

Attitudes of High School Band Directors in the United States
toward Solo and Ensemble Activities

by

Brian D. Meyers

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Musical Arts

Approved April 2011 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Jill Sullivan, Chair
Jeffrey Bush
Margaret Schmidt
Sandra Stauffer
Evan Tobias

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

April 2011

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of high band directors in the United States toward solo and ensemble activities. Independent variables such as teaching experience, level of education, MENC region in which directors taught, personal solo and ensemble activity experience, teaching assignment, and director-centered external factors (supplemental contracts, teaching evaluations, program awards) were used to investigate potential differences in attitudinal responses. Subjects were high school band directors ($N = 557$) chosen through a stratified random sample by state. Participation in the study included completing an online researcher-designed questionnaire that gathered demographic information as well as information regarding directors' attitudes towards benefits from student participation in solo and ensemble activities, the importance of such activities to directors, and attitudes towards student participation in local, regional, and state solo and ensemble festivals and contests. One-way analyses of variance and two-way multivariate analyses of variance were conducted to investigate potential differences in responses according to various independent variables. Significant differences were found in responses to statements of the importance of solo and ensemble to directors and of solo and ensemble festivals and contests according to region, solo and ensemble experience, and director-centered external factors. No significant differences were found for statements of director's attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities according to any independent variables. Results indicate that directors understand and believe strongly in the benefits of solo and

ensemble activities to students, but factors such as time, job demands, band program expectations, and festival and contest adjudication, format, and timing may hinder directors' inclusion of solo and ensemble activities as an integral part of their program. Further research is suggested to investigate directors' attitudes within individual states as well as ways to integrate solo and ensemble activities into daily band rehearsals.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Timothy Swinehart, my teacher, mentor, and friend, without whom I would not be the educator I am today. His confidence and faith in me is something I will always remember and treasure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to Dr. Jill Sullivan, my committee chair and advisor throughout my years at Arizona State University. Her guidance and hours of assistance have been indispensable to my growth in higher education. It has been a joy to work with her. Thank you also to the music education faculty at Arizona State University for an amazing experience throughout my master's and doctoral degrees. Thank you to Dr. Sandra Stauffer for her persistent desire to help me improve my research and writing, to Dr. Margaret Schmidt for her many kind words and insight, to Dr. Jeff Bush for making the walls less beige on many days, and to Dr. Evan Tobias for helping push my thinking into new areas, even when not in his classes.

A belated but much needed thank you to the band directors of my youth, Dale Davidson, Lisa Agliotti, and Karl Tittl. These three individuals were the reason that I chose to become a music educator many years ago, and I will forever be indebted to them.

Thank you also to the directors who participated in this study from across the nation. I hope that their thoughts and opinions will help me and others gain a better understanding of our profession. Also, thank you to my many teaching and doctoral colleagues for their insight and comments in the formation of this study.

A very special thank you to my parents, Dave and Sandy Meyers. Their love and support over the years has not waivered, even when thousands of miles away. The work ethic and dedication they have instilled in me is entirely responsible for making me the person I am today.

Finally, there is no way for me to express my gratitude to my wife, Liza. She has been a stalwart supporter for many years and has spent many hours listening to my rambling thoughts. I owe her much more than either of us can ever imagine. I look forward to many more years of fun, laughter, and adventure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Need for Study	8
Purpose of the Study	9
Study Questions	10
Delimitations.....	10
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
History of Solo and Ensemble Events.....	12
Benefits from Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities	15
Autonomous, Mutual, and Cooperative Learning Studies	24
Effect of Teacher Attitude on Student Perception	34
Influence of Solo and Ensemble Events	41
3 METHOD	46
Sampling Procedure and Participants.....	46
Instrumentation	50
Procedure and Response Rate	53
Operational Definitions	55
Research Questions.....	56
4 RESULTS	65
Descriptive Statistics	65

CHAPTER	Page
Research Question #1	68
Research Question #2	71
Research Question #3	72
Research Question #4	76
Research Question #5	79
Research Question #6	80
Research Question #7	81
Research Question #8	82
Research Question #9	83
Research Question #10	84
Research Question #11	85
Research Question #12	86
Research Question #13	87
Research Question #14	87
Research Question #15	88
Research Question #16	90
 5 DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, FURTHER RESEARCH, AND	
CONCLUSION	91
Summary	91
Discussion	92
Descriptive Statistics	92
General Attitudes	93

CHAPTER	Page
Region.....	97
Teaching Experience and Education Level	99
Personal Solo and Ensemble Experience	101
Teaching Assignment.....	103
Director-Centered External Factors	105
Implications.....	108
Future Research	115
Conclusion	117
REFERENCES	119
 APPENDIX	
A INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	128
B INFORMED CONSENT LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE ...	130

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	State Sampling Breakdown	49
2.	MENC Regions	53
3.	Response Rate by Region	55
4.	Frequency of Director Gender	66
5.	Frequency of Directors' Primary Instrument	66
6.	Highest Degree Obtained.....	66
7.	Total Years of Teaching Experience and Years in Current Position .	66
8.	Approximate School and Program Enrollment and Solo and Ensemble Participants	67
9.	Directors' Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities in High School	67
10.	Directors Reporting Director-Centered External Factors	67
11.	Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Benefits of Student Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities	69
12.	Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Commitment to Student Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities	70
13.	Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Solo and Ensemble Festivals/Contests	71
14.	Means of Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Commitment to Solo and Ensemble Activities by MENC Region	73

Table	Page
15. Means of Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Solo and Ensemble Festivals/Contests	77
16. MANOVA Results for Statements Measuring Directors' Attitudes toward Benefits of Student Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities and Directors' Level of Experience and Level of Education	80
17. MANOVA Results for Statements Measuring Directors' Attitudes toward Commitment to Student Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities and Directors' Level of Experience and Level of Education	81
18. MANOVA Results for Statements Measuring Directors' Attitudes toward Solo and Ensemble Festivals/Contests and Directors' Level of Experience and Level of Education	82
19. Frequency of Teaching Assignment	86

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Instrumental solo and small ensemble activities have long lived in the shadow of larger, more visible instrumental ensembles activities in high schools across the United States. While schools have offered concert bands, marching bands, and orchestras as curricular courses, solo and ensemble activities have largely been relegated by directors to an extra-curricular activity for excelling or private lesson students. These activities may serve as the primary and potentially only performance grouping that allows students to act independently of directors, as students determine musical intentions, lead individual practice sessions or small ensemble rehearsals, and generally have more responsibility for their learning and achievement.

Researchers have investigated various potential benefits of participation in solo and ensemble activities, including effects on achievement and ability (Jarrell, 1971; Larson, 2010; Olson, 1975; Sorensen, 1971; West, 1985, Zorn, 1969), intonation (Carmody, 1988; Sorensen, 1971; Stabley, 2000), motivation (Larson, 2010; Werpy, 1995), and attitude (Carmody, 1988; Larson, 2010; Olson, 1975; Sorensen, 1971; Stabley, 2000; Zorn, 1969). Sociological aspects of solo and ensemble performing have also been a topic of inquiry, including studies in cooperative learning (Cangro, 2004; Djordjevic, 2007; Johnson and Johnson, 1999), goal orientation (Bailey, 2006; Schmidt, 2005; Sandene, 1997), mutual learning (Allsup, 2003; Berg, 1997; Bononi, 2007), and autonomous and individual instruction (Anguiano, 2006; Cary, 1981). Others have inquired about

the effects of director attitude and characteristics on various aspects of the instrumental music program (Crochet, 2006; Franklin, 1979; Goodstein, 1987; Meyers, 2010; Simanton, 2000; Sullivan, 2005). The format and importance of musical competitions and festivals have also been probed for effects on attitude, performance, and achievement (Austin, 1988; Bergee & Platt, 2003; Howard, 1994; Hurst, 1994).

Long (1943) wrote of the need to continue solo and ensemble activities in the changing educational landscape in the years following the end of large group and solo and ensemble national contests:

Since, as most music educators would agree, solo and ensemble competition is the phase of our contest most worthy of preservation, it becomes imperative that we do our utmost to keep the solo and ensemble contests educationally sound and musically progressive. (p. 26)

Others note the importance of these events and even advocate for the inclusion of solo and chamber music participation as a central part of school music programs. Kuhn (1962), in reviewing components of high school instrumental music programs in secondary schools, states that “chamber music activities are essential to the instrumental program,” citing greater technical accuracy, independence, and control (p. 71) . Kaplan (1966) echoes this sentiment, saying, “The presence of small units [ensembles], well coached, but in some part self-reliant, is perhaps the clearest indication that a school performing music program is dynamic” (p. 54). House (1965) says, “One of the most effective steps a director can take is to

organize a series of small ensembles. These groups offer tremendous educational dividends with a minimum of investment” (pp. 171-172).

Solo and ensemble performing also suffers from some potential image problems. McGee (1966) posits that solo and small ensemble performance may not be pursued due to the lack of public visibility. He notes, “The objective of the music program has been brushed aside for too long. The ensemble contest should be looked upon as just another opportunity for performance and not as the sole end and purpose of the ensemble program” (p. 116). Battisti (1989) laments the lack of balance that has occurred in school band programs, noting the attention to marching band in particular. He says:

A good instrumental program should also involve students in solo, small ensemble, and large ensemble experience. . . . Through experiences in these groups, students can be exposed to a rich diet of music from the past and present and can be offered an opportunity to learn about music, its history, its literature, and its traditions and to develop good performance skills. (p. 25)

Stubbs (1983) points out that the thin texture and exposure in solo and ensemble performance could be a possible reason for its lack of appeal, pushing students past a threshold of comfort and effecting their self-confidence, initiative, and enjoyment. While noting that participating in solo and ensemble activities can actually help with these areas, Stubbs cites the perpetuation of a cycle of neglect of these activities by directors, where solo and small ensemble events are seen only as peripheral activities and, therefore, have no place within the

curriculum. He places part of the blame on university education faculty who place too much focus on how to rehearse large groups and little focus on the importance and need for small groups.

Solo and ensemble activities also have potential obstacles that must be overcome. In a time of dwindling budgets, purchasing music for small ensembles and soloists may seem like an ineffective and inefficient use of funds. However, the same pieces can be used from year to year with different students, necessitating a large budget for only one year followed by smaller expenditures in future years (House, 1965). Time is perhaps a more precious commodity for directors and students. Solo and ensemble activities can erode before and after-school time quickly, and forfeiting large group rehearsal time can be perceived as a detriment to the large ensemble. However, solo and ensemble activities give students the opportunity to focus on their individual needs while also giving the director time to work with individual students (Gary, 1966; Zorn, 1970). Rutowski (2000) also points out that solo and ensemble activities offer directors a chance to alter their roles, saying, “When a director puts down the baton and sits down to play one of the parts with the students, he or she is demonstrating mastery of the skills the students want to learn. This can be a very positive motivating force” (p. 24).

Implementing a solo and ensemble program can also present logistical problems and difficulties, such as supervision of students, finding adequate rehearsal spaces, proper instrumentation, grouping students by ability level, investigating and choosing appropriate literature, and scheduling rehearsals with

accompanists and other ensemble members (House, 1965; Kinney, 1980; Latten, 2001; Rutowski, 2000; Weidensee, 1969). Solutions to these issues require creative thinking by educators as well as faith in the eventual results. Organizing a program that utilizes small ensembles instead of large ensembles as the center of instruction can give directors, administrators, and districts greater flexibility in scheduling classes due to the fact that 40 to 60 students do not have to be scheduled into the same class period to form a band. Instead, smaller ensembles mean that student schedules can be more easily arranged to form groups with similar ability levels, workable instrumentation, and utilize rehearsal space efficiently (Gary, 1966; Weidensee, 1969; Zorn, 1970).

The potential musical benefits of participating in solo and small ensemble activities have been of particular interest to educators for decades. Performing in such activities can fulfill portions of the National Standards for Music Education, such as Standards 2 (Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music), 3 (Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments), 4 (Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines), 7 (Evaluating music and performances), and 9 (Understanding music in relation to history and culture) (Latten, 2001). Kuhn (1962) suggests solo and ensemble performance can also be beneficial to both advanced and beginning players, allowing students to find technical and musical challenges that are appropriate for their individual levels and, thus, fostering greater feelings of accomplishment. He further states, “More rapid musical development is possible, because chamber music introduces new fields of music literature and sensitizes both player and listeners to deeper

enjoyment in music” (p. 71). Performing in small ensembles requires students to listen more intently and process information about balance, blend, and intonation (Colwell, 1969; Griffing, 2004; Kinney, 1980; Kuhn, 1962; Weidensee, 1969). With no conductor to direct and maintain tempo or dictate interpretation, greater responsibility falls upon students to identify and correct mistakes, make musical decisions, and communicate ideas clearly, promoting interpersonal, problem solving, critical thinking, and leadership skills (Colwell, 1969; Gibbs, 1970; Griffing, 2004; House, 1965; Kinney, 1980; Kuhn, 1962; Latten, 2001; Rutowski, 2000; Zorn, 1970).

Organizing small student ensembles can also stimulate community interest in the program and may help students to continue playing following their departure from high school (Kuhn, 1962; Schoenbach, 1963). Schoenbach (1963) supports this possibility, citing his own personal experience:

I have spent my entire lifetime in music and have had the personal satisfaction of participating in music of all types. The richest experience has always been chamber music. I heartily recommend it for inclusion in the curriculum of all secondary schools – that is where it all began for me.

(p. 74)

The November 1970 edition of the *Music Educators Journal* included a series of three articles titled “The New Breed of Band Director...” that synthesizes much of the above impressions. In the first of these articles, titled “Thinks Realistically,” Gibbs (1970) questions the imposed importance of concert and marching bands in the instrumental program and suggests that these

ensembles serve the director, music industry, and public impression more than they serve the students, leaving little room for student expression, improvisation, composition, and interaction. Gibbs proposes that one possible solution to this dilemma is placing small ensembles as the center of the high school band program, allowing students more control of their education and fostering greater self-expression and creativity on the terms of the students rather than the director. In the second of these articles, titled “Thinks Imaginatively”, Zorn (1970) builds upon Gibb’s positioning of small ensembles as the focal point of the band program. Zorn reinforces the need to provide students with greater control over their music making, going as far as to suggest that large ensembles are largely geared to be quasi-professional organizations focusing on public performance instead of student learning and growth. Zorn proposes that small ensembles provide students and directors such an opportunity.

Dackow (1981), in supporting the inclusion of chamber music in high school music curriculums, summarizes much of the above in the following words:

The performance of chamber music represents the highest degree of sophistication in ensemble playing, and makes substantial technical demands on the individual player. Too often, the only kind of playing experience the high school instrumentalist had is in a band or orchestra, whose section members play the same part. But the performance of chamber music requires the player to function as an individual, while at the same time contributing to a complex group sonority. Because all parts are readily accessible to the listener, the player must prepare to a greater

degree than he or she probably would for a band or orchestra performance. When the player does perform in a large group he will more likely be conscious of intonation, will have a wider variety of tone colors and articulations at his disposal, will be more sensitive to the subtleties of ensemble playing, and will not depend excessively on the rest of the group or section. (p. 38)

Need for Study

Many states continue a long history of offering solo and ensemble performers the opportunity to be evaluated at local and state events, resulting in comments and ratings from an adjudicator. These events are part of the numerous professional responsibilities and duties of high school band directors, including responsibility for teaching multiple performance ensembles, staffing for each ensemble, scheduling and planning of rehearsals, managing budgets and equipment, coordinating and cooperating with parent booster groups, completing required paperwork, serving on school committees, and advising students, all the while also living a life outside of school. Additionally, school and band budgets continue to dwindle and more programs struggle to survive cuts in school offerings, necessitating careful allocation of funds and time so as to maximize benefits for students. With this mass of jobs and duties, directors must carefully choose the activities and events they support and encourage, so as not to overwhelm themselves or the students within their program while taking into account the musical education outcomes that each activity potentially provides.

The existing literature suggests student may benefit in various areas (balance, blend, independence, inter-personal skills, intonation, leadership skills, listening skills, and problem solving skills) from participation in solo and ensemble activities, although much of the literature is over 20 years old. Missing from the research literature is a concerted and focused effort to examine the attitudes and beliefs of directors toward the potential benefits and issues surrounding the inclusion of solo and ensemble activities in the high school band program. Solo and ensemble events flourish in some states while floundering in others, and little has been discussed as to the reasons why this occurs. If solo and ensemble activities are to survive as part of high school band programs, a better understanding of director beliefs and the variables that affect them must be investigated.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate attitudes of high school band directors in the United States towards solo and ensemble activities in regard to benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities, the importance of such activities to directors, and student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests. Investigation of these attitudes may help festival organizers, music teacher educators, and researchers understand why directors support or do not support these activities. This research could be used to seek ways in which attitudes might be changed in the future, possibly enabling directors to utilize solo and small ensemble activities as an integral part of their band program or in gathering potential reasons for decreasing interest in solo and ensemble activities.

Study Questions

Study Question One: What are the general attitudes of the selected high school band directors in the United States towards solo and ensemble activities?

Study Question Two: What variables reveal significant differences among the attitudes of the selected high school band directors in the United States towards solo and ensemble activities?

Delimitations

This study deals only with the attitudes of high school band directors towards solo and ensemble activities. The attitudes of orchestra and choral directors and directors outside of high school are outside the scope of this study. Research questions have been developed and written to reflect this focus. Some participants may teach in multiple subject areas and across multiple grades. While this may influence their attitudes, their position as the instructor of a high school band program justified their inclusion in this study. Also, this study investigated attitudes towards solo and ensemble activities through self-reporting by the director and may not necessarily represent the actual practices of directors.

This study does not evaluate the quality and appropriateness of solo and ensemble events at the local, regional, or state level. The quality of these events is outside the scope of this study, although director and student satisfaction with events may influence individuals' responses. Similarly, there is no intended implication of band director quality in relation to attitude and opinions towards solo and ensemble activities. While education, experience, and other characteristics of band directors and their programs will be used for analysis, it is

not implied that positive attitudes towards these activities equates to quality instruction or to a quality band program.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In considering solo and ensemble activities, various areas will be reviewed. Benefits from participation in solo and ensemble activities (Carmody, 1988; Jarrell, 1971; Larson, 2010; Olson, 1975; Sorensen, 1971; Stabley, 2000; Werpy, 1995; West, 1985; Zorn, 1969), influence of autonomous, mutual, and cooperative learning scenarios (Allsup, 2003; Anguiano, 2006; Bailey, 2006; Berg, 1997; Bononi, 2000; Cangro, 2004; Cary, 1981; Djordjevic, 2007; Johnson and Johnson, 1999; Schmidt, 2005; Sandene, 1997), influence of director attitude on student perception (Crochet, 2006; Franklin, 1979; Goodstein, 1987; Meyers, 2010; Simanton, 2000; Sullivan, 2005), and experience of contests and festivals (Austin, 1988; Bergee and McWhitier, 2005; Bergee and Platt, 2003; Howard, 1994; Hurst, 1994) must be considered in order to provide a thorough picture of how these attitudes are conceived. In doing so, this study utilizes research studies in the areas of music and general education to fulfill this purpose. The following review of literature covers these areas of research: (1) the history of solo and ensemble events, (2) benefits from participation in solo and ensemble activities, (3) autonomous, mutual, and cooperative learning, (4) the influence of director attitude on student perception, and (5) influence of solo and ensemble events.

History of Solo and Ensemble Events

Instrumental music in schools in the United States was first found in the mid-1800's, although not on a widespread level (Keene, 1987). The professional ensembles of Patrick S. Gilmore, Helen Mae Butler, and John Philip Sousa

expanded the visibility of band music through their tours of the United States, which resulted in the organization of many town bands during what became known as the Golden Age of Bands in the early 1900's. Instrumental music in the schools became more widespread during this time, particularly following the end of World War I (Mark and Gary, 1999). While little is recorded specifically about solo and ensemble festivals or contests, Mark and Gary (1999) note evidence of early community music competitions, such as contests for voice and violin in Virginia in 1737 as well as singing contests, called *eisteddfods*, by Welsh miners in Pennsylvania and Kansas in the 1800's. The first solo and ensemble event organized specifically for school occurred at Bethany College in Kansas in 1912 (Keene, 1987). Soon after, other states began organizing their own solo and ensemble for schools.

The early 1920's marked the beginning of the school contest movement in instrumental music, beginning with the National Band Tournament in 1923 in Chicago. This tournament led to a more concerted effort to control and regulate competitions to ensure their educational content (Holz, 1962). Three years later, the National Band Contest, conducted in cooperation with the National Bureau for the Advancement of Music and the Committee on Instrumental Affairs of the Music Supervisors National Conference (MSNC), took place in Fostoria, Ohio in 1926 (Moore, 1968). At the contest, the National School Band Association (NSBA) was formed to assist with future contests. One of the projects given to the NSBA and its president, A.R. McAllister, by the National Bureau and the Committee was the creation of a solo and ensemble contest to be held in

conjunction with the National Band Contest (Moore, 1968). McAllister proceeded to write rules and compile a music list for the Contest, with the help of such notable educators as A. Austin Harding from the University of Illinois (Meyers, 2011). This contest served as another level of competition beyond the festivals in the individual states, with the winners of state-level events being eligible to compete at the national contest.

The first National Solo Contest, held in 1929 in Denver, Colorado, consisted of events for the following: flute or piccolo, oboe or English horn, bassoon, clarinet, alto or bass clarinet, cornet, trumpet or flugelhorn, French horn, trombone, baritone, tuba, saxophone, and marimba or xylophone (Maddy, 1929). Small ensembles were added for the 1930 contest in Flint, Michigan. The popularity of the contests grew steadily over the years and more states began conducting solo and ensemble contests as preliminary contests to the National Contest, often adopting the same rules and guidelines for participation as the National event (Meyers, 2009).

The popularity of the Contests is perhaps best seen in the events of 1932. Directors, administrators, and others began to question the competitive aspect of the Band, Orchestra, and Solo and Ensemble Contests, feeling that placing ensembles and students into ranked order of first, second, and third, and so on, was detrimental to the educational intent of the contests. During the same time, the country was embroiled in the Great Depression and the Contests put considerable financial strain on the bands, school districts, and contest host cities. These factors led to the decision by the NSBA and the National School Orchestra

Association (NSOA) to cancel the Band and Orchestra Contest for 1932.

However, both organizations agreed to still hold the National Solo and Ensemble Contest jointly in Marion, Indiana in May 1932, citing the low cost to schools and the importance of the event to students (“1932 National Band”, 1932).

Beginning in 1935, the NSOA and NSBA decided that holding two large national festivals, one for bands and one for orchestras, was not in the best interest of the organizations. Beginning that year, the National Band and Orchestra Contests were held on alternating years, beginning with the orchestra contest. Even with this change, the two organizations continued to hold a joint Solo and Ensemble Contest for all instrumentalists. In Columbus, Ohio in May 1937, 797 soloists and 289 ensembles competed in the final National Contest (Meyers, 2010). The event had grown significantly during its brief eight-year history and, along with the large-group contests, had become too large to host in one city and at one venue. The contests were separated into regional competitions, but these did not have the same allure as the National Contests and they soon disappeared, being supplanted by those festivals run by the state music organizations (Meyers, 2009).

Benefits from Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities

Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate the potential benefits from participation in solo and ensemble activities. Zorn (1969) investigated the effects of chamber music ensemble experience on performance ability, cognitive learning, and attitude of participants. The study took place over a 32-week period and included 30 ninth-grade students at one high school. Two

treatment groups ($n = 7$ and $n = 10$) and two control groups ($n = 5$ and $n = 10$) were created by dividing the band's clarinet section and brass section in half. The treatment groups received one 50 minute chamber music rehearsal each week and spent the remainder of the week in large group rehearsals while the control group received only large group instruction. A battery of six test instruments was utilized to collect data at the beginning of the study, at the 16 week mark, and at the end of the study. Three researcher-designed tests collected data on instrumental performance, musical concepts (terms, history, and compositional items), and attitude change. Zorn also utilized Part III of the *Musical Aptitude Profile* (MAP), the *California Test of Mental Maturity*, and the *Differential Aptitude Tests* to measure changes in musical sensitivity, intelligence, and educational aptitude, respectively.

Results showed no significant differences in the performance ability or cognitive learning between the treatment and control groups, although the treatment group did show gains in ability over the control group. Attitude measures showed significant differences between the treatment and control groups, with the students receiving chamber music experience having better attitudes towards their band experience. Zorn suggests further study of the effectiveness of large group and chamber group experiences, as well as how chamber music ensembles can be utilized as a means of increasing performance ability and musical learning.

Jarrell (1971) conducted a study of how certain high school band activities affected music achievement. For the purposes of his study, Jarrell considered the

following activities: marching band, concert band, orchestra, stage band, district and state solo and ensemble festival/contest, all-district and all-state bands, and private lessons. John Iltis' *A Test to Measure the Ability of High School Students to Evaluate Musical Performance* was administered to 1,695 Oklahoma high school students. The Iltis test consisted of recorded aural excerpts, performed by a brass or woodwind quintet, which were evaluated by students in one of five sub-test areas: intonation, tone quality, interpretation, ensemble and technique. Fifty-two percent of the participants in the study reported having participated in solo and ensemble activities, although Jarrell notes it is unclear whether this participation occurred recently or in the past.

Results showed that students who participated in solo and ensemble activities scored significantly higher on the Iltis test, leading Jarrell to suggest that participation increased achievement. Jarrell also found that students who participated in solo and ensemble or all-district or all-state bands scored significantly higher in the area of interpretation. Due to the high percentage of students who reported participating in solo and ensemble activities and the findings of higher overall achievement for solo and ensemble participants, Jarrell suggests further research is needed specifically in the area of solo and ensemble participation to determine the characteristics of the activity that aid in increasing student achievement. Jarrell further suggests further experimental studies to determine the potential differences in effectiveness between large group instruction and solo and ensemble participation.

West (1985) investigated the effects of performance success on the musical achievement of high school band students. Participation in the study was limited to high school seniors ($N = 284$) in 20 Florida high schools in order to control for age and experience. Performance success was divided into two areas: band success and solo and ensemble success. Success in solo and ensemble was divided into three levels, determined by assigning points for participation in solo and ensemble festival as well as points for particular ratings received at the festival. Students who did not participate in the festival received a score of zero and were placed in the lowest level. All participants completed the *Long-Hoffer Musicianship Test*, which gathers data on musical knowledge through a series of questions as well as data on interpretation, discrimination, style, form, timbre recognition, and artistic judgment, through responses to recorded music examples. Results showed that students placed in the highest success level scored significantly higher on the Long-Hoffer test than those in the lowest level. There was no significant difference between the second level of success and either the highest level or the lowest level. Results of a factor analysis showed that solo and ensemble participation accounted for 14.5% of the variance in scores, considerably larger than the 3.6% difference found for band success. These findings prompted West to state, “The use of solos and ensembles as a vital part of the total band program is certainly supported by the results of the present study. Indeed, these activities may prove more important than the large ensemble” (p. 82).

Carmody (1988) investigated the effects of chamber music experience on the intonation and attitude of junior high string students. The study included two school string programs, one which utilized chamber music in its curriculum ($n = 26$) and one focusing on large group ensembles ($n = 21$). During a 14-week period, treatment-group students participated in one 60-minute after-school chamber music rehearsal each week where the teacher was available for coaching. Large group in-class rehearsal time was the same between the two programs. At the end of the treatment period, the Zorn Music Attitude Inventory was administered to each student. The researcher also developed an Intonation Test, administered at the end of the study, in which each student played a researcher-composed exercise along with a professional player while being recorded. Recordings were later scored by five judges for accuracy. Results from these two measures showed that students who received chamber music instruction had significantly better intonation and more positive attitudes than those who had only large group instruction. This finding prompts Carmody to suggest that “Chamber music is effective in improving performance skills such as intonation, as well as positive musical attitudes which may prolong interest in music performance” (Carmody, 1988).

Stabley (2000) investigated how chamber music experience effected the intonation and attitude of middle school string students. During a 39-week experimental period, two sixth-grade and one seventh-grade orchestra classes participated in the study. The experimental design resulted in one sixth-grade class received only large group instruction, and the second class received full

group instruction for half of the time and chamber music experience for half of the time. The seventh grade class was divided in half, with one half receiving only large group instruction and the other receiving both full group and chamber music experience. The chamber music rehearsals were largely student-run and included little instructor involvement. Stabley administered Gordon's *Music Aptitude Profile* (MAP) before the experimental period to assure similar ability between the control and treatment groups and the *Zorn Music Attitude Inventory* (MAI) and the *Carmody Intonation Test* after the experimental period. Following the experimental period, the treatment groups showed significantly higher intonation scores than the control group, suggesting that the chamber experience positively affected intonation. The treatment group was also found to have more positive attitudes, although only the seventh-grade treatment group showed significant differences.

Sorensen (1971) was interested in the effects of small ensemble experience on the achievement, intonation, and attitude of junior high band students. Brass quintets were formed at each of three middle schools in Illinois, resulting in 15 students in the treatment group. Students were selected based upon similarities to each other on pre-test results of the *Farnum Music Notation Test*, a researcher-designed *Music Experience Survey*, school grade point averages, a favorite subject index, and the recommendation of the school's director. A similar sample of students was identified at each school for the control group. During the nine-week treatment period, quintet members held one small ensemble rehearsal a week during their regularly scheduled band time while

the control group participated in large group instruction on technical exercises. At the conclusion of the study period, posttest measures included the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale*, the *Colwell Music Achievement Test*, the *Oregon Test for Attitude Towards Music*, a researcher-designed intonation test, and a *Director's Student Attitude Checklist*, filled out by the director for each student. Analyses showed significant difference in achievement between the treatment and control groups, with students who participated in the quintets showing higher achievement. Treatment group students were also found to score significantly better on the intonation and *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale* measurements. There was no significant difference in attitude toward music between the treatment and control groups, but the *Director's Student Attitude Checklist* did note that directors felt that quintet members demonstrated more positive attitudes following the treatment period. Analysis of practice records also showed that students in the treatment groups reported more practice time outside of school.

Olson (1975) conducted a study similar to Sorensen's, comparing the effectiveness of small ensemble experience with large ensemble experience, particularly in the areas of "cognitive musical achievement, music performance achievement, and change in attitude towards music" (p. 1). Twelve private high school students in Nebraska participated in the study, with six students serving as the control group and six students as the treatment group. Students were selected based upon matching pretest scores on the *Colwell Music Achievement Test*, the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale*, the *Oregon Test for Attitude Towards Music*, and individual IQ scores. During a twenty-week treatment period, the

control group received full group instruction three days a week while the treatment group received two days of full group instruction and one day of chamber music rehearsal. Posttest measures were completed at the end of the treatment period and showed significant difference between the groups on the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale*, with the treatment group scoring higher. Results of the *Music Achievement Test* also showed significant gains in achievement by the treatment group, particularly in measures of pitch, interval, and meter discrimination. Results of the *Oregon Test for Attitude Towards Music* reported the treatment group did show an increase in positive attitude, but not at a significant level. From these results, Olson posits that small ensembles enhance the achievement of students more than large ensemble experiences.

In a more recent study, Larson (2010) researched the effects of chamber music participation on performance achievement, motivation, and attitude of high school band students. This study used a quasi-experimental design where 79 high school band students from three separate bands in one high school were divided into treatment and control groups during their band rehearsal time. Prior to division, all participants completed three pre-test measures: the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale*, the *Zorn Attitude Inventory* as edited by Carmody, and the *Asmus Motivation Factors toward Music*. Students were placed in order from high to low score on the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale* and alternately placed in either the treatment or control group during their class period, in an attempt to divide groups evenly by performance achievement (Bonate, 2000). Two days of the week, students in the control group ($n = 36$) participated in a director-led

rehearsal. The music performed was unique to the director-led ensemble and was not music performed by the intact large ensemble. Treatment group students ($n = 43$) were placed into student-led small ensembles during their band class and rehearsed within their chamber groups two days a week. The study consisted of 17 treatment periods over 14 weeks and concluded with a final recital performance by all treatment and control groups.

Following the treatment period, all participants completed post-test measurements using the same instruments used for the pretest. Analyses showed significant differences in the attitudes between the treatment and control group, favoring the treatment group. Significant differences in attitude were also found between low-achieving students and high achieving students, with low-achieving students showing greater gains in attitude toward music. Treatment group students did show increases in music performance scores and motivation, but results were not significant. Larson suggests that the inclusion of chamber music into a high school large ensemble program format may help promote more favorable attitudes towards music, especially in low-achieving students, while also potentially increasing achievement and motivation.

Werpy (1995) examined the essential components of musical experience of high school band program and how they influence the motivation of students. Using a researcher-designed *Band Motivation Inventory* and Raynor and Nochajski's *Motivation for Particular Activity Scale*, Werpy surveyed 619 high school band students from 24 randomly selected Montana high schools. Results showed that while aesthetic/affective factors had the greatest influence on student

motivation, participation in solo and ensemble events was a significant motivating factor in both questionnaire instruments, ranking second out of thirteen factors of motivation.

Autonomous, Mutual, and Cooperative Learning Studies

Solo and ensemble activities have also been touted for benefits in fostering interaction between students. Berg (1997) investigated the social construction of music experience in chamber music ensembles through a qualitative ethnographic study of two high school chamber music groups over a five-month period. Berg wanted to understand the nature of the collaboration between the ensemble members through their patterns of musical thought and activity and how these interactions affected student achievement and progression through Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development. Through analysis of live and taped observations of rehearsals and coaching sessions as well as interviews with both student and coaching participants, Berg identified four global patterns: musical topics covered in rehearsals, amount and nature of music rehearsed, types of verbal and non-verbal activity used by members, and the sequence of activity in a student rehearsal. Berg found that ensemble members spent the majority of their time working on basic musical concepts, such as tempo, ensemble precision, and intonation, and, rehearsed from small sections of music towards larger sections. Ensemble members each demonstrated moments of leadership and teaching in shaping the interpretation of the music, challenging one another to higher levels of development by asking others to clarify or elaborate on comments and techniques used. These shifting roles sometimes aided the progress of the

individuals and group while hindering progress at other times. Assistance from a coach also had a significant impact on the ensembles, sometimes aiding musical progress while stymieing the interaction between the group members. Berg concluded that while each member brought their own musical experiences into the ensemble setting, interaction between students and the collaborative environment of chamber ensembles has the potential to both aid and hinder musical growth and understanding. Berg also states:

Indeed, small ensembles require students to prepare and perform music without, as is common in large ensembles, daily guidance from a teacher. This experience also enables students to not only confront various musical interpretations and make informed choices, but also to identify aspects of technical concern in their own and each other's performance. At the same time, participation in chamber music ensembles often requires students to justify their perspective on a problem and its solution. Furthermore, chamber music can provide students with opportunities for taking initiative as well as learning how to negotiate and solve problems as a group member. (p. 2)

Bononi (2000) investigated the nature of student thinking and learning in chamber ensembles, particularly in the area of transfer of learning. A high school saxophone quartet was observed and interviewed over a 16-week period. Comments made throughout the study were recorded and coded according to their intent and purpose. A total of 731 student comments were recorded, 69% of which dealt with identifying problems or commenting on ensemble issues and the

remaining 31% dealing with musical issues. Bononi suggests that the number of technical comments made by the participants could be due to the influence of the member's large group instruction, thus shaping their interaction within the small ensemble. While there was a lack of balance between technical comments and musical comments, musical comments were largely comments and not questions, pointing to students taking control of their musical situation. Bononi also observed 38 examples of prompted and unprompted transfer of learning, also showing student taking control of their musical environment. As with Berg, Bononi posits that students bring their own experience, largely from a large group setting, into the small chamber setting, but that the student-centered small ensemble "can provide an intense learning experience that powerfully supplements the learning that takes place in the large ensemble" (p. 215). He further states:

Through this type of experience, students move away from a dependency on the conductor and begin the journey towards musical independence.

The chamber ensemble provides an authentic learning environment in which this is possible and one in which students can feel safe exploring what they know and do not know about musical performance. (p. 216)

Bailey (2006) investigated the effects of goal orientation and self-monitoring checklists on the motivation and achievement of students on student's self-regulation. Bailey states four general assumptions of how students engage in self-regulated learning: active/constructive (learner actively constructs meanings and goals), potential for control (learner may be able to regulate certain aspects of

their environment and behavior), goal criterion or standards (students have the ability to set goals that are in line with discrete goals and reference values), and success in achievement as a result of individual's self-regulation of motivation, cognition, and behavior. The theory of goal orientation deals with the ultimate result one desires from practice: mastery goal orientation (learning and improvement of skills) or performance goal orientation (to show knowledge or greater ability). Bailey's study included 29 high school instrumentalists who were randomly placed into one of four groups: mastery goal with self-monitoring checklist, mastery goal without self-monitoring checklist, performance goal with self-monitoring checklist, and performance goal without self-monitoring checklists. Students were to practice with the group in which they were placed, with some students receiving self-monitoring checklists as dictated by their grouping and others receiving no checklist. After one week of practice time, participants completed a researcher-designed questionnaire as well as selected parts of the *Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire* (MSLQ). Results showed that goal orientation and self-monitoring did not significantly affect student scores, although mastery goal students did score higher. It was also found that student perception of task-value correlated positively with intrinsic goal orientation and post-test scores.

Allsup (2003) was interested in the notion of democracy and mutual learning as an action of community-in-the-making in high school instrumental music programs. To investigate this, Allsup studied the interactions of nine high school band students completing a composition project. The students divided

themselves into two groups, one which chose to compose using their band instruments and the second utilizing electric guitars, bass, synthesizer, and drum set. The project was largely open ended and allowed students to direct and guide their group project as they felt necessary. Following an analysis of qualitative data collected through observation of group interactions and interviews with students, Allsup postulated that democratic and mutual learning environments provided a space for students to define their own roles rather than one that was defined for them. In doing so, Allsup concludes that democratic and mutual learning environments emphasizes “interpersonal relationships, peer learning and critique, as well as an expectation that members will take care of each other” (p. 8).

Cary (1981) compared traditional music instruction to individualized music instruction and the effects of both on achievement, performance, attitude and reading. One-hundred-and-twelve fifth grade music students were randomly placed into treatment (individualized instruction) and control (traditional) groups. Individualized instruction was defined as adapting the content of the class to fit the needs of each student, including their level and style of learning, differences in experiences, and the social grouping in which the student best learned. Data was collected through completion of all four parts the Colwell *Music Achievement Test*, Gordon’s *Music Aptitude Profile*, the *Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills*, and a researcher-developed performance instrument. Results showed that students in the treatment group scored significantly higher in measures of

achievement, performance and attitude. Students in the treatment groups also preferred to participate through small group interactions.

Schmidt (2005) investigated how various factors effected motivation, goal orientation, and self-concept in music students. Participants in the study were 300 band students in grades seven through twelve in four school districts. Using a survey designed by the researcher and drawing upon prior research, Schmidt collected demographic data including gender, instrument played, years of experience, and participation in honor ensemble and solo and ensemble festivals as well as data focusing on motivation orientation towards music (mastery, intrinsic, individual, cooperative, ego, competitive, approach success, avoid failure), self-concept, commitment to band, attitude, directors' rating of student achievement, and goal orientation. Fifty-five percent of the respondents reporting having participated in solo and ensemble events, and Schmidt found that there was significant correlation between motivation, intrinsic orientation, self-concept, and commitment to band and participation in solo and ensemble events. Schmidt also found that students emphasized mastery and cooperative orientations and over competition and ego orientations. Students also reported that they learned best and achieved more when they were in groups with others. In general, Schmidt found that students who participated in solo and ensemble events showed greater motivation and commitment to band as well as adoption of mastery goal orientations.

Anguiano (2006) investigated predictors of continuing motivation and achievement among adolescent band students. Continuing motivation was

defined as the desire to continue instruction into following years. Anguiano connects achievement goal theory and self-determination theory, stating that the motivational style of the teacher affects the motivation of the students, where autonomy instills a perception of confidence in the students and their choices and places students as facilitators of their own learning rather than solely as consumers. Anguiano posited that the presence of performance goals negatively affects the presence of intrinsic motivation through constant evaluation, comparison, and competition. Based on self-determination theory, Anguiano also posits that autonomous situations positively affect continuing motivation by fulfilling three basic needs: perceived competence, autonomy, and relatedness. To investigate this, Anguiano surveyed 290 middle school instrumental students using a researcher-designed questionnaire that gathered demographic information as well as students' perceptions of classroom motivation orientation, intention to continue in the band program, the students' quality and type of motivation. Results indicated that while sixth grade students showed the greatest instances of autonomy and mastery goal orientation, these items decreased significantly in the following years, leading to less continuing motivation with each passing year and, potentially, few students continuing in music in the future. Anguiano also found a positive correlation between student perception of classroom performance goals and student performance goals, suggesting that student often adopt the orientation of the classroom in which they learn. Finally, data also suggested that teachers who promoted student autonomy had students who were engaged in higher quality motivation, resulting in reduced drop-out rates.

Sandene (1997) investigated factors that influenced the motivation of music students, focusing on student background and classroom practices. Six-hundred-and-seventy-two students from six schools participated in the year-long study. Various measurement instruments were utilized throughout the study, including researcher-designed questionnaires on self-esteem in music (adapted from Schmidt), attributions of success and failure in music (adapted from Asmus), perceptions of classroom goal orientation, personal goal orientation, and motivation in music (adapted from Asmus). Demographic and socio-economic status (SES) data were also collected. Teachers also provided the researcher with ratings of their perception of each student's motivation early in the study period, rating students with low motivation as "1" and highly motivated students as "10." Sandene found that internal factors of ability and effort were rated highest in importance by students. Results also showed that motivation was tied to student self-esteem, which was influenced by teacher behavior and classroom environment. Student motivation was found to be greatest in classrooms that permitted student authority and, inversely, students in performance or ego goal orientation classrooms showed diminishing motivation throughout the year. Like Anguiano, Sandene also points out that students tended to emphasize the same motivation and achievement goals as their teachers.

While sharing characteristics with autonomous and mutual learning, cooperative learning is a teaching/learning strategy with clearly defined steps and stages, as defined by Johnson and Johnson (1999). Formal cooperative learning, where students work together to achieve a shared learning goal or complete a task,

involves certain steps taken by the teacher: pre-instructional decisions (objective of the lesson, group size, student roles within the groups), explain the task (define assignments and teach needed concepts), monitor and intervene, and assessment (how students are progressing). Johnson and Johnson also note five basic elements that must be present in all cooperative learning environments: positive interdependence (linking the success of one to the success of others), individual accountability (assessing the progress of individual students within the group), face-to-face promotive interaction (helping, assisting, and encouraging the effort of others), social skills (the use of decision making, leadership, and conflict-management skills) , and group processing (group members discuss and evaluate their interactions). Through these elements, Johnson and Johnson claim that cooperative learning can result in higher achievement, process gains, greater situational transfer, and better interpersonal relationship skills.

Djordjevic (2007) investigated student perceptions of a cooperative learning model in the music classroom. For her study, Djordjevic defines cooperative learning as “the use of small groups in an instructional setting with the goal of students working together to learn from each other” (p.1). Thirty high school string players were divided into two groups. The “control” group divided into three sections according to instrument and conducted sectional rehearsals of their large ensemble orchestra music while the “treatment” group divided into three small ensembles and rehearsed chamber music. Qualitative data were collected over a six week span through live and recorded observations of rehearsals, student email reflections, individual and group interviews, and journals

by students, director, and researcher. While sectional rehearsals largely replicated large group rehearsals and were dominated by first chair or advanced players, chamber groups were more interactive, with control spread out among the students, fostering greater listening, a greater variety of rehearsal strategies, and more evidence of problem solving. Although chamber group students spent more time in discussion than the sectional group, conversations were focused on the music and showed interaction between students in pursuit of achievement. Chamber students also reported positive feelings towards the cooperative learning format, noting that they often worked harder because they were being asked for their opinions.

Cangro (2004) applied cooperative learning strategies to a beginning instrument classroom to investigate effects on student achievement. Four teachers were trained in cooperative learning techniques prior to the study and utilized these techniques over a 20-week treatment period. Forty-six fifth and sixth graders from four schools were randomly placed into treatment and control groups. Treatment group students received a mix of direct instruction from the teacher as well as instruction through cooperative learning techniques. Control group students received only direct instruction from the teacher. Prior to the treatment, students completed portions of Gordon's *Music Aptitude Test* (MAP) and students were further stratified into high and low aptitude groups using pretest scores. All students learned identical concepts and used identical repertoire and method books during weekly 30-minute rehearsal periods. Following the treatment period, students participated in a post-test measure, consisting of three

etudes that were recorded and scored by the researcher. Cangro found that while high aptitude students received higher ratings than low aptitude students, there was no significant difference in achievement between the two groups following the introduction of cooperative learning strategies. Cangro notes that the age of the participants may have been a factor in the effects of cooperative learning.

Cangro states:

Perhaps in instrumental music, cooperative learning is better suited to be applied with more mature instrumental music students who have already developed a certain threshold of proficiency on their music instrument. By having mastered a level of proficiency of instrumental technique, students may be better able to work cooperatively, focusing on conceptual understanding and skill development, without having to simultaneously learn how to fundamentally operate their instrument. (p. 52)

Cangro suggests further study is necessary in determining the effectiveness of cooperative learning techniques. He further suggests that research should be conducted with secondary students over a longer period of time.

Effect of Teacher Attitude on Student Perception

The behaviors and attitudes of teachers can potentially influence the way they interact with students, influencing student perceptions. Franklin (1979) examined the attitudes of high school administrators, band directors, and band students on the importance of selected activities in a high school band program. Ten activities in the high school program were considered: concert band, football (marching) band, jazz band, all-state band, concert festivals, marching festivals,

solo and ensemble festival, civic parades, section rehearsals, and summer band camp. Franklin primarily wished to ascertain similarities and differences in how the three different groups viewed the importance of these activities. One hundred randomly selected high schools participated in the study, resulting in a final sample of 53 school administrators, 54 band directors, and 3,125 band students. Subjects completed a researcher-designed survey instrument that utilized a semantic differential format, where two opposing answers (fair/unfair, strong/weak, etc.) are presented across from one another with indications of gradations of agreement between them. Respondents indicate their level of agreement within this continuum. Sequences of semantic differentials were presented for each of the activities and participants indicated their level of agreement for each pair of dichotomous words. Franklin found that while all three groups were diverse in opinion, all groups reported concert band as being highest in importance. Solo and ensemble, the only small group activity utilized in the study, was rated similarly in importance by band directors (fourth) and administrators (fifth). Students rated solo and ensemble festivals as seventh in importance out of the ten activities. However, solo and ensemble festivals were rated above the midpoint of the semantic differential scale, showing some consensus of importance between the three groups. Franklin suggests that these findings point to the need to investigate and potentially alter band curriculum so that it properly reflects the views of all three groups.

Goodstein (1987) investigated the differences in descriptive characteristics and leadership behaviors of a group of “successful” band directors and a group of

randomly selected band directors. Variables such as age, experience, and director's education were compared with other variables such as program size, socioeconomic status, and solo and ensemble participation. Goodstein contacted National Band Association state representatives for each state, soliciting the names of successful directors from each state. Representatives from 39 states submitted 104 names to the researcher. Goodstein then randomly selected an equal sample of directors from the same thirty-nine states for comparison. A total of 208 directors were invited to complete the *Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self-test* (LEAD-Self) and provide necessary demographic information. Ninety-four "successful" directors and 66 randomly selected directors responded to the mailed survey. While Goodstein found no significant differences in the leadership behaviors between the two groups, he did find that directors who were labeled as "successful" were older, held higher degrees, taught in larger schools of higher socioeconomic status, had larger programs, larger concert and marching bands, and had more students participate in solo and ensemble festivals.

Simanton (2000) investigated the assessment and grading practices of high school band directors, including what practices were being used, how satisfied directors were with these practices, and differences based upon region, state, and other director demographics. A stratified random sample was used to gather information from all six Music Educators National Conference (MENC) regions, resulting in 202 directors completing the researcher-designed survey. The survey instrument utilized assessment guidelines suggested by MENC as "best practices"

for grading and assessment. Findings indicated that a majority of directors did not use assessments and grading practices that were similar to MENC's prescribed "best practices." However, Simanton did find that directors from smaller band programs and those with higher educational degrees were closest to the best practice model. Further research is suggested on attitude towards grading and assessment methods as well as the effect of program size on the practices of small program directors.

Crochet (2006) researched the repertoire selection practices of band directors according to their experience, education, and success. Two researcher-designed surveys (the *Band Director Questionnaire* and *Repertoire Selection Questionnaire*) were administered to 212 band directors in 29 different states. As Crochet points out that repertoire is an important component in the success of band students, understanding how directors choose music is equally important and knowledge of differences between directors can help to shape future instruction in literature selection. Results showed significant differences between experienced, "successful" directors and younger, less experienced directors. Experienced directors applied a more "holistic" approach to music selection, taking into account aesthetic aspects, social implications, appropriateness for the ensemble, and personal or concert experience with pieces as important factors. Crochet points to the need for further research on music selection as important not only to the director, but to the success of the students in the ensemble, writing, "In teaching students the use of repertoire selection principals, we equip them to become independent higher-level thinkers – critical and analytical" (p. 111).

Sullivan (2005) surveyed high school music teachers in Arizona on their attitudes towards solo and ensemble festival participation. Teachers surveyed ($n = 191$) included band (39%), orchestra (16%), and choral (31%) directors from throughout the state. Teachers with split placements made up the remaining 14% of respondents. The researcher-designed survey collected demographic data and used Likert-type questions to investigate attitudes of teachers towards the benefits of solo and ensemble participation as well as obstacles to their participation. Another area investigated was attitudes towards the scheduling of the festival in Arizona, where solo and ensemble festival events are scheduled on the same day and at the same locations as auditions for regional honor ensembles. School size, level of education, gender, teaching area, and degrees held were considered as independent variables.

Directors reported overall positive attitudes towards solo and ensemble participation, but only 82% of the respondents reported having students who participated in the most recent solo and ensemble festival, with an average of 20 students per school participating. School size and teaching area were found to not have a significant effect on the number of students participating or on benefit and obstacle attitudes. However, a significant difference was found between teaching areas and attitudes towards scheduling, with split placement teachers showing greater dissatisfaction with scheduling than band and choir directors. Level of education and college major were found to have no significant effect on value and scheduling attitudes, but college major did significantly affect attitudes towards two obstacle statements. Teachers that held a music degree favored participation

in honor ensemble auditions while non-music degree teachers favored solo and ensemble festival. Sullivan suggests this difference may be due to teachers with music degrees having participated in similar ensembles during their high school experience. Significant difference was also found between these two groups on accompanists, with music degree-holding directors more concerned with paying for accompanists than non-degree holding teachers. Sullivan notes that this may be due to non-music degree directors teaching in smaller schools and, therefore, not requiring as many accompanists, but points out smaller schools were participating at similar levels to larger schools.

Although the data intimates that “(H)aving to prepare students for two events on the same day is surely a daunting task” (p. 10), teachers did not advocate a change in the scheduling of either event. Sullivan further states,

Juggling the remarkable number of activities in a high school ensemble schedule is a time-consuming task. Music educators must choose judiciously which events during the year will provide the most benefit to their students’ achievement and possibly foster lifetime musical enjoyment and participation. It would appear that Arizona music educators value and perceive the benefits of solo and small ensemble participation; however, they are cautious to add another event to their calendars even though the research evidence for doing so is strong. (p. 10)

Sullivan suggests further research on the attitude of Arizona students towards the scheduling solo and ensemble festivals.

Meyers (2010) pursued Sullivan's suggestion, investigating the attitudes of Arizona high school band students towards solo and ensemble events. A stratified random sample was used to choose nine schools varying sizes to participate in a student survey. Seven schools completed the survey, resulting in 281 students completing a researcher-designed survey questionnaire. Data collected for use as independent variables included grade, instrument played, and previous solo and ensemble and honor band audition participation. Likert-type questions were utilized to gather attitudinal information on perceptions of benefits of participation, obstacles to participation (including scheduling), and support from their director and used as dependent variables. Attitudes of support for participation in honor band auditions were also collected. Results showed that students felt that participation in solo and ensemble was or would be beneficial to their improvement as musicians. Some differences in perceptions of support were found by grade level, showing that freshmen felt less support for their participation in solo and ensemble than older students. Analyses also showed that students with prior solo and ensemble experience reported significantly higher means in responses to benefits and support and lower means to obstacle responses than students who participated in honor band auditions or who had not participated in either event. Meyers suggests since responses show that students who participate in solo and ensemble events continue to do so in the future, it becomes imperative to encourage students to participate early in their high school careers.

Analyses of support responses by solo and ensemble participants and honor band audition participants showed an interesting similarity: students who participated in solo and ensemble festival felt supported to do so while students who participated in honor band auditions felt similar support to participate in auditions. Meyers concluded that students participate in the event in which they feel the most support from the director. Demographic data showed that 159 students had participated in honor band auditions that year while 88 had participated in solo and ensemble festival. While Sullivan (2005) reported that directors reported encouraging students to participate in solo and ensemble events in Arizona, these figures caused Meyers to posit that directors, in fact, showed greater support and encouragement for participation in honor band auditions. Meyers also found that students felt that holding both events on the same day limited their preparation time for both, pointing to a potential conflict in the schedule. While Sullivan (2005) found that directors did not advocate a change in schedule, Meyers suggests that students may benefit by holding the events on two different days.

Influence of Solo and Ensemble Festivals/Contests

Some schools, districts, and local and state organizations regularly conduct festivals or contests that may influence director attitude toward solo and ensemble activities. Austin (1988) investigated the effects of contest format on the self-concept, motivation, achievement, and attitude of elementary band students. Forty-four fifth and sixth grade students participated in a school solo contest after one month of preparation during students' regular class time.

Students were divided into two groups, one which received written comments and a rating and one which received only written comments. Pretest and posttest data were collected through the *Music Achievement Test* (MAT) and the *Self-Concept in Music* (SCIM) scale. Students also completed a posttest measure of achievement motivation and attitude via a researcher-designed questionnaire. Results showed that both groups of students showed significant improvement on the SCIM scale, which Austin points to as evidence of the activity increasing student confidence. Results from the MAT showed that only the students who received ratings showed significant gains in achievement. Both groups attributed success in the contest to their effort, although comment-only students rated it higher than students who received ratings. Austin also points out a curious discrepancy in the perceptions of students, showing that while 66% of students felt that knowledge of being rated motivated students, only 34% believed that rated students performed better. Students also felt that the rated format was more rewarding and would choose to participate in the rated portion in the future, although this sentiment was less pronounced for students in the comment-only group and in students who received lower ratings. Austin suggests that “prior experience or success in competition (or both) tends to produce a type of dependency on continued involvement in competitive scenarios” (p. 104).

Bergee and Platt (2003) examined the influence of selected variables on ratings at solo and ensemble festivals. Utilizing festival data a Midwestern state in 2001 and 2002, they compared ratings to ascertain the influence of time of day, performance medium (instrumental or vocal), type of event (solo or ensemble),

and school size. Results showed that while a greater number of small schools participated in the festival, larger schools had more entries. Ratings were found to be significantly influenced by the time of day in which the events occurred, with early morning events, largely assigned to smaller schools, being less likely to receive the top rating. Solo events and instrumental events were also found to receive higher ratings than ensembles and vocal events. Results further showed that larger schools received more top ratings than smaller schools, which Bergee and Platt suggests may be due to larger schools having more staff and larger budgets. In a follow-up study, Bergee and McWhitier (2005) replicated the original study but included school expenditure as a potential influencing factor on ratings. Results of this study showed that higher per pupil expenditure by the school did significantly influence ratings in a positive way.

Howard (1994) was interested in the self-perceptions and attitudes of high school band students towards music contests. Four types of music contests were investigated: concert band, marching band, small ensemble, and solo. Data pertaining to perceptions of enjoyment, importance, motivational value, anxiety, increased musicianship, and goal structure towards contests was collected from 1,591 high school band students in Iowa through a researcher-designed student questionnaire and the Asmus *Music Attribution Orientation Scale*. Gender, prior solo and ensemble experience, perceived ability, and causal attributions were used independent variables. Results showed that students scored concert and solo contests highest in motivation and improving musicianship. Students also considered solo contests as most stressful, followed by ensemble contests.

Howard reported a positive correlation between perceived musical ability and the motivational value of solo and ensemble contests. Weak positive correlations were also found for prior solo and ensemble contest participation and attitude towards the contests.

Hurst (1994) conducted a nationwide investigation of the reasons high school band directors participate in music competitions. Six types of competitions were considered: concert band, marching band, solo and ensemble, jazz band, and honor ensemble auditions. Directors ($n = 293$) were randomly selected from around the country and completed a researcher-designed survey. Data collected included the number of each competitions participated in during the previous year and two sequences of Likert-type questions, one pertaining to attitudes towards competition and other pertaining to the director's impression of competition within their current state. Results indicated that directors participated in competition to "provide a sense of accomplishment for students, help maintain quality student performance and high standards of music education, provide a means of evaluation, and a clear goal of instruction" (p. 115). Primary reasons cited by directors for their participation in solo and ensemble competitions were creating clear goals for instruction, improving student understanding, evaluation of student performance, and promotion of high music education standards. Secondary analyses also showed that directors rated outside expectations and showcasing the band program as less significant reasons for participation in solo and ensemble competitions. Hurst also notes significant differences in the reasons for participation depending on the state's competition participation level.

Competition-heavy states relied more on tradition, expectation, and professional advancement than states with less competition emphasis. Hurst suggests further research in determining the merits of competition, especially within competition-heavy states, saying, “As music educators, perhaps our task is to gain a clearer perspective of the circumstances competitive music activities bring to the process of teaching instrumental music and realize that competition should be incorporated in a careful and prudent manner” (p. 132).

Chapter 3

METHOD

The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes of high school band directors in the United States towards solo and ensemble festivals and activities, and the influence of independent variables including teaching experience, level of education, personal solo and ensemble experience, region taught in, director-centered external factors, and teaching assignment on these attitudes.

Sampling Procedure and Participants

A list of all public high schools, including charter schools, was obtained for each state from National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) 2008 – 2009 databases. The number of schools for each state was compiled and resulted in a population of 18,124 high schools in the United States. This especially high number of schools required careful consideration of the sampling technique for this study in order to generalize the results across the entire population while also making the study manageable.

When considering the sample size of a large population, researchers must be careful to neither over-represent nor under-represent the population. Cochran (1977) proposed a sample size equation that takes into consideration the following factors: the abscissa in both tails of the normal curve of the level of precision desired (Z), the desired level of precision or confidence (e), and the estimated proportion of an attribute in the population (p and q , where q is equal to $1 - p$). The resulting equation is as follows:

$$n = \frac{Z^2 pq}{e^2}$$

Yamane (1973) proposed a simplified model of Cochran's equation that utilized the total population (N) and the desired level of precision (e) in order to obtain an appropriate sample size, as shown below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Using Yamane's equation with the total population of 18,124 schools and a desired confidence level of $\pm 3\%$, the resulting sample size was $n = 1047$. This figure was rounded to $n = 1050$ as the appropriate sample size for this study. The sample size derived from this formula equates to 5.79% of all high schools in the United States.

A number of sampling techniques were investigated for use in this study. A random sample of all states was considered, but was discarded for a number of reasons. The existence and administration of solo and ensemble festivals/contests are different for each state and could, therefore, affect the attitudes of the state's directors. Selecting only a limited number of states may not adequately represent the overall attitude of band directors, given these differences. A random sample by region was considered but was discarded for similar reasons. As there are potential for differences between all states, it cannot be presumed that directors in different states in a particular region think or believe the same things. Therefore, sampling from only one or two states in a region may not provide the clearest picture of general attitudes toward solo and ensemble. Only through gathering information from each state can attitudes of a national sample be most clearly

investigated and other factors isolated in order to begin to understand the attitudes of directors toward student participation in solo and ensemble activities.

A random sample of twenty band directors from each state was also considered, but was discarded due to the disproportionate number of schools in each state. The number of high school in each state ranged from 29 in one state (Delaware) to 1,371 in another state (California). Sampling using this method could potentially lead to the possible over-representation of attitudes in some states while under-representing others. A random sample of 10% of schools from each state was also considered, but discarded for similar reasons.

Due to these problems of selecting a representative sample, a stratified random sample was employed where the number of potential participants per state reflected the state's proportion of all high schools in the United States. In order to obtain the appropriate proportions, the number of schools for each state was divided by the total number of high schools across the nation ($n / 18,124$, where n represents the number of high schools in each state). The resulting proportion was multiplied by the desired sample size ($n = 1050$) and the resulting product, rounded appropriately, became the number of schools in each state that were randomly selected for inclusion in the study. For example, Alabama has 364 high schools. This equates to 2.01% of the total high schools in the United States. Multiplying this percentage by the 1,050 resulted in 21 schools from Alabama being included in the study. The total number of schools per state, the resulting proportion, and number of schools for each state included in the study are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
State Sampling Breakdown

State	Number of High Schools	Proportion of Population	Schools Included in Study
Alabama	364	2.01%	21
Alaska	244	1.35%	14
Arizona	482	2.66%	28
Arkansas	283	1.56%	16
California	1371	7.56%	79
Colorado	338	1.86%	20
Connecticut	163	0.90%	9
Delaware	29	0.16%	2
Florida	549	3.03%	32
Georgia	412	2.27%	24
Hawaii	63	0.35%	4
Idaho	147	0.81%	9
Illinois	666	3.67%	39
Indiana	373	2.06%	22
Iowa	359	1.98%	21
Kansas	379	2.09%	22
Kentucky	231	1.27%	13
Louisiana	297	1.64%	17
Maine	123	0.68%	7
Maryland	190	1.05%	11
Massachusetts	305	1.68%	18
Michigan	731	4.03%	42
Minnesota	462	2.55%	27
Mississippi	254	1.40%	15
Missouri	528	2.91%	31
Montana	168	0.93%	10
Nebraska	305	1.68%	18
Nevada	103	0.57%	6
New Hampshire	85	0.47%	5
New Jersey	344	1.90%	20
New Mexico	157	0.87%	9
New York	1045	5.77%	61
North Carolina	437	2.41%	25
North Dakota	165	0.91%	10
Ohio	859	4.74%	50
Oklahoma	467	2.58%	27
Oregon	299	1.65%	17
Pennsylvania	678	3.74%	39
Rhode Island	48	0.26%	3
South Carolina	210	1.16%	12
South Dakota	167	0.92%	10
Tennessee	329	1.82%	19
Texas	1328	7.33%	77
Utah	131	0.72%	8
Vermont	65	0.36%	4
Virginia	316	1.74%	18
Washington	355	1.96%	21
West Virginia	126	0.70%	7
Wisconsin	527	2.91%	31
Wyoming	67	0.37%	4

Schools within each state were listed in alphabetical order and assigned a chronological number. Random numbers were generated for each state and schools associated with these numbers were included in the study. Email addresses for directors of each of the chosen schools were compiled by visiting each school's website or by contacting the school directly for the director's email address. Schools that did not have a band program were discarded and replacement schools were chosen via the same technique.

Instrumentation

Data were collected via an online researcher-designed questionnaire, through the internet website ZipSurvey.com (Appendix B). The use of internet-based research questionnaires continues to grow each year. Researchers have cited ease, speed, and cost-effectiveness of contacting and surveying large numbers of participants in vastly different areas as significant advantages to online questionnaires (Schonlau, 2002; Sue & Ritter, 2007). Schonlau further points out online surveys may solicit more authentic responses from participants in that there is no contact between researcher and participant, thus fortifying anonymity of responses. Early studies of the accuracy and validity of internet and e-mail based research had varying results (Parker, 1992; Quigley et al., 2000; Schleyer and Forest, 2000), which Schonlau attributes to unfamiliarity with the internet at the time of these studies. Sue and Ritter (2007) note that in 2005, 89% of college students reported having internet access and the Pew Internet & American Life Project estimates that 79% of all Americans had access to the

internet in March 2010. Internet access for schools is shown to be much higher, with 2005 NCES data reporting 94% of all schools had internet access.

The use of internet-based research surveys in music education has increased in recent years, largely due to the increase in availability of internet access, particularly within public schools. State-wide surveys (Carney, 2005; Johnson, 2010; Kuehne, 2003; Rickels, 2008; Shelfo, 2007; Washington, 2007), national surveys (Christensen, 2000; Johnson & Stewart, 2004, 2005; Kancianic, 2004; Rickels, 2009; Rushing, 2010), and other specific group surveys (Bauer, Reese, & McAllister, 2003, Wexler, 2009) have been utilized successfully to gather data in past studies.

The survey instrument for the current study was divided into multiple sections according to question type and information collected. Tools available in ZipSurvey allow page breaks to be inserted as needed in order to divide sections or delineate questions that ask for similar information. Multiple page breaks were utilized so as not to overwhelm participants with questions and to aid in the flow of the survey.

The initial survey section contained a statement of informed consent for inclusion in the study, a description of the method by which directors were chosen, and other information necessary for participation in the study. The second section included various demographic questions (such as gender, years of experience, and education level) and other background data about the participant that was utilized as independent variables. While the procedure of selecting the sample for this study included schools from every state, the survey did not require

directors to identify their individual state since comparison by state was not a desired component of this study. Instead, directors were asked to identify the MENC region in which they taught. Regions were listed in the survey with a list of their constituent states. The states within each region can be found in Table 2. This eliminated potential exposure of the identities of respondents in smaller states.

The third section of the questionnaire investigated the attitudes of directors towards various aspects of solo and ensemble activities and festivals through the utilization a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 5 for “Strongly Agree” to 1 for “Strongly Disagree.” Attitudinal questions were divided into three groups: (1) directors’ attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities, (2) directors’ attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities, and (3) directors’ attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests. Questions within the first group included statements designed to investigate what directors believed were the potential direct benefits of participation in solo and ensemble activities to their students, as related to the existing research literature on solo and ensemble activities. The second group of questions included statements that dealt with how solo and ensemble activities potentially affected the director, whether through the influence on their job and performance or on the effort such events required of them. The third group of questions dealt with the attitudes of directors towards local, regional, and/or state solo and ensemble festivals/contests. Negatively worded statements

Table 2
MENC Regions

Eastern	North Central	Northwestern	Southern	Southwestern	Western
Connecticut	Illinois	Alaska	Alabama	Arkansas	Arizona
Delaware	Indiana	Idaho	Florida	Colorado	California
Maine	Iowa	Montana	Georgia	Kansas	Hawaii
Maryland	Michigan	Oregon	Kentucky	Missouri	Nevada
Massachusetts	Minnesota	Washington	Louisiana	New Mexico	Utah
New Hampshire	Nebraska	Wyoming	Mississippi	Oklahoma	
New Jersey	North Dakota		North Carolina	Texas	
New York	Ohio		South Carolina		
Pennsylvania	South Dakota		Tennessee		
Rhode Island	Wisconsin		Virginia		
Vermont			West Virginia		

were interspersed throughout the three groups of statements and results were inverted prior to analyses. The survey required less than 15 minutes to complete.

The questionnaire was pretested with doctoral colleagues of the researcher and pilot tested with 20 high school band directors across the United. Comments and results from the pretest and pilot tests were collected and appropriate changes were made to the survey for clarity and correctness and to ensure the content validity of the survey instrument. Cronbach’s Alpha was conducted on main study results to test the internal consistency and reliability of the survey instrument (Huck, 2004) and resulted in a reliability of .838.

Procedure and Response Rate

Emails were sent to the director of each school selected through the ZipSurvey website in late January 2011. The initial email included information about the study as well as a personalized web link to the survey. Tools in ZipSurvey tracked the personalized links used and noted links that had not been utilized. Some school districts employed an email filter that required verification of the authenticity of the message sent via the ZipSurvey website. Additionally,

some emails were returned as undeliverable. In such cases, the school was contacted in order to obtain the proper email address for the director and the invitation email was resent. Follow-up emails were sent approximately two weeks following the initial email contact. Subsequent email reminders were sent in one week intervals until a response rate of 50% was achieved. The total number of respondents for the study was $n = 557$, for a response rate of 53.05%. The number of responses per region and their representative response rates can be found in Table 3.

All data were stored securely online and retrieved by the researcher when needed via a secure, password-protected login. All participant responses were anonymous; identifying information was not collected or was removed prior to analysis. Data were imported into PASW 18 (Predictive Analytic Software, formerly SPSS) for analysis. The following statistical analyses were utilized to analyze data: Pearson's Correlation of Coefficient, one-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs), Welch's ANOVAs, Tukey HSD post- hoc tests, two-way Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVAs), Pillai's Trace, and basic non-parametric and demographic analyses. Due to the increased risk of Type I error associated with conducting multiple analyses, a Bonferroni procedure of adjustment was utilized where necessary (Huck, 2004). A Bonferroni adjustment minimizes the potential for Type I error by decreasing the area of rejection (alpha level) by dividing the desired alpha level ($p = .05$ for all tests) by the number of tests conducted.

Table 3
Response Rates by Region

Region	Schools in Region	Number of Schools Surveyed in Region	Number of Respondents	Region Response Rate
Eastern	3075	179	88	49.16%
North Central	4614	270	157	58.15%
Northwest	1280	75	44	58.67%
Southern	3525	203	95	46.80%
Southwest	3480	202	94	46.53%
Western	2150	125	73	58.40%
Missing			6	

Some ANOVA and MANOVA results were found to violate the assumption of like variances and required alternate analyses that accounted for this violation. When standard ANOVA results were found to violate this assumption, Welch’s ANOVA was utilized as an alternative that is more robust in dealing with potential problems from unlike variances (Huck, 2004). Likewise, MANOVA results that were found to violate the assumption of like variance were analyzed using Pillai’s Trace, a more robust MANOVA test that accounts for differences in variance (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005).

Operational Definitions

Ensemble, Small Ensemble, or Chamber Ensemble – A group of two to twelve people performing as one unit with one performer on a part, typically without a conductor.

Solo – Performance of a piece of music by one performer, either with or without accompaniment.

Solo and Ensemble Activities – Any rehearsal or performance of solo or small ensemble music, regardless of venue, sanctioned event, or curricular standing within a school band program.

Solo and Ensemble Festivals/Contests – Any local, regional, or state level gathering where students perform as soloists or as members of small ensembles for one or more adjudicators who provide written and/or recorded comments and either a rating (such as *Superior, Excellent, or Good* or *I, II, or III*) or hierarchical ranking (such as *First Place* and *Second Place*).

Solo and Ensemble Experience – The participation in the rehearsal or performance of solo or small ensemble music, whether part of or outside a school setting.

Research Questions

1. What are the general attitudes of high school band directors in the United States toward solo and ensemble activities?
2. Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to region of the United States?

Q₁: Are there significant differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities between regions of the United States?

H₀: There are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities between regions.

3. Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to region of the United States?

Q₁: Are there significant differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities between regions of the United States?

H₀: There are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities between regions.

4. Do directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to region of the United States?

Q₁: Are there significant differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests between regions of the United States?

H₀: There are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests between regions.

5. Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities according to teaching experience and level of education?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities among years of teaching experience?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities among years of teaching experience.

Q₂: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by director's level of education?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by director's level of education.

Q₃: Is there a significant interaction between years of teaching experience and education level on directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities?

H₀: There is no significant interaction between years of teaching experience and education level on directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities.

6. Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to teaching experience and level of education?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities among years of teaching experience?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities among years of teaching experience.

Q₂: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by director's level of education?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by director's level of education.

Q₃: Is there a significant interaction between years of teaching experience and education level on directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities?

H₀: There is no significant interaction between years of teaching experience and education level on directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities.

7. Do directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to teaching experience and level of education?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests among years of teaching experience?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests among years of teaching experience.

Q₂: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests by director's level of education?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests by director's level of education.

Q₃: Is there a significant interaction between years of teaching experience and education level on directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests?

H₀: There is no significant interaction between years of teaching experience and education level on directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests.

8. Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to directors' personal experiences with solo and ensemble activities during their high school career?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in director attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by directors' solo and ensemble experience?

H₀: There are no significant mean difference in director attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by directors' personal solo and ensemble experience.

9. Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to directors' personal experiences with solo and ensemble activities during their high school career?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by directors' solo and ensemble experience?

H₀: There are no significant mean difference in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by directors' personal solo and ensemble experience.

10. Do directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to directors' personal experiences with solo and ensemble activities during their high school career?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests by directors' solo and ensemble experience?

H₀: There are no significant mean difference in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests by directors' personal solo and ensemble experience.

11. Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to the director's teaching assignment?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by teaching assignment?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by teaching assignment.

12. Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to the director's teaching assignment?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by teaching assignment?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by teaching assignment.

13. Do directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to the size of the director's teaching assignment?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests by teaching assignment?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests by teaching assignment.

14. Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to director-centered external factors (supplemental contracts, evaluations, awards)?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities according to director-centered external factors?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by the existence of director-centered external factors.

15. Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to director-centered external factors?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities according to director-centered external factors?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by the existence of director-centered external factors.

16. Do directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to director-centered external factors?

Q₁: Are there significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests according to director-centered external factors?

H₀: There are no significant mean differences in directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests by the existence of director-centered external factors.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate attitudes of high school band directors in the United States towards solo and ensemble activities in regard to benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities, the attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities, and student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests. Additionally, differences in attitudes were investigated according to independent variables of teaching experience, level of education, personal solo and ensemble experience, region in which directors taught, and teaching assignment.

Descriptive Statistics

The total number of subjects who participated in the study was 557 band directors. Background data were collected to provide an overall description of the sample, including: gender, primary performance instrument, highest degree obtained, total years of teaching experience, years of experience in current position, approximate total school enrollment, approximate program enrollment, directors' experience performing solo and ensemble literature in high school, and director-centered external factors. Data for the director-centered external factors was compiled from questions that asked directors whether solo and ensemble activities were a factor in their teaching evaluations, included in obtaining a state-wide award, or part of a supplemental contract. Frequencies and percentages as well as means, standard deviations, and ranges of these descriptive data appear in Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Table 4
Frequency of director gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	422	75.8
Female	134	24.1
Missing	1	.2

Table 5
Frequency of Directors' Primary Instrument

Instrument	Frequency	Percentage
Flute	31	5.6
Oboe	6	1.1
Bassoon	8	1.4
Clarinet	43	7.7
Saxophone	82	14.7
Trumpet	115	20.6
Horn	51	9.2
Trombone	65	11.7
Baritone/Euphonium	17	3.1
Tuba	36	6.5
Percussion	56	10.1
String Bass	3	.5
Piano	17	3.1
Guitar	9	1.6
Voice	8	1.4
Missing	10	1.8

Table 6
Highest Degree Obtained

Degree	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelors	239	42.9
Masters	290	52.1
Doctorate	20	3.6
Missing	8	1.4

Table 7
Total Years of Teach Experience and Years of Experience in Current Position

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max
Years of Experience	556	14.92	9.90	1	41
Years in Current Position	555	8.47	7.49	1	41

Table 8
Approximate School and Program Enrollment and Solo and Ensemble Participants

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max
School Enrollment	552	1017.97	804.32	24	4200
Band Program Enrollment	550	89.08	68.61	1	600
Solo and Ensemble Participants	553	30.13	40.63	0	310

Table 9
Directors' Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities in High School

Participation	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	494	88.7%
No	59	10.6%
Missing	4	0.7%

Table 10
Participants Reporting Director-Centered External Factors

External Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	120	21.5%
No	432	77.6%
Missing	5	0.9%

Demographic data collected indicates the average participant in this study was a male (75.8%) director with a Master's degree (52.1%) whose primary instrument was trumpet (20.6%) or saxophone (14.7%). They had taught for an average of 14.92 years, the past 8.47 years of which were spent teaching in their current position, and had participated in solo and ensemble activities while a student in high school (88.7%). The average school in which participants taught had a student enrollment of 804.32 students, with 89.08 students enrolled in the band program. Directors did not experience director-centered external factors

(77.6%) and reported an average of 30.13 students had participated in the most recent local/regional/state solo and ensemble festival or contest.

Research Question #1: What are the general attitudes of high school band directors towards solo and ensemble activities?

Attitudinal statements were divided into three groups: (1) directors' attitudes toward benefits from student participation in solo and ensemble activities; (2) directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities; and (3) directors' attitudes toward student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests. Means and standard deviations for each statement in these categories appear in Tables 11, 12, and 13, respectively.

Table 11
Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Benefits of Student Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities

Statement	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Performing solo and ensemble literature is important to the musical development of my students	550	4.56	.64
Solo and ensemble activities help develop students' musical independence	550	4.76	.44
Solo and ensemble activities are beneficial for both high and low achieving students	548	4.42	.76
Solo and ensemble activities help increase the performance confidence of my students	547	4.50	.68
The skills learned by performing solo and small ensemble literature help my students' performance in large ensembles	550	4.65	.57
Participating in solo and ensemble activities helps to motivate my students	549	4.00	.89
Once my students participate in solo and ensemble activities, they will be more likely to participate in the future	550	4.13	.83
Solo and ensemble activities enable students to focus on their individual musical needs	549	4.42	.70
Performing in small ensembles helps students learn how to work together	546	4.54	.56
Performing in a small ensemble is an excellent way to foster peer learning	545	4.47	.61
Solo and ensemble activities are an excellent way for students to show their musical knowledge	543	4.42	.67
My students are aware of the benefits of participating in solo and ensemble activities	546	3.82	.85
Solo and ensemble activities are important in helping students learn self-motivating and monitoring skills	544	4.21	.69
The autonomy/freedom associated with solo and ensemble activities is beneficial to students' growth and self-concept	542	4.25	.70
Participation in solo and ensemble activities help students improve their tone and intonation	546	4.35	.68
Participation in solo and ensemble activities helps students improve their listening skills	545	4.45	.63

Table 12
Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Commitment to Student Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities

Statement	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Solo and ensemble activities require significant involvement from me	542	4.17	.85
I make myself available to coach small ensembles and soloists	541	4.39	.69
Helping students with solo and ensemble activities is worth the extra time and commitment	541	4.37	.74
I have adequate time to assist soloists and small ensembles with my current teaching assignment/load	540	2.49	1.20
I primarily coach solo and ensemble students outside the school day	542	3.81	1.10
My students are interested in performing solo and ensemble literature	541	3.29	1.02
My students are afraid to play solos	542	3.25	.98
My students have adequate time to prepare solos and small ensembles	541	3.43	1.06
The teaching of solos is primarily the responsibility of private lesson teachers	541	2.65	1.11
More of my students would participate in solo and ensemble events if they took private lessons	542	4.02	.92
I encourage students to participate in solo and ensemble activities	538	4.34	.80
I encourage solo and ensemble activities because of our local/regional/state festival or contest	527	3.40	1.19
I encourage students to perform solo and small ensemble literature throughout the school year	535	3.55	1.05
Solo and ensemble activities are an important part of our band program	534	3.72	1.07
I provide class time for students to rehearse their solos and small ensembles	535	3.37	1.13
My students use the band room to rehearse their solos and small ensembles	538	4.22	.72
I have my students perform solo and ensembles at our band concerts	548	3.63	1.06
The cost of performing solo and ensemble activities is primarily the responsibility of my students	535	3.08	1.32
The cost of solo and ensemble activities is prohibitive for my students	535	2.68	1.17

Table 13

Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Solo and Ensemble Festivals/Contests

Statement	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial to my students	536	4.44	.73
Comments received at solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial to my students	531	4.16	.80
The format of our local/regional/state solo and ensemble festival/contest is conducive to the success of my students	534	3.83	1.00
The timing of the local/regional/state solo and ensemble festival/contest is appropriate for my students and program	536	3.61	1.12
I am pleased with the format and operation of the local/regional/state solo and ensemble festival/contest	532	3.68	1.07
Judges at our local/regional/state solo and ensemble festival/contest are knowledgeable, positive, and helpful	536	3.89	.84

Research Question #2: Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to region of the United States?

Before any analyses were conducted, data were checked to assure that assumptions of normalcy and like variances were met. Results from Levene's Test of Equality of Variance indicated that the assumption of like variance were violated by seven of the seventeen statements at the $p = .05$ level. Due to these violations, Welch's ANOVA tests were conducted. One-way ANOVAs were conducted for the remaining ten statements. A Bonferroni adjustment for this research question resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .003$. Results showed no significant mean differences for any of the benefit statements among the regions of the United States in which directors taught. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits from student participation in solo and ensemble activities was retained.

Research Question #3: Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to region of the United States?

Results from Levene's Test of Equality of Variance indicated that responses to three of the eighteen statements did not fulfill the assumption of like variances at the $p = .05$ level. Welch's ANOVAs were conducted for each of the violating statements. One-way ANOVAs were conducted for the remaining fifteen statements. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in an alpha level of $p = .003$ for the ANOVA analyses. Significant mean differences were found for eight of the statements of directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by the region of the United States in which directors taught. The means these eight statements by region can be found in Table 14. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by region was rejected.

ANOVA results indicated significant mean differences for the statement "Solo and ensemble activities require significant involvement from me" by the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 534) = 5.356, p = .000$. A post-hoc Tukey HSD test showed that directors who taught in the North Central ($M = 4.34, SD = .76$) and Southwestern ($M = 4.35, SD = .84$) regions had higher means than teachers who taught in the Southern ($M = 3.93, SD = .96$) and Western ($M = 3.88, SD = .88$) regions at the .05 significance level.

Table 14
Means of Statements of Directors' Attitudes toward Commitment to Solo and Ensemble Activities
by MENC Region

Statement	North					
	Eastern	Central	Northwest	Southern	Southwestern	Western
Solo and ensemble activities require significant involvement from me.	4.16	4.34	4.18	3.93	4.35	3.88
I make myself available to coach small ensembles and soloists.	4.29	4.60	4.28	4.35	4.61	3.95
I encourage students to participate in solo and ensemble activities.	4.19	4.50	4.41	4.14	4.54	4.14
I encourage solo and ensemble activities because of our local/regional/state festival or contest.	3.05	3.57	3.80	3.05	3.84	3.08
Solo and ensemble activities are an important part of our band program.	3.52	3.96	3.61	3.45	4.04	3.44
I provide class time for students to rehearse their solos and small ensembles.	2.99	3.58	3.48	3.33	3.63	3.03
My students use the band room to rehearse their solos and small ensembles.	4.15	4.32	4.23	4.21	4.43	3.85
The cost of performing solo and ensemble activities is primarily the responsibility of my students.	3.05	2.86	2.93	3.56	2.74	3.44

ANOVA results further indicated significant mean differences for the statement “I make myself available to coach small ensembles and soloists” by the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 533) = 12.627, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD tests showed for directors in the North Central region ($M = 4.60, SD = .55$) a

significantly higher mean than directors in the Eastern ($M = 4.29, SD = .73$), Southern ($M = 4.34, SD = .64$), and Western ($M = 3.95, SD = .88$) regions. Results also indicated that directors in the Western region had a significantly lower mean than directors in the Eastern, Southern, and Southwestern ($M = 4.61, SD = .51$) regions. Further results also indicated that directors in the Southwestern region had a significantly higher mean than directors in the Eastern region.

ANOVA results indicated significant mean differences among the regions in which directors taught for the statement “I encourage students to participate in solo and ensemble activities”, $F(5, 530) = 5.397, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed that directors who taught in the Southwestern ($M = 4.55, SD = .62$) and North Central ($M = 4.50, SD = .72$) regions had significantly higher means than directors in the Eastern ($M = 4.19, SD = .92$), Southern ($M = 4.14, SD = .86$), and Western ($M = 4.14, SD = .88$) regions.

ANOVA results indicated significant mean differences for the statement “I encourage solo and ensemble activities because of our local/regional/state festival or contest” by the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 529) = 8.620, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who taught in the North Central ($M = 3.57, SD = 1.16$), Northwest ($M = 3.80, SD = 1.05$), and Southwestern ($M = 3.84, SD = 1.20$) regions had significantly higher means than directors in the Eastern ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.23$), Southern ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.14$), and Western ($M = 3.08, SD = 1.04$) regions.

Welch's ANOVA results indicated significant mean difference for the statement "Solo and ensemble activities are an important part of our band program" by the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 201.314) = 6.110, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed that directors who taught in the North Central ($M = 3.96, SD = .95$) and Southwestern ($M = 4.03, SD = 1.06$) regions had significantly higher means than directors in the Eastern ($M = 3.52, SD = 1.12$), Southern ($M = 3.45, SD = 1.12$), and Western ($M = 3.44, SD = 1.04$) regions.

Significant mean differences were found for the statement "I provide class time for students to rehearse their solos and small ensembles" by the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 527) = 5.571, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who taught in the North Central ($M = 3.58, SD = 1.13$) and Southwestern ($M = 3.63, SD = 1.17$) regions had significantly higher means than directors in the Eastern ($M = 2.99, SD = 1.09$) and Western ($M = 3.03, SD = 1.17$) regions.

ANOVA results indicated significant mean differences for the statement "My students use the band room to rehearse their solos and small ensembles" by the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 530) = 6.490, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who taught in the Western region ($M = 3.85, SD = .85$) had a significantly lower mean than directors in the North Central ($M = 4.32, SD = .69$), Southern ($M = 4.21, SD = .64$), and Southwestern ($M = 4.43, SD = .56$) regions.

Results from Welch's ANOVA indicated significant mean differences for the statement "The cost of performing solo and ensemble activities is primarily

the responsibility of my students” by the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 206.227) = 6.678, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who taught in the Southern ($M = 3.56, SD = 1.09$) and Western ($M = 3.44, SD = 1.11$) regions had significantly higher means than directors who taught in the North Central ($M = 2.86, SD = 1.49$) and Southwestern ($M = 2.74, SD = 1.34$) regions.

Research Question #4: Do directors’ attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to region of the United States?

Results from Levene’s Test of Equality of Variance indicated that only one of the six statements of directors’ attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests fulfilled the requirement of like variances. Therefore, Welch’s ANOVAs were performed for the five statements violating this assumption. A one-way ANOVA was conducted for the remaining statement. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in an alpha level of $p = .008$. Significant mean differences by region were found for all six statements. The means and standard deviations by region for these statements can be found in Table 15. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors’ attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests between regions was rejected.

Results from a Welch’s ANOVA indicated significant mean differences by the region in which directors taught for the statement “Solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial to my students”, $F(5, 195.985) = 8.512, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who

Table 15
Means of Statements of Director's Attitudes toward Solo and Ensemble Festivals/Contests by
MENC Region

Statement	North					
	Eastern	Central	Northwest	Southern	Southwestern	Western
Solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial to my students.	4.22	4.64	4.34	4.21	4.67	4.32
Comments received at solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial to my students.	3.99	4.33	4.09	4.00	4.31	4.06
The format of our local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests are conducive to the success of my students.	3.47	4.09	3.89	3.73	4.07	3.52
The timing of the local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests are appropriate for my students and my program.	3.44	3.96	3.59	3.28	3.73	3.23
I am pleased with the format and operation of the local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests.	3.40	4.03	3.51	3.34	3.93	3.46
Judges at our local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests are knowledgeable, positive, and helpful.	3.61	4.04	3.51	3.34	3.93	3.46

taught in the North Central ($M = 4.64$, $SD = .52$) and Southwestern ($M = 4.67$, $SD = .56$) regions had significantly higher means than directors who taught in the Eastern ($M = 4.22$, $SD = .92$), Southern ($M = 4.21$, $SD = .87$), and Western ($M = 4.32$, $SD = .71$) regions.

Results of the one-way ANOVA indicated significant mean differences for the statement “Comments received at solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial to my students” among the region in which directors teach, $F(5, 523) = 3.854, p = .002$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who taught in the North Central region ($M = 4.33, SD = .62$) had significantly higher means than directors who taught in the Eastern ($M = 3.99, SD = .87$) and Southern ($M = 4.00, SD = .91$) regions.

Welch’s ANOVA results indicated significant mean differences for the statement “The format of our local/regional/state solo and ensemble festival/contest is conducive to the success of my students” among the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 199.601) = 7.234, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who taught in the North Central ($M = 4.09, SD = .84$) and Southwestern ($M = 4.07, SD = .97$) regions had significantly higher means than directors who taught in the Eastern ($M = 3.47, SD = 1.01$) and Western ($M = 3.52, SD = 1.04$) regions.

Welch’s ANOVA results indicated significant mean differences for the statement “The timing of the local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests is appropriate for my students and my program” among the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 202.313) = 6.439, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed that directors who taught in the North Central region ($M = 3.96, SD = 1.02$) had a significantly higher mean than directors who taught in the Eastern ($M = 3.44, SD = .96$), Southern ($M = 3.28, SD = 1.33$), and Western ($M = 3.32, SD = 1.07$) regions at the $p = .05$ level.

Welch's ANOVA results indicated significant mean differences for the statement "I am pleased with the format and operation of the local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests" among the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 196.483) = 9.190, p = .000$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who taught in the North Central region ($M = 4.03, SD = .89$) had a significantly higher mean than directors who taught in the Eastern ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.00$), Northwest ($M = 3.51, SD = 1.12$), Southern ($M = 3.34, SD = 1.29$), and Western ($M = 3.46, SD = .94$) regions. Results also showed that directors who taught in the Southwestern region ($M = 3.93, SD = 1.01$) had a significantly higher mean than directors who taught in the Eastern and Southern regions.

Welch's ANOVA results indicated significant mean differences for the statement "Judges at our local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests are knowledgeable, positive, and helpful" among the region in which directors taught, $F(5, 199.847) = 3.977, p = .002$. Post-hoc Tukey HSD results showed, at the $p = .05$ level, that directors who taught in the North Central ($M = 4.04, SD = .71$) and Southwestern ($M = 4.04, SD = .83$) regions had significantly higher means than directors who taught in the Eastern region ($M = 3.61, SD = .87$).

Research Question #5: Do directors' attitudes toward benefits from student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to teaching experience and level of education?

A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of teaching experience and level of education on responses

to statements measuring directors' attitudes toward benefits from student participation in solo and ensemble activities. Box's *M* Test of Homogeneity of Covariance indicated that the assumption of like variances was not fulfilled. Therefore, Pillai's Trace Test was utilized for analyses in place of the more common Wilks' Lambda. Pillai's Trace is a more robust multivariate analysis that is less susceptible to errors due to unequal variances and, therefore, should be used when the assumption of like covariance is not met. MANOVA results indicated no significant differences in responses among levels of teaching experience or levels of education and no significant interaction between the independent variables (Table 16). All three null hypotheses were retained.

Table 16
MANOVA Results for Statements Measuring Directors' Attitudes toward Benefits of Student Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities and Director's Experience Level and Level of Education

Effect	Pillai's Trace	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	Error <i>df</i>	Sig.
Degree	.049	.721	34	986	.882
Experience Level	.068	.679	51	1482	.960
Degree * Experience Level	.162	.811	102	2982	.916

Research Question #6: Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to teaching experience and level of education?

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of teaching experience and level of education on responses to statements measuring directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble

activities. Box's *M* Test of Homogeneity of Covariance indicated that the assumption of like variances was not met. Therefore, Pillai's Trace Test was utilized for analysis. MANOVA results indicated no significant differences in responses among levels of teaching experience or levels of education and no significant interaction between the independent variables (Table 17). All three null hypotheses were retained.

Table 17
MANOVA Results for Statements Measuring Directors' Attitudes toward Commitment to Student Participation in Solo and Ensemble Activities and Directors' Level of Experience and Level of Education

Effect	Pillai's Trace	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	Error <i>df</i>	Sig.
Degree	.094	1.250	38	960	.145
Experience Level	.115	1.006	57	1443	.464
Degree*Experience Level	.244	1.079	114	2904	.271

Research Question #7: Do directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to teaching experience and level of education?

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of teaching experience and level of education on responses to statements measuring directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests. Box's *M* Test of Equality of Covariance results indicated that the assumption of like variances was violated. Therefore, Pillai's Trace Test was utilized for the MANOVA test. MANOVA results indicated no significant differences among levels of teaching experience or

levels of education as well as no significant interaction between these independent variables (Table 18). Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Table 18
MANOVA Results for Statements Measuring Directors' Attitudes toward Solo and Ensemble Festivals/Contests and Director's Level of Experience and Level of Education

Effect	Pillai's Trace	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	Error <i>df</i>	Sig.
Degree	.033	1.401	12	1002	.159
Experience Level	.046	1.291	18	1506	.184
Degree * Experience Level	.074	1.055	36	3030	.381

Research Question #8: Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to directors' personal experiences with solo and ensemble activities during their high school careers?

Before ANOVAs were conducted, Levene's Test of Equality of Variance was conducted to check that data fulfilled assumptions of like variance.

Responses to one statement were found to violate this assumption. Therefore, Welch's ANOVA was utilized for analysis of this statement. One-way ANOVAs were utilized for the remaining sixteen statements. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in an alpha level of $p = .003$. Significant differences were found for one of the seventeen statements. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by directors' personal solo and ensemble experience was rejected.

ANOVA results indicated significant mean difference by director's solo and ensemble experience in high school for the statement "Performing solo and ensemble literature is important to the musical development of my students", $F(1, 548) = 10.090, p = .002$. Further investigation showed that directors who experienced solo and ensemble activities during high school ($M = 4.59, SD = .62$) had a significantly higher mean than directors who did not experience solo and ensemble activities during high school ($M = 4.31, SD = .73$).

Research Question #9: Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to directors' personal experiences with solo and ensemble activities during their high school careers?

Levene's Test of Equality of Variance was conducted on the nineteen statements of directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities. One of the statements was found to violate the assumption of like variances and Welch's ANOVA was conducted for this statement. ANOVAs were conducted for the remaining eighteen statements. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .003$. Significant differences were found for two statements, so the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by directors' personal solo and ensemble experience was rejected.

Results of a one-way ANOVA indicated significant mean differences by director's personal experience with solo and ensemble activities in high school for

the statement “I make myself available to coach small ensembles and soloists” , $F(1, 539) = 12.316, p = .000$. Directors who experienced solo and ensemble activities in high school ($M = 4.43, SD = .67$) had a significantly higher mean than directors who did not experience solo and ensemble activities in high school ($M = 4.09, SD = .82$).

Results also indicated significant mean differences by director’s experience with solo and ensemble activities in high school for the statement “I provide class time for students to rehearse their solos and small ensembles” , $F(1, 533) = 16.317, p = .000$. Directors who experienced solo and ensemble activities in high school ($M = 3.44, SD = 1.11$) had a significantly higher mean than directors who did not experience solo and ensemble activities in high school ($M = 2.81, SD = 1.14$).

Research Question #10: Do directors’ attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/events differ according to directors’ personal experiences with solo and ensemble activities during their high school careers?

One-way ANOVAs were conducted for each statement measuring directors’ attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests based upon the director’s experience with solo and ensemble activities in high school. Levene’s Test of Equality of Variance indicated that all statements fulfilled the assumption of like variance. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .003$. Results of the ANOVAs showed no significant mean differences for responses to statements of directors’ attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests among directors’ high school experience with solo and

ensemble activities. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests by directors' personal solo and ensemble experience was retained.

Research Question #11: Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to the director's teaching assignment?

Data collected pertaining to directors' teaching assignment was analyzed to determine proper categorization of teaching assignment. Data indicated directors were responsible for many different types of courses across multiple grade levels. Respondents were grouped according to whether they taught only band classes or taught courses in multiple areas of musical specializations (band, general music, orchestra, or choir). This categorization resulted in the proportions found in Table 19. These groups were used to analyze responses to statements that measured directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities.

Levene's Test of Equality of Variance indicated that responses to three of the seventeen statements of directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities violated the assumption of like variance. Welch's ANOVAs were conducted for the three violating statements. One-way ANOVAs were conducted for the remaining fourteen statements. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .003$. No significant mean differences were found for any of the statements measuring directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities

Table 19
Frequency of Teaching Assignments

Assignment	Frequency	Percentage
Band Only	314	56.4
Multiple Music Areas	239	43.2
Missing	4	.7

based upon teaching assignment. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there were no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by teaching assignment was retained.

Research Question #12: Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to the director's teaching assignment?

One-way ANOVAs were conducted for each statement after determining that Levene's Tests of Equality of Variance indicated that all nineteen statements fulfilled the assumption of like variances. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .003$. Results indicated a significant mean difference for the statement "My students are interested in performing solo and ensemble literature" among director's teaching assignment, $F(1, 539) = 9.866, p = .002$. Directors who taught only band courses ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.01$) had a significantly higher mean than directors who taught courses in multiple areas of music specialization ($M = 3.13, SD = 1.02$). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there were no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to

student participation in solo and ensemble activities by teaching assignment was rejected.

Research Question #13: Do directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to the director's teaching assignment?

One-way ANOVAs were conducted for each statement measuring directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests after determining that Levene's Tests of Equality of Variance indicated that all six statements fulfilled the assumption of like variance. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .008$. Results indicated no significant mean differences in the responses to statements of directors' attitude toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests based upon director's teaching assignment. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests by teaching assignment was retained.

Research Question #14: Do directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to director-centered external factors (supplemental contracts, evaluations, awards)?

Results from Levene's Test of Equality of Variance indicated that responses to three of the seventeen statements violated the assumption of like variance. Due to this violation, Welch's ANOVAs were conducted on the three violating statements. One-way ANOVAs were conducted on the remaining fourteen statements. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .003$. No significant differences were found for statements of directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities based

upon director-centered external factors. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by the existence of director-centered external factors was retained.

Research Question #15: Do directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities differ according to director-centered external factors (supplemental contracts, evaluations, awards)?

Levene's Test of Equality of Variance indicated that three of the nineteen statements violated the assumption of like variances. Welch's ANOVAs were conducted for the three assumption-violating statements. One-way ANOVAs were conducted between the remaining sixteen statements. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .003$. Results showed significant mean differences for five of the statements measuring directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities based upon director-centered external factors. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities by the existence of director-centered external factors was rejected.

Results of the Welch's ANOVA indicated significant mean differences for the statement "I make myself available to coach small ensembles and soloists" among director-centered external factors, $F(1, 257.301) = 38.698, p = .000$. Further analysis showed that the mean for directors who reported director-

centered external factors ($M = 4.68, SD = .52$) was significantly higher than directors without director-centered external factors ($M = 4.31, SD = .71$).

Welch's ANOVA results indicated a significant mean difference for responses to the statement "I encourage students to participate in solo and ensemble activities" among director-centered external factors, $F(1, 206.715) = 12.353, p = .001$. Further analysis showed directors who reported director-centered external factors ($M = 4.56, SD = .71$) had significantly higher means than directors without director-centered external factors ($M = 4.29, SD = .81$).

Welch's ANOVA results also indicated a significant difference for responses to the statement "I provide class time for students to rehearse their solos and small ensembles" among director-centered external factors, $F(1, 201.503) = 17.245, p = .000$. Further analysis showed directors reporting director-centered external factors ($M = 3.77, SD = 1.03$) had a higher mean than directors without director-centered external factors ($M = 3.27, SD = 1.13$).

Results of a one-way ANOVA indicated a significant mean difference for responses to the statement "Solo and ensemble activities require significant involvement from me" among director-centered external factors, $F(1, 539) = 10.67, p = .001$. Further investigation showed that directors reporting director-centered external factors ($M = 4.39, SD = .73$) had a significantly higher mean than directors without director-centered external factors ($M = 4.11, SD = .87$).

One-way ANOVA results also indicated a significant mean difference for the statement "Solo and ensemble activities are an important part of our band program" among director-centered external factors, $F(1, 531) = 9.62, p = .002$.

Further investigation showed that directors reporting director-centered external factors ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.09$) had a significantly higher mean than directors without director-centered external factors ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.06$).

Research Question #16: Do directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests differ according to director-centered external factors?

Results from Levene's Test of Equality of Variance indicated that one statement measuring directors' attitude toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests violated the assumption of equal variances. Therefore, Welch's ANOVA was conducted for this statement. One-way ANOVA were conducted for the remaining statements. A Bonferroni adjustment resulted in a new alpha level of $p = .008$. Results indicated a significant mean difference for one of the six statements of directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble activities based upon director-centered external factors. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests by the existence of director-centered external factors was rejected.

Results from the Welch's ANOVA indicated a significant mean difference for the statement "Solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial for my students" among director-centered external factors, $F(1, 198.708) = 7.592$, $p = .006$. Further investigation showed that directors reporting director-centered external factors ($M = 4.59$, $SD = .67$) had a significantly higher mean than directors without director-centered external factors ($M = 4.40$, $SD = .74$).

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, FURTHER RESEARCH, AND CONCLUSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of high school band directors in the United States toward solo and ensemble activities. Research questions sought to investigate the general attitudes of directors as well as how various demographic variables, such as region in which directors taught, directors' experience with solo and ensemble activities during their high school careers, level of teaching experience, level of education, teaching assignment, and director-centered external factors, effect these attitudes. A stratified random sample of 1,050 band directors from across the nation was invited to participate in the study. Responses were collected from 557 participants, resulting in a response rate of 53.07%. Data were collected via a researcher-designed online questionnaire administered through the web service, ZipSurvey (www.zipsurvey.com). The questionnaire collected demographic information for each director and utilized a five-point Likert-type scale to collect attitudinal data in three groups: (1) directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities; (2) directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities; and (3) directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests.

Analyses of attitudinal data suggest directors are generally favorable towards solo and ensemble activities in all the above categories. Further analyses also showed that the MENC region in which directors taught had a significant effect on responses to some statements in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities and festivals/contests, but not in regards to potential benefits to students. Teaching experience and level of education were found to have no significant difference on attitudinal responses. Significant differences in attitude were also found for some statements measuring directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities and directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities based upon a director's personal experience with solo and ensemble in high school. Significant differences in attitude were also found for some statements measuring directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities based upon a director's teaching assignment. Director-centered external factors, such as supplemental pay or contracts, teaching evaluations, and program awards were found to have significant effect on some statements measuring directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities and directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests.

Discussion

Descriptive Statistics. Results of demographic data from this study may provide a picture of today's high school band director in the United States. Current findings suggest that directors are largely male (75.8%) and hold a

Master's degree (52.1%). Trumpet (20.6%) and saxophone (14.7%) were the most commonly reported primary instrument of directors. Additionally, directors have an average of 8.47 years of teaching experience in their current position and 14.92 years of teaching experience overall. The average total school enrollment for the study was 804.32 students and the average band program enrollment was 89.08 students. A majority of directors (56.4%) teach only band courses. The average number of students who participated in the most recent solo and ensemble festival or contests was 30.13 students. A majority of directors (77.6%) do not deal with director-centered external factors in regards to student participation in solo and ensemble activities.

Data show the high school band directing profession is diverse in many ways except for one: gender. The preponderance of male directors (75.8%) indicates the profession is male-dominated, a finding which may not be surprising to some. However, the reason for this disparity in number between male and female directors has not been adequately investigated in the research literature. In order for there to be greater gender balance in the high school band directing profession, differences in how males and females view the profession must be examined.

General Attitudes. It appears that directors across the United States believe that solo and ensemble activities are an important and worthwhile educational endeavor. Results showed that all mean responses were above the attitudinal midpoint. However, closer inspection of these results points to some interesting trends.

Responses to statements measuring directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities were all very high, with fifteen of the sixteen statements falling within the mean range of 4.00 to 4.76 on a five-point scale and standard deviations ranging from .44 to .89. The homogeneity of these responses indicates that directors strongly believe in the benefits of participation in solo and ensemble activities in areas which are consistent with findings of previous research (Allsup, 2003; Bailey, 2006; Berg, 1997; Cangro, 2004; Carmody, 1988; Cary, 1981; Djordjevic, 2007; Jarrell, 1971; Johnson and Johnson, 1999; Larson, 2010; Olsen, 1975; Schmidt, 2005; Sandene, 1997; Sorensen, 1971; Stabley, 2000; Werpy, 1995; West, 1985; Zorn, 1969). This is an encouraging finding that highlights the potential for solo and ensemble performance to have a positive impact on the achievement of students across multiple areas.

One area of concern, however, was responses to the statement "My students are aware of the benefits of participating in solo and ensemble activities," which had a lower mean of 3.82. This pronounced dip in attitude may indicate that while directors understand the benefits, the message may not be reaching students. One potential reason for the loss of message could be that students may better understand benefits through personal experience with solo and ensemble activities rather than being told of the potential benefits. If solo and ensemble activities are only offered outside of regular rehearsal time, some students may not be exposed to these benefits or may perceive these activities as extra or unnecessary. If directors were to begin or continue to utilize solo and ensemble

activities as a component of their regular band rehearsals, more students could directly experience, and therefore may become more aware of these benefits. Additionally, inclusion of these activities during a class period could demonstrate to students that directors actively support them, leading to increased desire to participate, as found by Meyers (2010).

While responses to statements of directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities were homogenous, responses to statements measuring directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities show considerably more variation, with response means ranging from 2.49 to 4.39 and standard deviations from .72 to 1.32. These results may indicate difficulties in the conceiving and maintenance of a solo and ensemble program component among the many other duties of directors, a finding consistent with Sullivan (2005). As with the benefit statements, some encouraging attitudes can be seen among directors in this study, such as the positive response ($M = 4.37$, $SD = .74$) to the statement "Helping students with solo and ensemble activities is worth the extra time and commitment" and similar responses to the statement "Solo and ensemble activities are an important part of our band program" ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 1.07$), indicate that that solo and ensemble activities are important to many directors.

However, the commitment of time does appear to be an issue for some directors. In one statement, directors noted that "Solo and ensemble activities require significant involvement from me" ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .85$). When this statement is compared to responses to a second statement, "I have adequate time

to assist soloists and small ensembles with my current teaching assignment/load” ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 1.20$), the differences in responses become a bit alarming. While directors agree that solo and ensemble activities do require more from them in terms of time and energy, they may have considerable difficulty doing so with their current work load. This can potentially lead to less student involvement due to students’ perceptions of less support from the director (Goodstein, 1987; Meyers, 2010). Directors, however, may not need to relinquish their personal time after school to show their support. Providing class time to rehearse solo and ensemble literature, as mentioned above, can solve this dilemma, if directors are willing to lose a portion of their large group rehearsal time. One potential way of doing this would be to provide some sections of the band with solo and ensemble rehearsal time during class while conducting a sectional rehearsal with other students at the same time. This provides the director with time to address the needs of a particular section in a large ensemble piece while also allowing other students to explore and reap the benefits from the study of solo and ensemble literature. Such a format, however, requires adequate facilities for multiple groups and may create issues with student supervision.

Responses to statements measuring directors’ attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests were also generally positive ($M = 3.61$ - 4.44 , $SD = .73$ - 1.12); however, closer inspection finds an interesting trend. Statements that deal with festivals and contests being beneficial for students were positive ($M = 4.44$, $SD = .73$ and $M = 4.16$, $SD = .80$), matching earlier findings by Austin (1988) and Howard (1994). However, statements regarding the format ($M = 3.83$, $SD =$

1.00), timing ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.12$), operation ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.07$), and adjudication ($M = 3.89$, $SD = .84$) were somewhat lower, pointing to these factors being a matter of contention for directors, similar to findings by Bergee and Platt (2003) and Bergee and McWhitier (2005). Directors may not be entirely pleased with how festivals are conducted in their area, but they might consider that the potential benefits to students may outweigh these difficulties. Therefore, it behooves directors and organizers of solo and ensemble festivals/contests to address such concerns with these events in order to remove any obstacles that might hinder further student involvement or director frustration in the future.

Region. Significant mean differences were found by MENC region (Eastern, North Central, Northwest, Southern, Southwestern, or Western) for directors' responses in multiple statements measuring directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities and in statements measuring directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests. These differences may point to a number of issues that exist across the nation, both regarding solo and ensemble activities directly and as an expression of the current national educational climate. Directors in the North Central (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin) and Southwestern (Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas) regions were considerably more favorable in attitude toward solo and ensemble activities than directors in other regions. Investigation of these two regions reveals they include states that account for a large percentage of high schools in the United States as compared to

other states in other regions, possibly influencing results. For example, the Southwestern region includes seven states, which includes Texas, which has a strong band and contest tradition and accounts for 38.16% of the high schools selected for that region. The distribution of schools in the North Central region is more uniform, but may point to a reason why directors in these regions tend to be more positive. The beginnings of solo and ensemble contests in the United States in the 1920's and 1930's can be traced to states such as Colorado, Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma and Wisconsin (Fonder, 1989; Moore, 1968). These states are all part of either the Southwestern or North Central regions. The long tradition and history of solo and ensemble events in these states could be a potential reason for their continued favorable attitudes. If the prevailing attitude and culture in a state is that solo and ensemble events are important and worthwhile, directors may be more likely to commit the extra time, energy, and focus on these activities. States within other regions may not have the same history and tradition and may be less well established as a common and integral part of directors' general band education philosophies, potentially affecting attitudes.

One interesting note is the absence of any significant differences in directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities according to region. While histories and traditions may have an effect on directors' attitudes of the importance of solo and ensemble activities within a state, directors' overall attitudes of benefits to students may eclipse any differences between states and regions. Furthermore, the homogeneity of the

positive responses may indicate that attitudes toward benefits are not dependent upon local, regional, or state festivals or contests or the challenges of the band directing profession (time, finances, class load, etc.), but upon the desire to provide students with the greatest opportunity for individual, as well as group, achievement.

Teaching Experience and Education Level. No significant differences were found for any attitudinal statement by teaching experience or level of education. This matches similar findings by Goodstein (1987) and Sullivan (2005) but contradicts Crochet's (2006) results that directors with more experience tended to pursue a more holistic approach within their programs, which includes solo and ensemble activities. The current results could indicate a number of different possibilities. One such possibility for this lack of difference could be that perceptions of solo and ensemble events are deep seated and perhaps change little during directors' careers.

This leads to a second possibility: the perpetuation of a common perspective on solo and ensemble activities through each generation. The current study included directors who were in their first year of teaching as well as directors with as many as 41 years of experience, and some differences could be expected. However, when no differences in attitude by years of experience are found, with less experienced directors expressing the same feelings and thoughts as more experienced directors, the potential source of these attitudes must be investigated. One possibility is that attitudes towards solo and ensemble activities are instilled in directors well before the beginning of their careers. This could

mean that directors are affected by their own experiences with solo and ensemble activities (a variable discussed later in this chapter) or are influenced by the directors they had in high school. The majority of band directors have been a part of a high school band program and the thoughts, ideologies, and attitudes of their high school band director(s) may have a strong influence on how they perceive all portions of their own programs. The current sample may contain multiple generations of directors, and the lack of change could be due to the perpetuation of an attitude from previous directors. Additionally, there may be a homogenous attitude towards solo and ensemble activities by teacher educators in the nation's colleges and universities, a possibility which Stubbs (1983) suggests could be the reason for a "cycle of neglect" (p. 36) toward solo and ensemble activities. Considering this possibility, collegiate programs could be an arena in which future educators critically discuss the merits and benefits of including solo and ensemble activities as part of their high school programs in order to determine their viability and impact on student success. Additionally, ways of incorporating solo and ensemble activities into daily rehearsals could be investigated and demonstrated

The similarity of attitudes by level of experience and education could also signal that solo and ensemble activities have progressed little from its roots in the 1920's and 1930's. Instrumentation of ensembles has changed minimally over the years, diverging little from standard groupings such as flute trios, saxophone quartets, and brass choirs, and the introduction of new solo and ensemble literature appropriate for high school students has been limited, resulting in a

dated repertoire that may hold little interest for today's music students. Directors need to re-envision these activities into a more contemporary idea, where non-traditional groupings of instruments are considered a viable possibility for performance and the generally accepted genres for music include those outside the traditional realm, including the use of jazz and popular music.

Personal Solo and Ensemble Experience. While analyses found only a few instances of significant differences in attitude by director's personal solo and ensemble experiences in high school, the unequal numbers of those who participated in solo and ensemble activities in high school (494) and those who did not (59) should cause a pause in considering these findings. The high number of directors (88.69%) who did participate in these activities may be the reason for the high mean responses to the statements of benefit. If directors experienced these benefits first hand as students in high school, this could heavily influence their attitudes toward solo and ensemble activities as a director many years later. With this idea in mind, responses to the statement, "Performing solo and ensemble literature is important to the musical development of my students," suggest that directors who had participated in solo and ensemble activities in high school ($M = 4.59$, $SD = .62$) had a significantly higher mean than those directors who did not ($M = 4.31$, $SD = .73$). This is not particularly startling. However, the attitude of directors who did not participate in solo and ensemble activities at the high school level is still largely positive. Therefore, it could be posited that directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble

activities are not solely dependent upon previous participation during the director's student years.

While attitudes toward benefits can potentially be linked to directors' experiences with solo and ensemble activities in high school, the statements measuring directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities deal more directly with their impressions as a teacher instead of a student. Many of the statements dealt with concepts that would seldom be considered by students, instead dealing with perceptions of logistics and difficulties in management of such activities. This removes them somewhat from their high school experiences and forces directors to respond to the statements at a different level of inquiry, dealing instead with matters such as the management of such activities (instruction, supervision, time, funds, and facilities).

For this reason, the significant differences found for the statements, "I make myself available to coach small ensembles and soloists" and "I provide class time for students to rehearse their solos and small ensembles," become more interesting. With these statements, directors must weigh their personal and professional attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities with the involvement they believe is required from them. As with the connection between responses to benefit statements and directors' experience with solo and ensemble activities, a director's positive personal experience may result in the benefits of participation in solo and ensemble activities being significant enough to warrant the extra effort required of them.

These directors may have received coaching or were provided class time during their high school experiences to rehearse and, therefore, may perceive the impact as positive, possibly making them more likely to adopt a similar approach. Those without high school solo and ensemble experience do not have the same personal knowledge from which to draw and, therefore, may be less likely to consider the extra effort to be worthwhile.

As with statements measuring directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities, the similarity of responses to statements regarding directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests may rely more on respondents' experiences as a director than as a student participant. Students are not concerned with matters as festival/contest format, timing, adjudication, and quality, instead focusing their attention on their performance, such as being aware of passages they have had difficulty with or following an accompanist or other ensemble members. Therefore, the statements regarding attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests called upon respondents' experiences as directors. Because of this, the commitment of time that potentially leads up to a festival/contest as well as the potential forfeiture of hours for the actual event may result in directors being more critical of these components regardless of their high school experiences.

Teaching Assignment. The results of analyses conducted on attitudinal responses by directors' teaching assignment (band only or multiple specialization areas) could be viewed as surprising, considering the concerns about time commitment directors feel is required of them for solo and ensemble activities.

The only significant difference discovered based on teaching assignment was in the statement, “My students are interested in performing solo and ensemble literature,” where directors who directors taught band only ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.01$) were more positive than directors who taught multiple areas of specialization ($M = 3.13, SD = 1.02$) . Directors who divide their attention between multiple programs may have some difficulty managing their time and energy so as to give students in all parts of their programs adequate attention, which could potentially result in less favorable attitudes towards solo and ensemble activities.

Additionally, directors who teach multiple areas of specialization may offer other musical opportunities for their students that provide similar benefits to those found in solo and ensemble activities.

Conversely, the similarity in responses may demonstrate that directors who teach multiple musical areas have learned to manage and adapt their time and energy in order to provide what they deem is appropriate support for all portions of their teaching assignment. While such a teaching assignment can be time-consuming, it is possible that the components of a program that provide the most potential for student growth are given greater attention. In doing so, directors may maximize their efforts through careful consideration of potential benefits. Solo and ensemble activities can provide an opportunity for increased musical growth on a potentially wide-reaching basis if directors commit to fostering this segment of their program.

Another possible reason for this similarity of attitudes toward solo and ensemble activities is that directors of multiple specialties may have experienced

benefits from solo and ensemble activities in multiple areas, not just within the context of band students. If a director has perceived an increase in student performance achievement or attitude due to similar activities in orchestra or choral programs, they may be more willing to commit to these activities within their band program. Similarly, a director who also teaches general music classes may have experienced positive outcomes from small group instruction or projects with these students, leading to an increased consideration of similarly styled groups within their band program. Band programs have long been dominated by large group instruction, focusing on concert or marching bands that require numerous students for the viability of an ensemble. Solo and ensemble activities, however, utilize a small format that allows for individual assessment as well as a greater focus on the individual needs of students while also allowing them to take greater creative and pedagogical control over their musical progress.

Director-Centered External Factors (supplemental contract, teaching evaluations, program awards). The mixture of results found for the effects of supplemental pay, teaching evaluations, and program awards on directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble activities poses an interesting dilemma for directors and school administrators. As found elsewhere in this study, the similarity of directors' positive attitudes towards benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities by director-centered external factors is an encouraging finding. Attitudes of benefits were affected little by any independent variable, showing a virtually universal view of solo and ensemble activities as being advantageous to student musical and personal growth. In the case of

director-centered external factors, directors were not influenced by money, prizes, or evaluations in determining the benefits to their students, although the number of directors who dealt with such factors in this study was limited (119).

Unlike directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities, there were considerably more differences in directors' attitudes toward commitment to student participation in solo and ensemble activities based upon external factors. Directors who reported external factors were more positive on statements relating to committing personal and large-group rehearsal time to solo and ensemble activities. This could be due to a number of reasons. External factors may impress the importance of such activities on directors, leading to their greater willingness to provide time to students who are involved as well as a greater willingness to encourage students to participate. This is perhaps also indicative of the difference found in the statement, "Solo and ensemble activities are an important part of our band program," where external-factor respondents were more positive ($M = 3.99, SD = 1.09$) toward such activities than to other directors ($M = 3.65, SD = 1.06$). If directors reap benefits from their students' participation in solo and ensemble activities, they may be more likely to be positive toward solo and ensemble activities' importance. However, linking these differences to similarities in benefit statements further strengthens the thought that directors' attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities are indifferent to numerous variables. Evaluations, money, and awards may influence directors' daily interactions with

solo and ensemble activities, but they do not speak to the why these activities are important to the development of students.

Some differences could be expected when considering the effect of external factors (supplemental contracts, teaching evaluations, program awards) on directors' attitudes toward solo and ensemble festivals/contests, but, in this study, only one significant difference existed. The mean difference between directors reporting external factors ($M = 4.59, SD = .67$) and those who did not ($M = 4.40, SD = .74$) on the statement, "Solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial for my students," does not seem as drastic considering the positively high means and small standard deviations of both groups. Otherwise, the similarity in responses may indicate that attitudes towards festivals and contests have little to do with director-centered factors. This leads to another consideration of attitudes towards festivals and contests: responses to these statements have less to do with what occurs in these *activities* than it does about the *festivals or contests* specifically. When external director-centered factors have little effect on the attitudes of those directors who garner positive benefits from student participation, this may indicate a more common issue with the administration and rules of festivals and contests.

From these results, it could be suggested that director-centered external factors could result in an increase in directors' willingness to include solo and ensemble activities in their program. Providing financial and/or evaluation incentives to directors would certainly increase the likelihood they would foster and utilize solo and ensemble activities in their programs, and may result in an

increase in students' musical growth as well as greater student participation in festivals and contests. This is, arguably, a worthwhile result. However, such incentives or requirements could also deteriorate directors' perceptions of control over their program, creating an additional duty that is not born out of a true educational mission, but out of obligation. Obligation can be perceived as a means of control that hinders fulfillment. It behooves schools and districts to support their directors in doing whatever they can to foster student musical growth and creativity while still allowing directors' teaching philosophies to pervade their decisions for their programs. If time is an issue, as has been found earlier in this study, districts should investigate ways to compensate their directors for the extra work and commitment solo and ensemble activities requires from music educators.

Implications

The results from this study suggest that directors across the nation feel that solo and ensemble activities are beneficial to their students. Other researchers have found that student participation in solo and ensemble activities positively impact intonation (Carmody, 1988; Colwell, 1969; Griffing, 2004; Sorensen, 1971; Stabley, 2000), independence (Bailey, 2006; Cary, 1981; Gibbs, 1970; House, 1965; Kinney, 1980; Latten, 2001; Rutowski, 2000; Zorn, 1970), motivation (Anguiano, 2006; Larson, 2010; Schmidt, 2005; Sandene, 1997; Werpy, 1995), attitude (Carmody, 1988; Larson, 2010; Olson, 1975; Stabley, 2000; Sorensen, 1971), listening skills (Colwell, 1969; Griffing, 2004), student self-image and confidence (Howard, 1994; Schmidt, 2005), and overall music

achievement (Jarrell, 1971; West, 1985; Zorn, 1969) within a space that permits students to be in control of their musical learning and performance (Allsup, 2003; Berg, 1997; Cangro, 2004; Djordjevic, 2007). In doing so, solo and ensemble activities aid in fostering student creativity and interaction while teaching intrapersonal and self-motivating and monitoring skills on a more intimate level than what is found in large ensembles. Within the findings of this study and the findings of other researchers, solo and ensemble activities could be envisioned as the panacea of instrumental music education, fulfilling the many implied and overt educational intentions attributed to the study of music.

However, there is a disconnect between these sentiments and the practical application and use of solo and ensembles activities in school band programs today. The current study found that an average of 30 students participated in solo and ensemble festivals or contests each year regardless of program size. This shows an increase from the average of 20 student participants found by Sullivan (2005). This increase in numbers is a positive trend, but it still accounts for only 33.71% of the average program size of 89 students found in this study.

Considering the positive attitudes toward benefits of student participation in solo and ensemble activities among directors, one would expect the average number of participants to be considerably higher and, perhaps, even include every student in the program, but this is not the case. Instead, band programs are centered around concert and marching bands, ensembles in which student are often given little if any authority or control over rehearsal activities and overall creativity, becoming a cog within a larger machine where the machine is more important than the

individual student, possibly resulting in little individual attention and feedback. This lack of balance, consideration, and, perhaps even, respect for the students and their education should cause all music educators to take up arms and rebel against a system that may actually hinder students' musical enjoyment, achievement, and growth.

However, this is not the case. While some programs across the nation stress the importance of solo and ensemble activities, others align to a large-ensemble-centered format that Battisti (1989) railed against, stating these programs "are geared toward entertainment and the short-term reward of competitive recognition rather than toward the development of musical skills, understanding, creativity, and the long-term appreciation of great music" (p. 23). Small ensembles may be under-utilized, neglected, or outright ignored in order to provide as much time, energy, finances, and attention as possible to their mass-instruction, award-pursuing, educationally-questionable larger cousins. This can result in a tyranny of the large ensemble, where individuals are oppressed into conformity and are stripped of their individual needs, desire, and creativity in favor of a program that brings perceived glory to the district, school, or director at the expense of musical education progress.

The time may be at hand for the music education profession, band educators specifically, to address these skeletons in their closets. In an era of constant funding and educational cuts, directors must find ways to make instruction more diversified and meaningful to students, perhaps resulting in increased student interest and enrollment. As the rest of the education profession

works for more evidence of individual student learning and struggles to maintain smaller class sizes to foster this learning, the band profession has retained the status quo, focusing on increasing the size and number of ensembles in order to save jobs and warrant larger budgets. In doing so, the integrity and intention of music education may be compromised. We, therefore, must investigate and consider our current program structures and how they influence student progress and achievement.

Directors believe strongly in the benefits of solo and ensemble activities, but the focus of large ensembles may pull their attention away from such a potentially powerful educational experience. These beliefs may call for the re-configuration of high school music programs to place solo and small ensemble activities at the heart of instruction. In doing so, the individual students may be better served due to the flexibility in instruction, topic, and attention possible with a focus on soloists and smaller ensembles. Concerns regarding the time required for solo and ensemble activities, found in multiple areas of this study, may no longer be as significant a factor when these ensembles are not seen as peripheral, but as the root of all instruction.

Large ensembles can still have a place within this new structure, being viewed as an extension of small group instruction or as an enrichment, co-curricular or extracurricular activity that places the skills of individual players within a larger ensemble context. Directors expect their large ensemble players to know their parts well, like a soloist, but they may seldom provide a place where students can explore this individual achievement, whether as a single player or as

a single player within a trio, quartet, quintet, or other small ensemble. Placing solo and ensemble study as the center of a program may provide this opportunity and result in a stronger program, both in student performance, attitude, and achievement and in music education outcomes.

Other potential benefits may result from this type of restructuring of band programs. One such benefit could be the increase flexibility in student scheduling, as suggested by Gary (1966), Weidensee (1969), and Zorn (1970). As graduation requirements increase for high school students, the scheduling of large groups of students into one period becomes potentially more difficult. If a program shifts focus to smaller ensembles, this large scheduling endeavor is replaced with a more flexible format that may cause fewer class conflicts for students, resulting in increased enrollment as students are placed into classes throughout the day, rather into one set time period, which could allow for mixed skill levels within one class period. A second potential benefit could be a more efficient use of available finances. Large group instruction can require significant quantities of full band pieces and instruments which, in turn, requires the commitment of more finances. In the case of large competitive marching bands, the expenditure of finances is perhaps even more substantial, considering the cost of uniforms, staffing, drill and music writing, transportation, and other ancillary expenditures. Small ensembles music is often less expensive and can include multiple pieces within one book, requiring less music expenditure. Furthermore, the same pieces can be used from year to year with various groups of students, as suggested by House (1965), requiring less expenditure in future years.

Additionally, the number of school-owned instruments required by a program could be reduced since the use of instruments would be spread out over a school day rather than concentrated during one large ensemble period.

The complete restructuring of band programs may be a difficult and unrealistic goal in today's music education environment. However, smaller adjustments can be made to programs that can allow students the opportunity to experience and reap the benefits of participating in solo and ensemble activities. As mentioned earlier, rehearsal schedules could be structured to allow the director the opportunity to run a sectional rehearsal on full ensemble music while other students rehearse within small ensembles. Larson (2010) utilized a similar structure that included student-led and director-led ensembles during the same class period. Such a structure can allow directors the flexibility to form an ensemble of students requiring additional attention in the director-led ensemble while forming smaller ensembles of students with like ability. Finally, directors could structure a small ensemble unit of instruction, where large ensemble rehearsal is not held for a period of time, allowing all students to participate in small ensembles for a specified amount of time. Directors can circulate between multiple small ensembles, acting as a coach, while still allowing students to lead the majority of their rehearsals. Scheduling a small ensemble unit in the months leading up to local, regional, or state solo and ensemble festivals or contests could also increase student participation in these events.

While solo and ensemble activities can be beneficial to students and advantageous to a band program, other changes may still be required for band

education to progress into the twenty-first century. The current model of band education is based upon a model developed in the 1920's and 1930's, and progress from this beginning has been sporadic and limited. Public performances continue to be an unsettling focus of instruction in many programs, focusing not on educating students but in producing quality performances at the expense of learning. The same arguments could be made regarding solo and ensemble activities. The literature available for soloists and small ensembles is quickly becoming dated as composers have largely avoided writing pieces appropriate for the performance of level of high school students. This dearth of quality literature is an issue that must be addressed if directors and students are to become committed to increasing the use of solo and ensemble activities. Similarly, the scope of appropriate literature must be broadened to include genres that have been deemed inappropriate in the past, such as jazz and popular music pieces.

The lack of literature, however, may provide an opportunity for directors and students to investigate the composition process, allowing students to write and arrange compositions of their own or to experiment with and pursue improvisatory projects and skills. In the process of pursuing new literature, the potential types of ensembles must be expanded as well. Trios, quartets, and quintets of saxophones, trumpets, flutes, woodwinds, brass, percussion, and many other instrument groupings will continue to be used, but more diverse ensemble components, such ethnic instruments, guitar, synthesizer, and computer loops and mash-ups, could permit more students to participate within the program. Under this idea, a jazz trio of alto saxophone, shakuhachi, and guitar could be a

potentially interesting combination with some immense possibilities for composition and creativity.

Finally, the use of non-traditional accompaniments, already permitted for festivals and contests in some states, could cultivate increased interest in performing solos. Rehearsing with an accompanist is an important component of solo performance and may not be totally replaceable, but the ability for a student to rehearse with a computerized accompaniment through MakeMusic's SmartMusic or an audio recording, such as Music Minus One, may remove a potential obstacle to students studying and performing solos.

Future Research

The current study is the first investigation into the attitudes to include band directors from throughout the United States toward solo and ensemble activities and, therefore, has raised a number of questions and observations that require further research. The researcher suggests the following:

1. Further research is needed into the attitudes of directors within regions of the United States. The significant differences found in the current study suggest that there are regional factors that influence director attitude and a more in-depth study of the attitudes within a region may yield interesting findings.
2. In-depth research into the attitudes of directors in individual states is also needed in order to provide a more thorough picture of perceptions of solo and ensemble activities. Differences in regions may obscure

differences between states. In addition, focusing on individual states may highlight unique positive or negative attitudes.

3. Further research is needed into directors' opinions and feelings toward local, regional, and state solo and ensemble festivals and contests.

Such events are present in many states and their quality and operation may have a significant effect on directors' attitudes. This may, in turn, affect directors' support for solo and ensemble activities, not just in a festival or contest, but as a primary component of a band program.

4. Research focusing on the personal experiences of students who participate in solo and ensemble activities is largely lacking in the profession. Studies that follow students through the process of rehearsing and performing solos and ensembles may help educators better understand ways to utilize these activities in order to build student support, participation, and achievement through the perspective of those that are directly participating and experiencing the activity.

5. Little if any research has been conducted directly on the effects of study of solo instrumental literature on student achievement.

Performing solo literature is the epitome of individualized instruction, and the absence of scholarly investigation into this component of music education must be addressed.

6. Further experimental research is necessary to determine the direct benefits from the study and performance of solo and ensemble literature. Many studies have already investigated these possibilities,

but continued manipulation of independent variables (i.e. format, length of treatment, number of participants, grade level, school location, socioeconomic and cultural factors) within these studies may help to illuminate ways to maximize the benefits from solo and ensemble activities for students.

7. The history and development of solo and ensemble festivals and contests within individual states requires more scholarly attention. While the initial history of events on a national scale has been investigated (Meyers, 2010), the history of events within each state may help to explain the prevailing attitudes in that state and how the events have or have not developed over the years in order to better serve the students.
8. Findings in this study indicate that directors may have concerns with aspects of festivals and contests. Additional research on festival and contest formats at the local, regional, and state levels may help provide additional information and insight into these concerns and investigate current rules toward digital accompaniment, alternative instrument groups, and use of student compositions.
9. Research into alternative program formats may reveal ways in which directors can alter their programs to better serve their students and school community. While band programs are important components of some high school campuses, educators must seek out ways to reach out to more students outside the normal scope of band programs, providing

avenues for more participants through the greater diversification of class offerings and other formats where the aims of music education may be met for all students. Solo and ensemble activities can be a component of such programming format.

Conclusion

Solo and ensemble activities have the potential to provide an incredible and powerful opportunity for students to take control of their musical growth and progress. Instead of a director-centered and -led ensembles, students can become active, creative, and integral parts of the music education process, showing a level of respect and consideration for their musical desires, goals, and dreams.

Directors across the nation, regardless of variables such as education, experience, region, and personal experience, recognize the many potential musical and educational benefits from participation in solo and ensemble activities. Even with this overwhelming sense of importance, the implementation of solo and ensemble activities within current band programs is relegated to a lower priority level of importance, taking a backseat to larger ensembles, such as concert and marching bands. Factors such as time, energy, professional demands, and finances are perceived as obstacles that outweigh potential benefits, resulting in less director support for these activities and lower levels of student participation.

The findings of this study support the preponderance of prior research (Allsup, 2003; Bailey, 2006; Berg, 1997; Cangro, 2004; Carmody, 1988; Cary, 1981; Djordjevic, 2007; Jarrell, 1971; Johnson and Johnson, 1999; Larson, 2010; Olsen, 1975; Schmidt, 2005; Sandene, 1997; Sorensen, 1971; Stabley, 2000;

Werpy, 1995; West, 1985; Zorn, 1969), which suggests that solo and ensemble activities can become a driving force in the musical development of students..

The current program models that place large ensembles as the primary venue for music education must undergo significant modification if students are to be given a regular opportunity to experience the benefits of increased ability, achievement, positive attitude, motivation, and intrapersonal interaction that are possible through solo and ensemble participation. By shifting the priorities and attitudes of directors, the time and energy expended for such activities may not be viewed as misplaced or lost, but as a worthwhile and lucrative investment that will show considerable returns in the human terms of student enjoyment, engagement, and learning. These activities may no longer be seen as an ancillary part of a program, but as the primary means by which students experience the joy and power of music on an intimate level.

REFERENCES

- 1932 National Band contest deferred. (1932, January). *The School Musician*, 7-9.
- Allsup, R. E. (2003). Mutual learning and democratic action in instrumental music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(1), 24–37.
- Anguiano, K. R. (2006). *Motivational predictors of continuing motivation and achievement for early adolescent instrumental music students*. (Doctoral thesis, University of Iowa). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3229641)
- Austin, J. R. (1988). The effects of music contest format on self-concept, motivation, achievement, and attitude of elementary band students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 36(2), 95–107.
- Bailey, L. W. (2006). *A study of motivation and self-regulation among high-school instrumental music students*. (Doctoral dissertation, Cappella University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3216029)
- Battisti, F. L. (1989). Clarifying priorities for the high school band. *Music Educators Journal*, 76(1), 23–25.
- Bauer, W. I., Reese, S., & McAllister, P. A. (2003). Transforming music teaching via technology: The role of professional development. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(4), 289–301.
- Berg, M. H. (1997). *Social construction of musical experience in two high school chamber music ensembles*. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 9731212)
- Bergee, M. J. & McWhirter, J. L. (2005). Selected influences on solo and small ensemble festival ratings: Replication and extension. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(2), 177–190.
- Bergee, M. J. & Platt, M. C. (2003). Influence of selected variables on solo and small-ensemble festival ratings. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(4), 342–353.
- Bonate, P.L. (2000). *Analysis of pretest posttest design*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman and Hall Press.

- Bononi, R. A. (2000). *Student learning in a chamber ensemble: A study of transfer*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 9978964)
- Cangro, R. M (2004). *The effects of cooperative learning strategies on the musical achievement of beginning instrumentalists*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Hartford). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3139428)
- Carmody, W. J. (1988). *The effects of chamber music experience on intonation and attitudes among junior high school string players*. Abstract retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 0563729)
- Carney, P. K. (2005). *Rankings and ratings of literature selection criteria among Florida public school wind band conductors*. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3216579)
- Cary, S. E. (1981). *Individualized music instruction – traditional music instruction: Relationships of music achievement, music performance, music attitude, and reading in classes of fifth grade students*. Abstract retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 8201812)
- Christensen, L. (2000). *A survey of the importance of functional piano skills as reported by band, choral, orchestra, and general music teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertation and Theses. (UMI 9975796)
- Cochrane, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Colwell, R. (1969). *The teaching of instrumental music*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Crochet, L. S. (2006). *Repertoire selection practices of band directors as a function of teaching experience, training, instructional level, and degree of success*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3215250)
- Dackow, S. (1981). A proposal for chamber music in the high school curriculum. *Music Educators Journal*, 67(9), 38–41.
- Djordjevic, S. A. (2007). *Student perceptions of cooperative learning in instrumental music*. (Master's thesis, University of Michigan). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 1456226)

- Fonder, M. (1989). The Wisconsin School Music Association and its contests: The early years. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37(2), 112–131.
- Franklin, J. O. (1979). *Attitudes of school administrators, band directors, and band students towards selected activities of the public school band program*. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern State University of Louisiana). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 8007218)
- Gary, C. L. (1966). Why band?. In B. C. Kowall (Ed.), *Perspectives in music education*. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference.
- Gibbs, R. A. (1970). The new breed of band director thinks realistically. *Music Educators Journal*, 57(3), 34–27.
- Goodstein, R. E. (1987). An investigation into leadership behaviors and descriptive characters of high school band directors in the United States. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 35(1), 13–25.
- Griffing, J. (2004). Incorporating chamber music into a school music program. *American String Teacher*, 54(3), 60–63.
- Holz, E. A. (1962). The school band contest of America (1923). *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 10(1), 3-12.
- Howard, K. K. (1994). *A survey of Iowa high school band students' self-perceptions and attitudes towards types of music contests*. Abstract retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses.
- House, R. W. (1965). *Instrumental music for today's schools*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Huck, S. W. (2004). *Reading statistics and research* (4th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Hurst, C. W. (1994). *A nationwide investigation of high school band directors' reasons for participating in music competitions*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 9424380)
- Jarrell, J.A. (1971). *An analysis of achievement, procedures, and activities of selected high school band programs in Oklahoma*. (Doctoral

- dissertation, University of Oklahoma). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (72-3400)
- Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, R. T. (1999). Making cooperative learning work. *Theory Into Practice*, 38(2), 67–73.
- Johnson, C. M. and Stewart, E. E. (2004). Effect of sex identification on instrument assignment by band directors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 52(2), 130–140.
- Johnson, C. M. and Stewart, E. E. (2005). Effect of sex and race identification on instrument assignment by music educators. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(4), 348–357.
- Johnson, V. V. (2010). *Competencies, curricula, and compliance: An analysis of music theory in music education programs in Texas*. (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3399494)
- Kancianic, P. A. (2004). *Classroom assessment in United States high school band programs: Methods, purposes, and influences*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3222315)
- Kaplan, M. (1966). *Foundations and frontiers of music education*. New York, NY: Hold, Reinhart and Winston, Inc.
- Keene, J.A. (1987). *A history of music education in the United States*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Kinney, G.S. (1980). *Complete guide to teaching small instrumental groups in the high school*. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Kuehne, J. M. (2003). *A survey of sight-singing instructional practices in Florida middle school choral programs*. (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3109293)
- Kuhn, W. E. (1962). *Instrumental music: Principles and methods of instruction*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Larson, D. D. (2010). *The effects of chamber music experience on music performance achievement, motivation, and attitudes among high school band students*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

- Latten, J. E. (2001). Chamber music for every instrumentalist. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(5), 45–53.
- Long, N. H. (1943). Fortifying solo and ensemble contest. *Music Educators Journal*, 29(3), 26–27.
- Maddy, J. E. (1929). Instrumental music department. *Music Supervisors' Journal*, 18(3), 47-48.
- Mark, M. L. & Gary, C. L. (1999). *A history of American music education*. Reston, VA: MENC: The National Association for Music Education.
- McGee, T. J. (1966). Emphasis on chamber music in the high school. *Music Educators Journal*, 53(3), 116.
- Mertler, C. A. and Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods* (3rd ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.
- Meyers, B. D. (2009). *The national solo and ensemble contests 1929 – 1937*. Manuscript accepted for publication in *Journal of Research in Music Education*.
- Meyers, B. D. (2010). *Attitudes of Arizona high school students toward solo and ensemble activities*. Manuscript accepted for publication in *Journal of Band Research*.
- Moore, J. E. (1968). *The Nation School Band Contests from 1926 to 1931*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (69-2360)
- Olson, E. E. (1975). *A comparison of the effectiveness of wind chamber music ensemble experience with large wind ensemble experience*. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.
- Parker, L. (1992). Collecting data the e-mail way. *Training & Development*, 46(7), 52–54.
- Quigley, B., Riemer, R. A., Cruzen, D. E., and Rosen, S. (2000). Internet versus paper survey administration: Preliminary finding on response rates. *42nd Annual Conference of the International Military Testing Association*. Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Rickels, D. A. (2008). A comparison of variables in Arizona marching band festival results. *Journal of Band Research*, 44(1), 25–39.


- Rickels, D. A. (2009). *A multivariate analysis of nonperformance variables as predictors of marching band contest results*. (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3353883)
- Rushing, M. (2010). *Survey of the integration of learning theories in American undergraduate piano pedagogy curricula*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3402828)
- Rutowski, J. Starting a high school chamber music group. *Music Educators Journal*, 86(6), 23–27.
- Schmidt, C. P. (2005). Relations among motivation, performance achievement, and music experience variables in secondary instrumental music students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(2), 134–147.
- Schleyer, T. K. L., & Forrest, J. L. (2000). Methods for the design and administration web-based surveys. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 7, 2000, 416–425.
- Schoenbach, S. (1963). Chamber music in secondary schools. *Music Educators Journal*, 49(4), 73–74.
- Schonlau, M., Fricker, R. D., and Elliott, M. N. (2002). *Conducting research surveys via e-mail and the web*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corp.
- Sandene, B. A. (1997). *An investigation of variables related to student motivation in instrumental music*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 9811178)
- Shelfo, K. L. (2007). *The status of inclusive education in Maryland school band and orchestra programs*. (Masters thesis, University of Maryland). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 1443417)
- Simanton, E. G. (2000). *Assessment and grading practices among high school band teachers in the United States: A descriptive study*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 9986536)
- Sorensen, J. M. (1971). *The effects of small ensemble experience on achievement and attitude of selected junior high school instrumental music students*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois).

- Stabley, N. C. (2000). *The effects of involvement in chamber music on the intonation and attitude of 6th and 7th grade string orchestra players*. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3000625)
- Stubbs, D. W. (1983). Chamber music's lesson in performing confidence. *Music Educators Journal*, 70(3), 34–37.
- Sue, V. M. & Ritter, L. A. (2007). *Conducting online surveys*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Sullivan, J. M. (2005). A comparison of Arizona music educators' attitude towards solo and small ensemble festival participation. *Bulletin of the Council on Research in Music Education*, 165, 1–12.
- Washington, K. E. (2007). *A study of selected characteristics of Mississippi high school bands and band festival ratings*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3280886)
- Weidensee, V. (1969). *Instrumental music in the public schools: Organization and administration*. Boston, MA: Crescendo Publishing Co.
- Werpy, S. F. (1995). *Relationships between selected factors of motivation for participation in high school band and general motivation for musical experience*. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University).
- West, J. T. (1985). *The effects of performance success on the musical achievement of high school band students in four Florida counties*. (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 8513401)
- Wexler, M. K. (2009). *A comparative survey of goals and strategies of college music performance teachers across instrumental groups*. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 3348365)
- Yamane, T. (1973). *Statistics: An introductory analysis*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Zorn, J. D. (1969). *The effectiveness of chamber music ensemble experience for members of a ninth grade band in learning certain aspects of music and music performance*. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (AAT 7011945)

Zorn, J. D. (1970). The new breed of band director thinks imaginatively. *Music Educators Journal*, 57(3), 37–39.

APPENDIX A
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

To: Jill Sullivan
MUSIC BUJL

From:  Mark Roosa, Chair
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 11/05/2010

Committee Action: Exemption Granted

IRB Action Date: 11/05/2010

IRB Protocol #: 1011005687

Study Title: Attitudes of High School Band Directors in the United States Towards Solo and Ensemble Activities

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2) .

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE



Attitudes of High School Band Directors toward Solo and Ensemble Activities in the United States

To participate in this research, please read the informed consent information below and click “Accept and continue” at the bottom of this page.

Informed Consent Information

The purpose of this form is to provide you (as a prospective research study participant) information that may affect your decision as to whether or not to participate in this research and to record the consent of those who agree to be involved in the study.

I am a doctoral student in music education at Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona, under the direction of Dr. Jill Sullivan. I am inviting your participation in this research study as part of my degree requirements for dissertation research.

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the attitudes of high school band directors towards solo and ensemble activities, including perceptions of benefits from participation in solo and ensemble activities, directors’ feelings towards solo and ensemble activities, and the perceptions of organized solo and ensemble events. If you decide to participate, then you will join a study involving research into these aspects of solo and ensemble activities. If you say YES, then your participation will last about 15-20 minutes. You will be asked to fill out an online questionnaire. Twenty high school directors from each state have been randomly invited to participate in this study.

All information obtained in this study is strictly anonymous. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, and publications, but the researcher will never identify you. In order to maintain anonymity of your records, the research team will not collect your name or other personally identifiable information in this questionnaire. All data collected online is safeguarded by a password-protected access used by the researchers.

There are no known risks associated with taking part in this study, but in any research, there is some possibility confidential information may accidentally be released. The above measures will be taken to help minimize this risk by assuring that your responses remain anonymous. The possible benefit from your participation in the research is an increased knowledge for the music education community about solo and ensemble activities across the United States.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. It is ok for you to say no. Even if you say yes now, you are free to say no later, and withdraw from the study at any time. Your decision to withdraw from the study will not affect your relationship or your students’ relationship with Arizona State University. There is no payment for your participation in this study, but we hope that you will give your time to help increase knowledge about solo and ensemble activities.

Any questions you have concerning the research study or your participation in the study, before or after your consent, will be answered by Brian Meyers, brian.meyers@asu.edu, (602) 312-7369. You may also contact the principal advisor for this research, Dr. Jill Sullivan, jill.sullivan@asu.edu, (480) 965-7369. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subject Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

You may print a copy of this consent form from your web browser for your records.

Clicking "Accept and Begin" below indicates that you consent to participate in the above study. You will only be able to access this survey once. Closing your web browser anytime during the questionnaire will end your participation.



Attitudes of High School Band Directors toward Solo and Ensemble Activities in the United States

-
1. Gender:
 - Male
 - Female

 2. Highest degree (musical or non-musical) received:
 - Bachelors
 - Masters
 - Doctorate
 - Other (please specify)

 3. Total years of band teaching experience (including this year):

 4. Total years in your current position (including this year):

 5. My primary instrument is:
 - Flute
 - Oboe
 - Bassoon
 - Clarinet
 - Saxophone
 - Trumpet
 - Horn
 - Trombone
 - Baritone/Euphonium
 - Tuba
 - Percussion
 - Violin
 - Viola
 - Cello
 - Bass
 - Piano
 - Harp
 - Guitar
 - Voice
 - Other (please specify)

6. The region in which I currently teach is:
Eastern (CT, DE, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT)
North Central (IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI)
Northwest (AK, ID, MT, OR, WA, WY)
Southern (AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)
Southwestern (AR, CO, KS, MO, NM, OK, TX)
Western (AZ, CA, HI, NV, UT)
7. My school's approximate total enrollment for high school (grades 9-12) is:
8. The total number of students involved in the high school band program (9-12) is:
9. Are you the only band director in the school?
Yes
No
10. At my current teaching assignment, I teach the following grades (check all that apply):
K
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
11. My current teaching assignment includes teaching (check all that apply):
Band
Choir
Orchestra
General Music
Music Theory/History
Guitar
Other (please specify)

12. The approximate percentage of my students that currently take private lessons is:
13. I performed solos and/or small ensemble music when I was in high school (in school OR outside of school).
 Yes
 No
14. I participated in some sort of solo and/or ensemble festival or contest when I was in high school.
 Yes
 No
15. Is there a local, regional, or state solo and ensemble festival or contest in which your students are able to participate?
 Yes
 No
16. Do your students regularly participate in this festival/contest?
 Yes
 No
17. Approximately how many of your students participated in the most recent festival/contest?
18. Is student participation in solo and ensemble festivals/contests associated with your teaching evaluation?
 Yes
 No
19. Do you receive any extra pay (via supplemental contracts, stipend, etc.) specifically for your students' participation in solo and ensemble festivals?
 Yes
 No
20. Does your school's participation in solo and ensemble festival/contest have any effect on attaining an award (state title, sweepstakes award, etc.) for your program?
 Yes
 No

* Solo and ensemble activities pertain to the rehearsing and/or performance of solo and small ensemble literature either as part of a festival/contest or as a supplemental or curricular part of the band curriculum.

21. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements:
- Strongly Neither Strongly

Agree Agree Agree/Disagree Disagree Disagree

1. Performing solo and ensemble literature is important to the musical development of my students.
2. Solo and ensemble activities help develop students' musical independence.
4. Solo and ensemble activities are beneficial for both high and low achieving students.
5. Solo and ensemble activities help increase the performance confidence of my students.
6. The skills learned by performing solo and small ensemble literature help my students' performance in large ensembles.
7. Participating in solo and ensemble activities helps to motivate my students.
8. Once my students participate in solo and ensemble activities, they will be more inclined to participate in the future.
9. Solo and ensemble activities enable students to focus on their individual musical needs (rhythm, range, etc.).

* Solo and ensemble activities pertain to the rehearsing and/or performance of solo and small ensemble literature either as part of a festival/contest or as a supplemental or curricular part of the band curriculum.

22. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

Strongly Neither Strongly
Agree Agree Agree/Disagree Disagree Disagree

1. Performing in small ensembles helps students learn how to work together.
2. Performing in a small ensemble is an excellent way to foster peer learning.
3. Solo and ensemble activities are an excellent way for students to show their music knowledge.
4. Solo and ensemble festivals/contests do not motivate students to play more frequently.
5. My students are aware of the benefits of participating in solo and ensemble activities.
6. Solo and ensemble activities are important in helping students learn self-motivating and monitoring skills.
7. The autonomy/freedom associated with solo and ensemble activities is beneficial to students' growth and self-concept.
8. Participation in solo and ensemble activities help students improve their tone and intonation.
9. Participation in solo and ensemble activities helps students improve their listening skills.

* Solo and ensemble activities pertain to the rehearsing and/or performance of solo and small ensemble literature either as part of a festival/contest or as a supplemental or curricular part of the band curriculum.

23. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

Strongly Neither Strongly
Agree Agree Agree/Disagree Disagree Disagree

1. Solo and ensemble activities require significant involvement from me.
2. I make myself available to coach small ensembles and soloists.
3. Helping students with solo and ensemble activities is worth the extra time and commitment.
4. I do not have adequate time to assist soloists and small ensembles with my current teaching assignment/load.
5. I primarily coach solo and ensemble students outside the school day (before or after school).
6. My students are not interested in performing solo and ensemble literature.
7. My students are afraid to play solos.
8. My students have adequate time to prepare solos and small ensembles.
9. The teaching of solos is primarily the responsibility of private lesson teachers.
10. More of my students would participate in solo and ensemble events if they took private lessons.

* Solo and ensemble activities pertain to the rehearsing and/or performance of solo and small ensemble literature either as part of a festival/contest or as a supplemental or curricular part of the band curriculum.

24. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

Strongly Neither Strongly
Agree Agree Agree/Disagree Disagree Disagree

1. I encourage students to participate in solo and ensemble activities.
2. I encourage solo and ensemble activities because of our local/regional/state festival or contest.
3. I encourage students to perform solo and small ensemble literature throughout the school year.
4. Solo and ensemble activities are not an important part of our band program.
5. I provide class time for students to rehearse their small ensemble.
6. My students use the band room to rehearse their solos and small ensembles.

- 7. I have my students perform solo and ensembles at our band concerts (before, during, or after).
- 8. The cost of performing in solo and ensemble activities is primarily the responsibility of my students.
- 9. The cost of solo and ensemble activities (e.g. fees, accompanists, music) is not prohibitive for my students.

25. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

Strongly	Neither	Strongly
Agree	Agree/Disagree	Disagree

- 1. Solo and ensemble festival/contest are beneficial for my students.
- 2. Comments received at solo and ensemble festivals/contests are beneficial to my students.
- 3. The format of our local/regional/state solo and ensemble festival/contest is conducive to the success of my students.
- 4. The timing of the local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests is appropriate for my students and my program.
- 5. I am pleased with the format and operation of the local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests.
- 6. Judges at our local/regional/state solo and ensemble festivals/contests are knowledgeable, positive, and helpful.

26. Are there any other comments or opinions about solo and small ensemble events/activities that you would like to share?

