institutions in each category which answered the particular question.

Listed was $50 and the largest was $6,500. The mean was $1,606 and the median was $1,050. Table II also shows the income from student fees arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Table III shows that the smallest amount of box office income listed was $10 and the largest was $16,286. The mean was $3,182 and the median was $800. Table III also shows the income from box office receipts arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Table IV shows that the smallest amount of state or school allotment income was $20 and the largest was $35,000. The mean was $1,846 and the median was $825. Table IV also shows the income from state or school allotment arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Table V shows that the smallest amount of other source income
listed was $6 and the largest was $3,000. The mean was $619 and the median was $300. Table V also shows the income from other sources arranged according to enrollment and geographical location. Those institutions which listed other sources included income primarily from rentals, program advertising, and concession sales.

**TABLE II. INCOME FROM STUDENT FEES PER YEAR FOR DRAMA PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Amount</th>
<th>Largest Amount</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$636</td>
<td>$562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>12,450</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>1,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Production Costs**

Question II-B asked for the approximate cost per production.

Table VI shows that the smallest amount listed was $65 and the largest was $3,000. The mean production cost for the schools surveyed was found to be $517 and the median was $400. Table VI also shows the production costs arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.
### TABLE III. INCOME FROM BOX OFFICE RECEIPTS PER YEAR FOR DRAMA PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Amount</th>
<th>Largest Amount</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,621</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>2,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>46,286</td>
<td>15,989</td>
<td>10,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46,286</td>
<td>4,068</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46,286</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV. INCOME FROM STATE OR SCHOOL ALLOTMENT PER YEAR FOR DRAMA PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Amount</th>
<th>Largest Amount</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>11,672</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table V. Income from Other Sources Per Year for Drama Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Amount</th>
<th>Largest Amount</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$203</td>
<td>$233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table VI. Cost Per Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Cost</th>
<th>Largest Cost</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$251</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,62</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Admission Charges

Question II-C asked if admission to plays was charged. The prices for adults, college students, high school students, and children were also asked. It was found that approximately 90% of the colleges charged admission with prices ranging from 50 cents to $1.50. The most recurring adult price listed was $1.00 which was charged by 43% of the schools. Of the institutions charging admission, fewer than 10% made no charge for college students. In other words, the majority of schools had an admission charge for college students whether it was the same as the adult price, a reduced price, or an activity fee. Because of the complexity of the answers received regarding the amount of admission charged, the writer feels that the preceding data includes the significant findings with the exception of mentioning that the majority of the institutions had a reduced admission price for high school and/or children and at several schools adults could get a reduction by buying season tickets.

Sufficiency of Income

Question II-D asked whether the income for the present drama program seemed to be (1) more than sufficient, (2) sufficient, or (3) insufficient. If the income seemed to be more than sufficient, the question asked for the approximate amount of surplus per year. Similarly,

---

3The percentage of schools not charging admission was 11.4%.
4The percentage of schools not charging admission to college students was 9.7%.
if the income seemed to be insufficient, the question asked for the approximate additional amount needed per year.

Table VII shows that 51.9% of the institutions felt that their income was sufficient for their present drama program, 42.4% felt their income was insufficient, and 5.7% felt their income was more than sufficient. Table VII also shows the percentage of institutions falling into the three categories of income sufficiency arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

<p>| TABLE VII. PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS Categorized ACCORDING TO INCOME SUFFICIENCY |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>More than Sufficient</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since only eight schools felt their income to be more than sufficient, it seems that the use of means and medians would have little meaning. It might be interesting to note that none of the schools having an enrollment of under 1,000 felt their income to be more than sufficient. Also, none of the Eastern institutions felt their income to be more than sufficient.
Fifty-six of the schools surveyed indicated the approximate additional amount needed for their present drama programs. Table VIII shows that $100 was the smallest amount needed and $10,000 was the largest amount needed. The mean was found to be $1,170 and the median was $500. Table VIII also shows the approximate additional amount needed per year for present drama programs arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

**TABLE VIII. ADDITIONAL AMOUNT NEEDED PER YEAR FOR PRESENT DRAMA PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Amount</th>
<th>Largest Amount</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$661</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need for Expansion

The first part of question II-E asked "Do you feel that your present drama program should be expanded? If yes, explain in what way(s); such as, more plays, community service, play tours, production of original plays, theatre-in-the-round, etc." The second part of the question asked these schools which felt they needed to expand to state the percentage of increase necessary per year for an expansion program.
Table IX shows that 76.8% of the institutions felt their present program should be expanded. Table IX also shows the percentage of schools desiring to expand their drama programs arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

**TABLE IX. PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS DESIRING TO EXPAND PRESENT DRAMA PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the schools which felt their present drama program should be expanded, a little more than 40% wished to include more plays and play tours in their program.5 The least checked item under method of expansion was community service. Of the written-in comments, better equipment, facilities, and increased staff headed the list. Next came experimental and children's theatre, then student-directed one acts, and finally summer theatre.

The second part of the question, asking for the percentage of

---

5"more plays" was listed by 42.3% of the institutions and "play tours" was listed by 40.8% of the institutions.
increase in income necessary for expansion, was answered by 52.3% of the institutions which returned questionnaires. It was found that several schools needed no increase in income to expand. Therefore, as is shown in Table X, the smallest percentage of increase listed was 0% and the largest percentage of increase listed was 400%. The mean was found to be 50.8% and the median was 25%. Table X also shows the percentage of increase necessary for expansion arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

**TABLE X. PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE IN INCOME NECESSARY TO EXPAND PRESENT DRAMA PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest %</th>
<th>Largest %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point the writer feels she should mention that questions II-B and II-E, regarding the sufficiency of income and need for expansion, brought written comments from several institutions. In some cases, factors other than lack of income limited expansion possibilities; for example,
"Income is not the problem—teaching load is." 6 "Space and staff-time are biggest limiting factors." 7 "Money is not enough, staff and facilities are prerequisites." 8

6 Russell J. Gradstaff, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
7 W. Blair Hart, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas.
8 Pauline Issacsoo, Wisconsin State College, Stevens Point, Wisconsin.
CHAPTER IV

EXTENSIVENESS OF DRAMA PROGRAM

This chapter presents the results of the questionnaire in regard to the extensiveness of the drama program. Items on the questionnaire under III, "Extensiveness of Drama Program," and IV, "Summer Drama Program," will be discussed. Included are the following areas: plays, auditorium capacity, audience attendance, drama majors, theatre staff, and summer drama program.

Plays

The first part of question III-A asked for the number of plays produced during the three school years of (1) 1955-56, (2) 1956-57, and (3) 1957-58. In answering this question some institutions listed various types of plays: major plays, drama productions, experimental productions, one-act plays, musicals, etc. However, since only a few institutions categorized their productions, only the number of major productions was used in the tabulations. The questionnaire was obviously weak in this part since there was no stipulation as to whether long and/or short plays were to be counted. However, for the purpose of tabulations, it was assumed that the institutions not classifying their productions were enumerating major productions.

Table XI shows that the smallest number of plays per year listed for 1955-56 was 1 and the largest number was 25. The mean number was 3.96 and the median was 3. Table XI also shows the number of plays for 1955-56 arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.
### TABLE XI. NUMBER OF MAJOR PLAYS FOR 1955-56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Number</th>
<th>Largest Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XII shows that the smallest number of plays per year listed for 1956-57 was 1 and the largest number was 25. The mean number was 4.2 and the median was 4. Table XII also shows the number of plays for 1956-57 arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Table XIII shows that the smallest number of plays per year listed for 1957-58 was 1 and the largest was 25. The mean number was 4.2 and the median was 3. Table XIII also shows the number of plays for 1957-58 arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

The second part of question III-A asked for the approximate number of students participating in productions, "such as, in acting, directing technical work, etc., excluding front of house duties (ushers, box office, etc.)." The number of participants listed was to include those participating during the school year 1957-58. Table XIV shows that the smallest number of student participants listed was 11 and the largest number was 1,000. The mean number listed was 119.8 and the median was 85. Table
XIV also shows the approximate number of participants for 1957-58 arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

### TABLE XII. NUMBER OF MAJOR PLAYS FOR 1956-57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Number</th>
<th>Largest Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| East                  | 26  | 1               | 7              | 2.7  | 2.0    |
| South                 | 50  | 1               | 15             | 4.0  | 3.0    |
| Central               | 52  | 1               | 15             | 4.5  | 4.0    |
| West                  | 30  | 2               | 25             | 5.3  | 4.0    |

| All                   | 158 | 1               | 25             | 4.2  | 4.0    |

### TABLE XIII. NUMBER OF MAJOR PLAYS FOR 1957-58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Number</th>
<th>Largest Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| East                  | 27  | 1               | 7              | 2.2  | 2.0    |
| South                 | 52  | 1               | 14             | 3.9  | 3.0    |
| Central               | 52  | 1               | 18             | 4.4  | 4.0    |
| West                  | 30  | 2               | 25             | 5.6  | 4.0    |

| All                   | 161 | 1               | 25             | 4.2  | 3.0    |
TABLE XIV. NUMBER OF STUDENT PARTICIPANTS IN DRAMA PROGRAM FOR 1957-58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Number</th>
<th>Largest Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>136.6</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>335.4</td>
<td>250.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>110.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>119.8</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question III-B asked for the average number of showings per play. Table XV shows that the smallest average number of showings per play listed was 1 and the largest average number was 25. The mean number was 3.2 and the median was 3. Table XV also shows the average number of showings per play arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Auditorium Capacity

Question III-C asked for the seating capacity of the auditorium. Table XVI shows that the smallest auditorium seating capacity listed was 75 and the largest was 6,300. The mean was 906.4 and the median was 750. Table XVI also shows the auditorium seating capacity arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Audience Attendance

Question III-D asked for the approximate audience attendance.
### Table XV. Number of Showings Per Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Number</th>
<th>Largest Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table XVI. Auditorium Seating Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Capacity</th>
<th>Largest Capacity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>757.9</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>869.1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>721.3</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>2,106.6</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>803.3</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>907.2</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>1,082.2</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>664.0</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>906.4</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
per performance. Table XVII shows that the smallest audience attendance per performance listed was 60 and the largest audience attendance was 1,400. The mean audience attendance per performance was 411.9 and the median was 350. Table XVII also shows the approximate audience attendance per performance arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Number</th>
<th>Largest Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>343.6</td>
<td>287.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>411.9</td>
<td>400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>387.3</td>
<td>336.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>751.1</td>
<td>800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>443.7</td>
<td>400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>381.8</td>
<td>332.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>443.2</td>
<td>350.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>378.1</td>
<td>387.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>411.9</td>
<td>350.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By using the information obtained from the answers to questions III-C and III-D the proportion of audience attendance to auditorium seating capacity was found to be 45.3%. Table XVIII shows the proportion of audience attendance to auditorium seating capacity arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

**Drama Majors**

Question III-E asked if there was a drama or drama-emphasis major
TABLE XVIII. PROPORTION OF AUDIENCE ATTENDANCE TO AUDITORIUM SEATING CAPACITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

offered on the undergraduate and/or graduate level. Table XIX shows that 61% of the institutions answering this question offered a drama or drama-emphasis major at the undergraduate level and 31.7% offered a drama or drama-emphasis major at the graduate level. Table XIX also shows the percentage of institutions offering drama or drama-emphasis majors at the undergraduate and graduate levels arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Theatre Staff

The first part of question III-F asked for the number of persons working in the drama program, classified into the following three categories: (1) regular staff, (2) graduate assistants, and (3) other help. Table XX shows that the smallest number of regular staff listed was 1/2 and the largest number was 60. The mean number of staff was 2.9 and the median was 2. Table XX also shows the number of regular staff working in the drama program arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.
TABLE IX. PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS OFFERING DRAMA OR DRAMA-EMPHASIS MAJORS AT UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE X. NUMBER OF REGULAR STAFF IN DRAMA PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Number</th>
<th>Largest Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the institutions which returned questionnaires, 18.5% listed the number of graduate assistants. The smallest number listed was 1 and the largest number was 32. The mean number was 4.6 and the median number was 2.5. Because the percentage of institutions listing graduate assistants was so low, a breakdown into enrollment and geographical location divisions will not be given. However, it may be interesting to note that the highest average numbers of graduate assistants were found in the "South" and "West" categories under geographical location and in the "Over 10,000" category under enrollment.  

Of the institutions which returned questionnaires, 41.3% listed other help. The description of other help mainly fell into three groups: (1) student assistants, (2) hired outside help, and (3) faculty assistance from other departments. From the 41.3% which listed other help, 80.5% listed student assistants, 13.4% listed hired help, and 5.9% listed other faculty assistants. Because of the variety of answers received regarding the description of persons working in the drama program, the writer feels that the preceding data includes the significant findings.

The second part of question III-7 asked if the drama program had a business manager, and for a description of the position; "such as, paid, unpaid; full time, part time; faculty member, student, etc." It became obvious in tabulating that this question was too general since institutions were not requested to describe fully and accurately the position of business manager. However, the following results seemed
apparent. Of the institutions returning questionnaires, 52.6% indicated they had a business manager. The most consistent description of these business managers was the status of the person holding the position; such as, faculty member, student, etc. Table XXI shows the percentage of drama business managers categorized according to status.

**TABLE XXI. PERCENTAGE OF DRAMA BUSINESS MANAGERS CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Help</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office Personnel</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages in this table do not total 100% because one institution which indicated having a business manager did not describe the position.*

**Summer Drama Program**

Question IV-A asked if there was a summer drama program. If there was a summer program, the institutions were asked to state the number of plays per summer session and how the program was financed.

Of the institutions returning questionnaires, 48.1% indicated that they had a summer drama program. Table XXII shows the percentages of institutions having summer drama programs arranged according to enrollment and geographical location.

Table XXIII shows that the smallest number of plays during the summer session listed was 1 and the largest number was 12. The mean number was 2.8 and the median was 1.5. Table XXIII also shows the number of plays during the summer session arranged according to enrollment and
TABLE XXII. PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS HAVING SUMMER DRAMA PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XXIII. NUMBER OF PLAYS DURING SUMMER SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Smallest Number</th>
<th>Largest Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 4,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three most common methods of financing the summer drama program were one or a combination of the following: (1) box office receipts, which was listed by 64.2% of the institutions having summer drama programs; (2) summer session allotment, which was listed by 28.5% of the institutions;
and (3) student fees, which was listed by 20.3% of the institutions.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate how drama programs at state colleges and universities in the United States are financed and to discover the extensiveness of these programs. The procedure of this study has been presented in Chapter II. Chapters III and IV have presented the results of the questionnaire in regard to the financing and extensiveness of drama programs. This final chapter will present these results in summary. The median was chosen for summarizing results since there were several extreme cases which may make the mean a less effective measure of central tendency than the median.

Financing Drama Programs

Income

1. The lowest median total income for drama programs was in the institutions with an enrollment of under 1,000.

2. The lowest median total income for drama programs was in the Southern institutions.

3. The highest median total income for drama programs was in the institutions with an enrollment of over 10,000.

4. The highest median total income for drama programs was found in the Western institutions.

5. The greatest source of income for drama programs was student fees (approximately 50%).
**Production Costs**

1. The lowest median production cost was in the institutions with an enrollment of under 1,000.
2. The lowest median production cost was in the Southern institutions.
3. The highest median production cost was in the institutions with an enrollment of over 10,000.
4. The highest median production cost was in the Western institutions.

**Admission Charges**

1. The majority of institutions (approximately 90%) charged admission to plays.
2. The majority of institutions (approximately 90%) charged admission for college students, using an adult price, a reduced price, or an activity fee.
3. Admission charges, other than activity fees, ranged from 50 cents to $1.50.
4. The usual adult price charged was $1.00.

**Sufficiency of Income**

1. Approximately 52% of the institutions indicated the income for their present drama program was sufficient.
2. Approximately 42% of the institutions indicated the income for their present drama program was insufficient.
3. Approximately 6% of the institutions indicated the income for their present drama program was more than sufficient.
Need for Expansion

1. Approximately 77% of the institutions indicated their present drama program should be expanded.
   a. The largest median percentage of increased income necessary to expand the drama program was in the institutions with an enrollment of under 1,000.
   b. The largest median percentage of increased income necessary to expand the drama program was in the Eastern and Southern institutions.
   c. The smallest median percentage of increased income necessary to expand the drama program was in the institutions with an enrollment of 5,000 to 10,000.
   d. The smallest median percentage of increased income necessary to expand the present drama program was in the Central and Western institutions.

2. The major method of expansion desired was the inclusion of more plays and play tours.

3. In some cases, factors other than lack of income (such as, teaching load, facilities, size of staff) limited expansion possibilities.

Extensiveness of Drama Program

Plays

1. The lowest median number of plays for 1955-56, 1956-57 and
1957-58 was in the institutions with an enrollment of under 1,000.9

2. The lowest median number of plays for 1955-56, 1956-57, and 1957-58 was in the Eastern institutions.

3. The highest median number of plays for 1955-56, 1956-57, and 1957-58 was in the institutions with an enrollment of over 10,000.

4. The highest median number of plays for 1955-56 was in the Western institutions.

5. The highest median number of plays for 1956-57 and 1957-58 was in the Central and Western institutions.

Participants

1. The smallest median number of student participants in drama programs was in the institutions with an enrollment of under 1,000.

2. The smallest median number of student participants in drama programs was in the Southern institutions.

3. The largest median number of student participants in drama programs was in the institutions with an enrollment of over 10,000.

4. The largest median number of student participants in drama programs was in the Western institutions.

Audience Attendance

1. The smallest median audience attendance per performance was in the institutions having an enrollment of under 1,000.

2. The smallest median audience attendance per performance was in the

9 A low median number of plays for 1956-57 was also found in the institutions with an enrollment of 1,000 to 1,999.
Southern institutions.

3. The largest median audience attendance per performance was in the
   institutions with an enrollment of over 10,000.

4. The largest median audience attendance per performance was in the
   Eastern institutions.

5. The proportion of audience attendance to seating capacity was found
to be approximately 50%.

Drama Majors

1. The smallest percentage of institutions offering a drama major was
   those with an enrollment of under 1,000.

2. The smallest percentage of institutions offering a drama major was
   in the Eastern institutions.

3. The largest percentage of institutions offering a drama major was
   those with an enrollment of 5,000 to 10,000 and over 10,000.

4. The largest percentage of institutions offering a drama major was
   in the Central and Western institutions.

Theatre Staff

1. The smallest median number of regular staff in drama programs was
   in the institutions with an enrollment of under 1,000.

2. The smallest median number of regular staff in drama programs was
   in the Eastern and Southern institutions.

3. The largest median number of regular staff in drama programs was
   in the institutions with an enrollment of over 10,000.

4. The largest median number of regular staff in drama programs was in
the Western institutions.

5. Approximately 20% of the institutions had graduate assistants which worked in the drama program.

6. Approximately 50% of the institutions had a business manager for their drama program.

**Summer Drama Program**

1. Approximately 50% of the institutions had a summer drama program.
   a. The lowest percentage of institutions having a summer drama program was those with an enrollment of under 1,000.
   b. The lowest percentage of institutions having a summer drama program was in the Eastern institutions.
   c. The highest percentage of institutions having a summer drama program was those with an enrollment of over 10,000.
   d. The highest percentage of institutions having a summer drama program was in the Western institutions.

2. The greatest source of income for financing summer drama programs was box office receipts (approximately 50%).

**General Indications**

From the preceding list of results dealing with financing and extensiveness of drama programs, the following indications seem apparent.

1. The amount of income, cost of production, and sufficiency of income increase as enrollment increases.

2. The feeling that the drama program needs to be expanded decreases as enrollment increases.
3. The number of productions, number of participants, audience attendance, size of staff, and presence of summer drama program increase as enrollment increases.

4. There is a definite indication that the Western institutions surpass the other institutions in amount of income, cost of production, and satisfaction with present drama programs.

5. The Western institutions seem to surpass the other institutions in number of student participants, offering drama major, size of drama staff, and presence of summer drama program.

6. The institutions in the East and South have the lowest trends in regard to financing and extensiveness of drama programs.

Because enrollment differences within each geographical location might tend to affect the data, the average (mean) enrollment for each geographical division is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>3,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>4,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>3,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since it appeared in the results that enrollment affected the financing and extensiveness of drama programs, it is possible that the small average enrollment of the Eastern institutions may be one reason for the low trends which were evident.

Application of Results

Table XXIV on page 38 contains the medians and percentages found
for each question. The information is arranged under three main headings: (1) all institutions, (2) enrollment, and (3) geographical location. The writer suggests that three medians or percentages for each question be used by a person comparing his drama program with the data in the table: (1) the median or percentage for all institutions, (2) the median or percentage corresponding to the enrollment of his institution, and (3) the median or percentage corresponding to the geographical location of his institution.

Implications for Further Research

The first suggestion for further research is that a similar study be done in the areas of forensics, interpretation, radio, television, or other speech activities.

A second suggestion is the repetition of this study at a later date, thus making it possible to study trends.

A third suggestion is that a similar study be made surveying private colleges.

A fourth suggestion is that a more comprehensive study be made limited to a specific geographical or enrollment area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1,000</td>
<td>1,000-4,999</td>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box office receipts</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or school allotment</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per production</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional amount needed for present program</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of plays</td>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of student participants</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showings per play</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium capacity</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience attendance</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>267.3</td>
<td>400.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of regular staff</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of plays per summer</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than sufficient</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiring to expand</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase needed to expand program</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of attendance to capacity</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering drama major</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having summer program</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median percentages*
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

MATERIALS USED FOR PRELIMINARY SURVEY

A. Preliminary letter sent to Director of Theatre
B. Preliminary letter sent to Business Office
C. Enclosed return postcard
November 21, 1957

Dear Sir:

For my Master's thesis at South Dakota State College, I am undertaking a study of the financing of theatre programs at state colleges and universities. For this study, I need information pertaining to the number of plays per year, estimated year's expenditures, average attendance per play, money allotted to the theatre program, source of money, etc. If a questionnaire were sent, would you be willing to furnish such information?

I would sincerely appreciate your filling out and returning the enclosed postcard at your earliest convenience.

I shall be happy to send you a copy of the results of this study.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Burris Edwards

Burris Edwards
Graduate Assistant
Department
South Dakota State College
Brookings, South Dakota
November 21, 1957

Dear Sir:

For my Master's thesis at South Dakota State College I am undertaking a study of the financing of theatre programs at state colleges and universities. For this study I need information pertaining to the amount of money allotted to the theatre program, the source of this money, college enrollment, etc. If such a questionnaire were sent, would you be willing to furnish this information?

I would sincerely appreciate your filling out and returning the enclosed postcard at your earliest convenience.

I shall be happy to send you a copy of the results of this study.

Sincerely yours,

/\ Burris Edwards

Burris Edwards
Graduate Assistant
Speech Department
South Dakota State College
Brookings, South Dakota
Please check:

We do______ have a theatre program.

don't______

I would_____ be able to furnish you with information
would not______
on the financing of our theatre program for your Master's
thesis.

I would______ like to have a copy of the results of
would not______
this study.

Name________________________
Position_____________________
Name of Institution____________________
Address______________________
APPENDIX II

MATERIALS USED FOR EVALUATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

A. List of evaluators
B. Letter accompanying questionnaire to be evaluated
APPENDIX II-A

LIST OF EVALUATORS

Professor Donald B. Polatin
Illinois College
Jacksonville, Illinois

Professor J. Daniel Krocher
Franklin College
Franklin, Indiana

Professor Donald A. Watters
Hanover College
Hanover, Indiana

Professor Richard E. Clarkstone
Morningside College
Sioux City, Iowa

Professor Richard Siegfried
Buena Vista College
Storm Lake, Iowa

Professor William S. Vanderpool, Jr.
Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa

Professor Virginia H. Miller
Wellesley College
Wellesley, Massachusetts

Professor Robert W. Corrigan
Carleton College
Northfield, Minnesota

Professor Patricia A. McIlrath
University of Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri

Professor Richard J. deLautenfels
Yankton College
Yankton, South Dakota

Dr. Ray E. Holcombe
MacMurray College
Jacksonville, Illinois

Professor C. L. Nystrom
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

Dr. George F. Rice
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Professor Howard A. Hill
Evansville College
Evansville, Indiana

Professor Vera T. Hahn
Valparaiso University
Valparaiso, Indiana

Professor Elizaith White
Simpson College
Indianola, Iowa

Professor Emily Ann Smith
Berea College
Berea, Kentucky

Professor Helen F. Wheeler
Vassar College
Poughkeepsie, New York

Professor Martin Bryan
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

Professor Joseph Wright
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee
APPENDIX II-B

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts
College Station—Brookings, South Dakota

Division of Science and Applied Arts
Speech Department

Professor Philip B. Clarkston
Speech Department
Morningside College
Sioux City, Iowa

Dear Professor Clarkston:

As a graduate student at South Dakota State College, I am working on my thesis which concerns the financial organization of drama programs at state colleges and universities. Before sending out a questionnaire to state colleges and universities, I wish to have the questionnaire evaluated by about twenty other colleges. Enclosed is a dittoed copy of the questionnaire which will eventually be mimeographed. I would like you to read the questionnaire and offer suggestions for its improvement, keeping in mind three criteria: (1) clarity of questions, (2) ease of answering, and (3) suitability of questionnaire for both large and small institutions.

A prompt reply would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Burris Edwards

(Miss) Burris Edwards
Graduate Assistant
Speech Department
South Dakota State College
Brookings, South Dakota

April 8, 1958
APPENDIX III

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Final questionnaire
B. Letter accompanying questionnaire
C. Follow-up letter
D. Institutions which returned questionnaire
   (a) arranged by enrollment
   (b) arranged by geographical location
APPENDIX III-A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE FINANCIAL ORGANIZATION OF DRAMA PROGRAMS AT STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

I. GENERAL DATA

A. Your name: __________________________________________________________

B. Name of institution: ________________________________________________

C. Address: __________________________________________________________

D. Approximate enrollment: ________

In answering items under II and III below, exclude factors of a summer drama program.

II. BUDGETING OF DRAMA PROGRAM

A. Approximate income sources per year:

1. Student fees $__________

2. Gate receipts $__________

3. State or school allotment $__________

4. Other (state source below) $__________

5. Approximate total income per year $__________

B. Approximate cost per production $__________

C. Do you charge admission to your plays? Yes _____ No _____

   If answer is yes, list prices below:

   1. Adults $__________

   2. College Students $__________

      a. No charge

      b. Activity ticket $__________ per student per year

      c. Other (Explain below) $__________

   3. High School Students $__________

   4. Children $__________

D. Do you feel that the income for your present drama program is more than sufficient, sufficient, insufficient?

   ___ more than sufficient

   ___ sufficient

   ___ insufficient

1. If more than sufficient, state approximate amount of surplus per year: $__________
2. If insufficient, state approximate additional amount needed for present program per year: $________

5. Do you feel that your present drama program should be expanded? Yes No
   1. If yes, explain in what way(s); such as more plays, community service, play tours, production of original plays, theatre-in-the-round, etc.

2. If yes, your present approximate total income per year would need to be increased by ______% to begin your expansion program.

III. EXTENSIVENESS OF DRAMA PROGRAM

A. Number of plays in
   1. 1957-58 _______
   2. 1956-57 _______
   3. 1955-56 _______

B. Approx. no. of students participating in productions this year; such as, in acting, directing, technical work, etc., excluding front of house duties (ushers, box office, etc.): ______

C. Average number of showings per play: _______

D. Seating capacity of auditorium: _______

E. Average audience attendance per performance: _______

F. Do you offer drama or drama-emphasis majors on the
   1. undergraduate level: Yes No
   2. graduate level: Yes No

F. Theatre Staff:
   1. Number working in drama program:
      a. Regular staff _______
      b. Graduate assistants _______
      c. Other (Explain below) _______

2. Do you have a business manager for your drama program? Yes No
   If yes, please describe position; such as, paid, unpaid; full time, part time; faculty member, student, etc.

IV. SUMMER DRAMA PROGRAM

A. Do you have a summer drama program? Yes No
   1. If yes, number of plays per summer session: _______
   2. If yes, how is your summer drama program financed?
APPENDIX III-B

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts
College Station--Brookings, South Dakota

Division of Science and Applied Arts
Speech Department

April 30, 1958

Dear Sir:

Thank you for indicating your willingness to assist me in my thesis by filling out a questionnaire concerning the financial organisation of drama programs at state colleges and universities. Enclosed you will find the questionnaire which I would appreciate your filling out and returning to me at your earliest convenience.

This questionnaire is being sent mainly to the Speech Departments at state colleges and universities, and in a few cases to the Business Offices. Since the validity of this study rests not only on the number of schools which answer, but also on the completeness with which the questionnaire is answered, you may find it necessary to refer to someone outside of your department for information.

Before sending you the questionnaire, it was evaluated by several colleges for (1) clarity of questions, (2) ease of answering, and (3) suitability for both large and small institutions. It is hoped that these criteria will prove helpful to you in answering the questionnaire.

Your help will be truly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Burris Edwards

(Miss) Burris Edwards
Graduate Assistant
Speech Department
South Dakota State College
Brookings, South Dakota
May 10, 1958

Dear Sir:

You were mailed a questionnaire concerning the financial organization of drama programs at state colleges and universities. Upon checking my records, I see the questionnaire has not yet been returned. Since the validity of the research is dependent upon the percentage of returns received, I am hoping you will complete and return the questionnaire to me soon. It will be appreciated, indeed.

If your questionnaire is now in the mail, please disregard this letter. Many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Burris Edwards

Burris Edwards
Graduate Assistant
Speech Department
South Dakota State College
Brockings, South Dakota
### APPENDIX III-D

INSTITUTIONS WHICH RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES

Arranged by Enrollment

### Under 1,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adams State College</th>
<th>Nebraska State Teachers College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamosa, Colorado</td>
<td>Chadron, Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama College</td>
<td>New Jersey State Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montevallo, Alabama</td>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn Agricultural and</td>
<td>New York State Teachers College, University of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical College</td>
<td>Fredonia, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorman, Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Peay State College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksville, Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California at Riverside,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grande, Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis Agricultural and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State College for Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milledgeville, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene Teachers College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene, New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort, Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmville, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland State Teachers College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nebras 

(Continued...)
State Teachers College
Valley City, North Dakota
State Teachers College
Edinboro, Pennsylvania
State Teachers College
Lock Haven, Pennsylvania
Tennessee, University of
Martin Branch, Martin, Tennessee
Utah, College of Southern
Cedar City, Utah
Valdosta State College
Valdosta, Georgia
Washington State Teachers College
Machias, Maine
Western State Teachers College
 Gunnison, Colorado

West Liberty State College
West Liberty, West Virginia

1,000 to 4,999

Arizona State College
Flagstaff, Arizona
Arkansas Agricultural and
Mechanical College
College, Arkansas
Arkansas State College
State College, Arkansas
Arkansas State Teachers College
Conway, Arkansas
California at Davis,
University of
Davis, California
Central Michigan College
Mount Pleasant, Michigan
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri
Central State College
Wilderforce, Ohio
Central Washington College
of Education
Ellensburg, Washington
Chico State College
Chico, California
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado
East Central State College
Ada, Oklahoma
Eastern Kentucky State College
Richmond, Kentucky
Eastern Michigan College
Ypsilanti, Michigan
Eastern Washington College
of Education
Cheney, Washington
East Texas State College
Commerce, Texas
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas
Idaho State College
Pocatello, Idaho
Idaho, University of
Moscow, Idaho
Illinois State Normal University
Normal, Illinois
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Ruston, Louisiana
Madison College  
Harrisonburg, Virginia

Maine, University of  
Orono, Maine

Mankato State College  
Mankato, Minnesota

Marshall College  
Huntington, West Virginia

Memphis State University  
Memphis, Tennessee

Minnesota, University of  
Duluth Branch, Duluth, Minnesota

Minot State Teachers College  
Minot, North Dakota

Mississippi Southern College  
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

Mississippi State College for Women  
Columbus, Mississippi

Montana State College  
Bozeman, Montana

Montana State University  
Missoula, Montana

Morehead State College  
Morehead, Kentucky

Nebraska State Teachers College  
Kearney, Nebraska

Nevada, University of  
Reno, Nevada

New Hampshire, University of  
Durham, New Hampshire

New Haven State Teachers College  
New Haven, Connecticut

New York College for Teachers,  
State University of  
Albany, New York

New York College for Teachers,  
State University of  
Buffalo, New York

New York State Teachers College,  
University of  
Brockport, New York

New York State Teachers College,  
University of  
New Paltz, New York

New York State Teachers College,  
University of  
Potsdam, New York

North Carolina, Agricultural and  
Technical College of  
Greensboro, North Carolina

North Carolina, Woman's College  
of the University of  
Greensboro, North Carolina

North Dakota Agricultural College  
Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota, University of  
Grand Forks, North Dakota

Northeastern Missouri State  
Teachers College  
Kirksville, Missouri

Northeastern State College  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma

Northeast Louisiana State College  
Monroe, Louisiana

Northern State Teachers College  
Aberdeen, South Dakota

Northwestern State College  
of Louisiana  
Natchitoches, Louisiana

Pennsylvania State University  
Center  
Ogontz Center, Abington  
Pennsylvania
Portland State College
Portland, Oregon

Radford College
Radford, Virginia

Sam Houston State Teachers College
Huntsville, Texas

Savannah State College
Savannah, Georgia

South Dakota State College
Brookings, South Dakota

South Dakota, State University of Vermillion, South Dakota

Southeast Missouri State College
Cape Girardeau, Missouri

Southeastern Louisiana College
Hammond, Louisiana

Southern State College
Magnolia, Arkansas

Southwest Missouri State College
Springfield, Missouri

State Teachers College
Montclair, New Jersey

State Teachers College
California, Pennsylvania

State Teachers College
East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania

State Teachers College
Indiana, Pennsylvania

State Teachers College
Kutztown, Pennsylvania

State Teachers College
Shippensburg, Pennsylvania

Stout State College
Menomonie, Wisconsin

Texas College of Arts and Industries
Kingsville, Texas

Texas Western College
El Paso, Texas

Towson State Teachers College
Baltimore, Maryland

Troy State College
Troy, Alabama

Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Vermont, University of
Burlington, Vermont

Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg, Virginia

Virginia, University of Charlottesville, Virginia

Wayne State Teachers College
Wayne, Nebraska

Western Carolina College
Cullowhee, North Carolina

Western Washington College of Education
Bellingham, Washington

West Texas State College
Canyon, Texas

Winthrop College
Rock Hill, South Carolina

Wisconsin State College
Eau Claire, Wisconsin

Wisconsin State College
La Crosse, Wisconsin

Wisconsin State College
Oshkosh, Wisconsin
Wisconsin State College
Platteville, Wisconsin

Wisconsin State College
River Falls, Wisconsin

Wisconsin State College
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

5,000 to 10,000

Alabama Polytechnic Institute
Auburn, Alabama

Arizona State College
Tempe, Arizona

Arkansas, University of
Fayetteville, Arkansas

Ball State Teachers College
Muncie, Indiana

Colorado, University of
Boulder, Colorado

Florida, University of
Gainesville, Florida

Fresno State College
Fresno, California

Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

Georgia, University of
Athens, Georgia

Iowa State College
Ames, Iowa

Kansas State College
Manhattan, Kansas

Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Maryland, University of
College Park, Maryland

Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

Missouri, University of
Columbia, Missouri

Nebraska, University of
Lincoln, Nebraska

North Carolina, University of
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Northern Illinois University
De Kalb, Illinois

North Texas State College
Denton, Texas

Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon

Oregon, University of
Eugene, Oregon

Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

State College of Washington
Pullman, Washington

Tennessee, University of
Knoxville, Tennessee

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
California at Los Angeles, University of
Los Angeles, California

Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Michigan, University of
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Minnesota, University of
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Northern Michigan College
Marquette, Michigan

Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Oklahoma, University of
Norman, Oklahoma

Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Texas, University of
Austin, Texas

Washington, University of
Seattle, Washington

Wisconsin, University of
Madison, Wisconsin

Arranged by Geographical Location

East

**Connecticut**
New Haven State Teachers College
New Haven

**Maine**
Maine, University of
Orono
Washington State Teachers College
Machias

**Massachusetts**
State Teachers College
Fitchburg
State Teachers College
North Adams
State Teachers College
Westfield

**New Hampshire**
Keene Teachers College
Keene
New Hampshire, University of
Durham
Plymouth Teachers College
Plymouth

**New Jersey**
State Teachers College
Jersey City
State Teachers College
Montclair

**New York**
New York College for Teachers,
State University of
Albany
New York College for Teachers, State University of Buffalo
New York State Teachers College, University of Brockport
New York State Teachers College, University of Fredonia
New York State Teachers College, University of New Paltz
New York State Teachers College, University of Potsdam

Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University University Park

Vermont
Vermont, University of Burlington

South
Alabama
Alabama College Montevallo
Alabama Polytechnic Institute Auburn
Troy State College Troy

Arkansas
Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College College Heights

Arkansas State College
Arkansas State Teachers College Conway
Arkansas, University of Fayetteville
Southern State College Magnolia

Florida
Florida, University of Gainesville
Georgia
Georgi Institute of Technology
Atlanta
Georgia State College for Women
Milledgeville
Georgia, University of
Athens
Savannah State College
Savannah
Valdosta State College
Valdosta

Kentucky
Eastern Kentucky State College
Richmond
Kentucky State College
Frankfort
Morehead State College
Morehead

Louisiana
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Baton Rouge
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge
Northeast Louisiana State College
Monroe
Northwestern State College
Natchitoches
Southeastern Louisiana College
Hammond

Maryland
Maryland State Teachers College
Salisbury

Maryland, University of
College Park
State Teachers College
Bowie
Towson State Teachers College
Baltimore

Mississippi
Alcorn Agricultural and
Mechanical College
Lorman
Mississippi Southern College
Hattiesburg
Mississippi State College for Women
Columbus

North Carolina
Fayetteville State Teachers College
Fayetteville
North Carolina, Agricultural
and Technical College of
Greensboro
North Carolina, University of
Chapel Hill
North Carolina, Woman's College
of the University of
Greensboro
Western Carolina College
Cullowhee

South Carolina
Winthrop College
Rock Hill

Tennessee
Austin Peay State College
Clarksville
Memphis State University
Memphis
Tennessee, University of
Knoxville
Tennessee, University of
Martin Branch, Martin

Tennessee
East Texas State College
Commerce
North Texas State College
Denton
Sam Houston State Teachers College
Huntsville
Texas College of Arts and Industries
Kingsville
Texas, University of
Austin
Texas Western College
El Paso

Central

Illinois
Illinois State Normal University
Normal
Illinois, University of
Chicago
Northern Illinois University
De Kalb
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale

Indiana
Ball State Teachers College
Muncie

West Texas State College
Canyon

Virginia
Longwood College
Farmville
Madison College
Harrisonburg
Radford College
Radford
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg
Virginia, University of
Charlottesville

West Virginia
Marshall College
Huntington
West Liberty State College
West Liberty

Purdue University
Lafayette

Iowa
Iowa State College
Ames

Kansas
Kansas State College
Manhattan
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia
Michigan
Central Michigan College
Mount Pleasant
Eastern Michigan College
Ypsilanti
Michigan, University of
Ann Arbor
Northern Michigan College
Marquette
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo

Minnesota
Mankato State College
Mankato
Minnesota, University of
Minneapolis
Minnesota, University of
Duluth Branch, Duluth

Missouri
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg
Missouri, University of
Columbia
Northeastern Missouri State
Teachers College
Kirksville
Southeast Missouri State College
Cape Girardeau
Southwest Missouri State College
Springfield

Nebraska
Nebraska State Teachers College
Chadron

Nebraska State Teachers College
Kearney
Nebraska, University of
Lincoln
Wayne State Teachers College
Wayne

North Dakota
Minot State Teachers College
Minot
North Dakota Agricultural College
Fargo
North Dakota, University of
Grand Forks
State Teachers College
Valley City

Ohio
Central State College
Wilberforce
Kent State University
Kent
Miami University
Oxford
Ohio State University
Columbus

Oklahoma
East Central State College
Ada
Northeastern State College
Tahlequah
Northwestern State College
Alvá
Oklahoma, University of
Norman
Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College
Goodwell

**South Dakota**

Northern State Teachers College
Aberdeen

South Dakota State College
Brookings

South Dakota, State University of Vermillion

Southern State Teachers College
Springfield

**Wisconsin**

Stout State College
Menomonie

**Arizona**

Arizona State College
Flagstaff

Arizona State College
Tempe

**California**

California at Davis, University of Davis

California at Los Angeles, University of Los Angeles

California at Riverside, University of Riverside

**Wisconsin State College**

Eau Claire

La Crosse

Oshkosh

Platteville

River Falls

Stevens Point

Madison

**Next**

Chico State College
Chico

Fresno State College
Fresno

**Colorado**

Adams State College
Alamosa

Colorado State College
Greeley

Colorado, University of Boulder

Fort Lewis Agricultural and Mechanical College
Durango
Western State College
Gunnison

Idaho
Idaho State College
Pocatello
Idaho, University of
Moscow

Montana
Montana State College
Bozeman
Montana State University
Missoula
Northern Montana College
Harve

Nevada
Nevada, University of
Reno

Oregon
Eastern Oregon College
La Grande
Oregon College of Education
Monmouth

Oregon State College
Corvallis
Oregon, University of
Eugene
Portland State College
Portland

Utah
Utah, College of Southern
Cedar City
Utah State University
Logan

Washington
Eastern Washington College
Cheney
Central Washington College
of Education
Ellensburg
Washington College
Pullman
Washington, University of
Seattle
Western Washington College
of Education
Bellingham
APPENDIX IV

PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS ANSWERING QUESTIONS
### Percentage of Institutions Answering Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II-A: Total income</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-B: Cost per production</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-C: Admission charges</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-D: Sufficiency of income</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-E: Need to expand</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of increase</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-A: Number of plays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students participating</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-B: Showings per play</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-C: Seating capacity</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-D: Audience attendance</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-E: Drama majors</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-F: Theatre staff</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-A: Summer drama program</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays per summer</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How financed</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>