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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to apply the instructional concept of teaching to the test in an instrumental music rehearsal and investigate its effects on student performance. Specifically, the study sought to determine the extent to which prior knowledge of evaluative criteria, and a lesson focused on a single criterion, might affect an ensemble’s performance and ability to make transfers. One high school band produced audio recordings under several instructional conditions that utilized varying degrees of criterion-referenced instruction. Evaluators ($N = 270$) consisted of college music majors ($n = 93$) and in-service music educators ($n = 177$) who listened to the recordings before evaluating the ensemble’s tone, intonation, technique, balance, and musicality on the Music Performance Assessment Scale (MPAS). Evaluators also assessed the ensemble’s performance of march style on the Performance Style Evaluation Form (PSEF). Finally, self-evaluation ratings, provided by members of the performing ensemble, were compared to ratings received from other evaluators.

The results revealed no significant differences between the baseline recording, a recording made after the ensemble was shown the evaluative criteria used by judges, and a transfer task recording made 48 hours after the ensemble participated in a lesson focused on march style. However, the recording made immediately after the march style lesson was rated significantly higher than the baseline and transfer task recordings. The results also indicated that students in the performing ensemble rated their performance significantly higher on the MPAS than music majors and in-service music educators, but no significant difference was found between the students and other evaluators on the PSEF. The findings suggest that a criterion-referenced music lesson focused on a single criterion may be an effective method of improving student performance of that criterion. However, the implementation of a single lesson may not produce enduring results. Implications of these results, additional findings, and suggestions for future research are discussed.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of teacher training programs is to assist pre-service educators to become good teachers. It is often difficult, however, to define the combination of characteristics necessary to be considered a good teacher. The teaching profession, like many service professions, relies heavily on the individuality of each educator. The unique characteristics that make one teacher effective may not help another find success. Although effective teachers may be easily identifiable, it is often difficult to indicate the specific factors that make a teacher effective (C. K. Madsen & Duke, 1993; C. K. Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992). Indeed, education researchers have found that students’ and professionals’ perceptions of good teachers vary (Grant & Drafall, 1991). Many students cite social qualities such as being “caring, patient, not boring, and polite” as necessary for good teachers (Murphy, Delli, & Edwards, 2004, p. 87). Teachers that possess such qualities may not only be considered effective teachers, but they may also leave a lasting impression on their students.

In a recent study, Darrow and Heath (2012) conducted a content analysis of essays describing music education majors’ “best teacher ever” (p. 1). After analyzing over 200 essays, the researchers reported music education majors’ best teachers were remembered as being equitable and caring. In a survey of over 800 graduates from private and public secondary schools, Johnson and Prom-Jackson (1986) found similar results. The researchers noted over 90 percent of respondents were able to identify a memorable and influential teacher or school administrator from their elementary or secondary school years. Influential teachers were not only cited as being scholarly and knowledgeable, but approachable, perceptive, honest, and persistent (S. T. Johnson & Prom-Jackson, 1986).

Domas and Tiedeman’s (1950) research indicated a plethora of educational researchers have provided data concerning characteristics of effective teachers since the early twentieth century. Harris (1998) posited the extant research on teacher effectiveness indicates a “need for teachers to adopt a wide repertoire of teaching approaches which foster different types of pupil
learning” (p. 176). Consequently, it is not surprising to find that much of the existing data has been the result of investigations into teacher assessment procedures (Albert, 1941; K. Jones & Whitford, 1997; Tuckman, 1995), teacher intensity (Cassidy, 1993; Colwell, 1995; Hancock, 2003; C. K. Madsen & Duke, 1993; C. K. Madsen, Standley, & Cassidy, 1989), perceptions of teacher effectiveness (Butler, 2001; Juchniewicz, 2010; Kelly, 2008a; C. K. Madsen et al., 1992; K. Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Murphy et al., 2004; Witty, 1947), and effective teaching models (Joyce & Weil, 1986; Joyce, Calhoun, & Hopkins, 1997; Joyce, Showers, & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1987; Polk, 2006; Tuckman, 1995). Investigations of the wide variety of teaching approaches have led to the development of an equally diverse number of educational paradigms.

The process-product paradigm is one of the most commonly cited educational paradigms in teacher effectiveness literature. While some educational paradigms identify disruptions between teacher variables and student learning outcomes (e.g., the mediating process paradigm or the classroom ecology paradigm), the process-product paradigm connects student products with specific teacher processes, and that relationship makes it unique among educational paradigms (Doyle, 1977). The foundation of the process-product paradigm is built upon two basic instructional concepts: schooling and education (Kelly, 2008b).

The concept of schooling involves a task-oriented approach to education. Schooling is primarily considered product-based and utilizes a propositional style of instruction, which includes proposing or directly providing information. The schooling approach often leads to competency-based instruction and student learning measured through testing (Kelly, 2008b; Milner, 1991). Although this method may be useful in many settings (e.g., vocational training), opponents of a product-focused education system argue schooling may provide too narrow a curriculum, because teachers tend to teach to the test (Kelly, 2008b; Lavy, 2007).

The phrase teaching to the test refers to the educational practice of devoting instructional time to test-taking strategies, or teaching specific test items expected to be found on required standardized tests. The results of standardized tests are often used in teacher evaluation portfolios and may affect future employment; therefore, the tests are often referred to as high-stakes tests. Many teachers teach to the test in an attempt to better prepare their students for
tested material (Menken, 2006). Proponents of high-stakes testing argue the tests measure the prescribed curriculum, so *teaching to the test* is really teaching the curriculum (Posner, 2004).

Conversely, opponents of high-stakes testing note that *teaching to the test* may be detrimental to student learning. After interviewing administrators in 10 New York City schools, Menken (2006) noted that high-stakes standardized testing had shaped educational policy in New York City high schools. One school administrator reported offering a class specifically for the New York Regents Examinations. Another school official noted English as a Second Language (ESL) students were required to pass ESL Benchmarks that were closely aligned to the English Regents exam, regardless of the students’ English proficiency level (Popham, 2001; Posner, 2004). Although the negative effects of *teaching to the test* may be apparent for New York ESL students, the phenomenon may not only exist within core academic subjects such as English or mathematics.

Within music education, the plethora of annual music performance assessments that attract school musicians (e.g., band and chorus contests, solo and ensemble festivals, all-state festivals, chair placements, etc.) may be considered a form of high-stakes testing. Austin (1990) noted many music educators were “immersed in the race to be number one” (p. 3). He argued the results of music contests may be education that is achieved as a “serendipitous byproduct, rather than a primary goal” (Austin, 1990, p. 3). Additionally, as students prepare for auditions, or directors prepare their ensembles for evaluation, the literature rehearsed may be limited to music that will be evaluated. For example, a band attending its state music performance assessment may only be evaluated on three musical selections (Black, 2010). Although the assessment may not occur for several months, the ensemble director may elect to only focus instructional time on the three pieces of music that will be performed at the state assessment. Unfortunately, the research literature indicates many nonmusical factors may affect an evaluator’s perception of a musical performance (Bermingham, 2000; Cavitt, 2002; Duerksen, 1972; Elliott, 1995; Radocy, 1976; VanWeelden, 2004; VanWeelden & McGee, 2007). The results of the aforementioned studies indicate the school curriculum often produced in a product-driven educational system may not only limit the scope of educational experiences offered to students, but it may lead to bias in student assessment (Henry, 2013; Menken, 2006).
Volante (2004) posited that when student assessment is biased toward specific academic subjects, the results might not only be detrimental to students in tested subject areas. He argued that students often lose instructional time in untested subjects like physical education, drama, and music in order to receive additional instruction on tested material. Since these subject areas are not usually subjected to standardized testing, little is known of the effects of *teaching to the test* on student achievement in these areas. Further research is therefore warranted.

The antithesis of schooling is the instructional concept of education, which promotes student exploration through an experiential framework. Education utilizes a process-based approach to learning, where outcomes are measured by student knowledge of how to produce accurate results rather than the results themselves (Kelly, 2008b). Unlike product-based schooling, the process-based model of education provides students with a wide variety of experiences, and a generalized curriculum that often incorporates a suppositional style of instruction that promotes creativity and conjecture (Milner, 1991). Although heavily influenced by the high-stakes testing of a product-driven system, many American public schools are designed with the process model of education in mind. Often schools provide an array of elective courses such as weight training, debate, musical theater, and swimming alongside core academic subjects like mathematics and biology. Many liberal arts colleges also prescribe to the process model of education. In the state of Florida, the New College of Florida maintains, as part of its mission statement, a goal to “design [students’] educational experience as much as possible in accordance with their individual interests, values, and abilities” (New College of Florida, 2013a). Students who attend New College have an opportunity to select a pre-designed major or to “design a multi-disciplinary or special area of concentration” in order to guide their own education through a variety of educational experiences (New College of Florida, 2013b).

Although process-based education may provide a wider range of experiences for learners, critics of the model argue it lacks measurability (Sheehan, 1986). The Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit (1980) (as cited in Sheehan, 1986) noted that knowing is a process, and process competencies can only be improved upon but may never be mastered. The lack of measurability creates accountability issues for proponents of the process-based education model. Opponents argue that products of teacher and student performances
(processes) must be measured in order to evaluate teacher effectiveness and student achievement (Sheehan, 1986).

Despite the abundance of process-product research in existence (Doyle, 1977; Freeman, 2002; Gage, 1989), perhaps no single method of instruction should be considered the correct method. The extant research indicates neither process- nor product-based models singularly provide a broad, student centered, experiential and measurable method of instruction. An effective teacher is often able to incorporate multiple instructional methods in a single lesson in order to communicate with a diverse group of learners (Harris, 1998). Indeed, it may be that the appropriateness of the selected method is measured only by the degree of student learning achieved.

Providing evidence of student learning has rapidly become one of the primary components of teacher evaluations, and may serve as a basis for teacher merit pay (Lavy, 2007). Additionally, as society has demanded higher levels of accountability from educators (Bruno & Nottingham, 1974; Eberts, Hollenbeck, & Stone, 2002; Fennell & Schroeder, 2006; Florida Department of Education, 2007; Lavy, 2007; Milliard, 2012; Quirk, 1973; West & Peterson, 2006), teacher trainers have been challenged to provide preservice teachers with more creative and effective teaching strategies, and to assist preservice teachers in developing the skills necessary to ensure student learning (Economic Policy Institute, 2010; K. Jones & Whitford, 1997).

The federal government of the United States has also worked to create an educational environment that promotes high standards, creativity, and accountability in order to improve student learning outcomes. In 2009, the Obama administration launched a contest known as Race to the Top as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The initiative was created as an attempt to foster systematic education reform at the state level. Race to the Top . . . provides funding to consortia of States to develop assessments that are valid, support and inform instruction, provide accurate information about what students know and can do, and measure student achievement against standards designed to ensure that all students gain the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college and the workplace. (U.S. Department of Education, 2013)
Central tenets of the contest include the development of “rigorous standards and better assessments” as well as helping teachers to become more effective (The White House, 2013). States participating in the Race to the Top program complete comprehensive reforms that challenge teachers and administrators to improve the level of instruction and subsequent student learning in their schools.

Music educators who are teacher trainers are not exempt from the challenge of teaching for measurable student learning. The current political and economic climate has fostered a social expectation for accountability in all fields of education (Asmus, 1999). Music educators are held to similar standards of excellence as other classroom teachers, and evaluation and compensation programs based on student performance do not discriminate on the basis of academic subject area (Fennell & Schroeder, 2006; Milliard, 2012). Participation in federally funded programs, such as Race to the Top, requires that state education agencies make systematic reforms to their current teacher and student assessment models in all academic areas (The White House, 2013). However, music is an abstract art, and musical assessments depend largely on subjective evaluations and individual perceptions of performance (McPherson & Thompson, 1998). Indeed, the Florida Department of Education has labeled music as a “hard to measure” subject (Florida Department of Education, n.d.). Therefore, developing methods of formal music instruction that promote student learning through the experiential process of music making, as well as more direct instruction guided by the specific criteria by which students will be evaluated, may be of primary concern for music educators and music teacher trainers.

**Need for the Study**

Since the late 1990s, the American education system has seen increased expectations for student performance and accountability for teachers (S. J. Adams, Heywood, Rothstein, & Koretz, 2009). Additionally, high-stakes testing and differential compensation programs have not only shaped the way teachers present material, but have frequently dictated the subject matter teachers choose to address (Eberts et al., 2002; Economic Policy Institute, 2010; Fennell & Schroeder, 2006; Lavy, 2007; Menken, 2006). For example, when students’ scores on tests required by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (U.S. Congress, 2002) are used as a means of teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness is determined by the basic math and reading skills of
students; therefore, teachers tend to present fewer topics in order to spend more time on tested material (Economic Policy Institute, 2010). Furthermore, a narrowing curriculum and increasing demand for evidence of student learning has contributed to the attrition (leaving the profession) and migration (moving to another position within the profession) of many educators who struggle to improve their students’ performance (Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley, 2006; Guin, 2004; Lavy, 2007). After a review of the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey, Hancock (2009) noted nearly 500,000 teaching vacancies existed each year. Roughly 5,000 of those annual vacancies were music teacher positions that remain unfilled (Hancock, 2009; Kimpton, 2005; Lindeman, 2004). In order to provide communities with highly qualified teachers, including music educators, school districts across the country are challenged to recruit promising new teachers while retaining their most talented and veteran educators (Guarino et al., 2006; Guin, 2004; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). This challenge is compounded by the expectation that schools be able to objectively report student learning outcomes as required by programs like Race to the Top (U.S. Department of Education, 2013); however, the lack of stability in school staffing faced by low-performing schools may have a “detrimental impact on the organizational functioning of a school,” and may deprive students in such schools from the high-quality education necessary to improve their performance (Guin, 2004, p. 4).

In addition to the effects of high attrition and migration on student learning, providing objective evidence of improved student performance may be problematic for music educators. Results of previous research indicate the common standardized achievement tests used to measure student academic performance may not be generalizable to music performance evaluation (Grant & Drafall, 1991; Milliard, 2012; Taebel, 1990a; 1990b; Tuckman, 1995). Furthermore, creating a reliable measure for music teacher performance has proven to be difficult for educational leaders (Maranzano, 2000).

Several state departments of education across the United States have initiated the development of standardized fine arts performance assessment measures (Center for Fine Arts Education, n.d.; Michigan Department of Education, 2013; San Diego County Office of Education, 2008; Texas State Legislature, 2013; University of South Carolina, n.d.). Unfortunately, most of the fine arts performance assessment measures are still in their
developmental stages, and they have yet to be standardized or placed in the regular battery of required student and teacher assessments for each state. In the absence of an appropriate standardized measure for music performance evaluation, many education officials have given local school districts the authority to determine the instrument by which student musical performance, and thus music teacher effectiveness, is measured (Max, 2007).

One common method of assessing a student musical performance is through participation in adjudicated music events. Annually, many music teachers include their ensembles in performance evaluation festivals provided by state music educator associations. These festivals provide easily observable outcomes of music student learning (NAfME, 2012). Morgan and Burrows (1981) noted the purpose of music contests and festivals is to “help directors improve their students’ music performance, foster their music growth and enrichment, and raise the standards” of student performance (p. 45). Unfortunately, results received at evaluation festivals may be biased due to the subjective nature of the performance evaluation procedures (Bergee, 2003; Bergee & Platt, 2003; Radocy, 1986).

Research on music performance evaluation has indicated nonmusical factors such as a performer’s physical appearance, race, and gender (Bermingham, 2000; Elliott, 1995; Griffiths, 2009; Ryan, Wapnick, Lacaille, & Darrow, 2006; VanWeelden, 2004; Wapnick, Darrow, Kovacs, & Dalrymple, 1997) may affect evaluators’ assessments of a performance. An evaluator may also be influenced by a developed expectation for an ensemble or musical performance based on the ensemble’s name or selection of music (Cavitt, 2002; Duerksen, 1972; Silvey, 2009; VanWeelden, 2004; VanWeelden & McGee, 2007). Furthermore, most music ensemble performance assessments represent a product-based model of assessment, during which a narrow curriculum (i.e., the performance of two or three musical selections) is evaluated. Since research has provided empirical evidence of the existence of bias in ensemble performance evaluations (Baker, 2004; Cassidy & Sims, 1991; Cavitt, 1997), a more objective method of music performance assessment seems warranted.

An alternative method of evaluating learning may involve assessing students’ abilities to transfer knowledge. Transferring knowledge outside of the context by which it was received may be considered an indicator of comprehension (D. N. Perkins & Salomon, 1988). Therefore,
promoting positive transfer of musical knowledge may be a primary educational goal for music educators, while assessing the transfer of knowledge may be of interest to performance evaluators.

Providing objective methods of evaluating effective music teaching and learning is important not only for the development of high quality music educators, but also for the retention of effective in-service music teachers. However, results of previous research have indicated a dearth of data from investigations of music teacher evaluation (Taebel, 1990b). Educational researchers do know with some certainty, however, that thousands of music teacher vacancies exist each year due to attrition and migration (Hancock, 2009). The music teacher attrition and migration phenomenon may only be exacerbated when students in low achieving schools fail to meet the benchmarks of required standardized tests. Talented music teachers in these schools are often compelled to move to more affluent communities in search of greater opportunity and success (Kimpton, 2005; Milliard, 2012). More objective methods of evaluating music teaching and learning may help to mitigate the effects of standardized testing on music teacher retention, which in turn may provide a more stable learning environment for K-12 music students. Furthermore, since most states lack a standardized measure appropriate for evaluating music teaching and learning, and since large ensemble performance evaluation is a common practice throughout the United States, it seems appropriate to investigate methods of instruction that might assist in improving ensemble performance ratings. If one were to consider music performance assessments held by state music education associations to be tests of musical teaching and learning, then no previous research is known to have investigated the effects of teaching to the test on music student learning and performance; such an investigation certainly seems warranted.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of criterion-referenced instruction, or teaching to the test, on ensemble performance evaluations and transfer tasks. For the purposes of this study, teaching to the test in music will be defined as instruction that focuses on the specific criterion used to evaluate ensembles in adjudicated events such as state music performance assessments. This definition of teaching to the test is consistent with those found in previous research (Menken, 2006; Popham, 2001; Posner, 2004; Volante, 2004). The study will
seek to compare ensemble performances that occur when musicians have no knowledge of the specific criteria by which they are being evaluated with performances influenced by criterion-referenced instruction. Furthermore, the study will examine the ability of performers to transfer musical knowledge when influenced by criterion-referenced instruction. Specifically, the study will attempt to determine (a) the extent to which criterion-referenced instruction might affect ensemble performance evaluations, (b) the extent to which criterion-referenced instruction might affect performers’ abilities to transfer specific musical knowledge, and (c) the extent to which an ensemble’s performance might be affected if the musicians are aware of the evaluative criteria used to assess their performance, but no additional instruction is provided.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter describes the literature relevant to research conducted in the areas of assessment and teacher effectiveness. It is organized in 8 sections: (a) historical overview, (b) development of standards and assessments, (c) factors affecting performance assessment, (d) effects of ensemble adjudication, (e) teacher assessments, (f) educational paradigms, (g) general principles of transfer, and (h) criterion-referenced instruction.

Historical Overview

Since 1838, many have recognized the study of music as an important component of a well-rounded American education. On August 14, 1838, Lowell Mason’s Hawes School choir demonstrated before a critical public audience that the ear could be trained to hear pitches just as the eye is taught to recognize colors (Birge, 1966). Mason’s students’ performance provided evidence contrary to the general belief that music was only for the talented few, and it lead to the establishment of music as a regular part of school curricula in Boston (Kelly, 2008b; Pemberton, 1971). The significance of Mason’s accomplishments in Boston was not necessarily the inclusion of music in public schools, as American singing-schools had been in existence since the eighteenth-century (Birge, 1966). The most notable consequences of Mason’s students’ performances were the establishment of music as an integral part of the public school curriculum, and the employment of Mason as the first music teacher whose remuneration was provided by public funds (Kelly, 2008b; Mark, 1996).

Although news of the successful vocal music experiment in Boston public schools spread across the country, the inclusion of instrumental music in school curricula was delayed for a variety of reasons–not least of which was that most music supervisors of the time were vocalists (Birge, 1966). Prescott and Chidester (1949) noted that by 1838 vocal music was recognized as a subject in American schools, but instrumental music education was not recognized until around 1900, and then it was only considered an extracurricular activity. Nevertheless, by the start of
the twentieth-century, many Midwestern communities had provided orchestral performance as an option for their high school students, and interest in school bands gained momentum by 1910 (Birge, 1966).

The popularity of bands grew during World War I thanks to a number of social factors:
1. The band [was] a mobile unit, capable of performing outdoors and indoors.
2. The volume and sonority typical of bands [had] been traditionally linked with a patriotic and martial spirit; society [had] been conditioned to this connection.
3. Bands [were] usually uniformed and provide a visible reinforcement of militaristic and patriotic feelings.
4. The band repertoire traditionally included much patriotic and military music as well as much popular music suitable for outdoor functions. (Whitehill, 1969, p. 181)

During World War I, many musicians were conscripted into the United States armed forces and were trained to perform in and lead military bands. After the war, many of these men served as qualified bandleaders and music educators (Whitehill, 1969). Professional bands, such as those lead by John Philip Sousa and Patrick Gilmore, received much acclaim across the country and inspired others to form bands of their own. Bands enjoyed such great popularity that Harding (1916) recounted the president of the University of Illinois as being “astounded when [Harding] told him that there were more bands in the State of Illinois than there were towns” (p. 189).

Unfortunately, many professional bands began to suffer as the market became saturated with amateur bands and charlatans, and with the increasing popularity of such sociocultural innovations as jazz and the phonograph, many of the country’s bands were disbanded (Holz, 1962).

Although social conditions had left many of America’s outdoor bandstands deserted by 1920, instrumental music education had already planted roots in the American public schools—particularly in the Midwest. In 1922, the U.S. Bureau of Education reported that Midwestern states employed more music teachers and supervisors than any other area of the country (Fonder, 1989). Local music educators, who recognized the importance of instrumental music education, helped Wisconsin to become the first state to form a school band association. This organization, known as the Wisconsin Boys Band Association (and later the Wisconsin School Music
Association) was charged with improving the quality of school bands and organizing band contests (Fonder, 1989; Grabel, 1928).

As the popularity of band contests spread across the country, it became evident that standards of assessment would be necessary to ensure bands received the most equitable performance evaluation possible. Contests such as the 1923 Schools Band Contest of America, the first national band contest, helped to illuminate the need for higher standards in contest construction. Held in Chicago’s Grant Park, the contest utilized a single adjudicator, forced bands to compete in a single category regardless of their size or years of experience, had no required music list, and erected the performance bandstand between the tracks of the Illinois Central Railroad and Chicago’s busy Michigan Avenue (Holz, 1962). Other contest organizers recognized the need for a more unbiased performance environment and instituted classification requirements based on years of experience, required bands to perform from a specific repertoire list, or included a mandatory demonstration of adequate sight-reading skills (Fonder, 1989; Holz, 1962).

The regulations placed on early band contests served as indicators of development in the area of school music assessment. The decades that followed the first national band contest were marked by demands for higher standards and valid forms of assessment in all fields of education, and music education was no exception. However, many music educators have found the implementation of standards and subsequent assessment of student achievement to be somewhat elusive.

**Developing Music Standards and Assessments**

For nearly a century, music educators have noted the difficulty of defining standards of measurement for musical performances. Farnsworth (1921) attributed this difficulty to music’s connection with the human spirit:

> The essential things that determine the value of music teaching, for instance, are the love awakened and the knowledge and technique gained. The knowledge and technique we can measure, but love pertains to the world of spirit, and eludes us. We can only infer it from what is done. It escapes any form of measurement. We must admit this at the outset. (p. 24)
Despite their inability to measure the love awakened by music, researchers of Farnsworth’s time were able to design measurements for musical knowledge and technique. The concern with these measurements, however, was their relatively infrequent use. Farnsworth (1921) recognized this issue and appealed to other music supervisors to not only obtain and use the tests, but to report their results to the Educational Council of the Music Supervisors National Conference of which he was chair. By doing so, validity and reliability of the measurements might be obtained.

Although the extant research literature provides evidence of many measures of music performance (Abeles, 1973; Bergee, 1987; DCamp, 1980; Greene, 2012; Horowitz, 1994; H. Jones, 2012; Pazitka-Munroe, 2001; Pfenninger, 1990; D. T. Smith, 2009; Watkins & Farnum, 1954; Zdzinski & Barnes, 2002), the only measure that remains commercially published and easily accessible is the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale (Boyle & Radocy, 1987). Watkins (1942) was developed as an objective measure for solo cornet performance of musical excerpts at sight and after one week of practice. An analysis of 23 commonly used cornet performance methods led to the development of two evaluation forms consisting of musical excerpts that increased in difficulty. The two forms were highly correlated ($r = .98$), and validity coefficients between test scores and teacher rankings of the performers ranged from .66 to .91 (Watkins & Farnum, 1954).

The Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale: Form A for All Band Instruments (1954) is a full band adaptation of Watkins (1942). The performance scale is designed such that students begin with the first excerpt and continue playing until they receive a score of zero on two consecutive exercises. Each measure serves as a single scoring unit, and one unit is deducted for every measure containing an error. Deductions are incurred for errors in pitch, time, changes in time, expression, and articulation (indicated as a slur error). The Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale also suggests scores necessary for students to receive the grades of A, B, C and D.

Although Watkins and his colleagues were able to develop acceptable methods for assessing musical performance, the American educational system, as a whole, found itself struggling to compete with technological nations around the world. When the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, an artificial satellite, into orbit on October 4, 1957, Americans vehemently called for educational reforms that would help American students remain competitive with their
peers around the world (Fonder & Eckrich, 1999). The post-Sputnik era saw an increase in standards for elite students, which ultimately lead to an increase in high school graduation rates and the educational attainment of minority students. Unfortunately, the social and political climate during the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War had a detrimental effect on the educational progress made in the early 1960s (Ravitch, 1995). By the 1980s, the average scores on high school standardized achievement tests had declined, and the National Commission on Excellence in Education called for more rigorous and measurable standards (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; A. C. Porter, 1994). President George H. W. Bush supported this sentiment in 1990, when his America 2000 plan called for a substantial increase in academic rigor (A. C. Porter, 1994).

Music educators responded to the call for increased standards by organizing the Music Standards Task Force, which began developing voluntary national standards for music education (Lehman, 1993). Their work received support from the Bush administration with the passage of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act 1994. The Goals 2000 Act stated that all American children should received training in the arts (Orman, 2002). One month later, the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations published nine voluntary national standards for music in a document entitled The School Music Program: A New Vision (MENC Task Force for National Standards in the Arts & Music Educators National Conference (U. S.), n.d.). The standards included (a) singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music, (b) performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music, (c) improvising melodies, variations and accompaniments, (d) composing and arranging music within specific guidelines, (e) reading and notating music, (f) listening to, analyzing, and describing music, (g) evaluating music and music performances, (h) understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts, and (i) understanding music in relation to history and culture (MENC Task Force for National Standards in the Arts & Music Educators National Conference (U. S.), n.d.).

The nine national standards provided a framework that guided music curriculum development at the state and local levels, but the mere conception and implementation of national content standards was not enough of an impetus to create systemic improvements in
teaching and learning. Daring-Hammond (1994) posited that students learn in a variety of ways, and if teachers are to be effective, they must be willing and able to adapt their teaching to meet the educational needs of every student. However, despite music educators' willingness to diversify their instruction, many lacked the training or resources necessary to adequately address each of the prescribed national standards for music education upon their publication (S. J. Byo, 1999; Lehman, 1995). Furthermore, despite significant changes made by music teacher training programs to better prepare music education students to implement the national standards for music education, developing adequate methods of music teacher and student assessment continues to be a challenge (Conway, 2008; Fonder & Eckrich, 1999; Lehman, 1995).

Factors Affecting Performance Assessment

More than half of the national standards for music education require music students and teachers to engage in some form of performance or assessment of a musical performance. Unfortunately, the extant research literature on music performance assessment suggests a variety of factors may have a bias effect on evaluators. A review of such research is necessary to gain a better understanding of the factors that influence an evaluator’s assessment of a musical performance, as well as the nonmusical factors that ultimately affect music performers and teachers.

The nonmusical factors of race and gender have received much attention in the research literature. Abeles and Porter (1978) completed a series of studies that indicated the existence of gender associations with musical instruments. The results showed that gender associations might begin with students as early as kindergarten, where boys consistently chose masculine instruments (e.g., trumpet, drums, etc.), while girls selected a wider variety of instruments.

In a more recent study, Fortney, Boyle and DeCarbo (1993) surveyed nearly 1,000 band students in grades six through nine, and asked respondents to rate how 11 different factors influenced their choice of band instrument. Additionally, the students were asked to indicate instruments they would most and least like to play and why. The results indicated female students tended to play and prefer the flute and clarinet, while males tended to play and prefer the trumpet, percussion and low brass instruments.
When evaluators make gender associations with specific musical instruments, their assessments of a musical performance may be affected as well. Elliott (1995) videotaped eight students performing an etude from *The Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale, Form A*. A black male, black female, white male, and white female were recorded performing on a trumpet and a flute. A prerecorded soundtrack was paired with all videotaped performances. The results indicated black performers were rated significantly lower than white performers, and black female trumpet players received the lowest scores.

Although the results of Elliot (1995) were quite concerning, a study by Johnson and Stewart (2004) provided conflicting evidence concerning racial and gender specific associations of band instruments. The researchers asked 201 preservice music education majors, public school music teachers, and collegiate music teachers to view either the mouth or entire face of a student before assigning him or her to an instrument. The results indicated the students’ gender and race had no significant impact on the instruments they were assigned.

One’s race and gender are often discernible through visual representation of his or her physical characteristics. Like race and gender, physical attractiveness has received much attention during the last half-century. Researchers in the areas of psychology and mental health have provided evidence to suggest the physical attractiveness of men and women may influence their interpersonal attraction, perceived intelligence, and morality (Byrne, London, & Reeves, 1968); perceived vocational status and self-esteem (G. R. Adams & Huston, 1975); and perceived academic ability (R. Anderson & Nida, 1978).

Music education researchers have also investigated the effects of physical attractiveness on performance evaluations. Wapnick, Darrow, Kovacs and Dalrymple (1997) asked 82 participants, divided into visual, audio, or audiovisual groups, to evaluate 14 vocal performances. The visual group rated the attractiveness of the performer, while the other two groups rated performance quality. Although attractive female singers were rated significantly higher than less-attractive singers in the audio group, thus confounding the results, more-attractive male singers were rated higher than less-attractive males under the audiovisual condition, but not the audio condition. These data indicate more physically attractive males may have benefited from inflated evaluation scores provided by judges who received an audiovisual stimulus.
Ryan, Wapnick, Lacaille and Darrow (2006) continued this line of research by investigating the effects of high-level performers’ physical characteristics (i.e., physical attractiveness, dress and stage behavior) on adjudicators’ performance ratings. Two hundred twenty-seven evaluators assessed 18 audiovisual recordings of piano competition performances, while 38 evaluators received only audio recordings. The results were consistent with previous research that suggested the visual representation of a performer might influence an evaluator’s ratings. Ryan, et al. (2006) noted, “it may be that when judges rate audio and audiovisual recordings they are actually evaluating different things – in the first case, the playing, and in the second, the performance” (p. 568).

In a similar study, Griffiths (2009) recorded four female violinists playing classical, jazz, and folk pieces in jeans, a clubbing dress, concert dress, and in a point-light condition. Although a prerecorded master track was used in all conditions, performers in the point-light condition received the highest mean scores for technical proficiency and musicality. Additionally, performers were rated as less appropriately dressed in the clubbing dress and jeans while playing the classical piece than they were while wearing the concert dress. These results may indicate evaluators have certain preconceived expectations of performance attire appropriate for specific musical genres.

The investigation of expectation effects present in music performance evaluations has received much attention in the research literature. One of the most frequently cited studies in this area was conducted by Duerksen (1972), who asked approximately 500 college freshmen and sophomores to listen to two piano recordings of the same composition and provide ratings for rhythmic accuracy, pitch accuracy, appropriateness of tempo, appropriateness of accent, dynamic contrasts, tone quality, interpretation, and overall quality of performance. A master track was used for both recordings, but Duerksen told one group of evaluators they were listening to a professional pianist, while another group was told the performance was by a student seeking admission into a graduate piano performance program. A control group of evaluators was also used, but they listened to recordings identified by number only. For every evaluated performance characteristic, the student performance was rated lower than the
professional performance, suggesting evaluators may have expected a student to demonstrate a lower level of performance ability than a professional.

Expectation effects have also been shown to affect evaluators’ ratings of a performance based on their beliefs of a performer’s talent and work ethic (Schultz, 1994), or information concerning performers’ disabilities (Cassidy & Sims, 1991), level of experience (Cavitt, 1997), or ability and effort (Cavitt, 2002). Even the type or title of the performing ensemble may have an effect on evaluators. Silvey (2009) asked 157 musicians to listen to musical performances from different high school bands and rate each ensemble’s tone, intonation and expression on 10-point Likert-type scales. A control group was given an evaluation form that identified each performance as Excerpt One through Excerpt Twelve. Each member of the experimental group completed an evaluation form that identified the performances as being performed by either a Concert Band or Wind Ensemble. Although the results indicated band labels had no significant effect on evaluators, experienced evaluators, and student evaluators who were members of a wind ensemble, rated excerpts identified as Wind Ensemble performances higher than identical excerpts labeled as Concert Band performances. When combined with evaluator responses to open-ended questions, these data indicated band directors and wind ensemble members may have favored wind ensemble performances because they expected these types of performances to be of higher quality due to the perceived instrumentation or advanced skill level of the ensembles (Silvey, 2009).

Perception of advanced abilities may also be a factor for adjudicators who assess the performance of difficult music. Baker (2004) compared the ratings received by participants in high school choral competitions with the difficulty level of the music they performed. Ratings for 90 randomly selected choirs from three different regions of Texas were analyzed. Results indicated ensembles that performed literature at the highest difficulty level received significantly higher ratings than choirs who performed music at the minimal difficulty level.

VanWeelden (2004) and VanWeelden and McGee (2007) also investigated how literature selection and conductor appearance might affect perceptions of performance. In the former study, the researcher asked 169 undergraduate music majors to rate six prerecorded male conductors (three black and three white) and their ensembles. Although an excerpt of Ezekiel
Saw de Wheel was used as a master track for each conductor, evaluators rated the black conductor group significantly higher than the white conductor group, suggesting evaluators may have stereotyped Ezekiel Saw de Wheel as a selection more appropriate for black conductors.

In a similar study, VanWeelden and McGee (2007) recorded four professional male conductors (two black and two white) conducting Felix Mendelssohn’s When God Commanded Angels and William Dawson’s Ezekiel Saw de Wheel. Three hundred fifty-three undergraduate music majors served as evaluators, and provided ratings for each ensemble’s intonation, tone quality, attacks and releases, phrasing, dynamics, balance and blend, and diction. The results for the study indicated western art music may have been stereotyped as white music; therefore, the white conductor group received higher ratings than the black conductor group when they were conducting Mendelssohn’s When God Commanded Angels. Conversely, the black conductor group was rated higher than the white conductor group when they conducted Ezekiel Saw de Wheel. VanWeelden and McGee (2007) posited, “ensemble members may also be unfairly penalized or rewarded for their performances by evaluators... due to the conductor’s race and the music programmed” (p. 16).

In an effort to negate judging errors or biases, many competitive events have elected to employ judging panels of three or more evaluators (B. R. Smith, 2004). Many researchers have found these types of judging panels to provide reliable assessments of musical performance. For example, Perkins (1991) examined the reliability between judges’ rankings of taped string auditions for the 1989–1990 Texas Music Educators Association All-State Orchestras. Using Kendall’s coefficient of concordance ($W$), the researcher provided results that indicated a high level of interjudge reliability for each judging panel ($W = .79–.98$).

Bergee (2003) also found judging panels were able to provide reliable music performance assessments. In an investigation involving faculty evaluations of end-of-semester jury performances, the researcher found good interjudge reliability for rating scale total scores, subscales, and global letter grades. The results indicated the consistency in scores might have been related to a shared set of values and expectations for students among faculty members, as well as the use of criteria-specific ratings scales.
Although some researchers have found judging panels to provide reliable assessments, the subjective and complex nature of music performance evaluation has led others to note unsatisfactory levels of interrater reliability among panels of music performance evaluators. For example, Garman, Boyle, and DeCarbo (1991) examined the reliability between judges on five different orchestra festival judging panels in Dade County, Florida. The researchers found the interjudge reliability coefficients to be “marginally acceptable” for three of the five years, while data from the remaining two years produced “unacceptable” reliability coefficients (p. 23). Similar results were found by Hash (2012), who examined data from high school band contests in South Carolina between 2008 and 2010. The results indicated judges reached only a moderately high level of agreement in ranking bands \((r = .75)\) or providing specific ratings \((r = .70)\). The researcher also noted the vast majority of ensembles received a Division I or II rating, which he argued “does not adequately differentiate ensembles at various levels of achievement, and therefore, may actually weaken the validity of these ratings” (Hash, 2012, p. 94).

High levels of validity and reliability are important for adjudicated music ensemble events. Such events may be beneficial for the students, directors, and communities that participate by providing recommendations for improvement as well as boosting morale and performance standards (Rohrer, 2002). Conversely, poor results received at adjudicated music performance events may have a negative effect on music program growth and music educator job retention (Hash, 2012).

**Effects of Ensemble Adjudication on Teachers**

Although there are many alternative methods of assessing music teaching and learning (e.g., *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale*, public performances, guided listening activities, etc.), many music educators may feel it is necessary to attend adjudicated performance events. In a panel discussion at the 1983 Music Educators National Conference in-service meeting in Louisville, Kentucky, high school band directors reported feeling pressure from parents and students to be competitive (Burnsed & Sochinski, 1983). Rogers (1985) found similar results after surveying 421 high schools from all 50 states in 1981. Band directors and administrators were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning the values of marching band contests. The
results indicated the majority of directors from competitive programs partly attributed their participation in such events to pressure from their school communities.

Unfortunately, the results of adjudicated events are often dependent on subjective judgments of often-elusive categories (e.g. artistry, feeling of ensemble, etc.). Batey (2002) noted, “adjudicators tend to give more weight to items they believe are important” (p. 41). Some may even view the results of adjudication as a direct reflection of a director’s skills.

Music educators who feel pressured to participate in adjudicated music events in order to validate their professional abilities may be more susceptible to attrition caused in part by excessive stress. Lindeman (2004) noted teacher burnout was one of the reasons as many as 11,000 music educators left the profession each year. Barnes and McCashin (2005) surveyed representatives from state music educator associations about the procedures used during adjudicated orchestra festivals. Respondents reported the vast majority of their state’s teachers approached adjudicated festivals with medium to high levels of intensity. Some respondents also reported the festivals had a medium to high impact on music educator job security, which may contribute to high levels of stress experienced by many ensemble directors (Barnes & McCashin, 2005; Hedden, 2005; Heston, Dedrick, Raschke, & Whitehead, 1996; Scheib, 2003).

Furthermore, teachers who experience excessive stress while preparing for, or in the immediate aftermath of, adjudicated festivals may find themselves in somewhat of a catch 22, since stress may cause diminished teacher and student performance (Kaiser & Polczynski, 1982).

In an attempt to improve teacher and student performance, and by extension improve the global standing of American schools, some education officials have supported teacher compensation programs that align teacher pay with observable student and teacher outcomes. Lavy (2007) noted the three most common performance-based incentive programs used in education were merit pay, knowledge- and skill-based compensation, and school-based compensation. The basic merit pay system offers individual rewards contingent upon student performance outcomes. Knowledge- and skill-based compensation is tied directly to teacher skills rather than student outcomes. Finally, school-based compensation programs involve rewards based on school-wide teacher and student performance results rather than those of individuals.
The results of performance pay systems are somewhat inconclusive, and researchers have argued the complex structure of American schools may “mitigate student achievement effects of reforms based on individual incentive pay” (Eberts et al., 2002, p. 914). For example, Eberts, Hollenbeck and Stone (2002) noted performance pay systems within schools might produce unintended results. In a comparative case study between a school using merit pay and one using a traditional pay system, the researchers found the use of a merit pay system designed to increase course completion was effective; however, the results indicated student grade point averages, daily attendance rates, and course passing rates declined. Anecdotal evidence suggested teachers altered their course content and presentation in order to entice students to attend class, but little may have been done to produce gains in student achievement.

Lavy (2007) noted teachers who receive performance-based pay and struggle to improve their students’ test scores may be at risk of attrition. He also argued that attribution might be a concern in performance-based pay systems, because it is often difficult “to identify the contributions of previous teachers, who may have been superior or inferior” (Lavy, 2007, p. 92). The researcher went on to note that performance-based pay may foster a “teaching-to-the-test mentality,” whereby teachers focus their lessons on the specific material included in the standardized tests that will determine their compensation (Lavy, 2007, p. 92). This method of instruction, Lavy argues, creates a narrow curriculum and sacrifices student achievement and experience in areas excluded from standardized tests.

Despite inconclusive data concerning the ability of merit pay systems to improve teacher and student performance, education reformers have continued to suggest such systems for nearly a century (Figlio & Kenny, 2007). Furthermore, the use of school performance incentive programs increased during the last two decades of the twentieth century, such that by 1993, 12% of public school districts and 35% of private nonsectarian schools utilized a merit pay plan (Ballou, 2001). Many of these plans, as well as those still in existence today, provided financial incentives contingent upon teacher performance and student output (Chait & Miller, 2009). For example, the state of Florida’s Effectiveness Compensation Plan (E-Comp) required a portion of all teachers’ salaries to be based on their students’ achievement as measured, almost exclusively, by standardized test scores (Baratz-Snowden, 2007; Fennell & Schroeder, 2006). The program
was later replaced by the Merit Award Program (MAP), which provided more flexibility for school districts. Although no less than 60% of teachers’ assessments were based on their students’ performance, participating Florida districts were given the opportunity to determine which test scores were applicable, how many teachers would be rewarded, and how much of an impact test scores would have on teachers’ raises (Baratz-Snowden, 2007; Florida Department of Education, 2007). Florida’s Merit Award Program also provided districts with the opportunity to determine the testing instruments to be used for teachers of subjects or grades not included in statewide standardized tests (Florida Department of Education, 2007).

**Teacher Assessments**

Providing valid measures for assessing the performance of teachers in noncore subjects has been a challenge for educational reformers. Watson, Kraemer and Thorn (2009) noted that as many as 69% of school personnel may teach courses or grade levels not directly involved with the statewide standardized tests commonly used as a component of teacher assessments. Furthermore, the researchers posited that developing new measures to assess teacher performance in noncore subjects “is a very complicated, time-consuming, and expensive task” (Watson et al., 2009, p. 18).

In the field of music education, an effective teacher’s performance is said to demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter and what students need to know, as well as effective delivery and sequencing of the course materials (C. K. Madsen, 1988). Research has also provided evidence of a relationship between teacher effectiveness and teacher intensity (C. K. Madsen, 1990). Madsen and Geringer (1989) provided 22 senior music education majors with five classroom management lessons just prior to their public school internships. During the lessons, the instructor provided contrasting examples of teacher intensity, and the participating students had opportunities to practice effective teaching with their peers. Upon completing their internship experience, students submitted a videotape of their best teaching. Experts who assessed either teacher intensity or teacher effectiveness then evaluated the tapes. The results revealed a strong relationship between teacher intensity and teacher effectiveness.

Madsen, Standley and Cassidy (1989) noted not only that a relationship existed between teacher intensity and teacher effectiveness, but also that intensity could be operationally defined,
taught, demonstrated, and easily recognized by music education majors. Additional research has revealed that observers with no formal music training can recognize intensity in music instruction (J. L. Byo, 1990). Perhaps this is because evaluators are often able to recognize global teacher competence more so than specific instructor behaviors (C. K. Madsen et al., 1992; K. Madsen, 2003). Furthermore, research has indicated that teachers who use high intensity during content delivery are perceived as being more effective regardless of the accuracy of their instruction (K. Madsen, 2003). These results hold particular importance for music educators, since music teacher performance evaluations often involve classroom observations conducted by principals or other building supervisors who have little or no background in music education.

Nevertheless, teacher assessment is necessary in order to improve teaching (Tuckman, 1995). Designing assessments that provide data related to what teachers actually do and how effective their efforts actually are has proven difficult, however. Milner (1991) revealed the common forms of teacher assessment that have dominated education reforms since the second half of the twentieth century may not have only assessed teacher performance, but they may have caused teachers to change their methods of teaching. He argued that teachers tended to conform their methods of instruction to best fit the system by which they were being evaluated. The results of these evaluation systems, Milner notes, were classrooms where less creative thinking took place.

According to Tuckman (1995), many educational institutions employ a system of teacher assessment that involves performance-based evaluations, student evaluations, teacher portfolios, or some combination of the three. The researcher opined that, if used incorrectly, each assessment system presents problems of validity and reliability. Performance-based evaluation systems are designed to evaluate observable behaviors. In order to improve student learning, performance-based assessments must focus on the output of individual children, but such assessments are often aggregated and lose their validity (K. Jones & Whitford, 1997). For example, in the state of Kentucky, the Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) coupled scores received on student performance assessments with rewards or sanctions for teachers and administrators. Jones (1997) argued the high-stakes testing created by KIRIS undermined the purpose of performance assessments by aggregating student scores into school
scores, thereby shifting the focus of the school community from individual students to overall school performance on external assessments.

Additional research by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI) (Economic Policy Institute, 2010) supported the concerns posited by Jones (1997). Scholars who reported for the EPI noted that when used in isolation, student test scores were not a reliable or valid indicator of teacher effectiveness. The researchers suggested that when low student test scores are used as indicators of ineffective instruction, teachers might distort the curriculum in order to focus on tested material in order to avoid being identified as an ineffective teacher. Furthermore, the contributing researchers argued that attribution and nonrandom student assignments create limitations for the use of student test scores as indicators of teacher effectiveness.

In addition to performance-based evaluations, Tuckman (1995) noted student evaluations and teacher portfolios might be used as methods of assessing teacher effectiveness. However, he suggested student evaluations could be unreliable, because young students tend to provide subjective perceptions of teacher behavior rather than the sophisticated judgments necessary to be considered valid and reliable. Tuckman also argued that although teacher portfolios may provide evidence of teacher performance from multiple sources, the complicated process of compiling, scoring, and storing portfolios might contribute to the impracticality of their widespread use as a method of assessing teacher effectiveness.

It is clear, then, that educational reforms have created a need for the development of improved methods of assessing what students learn, and those in the field of music education are not exempt. According to MakeMusic, Inc. (2013), more than half of the state departments of education across the United States place music among the core academic subjects, provide standards for music education, and include objective evidence of student learning as a portion of teacher evaluations. Furthermore, many states use student achievement or growth as the primary criterion for teacher assessment. Without valid and reliable methods of assessment, education officials and school communities are unable to accurately determine music teacher effectiveness. However, some educators believe assessing music teaching and learning is difficult perhaps due to a lack of clearly identified learning goals (Asmus, 1999).
Educational Paradigms

The extent to which the identification of goals affects student learning may be dependent upon an assessor’s paradigmatic viewpoint. The mediating processes paradigm, for example, suggests “student learning outcomes are a function of the mediating activities employed by students during the learning process” (Doyle, 1977, p. 171). Although, student mediating processes may be influenced by instructional methods (including the identification of learning goals), it is the student’s cognitive ability to process the provided information that ultimately determines what is learned (Rothkopf, 1976). Conversely, teacher effectiveness within the process-product paradigm is dependent upon the direct relationship between teacher behaviors and student outcomes (Doyle, 1977).

As mentioned earlier in this review, when student outcomes are used as a direct measure of teacher effectiveness, the result is often a narrow curriculum focused specifically on the teaching and learning of concepts included in standardized assessments (M. L. Smith, 1991). This instructional method is often referred to as a schooling model (Kelly, 2008b). In order to ensure students learn tested material, practitioners of the schooling method use direct instruction. These teachers propose information to students rather than engaging them in discovery learning through indirect or suppositional instruction which may promote knowledge transfer (K. Jones & Whitford, 1997; Milner, 1991; Tuckman, 1995).

Transfer

The concept of knowledge and skill transfer has received much attention in educational research literature (Brainin, 1985; Cassidy, 1990; Gromko, 2005; Joyce et al., 1987; 1997). These studies suggest appropriate transfer of knowledge may be an indicator of effective teaching and student learning. Others have noted positive transfer may not occur unless students are taught to make transfers (Geringer & Madsen, 1987; D. N. Perkins & Salomon, 1988; Thorndike & Woodworth, 1901). Appropriate or positive transfer occurs when knowledge or skills learned in one context are appropriately applied to other situations in order to improve learning (D. N. Perkins & Salomon, 1988; 1992). Butterfield and Nelson (1989) defined positive transfer as “flexible use of knowledge and skills. . . . shown by using what one knows to good effect in new context or for new purposes” (p. 5). For example, while studying a Mozart horn
concerto, a music student may learn in an applied lesson that she should begin performing a crescendo slightly softer than the printed dynamic level before increasing her volume. When the same student encounters a crescendo in her large ensemble rehearsal, she immediately decreases her volume before performing the crescendo. Butterfield and Nelson (1989) opined the fundamental goal of teaching is to foster positive transfer.

Conversely, negative transfer occurs when knowledge or skill learned in one context is inappropriately applied or negatively affects another situation (D. N. Perkins & Salomon, 1992). For example, brass students in a jazz ensemble are taught that a wavy line extended horizontally to the right of a note head is an indication that a *shake* should be performed by producing consecutive and wide lip slurs from the indicated pitch to an unspecified harmonic above it. The students then encounter similar notation (e.g., a trill) in their concert band rehearsal and perform a *shake*, much to their director’s consternation.

The idea of transfer can also be discussed in terms of distance (e.g., near or far), although not in the metric sense of the word. Near transfer occurs when knowledge or skill learned in one context is transferred to a similar context (D. N. Perkins & Salomon, 1992). The two aforementioned examples of transfer (i.e., transfer from solo literature to ensemble literature, and transfer from jazz notation to symphonic notation) would be considered near transfers. Another example would be a euphonium player who might consider playing the sousaphone while in marching band. The two instruments share many qualities (e.g., clef, key, fingering system, basic construction, instrument family, etc.); therefore, much of what was learned to play the euphonium may easily transfer to sousaphone performance. On the other hand, far transfer occurs when knowledge or skill learned in one context is transferred to what might seem to be a dissimilar context. For example, a preschool music teacher might apply basic classroom management and instruction strategies (e.g., speaking clearly, use of high intensity and affect, movement around the room, etc.) to present a lecture to business professionals about fundraising and grant writing.

Thorndike and Woodworth (1901) were among the first to use transfer tasks to investigate how individuals learned. Their research attempted to determine whether improvement of one cognitive task might aid in the performance of another. Participants in the study were provided
with pictures of three squares of differing sizes, as well as 125 pieces of paper cut into different shapes and sizes. They were then asked to write down the area of each cut shape. Next, the participants were given several paper rectangles and asked to guess the area of each, look at the actual area, and record their error. When improvements were made, the participants were retested with the 125 original cut pieces of paper. The results indicated transfer was most likely to occur when identical elements were presented. Conversely, transfer was least likely to occur when elements were dissimilar.

In the field of education, the instructional strategies of hugging and bridging may aid students in making positive transfers. Hugging involves engaging students in activities to lead them to the desired outcome (reflexive transfer) by successive approximations (D. N. Perkins & Salomon, 1992). For example, while discussing left hand technique, a conducting teacher may allow students to conduct with a recording or a small laboratory ensemble rather than simply discussing left hand technique in class. Instead of depending on reflexive near transfers (as in the case with hugging), bridging requires learners to make abstractions of prior experiences to new situations. For example, an instructor may ask students to discuss how preparing for a recital performance has aided them in the completion of their comprehensive exams. Perkins and Salomon (1992) opined that a combination of the two strategies may produce the greatest results, and “education can achieve abundant transfer if it is designed to do so” (p. 8).

Education officials have previously provided evidence that one expectation of student learning outcomes is the ability to make transfers (K. Jones & Whitford, 1997). In the field of music, the national standards for music education include “understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts,” as well as “understanding music in relation to history and culture” (Conway, 2008, p. 38). Both standards require students to make near and far transfers to contexts outside of music; therefore, teaching students to make transfers might be a professional responsibility for music educators.

Although transfer has received much attention in education research literature, Bransford and Schwarts (1999) argued the common methodology used in transfer research might need to be altered. They note many researchers use sequestered problem solving, and direct application theory, in order to investigate learning. When researchers use sequestered problem solving,
participants are not allowed to “demonstrate their abilities to learn to solve new problems by seeking help from other resources such as texts or colleagues or by trying things out, receiving feedback, and getting opportunities to revise” (Bransford & Schwartz, 1999, p. 68). Bransford and Schwartz (1999) argued the sequestered problem solving approach might not be thorough enough to adequately detect transfer. They recalled the work of Singley and Anderson (1989), which revealed evidence of transfer might become apparent after some time rather than immediately; therefore, the single posttest model often used in transfer studies may not provide enough data concerning the amount of transfer that has occurred.

Alternatively, the Preparation for Future Learning (PFL) methodology proposed by Bransford and Schwartz (1999) asked not whether an individual could make transfers from one task directly to another, but to what extent the subject’s previous experiences had prepared him to learn the skills necessary to be successful in the future. The methodology broadens the scope of transfer by analyzing qualitative data such as questions or comments proposed by participants in transfer studies. Additionally, the PFL approach promotes learning in an environment where students are allowed to interact and receive feedback, thereby constantly increasing the cache of knowledge they may use to create transfers.

Fuchs et al. (2003) utilized a similar methodology to examine the effects of teaching third-grade students to make transfers in mathematical problem solving. The researchers found that providing explicit instructions, worked examples, and peer mediation was a successful method of teaching students to make transfers. The methodology used by Fuchs and her colleagues also bares semblance to Robert Mager’s model of criterion-referenced instruction (Cox, 2003).

**Criterion-Referenced Instruction**

Mager (1975) posited that in order for instruction to be measurable, evaluated, and subsequently improved, clear objectives must be developed. Each instructional objective must contain three characteristics: (a) it must identify what a student is expected to do, (b) it must reveal the specific conditions under which the task must be completed, and (c) it must describe the criterion for acceptable performance (Mager, 1975). The objectives should then be used to guide instruction and aid in the development of evaluation instruments. Criterion-referenced
tests provide data concerning a learner’s achievement of the stated objectives. Upon receiving such data, an instructor may provide feedback and create opportunities for the learner to practice and develop deficient skills (Mager & Beach, 1967). Therefore, simply put, criterion-referenced instruction is a method of instruction, guided by specific criteria used to assess the achievement of stated learning goals.

The iterative quality of criterion-referenced instruction necessitates more individualized and explicit instruction of learners, which may lead to improvement in student performance (Cox, 2003; Rust, Price, & O'Donovan, 2003). However, improved student performance may be dependent upon both the instructor and the student’s understanding of the evaluative criteria (Webster, Pepper, & Jenkins, 2000). Previous research in business education has indicated students recognize the benefits of using criterion-referenced assessment tools, but they find such tools to have “limited practical use if presented in isolation without the benefit of explanation, exemplars and the opportunity for discussion” (Rust et al., 2003, p. 151). These findings support earlier research in music performance assessment that suggested student awareness of evaluative criteria may be a consequential factor in improving musical performance (McPherson & Thompson, 1998); therefore, it would seem such an investigation might prove beneficial for the field of music education.

In an age of high-stakes testing and accountability, identifying the most efficient methods of effective teaching strategies and observable student learning is paramount. Unfortunately, music educators often struggle to provide evidence of the learning that occurs in their classrooms everyday. In the absence of statewide standardized measures of musical achievement, many music educators find themselves dependent upon performances at concerts and adjudicated festivals as products of student learning. However, these singular performances provide little insight into the music learning process. Criterion-referenced instruction not only recognizes the importance of assessment, but it provides frequent opportunities for student and teacher assessment throughout the learning process. An investigation of the effects of criterion-referenced instruction in a musical learning environment seems warranted; therefore, the following research questions guided this investigation:
1. If students are aware of the primary and secondary categories used by evaluators to assess music ensemble performances, to what extent will their performance be affected without additional instruction?

2. To what extent does criterion-referenced instruction, in the form of a music lesson focused on performing with appropriate style, affect ensemble performance evaluations?

3. To what extent does criterion-referenced instruction affect performers’ abilities to transfer specific musical knowledge over time and to new musical selections?

4. To what extent do differences exist between student performers’ perceptions of their performance and subsequent evaluators’ assessments?
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of criterion-referenced instructional methods on ensemble performance evaluations. Specifically, this study sought to determine the extent to which music instruction that is focused on and guided by evaluative criteria (or teaching to the test) may affect students’ learning and their ability to transfer musical knowledge. The study was developed in three parts. In part one, the author examined how prior knowledge of evaluative criteria affected an ensemble’s performance. In part two, the author utilized one specific evaluative criterion and investigated how a music lesson focused on that criterion might affect an ensemble’s performance. Finally, in part three, the author sought to determine whether the aforementioned criterion-referenced lesson might have an affect on student’s abilities to make music performance transfers.

The Ensemble

The ensemble selected to participate in this study was comprised of public school band students who attended the same school. This local school band was selected because expert instrumental music educators recognized it as being of typical quality for school ensembles in the area. The school where the band was located served roughly 1700 students in grades kindergarten through 12. The demographics for the school’s student population were typical for a school in the state of Florida: 50.2% female and 49.8% male; 51.47% White, 29.56% African-American, 10.37% Hispanic, 2.59% Asian, 0.36% Native American Indian, and 5.65% Multicultural. Additionally, roughly 55.9% of the population participated in the school’s free and reduced lunch programs.

Students who were members of the participating concert band were enrolled in grades eight through twelve. Each member had similar musical training, which consisted of school instrumental ensemble instruction that usually began in the sixth grade. The band rehearsed for fifty minutes during each regularly scheduled school day.
Stimulus Selection and Development

Upon considering short musical excerpts that would best control for student learning, the researcher elected to utilize the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale Form A for All Band Instruments (Watkins & Farnum, 1954). The performance scale consists of 14 musical excerpts ranging from the least technically and musically challenging to the most demanding. Although originally written as a measure for cornet performance (Watkins, 1942), Watkins (1954) adapted the original measure for flute; oboe and saxophone; soprano, alto, and bass clarinets; B-flat cornet and baritone (treble clef); horn; trombone, baritone (bass clef), and bassoon; tuba; and snare drum. The Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale has been used to measure thousands of musical performances, and when used as a measure of solo wind and percussion performance, it is considered to be valid ($r = .68–.87$, with the majority being above .80), reliable ($r = .87–.94$), and standardized (Watkins & Farnum, 1954).

All musical excerpts performed by the student ensemble in this study were adapted from the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale Form A for All Band Instruments. For the purposes of this study, excerpts five and six were selected because they shared the same meter, key signature, and phrase structure. Furthermore, considering Watkins’ description of the sequential organization of the 14 excerpts by difficulty level, utilizing two immediately adjacent excerpts helped to ensure one excerpt was not excessively more difficult than the other.

Since the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale was originally designed for the evaluation of solo performances, minor adaptations were necessary before the excerpts could be performed in unison by a concert band. The original performance scale required all saxophones and oboes to read from the same music with a key signature of G major. This may have been appropriate if students were performing individually, but it presented a problem for the unison performance of a concert band since alto and baritone saxophones are pitched in E-flat, tenor saxophones are pitched in B-flat, and oboes are naturally in C. Therefore, the combined saxophone and oboe excerpts were divided so that each instrument could perform with the full band in the key of B-flat major. Following Watkins’ model, “the notes of each exercise were kept within the range of the instrument, [and] the limitations and difficulties of each instrument were not exceeded” (Watkins & Farnum, 1954, p. 5).
Several adjustments to excerpts five and six were completed in an effort to make them similar: (a) the tempo of both excerpts was increased \( (\dot{\text{i}} = 120) \); (b) the time signature of excerpt number six \( (\text{C}, \text{or common time}) \) was changed to match the time signature for number five \( (\text{I}) \); and (c) all printed slur markings were removed from excerpt number six, and one slur was added between beats three and four in the 11th measure to balance the slur found in the 12th measure of excerpt number five.

The researcher transcribed each excerpt into Finale music notation software in order to create two pages of music for each performing student; excerpt number five was on one page, and excerpt number six was on the other. A secondary researcher confirmed the Finale excerpts were accurate melodic and rhythmic transcriptions (except for the aforementioned necessary adaptations) of excerpts five and six from the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale Form A for All Band Instruments*.

**Pilot Study 1**

The teaching stimulus was designed to represent a portion of a typical concert band rehearsal. A lesson was scripted and presented to graduate music education majors \( (n = 3) \) who had extensive experience teaching music at the K–12 and collegiate levels. As a result of the pilot lesson, minor adjustments were made to the technology used to present the lesson, as well as the construction of the evaluation instrument, in order to mitigate the effects of extraneous variables.

**Teaching Stimuli**

The lesson was presented to the student ensemble in their regular rehearsal room. The students’ normal concert band director agreed to memorize and present the material in order to provide the most natural classroom environment possible (C. K. Madsen & Geringer, 1990). Prior to making the first stimulus recording, students entered the classroom and performed in the regular warm-up routine for the class. Upon completion of the warm-up, the students’ teacher distributed excerpt number five to each member of the ensemble, and he informed the students that once instructed to do so, they were to begin a three-minute individual practice session before the full band recorded the selection. When all students in the ensemble had the excerpt, they were given the instruction to begin practicing.
The researcher monitored the time by using a SportLine digital stopwatch. In addition to minimizing errors caused by sight-reading, the three-minute practice session provided students with an opportunity to make musical decisions concerning the style and phrasing of the 16-measure excerpt. When three minutes had expired, the researcher cued the teacher, who motioned for the students to stop practicing by stepping onto a conducting podium and raising one hand in the air. The students recognized this motion as their normal nonverbal cue to be quiet. The teacher then started the following script:

It’s now time to record this excerpt. You’ll be making this recording without the assistance of a conductor. Instead, a metronome will be used to introduce the proper tempo (\( \infty = 120 \)). You will hear eight clicks, and then you should begin playing, in time, on beat nine. Let’s practice that. I’m going to start the metronome. Listen for the first eight clicks, and then start playing the first note of number five on beat nine. Ready?

The teacher and ensemble then rehearsed starting excerpt number five for the recording. Listening for eight metronome beats before playing was a technique commonly used by the ensemble; therefore, the students encountered no issues when attempting to start together.

After demonstrating how the recording would be started, the teacher concluded his instructions by saying, “. . . when you reach the end of the excerpt, stop playing and remain silent until the recorder is turned off. Do you have any questions?” Excerpt number five from the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale* was then recorded (as recording A or baseline) using a Roland R-09HR portable recorder.

**Part I: Prior Knowledge of Evaluative Criteria**

An online search for concert band adjudication forms was conducted. To assess the effects of prior knowledge of evaluative criteria on student performance, the student ensemble was presented with a list of commonly evaluated music performance characteristics adapted from assessment forms used by seven state music organizations: (a) Alabama Bandmasters Association Music Performance Assessment Adjudicator’s Comments and Rating Form, (b) Florida Bandmasters Association Adjudicator’s Comment Sheet for Concert Band, (c) Georgia Music Educators Association Band Large Group Performance Evaluation adjudication sheet, (d) Kentucky Music Educators Association Official Evaluator’s Comment Sheet, (e) North Carolina
Bandmasters Association Music Performance Adjudication Stage Form, (f) Oregon Band and Orchestra Evaluation Form, and (g) West Virginia Bandmasters Association Concert Band Adjudicating Form (Alabama Bandmasters Association, 2012; Florida Bandmasters Association, 2010; Georgia Music Educators Association, n.d.; Kentucky Music Educators Association, n.d.; North Carolina Bandmasters Association, 2012; Oregon School Activities Association & Oregon Band Directors Association, 2012; West Virginia Secondary School Activities Commission & West Virginia Bandmasters Association, 2010). Forms from Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oregon, and West Virginia (Appendix G) were used because each state’s music educator association made the forms readily available online. Additionally, evaluation forms were selected from these seven states because the forms shared similar construction and content to those used in the states where data were collected. All forms were divided into several primary categories (e.g., tone, intonation, musicality, etc.), which were then divided into subcategories (i.e., tone was further divided into the subcategories of beauty, blend, and control).

Each state’s music performance assessment form was carefully analyzed to determine music performance characteristics that were common to all forms. The primary categories of tone, intonation, technique, balance, and musicality/musical effect were selected because they were represented on three or more of the sample forms. These categories are also consistent with those used by adjudicated music festivals across the United States (Barnes & McCashin, 2005). Music performance characteristics included in each subcategory were selected because they were represented on two or more of the state evaluation forms. A complete list of the evaluative criteria used in this study is provided in Appendix B.

Following the initial recording session, a list of evaluative criteria selected from state music performance assessment evaluation forms was projected on a screen in front of the ensemble. Students were informed that judges would provide ratings for the band’s performance after assessing the ensemble’s achievement of each criterion. The students were then given sixty seconds to carefully read the evaluative criteria before they were asked to record exercise number five from the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale a second time (as recording B). The students followed the same recording procedure that was used during the first recording session.
(pretest), but the performance characteristics remained visible throughout the second performance (posttest). Additionally, after completing the second recording session, each student used the Music Performance Assessment Scale (Appendix D) to provide his or her evaluation of the ensemble’s performance of excerpt number five.

**Part II: Criterion-Referenced Music Instruction**

Before the effects of criterion-referenced instruction could be investigated, the specific knowledge or skills that needed to be learned had to be determined. For the purposes of this study, appropriate performance of march style was selected as the student learning goal. Sousa (1928) noted, “the march speaks to a fundamental rhythm in the human organization and is answered. A march stimulates every center of vitality, wakens the imagination...” (p. 358). Furthermore, many school bands across the United States elect or are required to perform a march as a portion of their state’s annual large ensemble performance evaluation; therefore, instruction specific to march style seemed appropriate.

Upon completion of the second recording session, the students’ band director began a scripted explanation of acceptable performance practice for march style (Appendix C). The characteristics of march style presented in the script were adapted from descriptions of common march performance practices published in related literature (Chevallard, 2003; Jagow, 2007). Experts in the areas of instrumental music education and performance, with a combined 53 years of K–12 and collegiate teaching experience, provided reliability for the scripted explanation. The panel of five experts was asked to review the scripted lesson on march style and indicate any march style characteristics that did not belong or were missing. Reliability was computed using the formula: agreements ÷ (agreements + disagreements) (C. K. Madsen & Madsen, 1998). Members of the panel unanimously agreed the scripted characteristics were appropriate for teaching common march style performance practices.

In an attempt to engage the student ensemble, and better focus their attention on march style, an aural representation of appropriate march style was developed. An audio recording of The United States Army Concert Band performing *The Stars and Stripes Forever* (Sousa, 1896) was imported into Adobe Soundbooth CS4. The file was edited such that only the introduction, first strain, and second strain were presented. All repeats of the first and second strains were also
included, and the recording was designed to fade out during the final six and one-half seconds of the track. The audio was then exported as an .mp3 file for use in this study. The final audio file included the first one minute and eleven seconds (1:11) of the original recording.

The *Stars and Stripes Forever* recording was played for the student ensemble using an iPhone 4S that was connected to a high-quality sound system with a 3.5mm RCA stereo audio cable. This audio equipment was preinstalled in the students’ classroom and was used regularly by the band director as an instructional tool.

After reading the scripted description, and providing an audio sample of appropriate march style, the students’ band director asked the ensemble to once again perform excerpt number five from the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale*; however, this time, the students were asked to play number five as if it were a march by using the march style performance techniques described in the lesson, and modeling their performance after the Army Band’s performance of *The Stars and Stripes Forever*. The students followed the recording procedure that was used during the first recording session (pretest). This final recording (recording C) of excerpt number five served as posttest material for the criterion-referenced music instruction variable.

**Part III: Transfer Task**

Forty-eight hours after the initial march style lesson was presented to the students, excerpt number six from the *Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale* was given to the ensemble. The title *Miniature March* was applied to the excerpt not only as a nonverbal cue related to the style in which the piece should be performed, but as an attempt to portray the excerpt as an actual musical selection rather than an exercise or excerpt from a method book. John Watkins and Stephen Farnum were also listed as the composers of the selection.

Following the ensemble’s usual warm-up routine, the students were asked to perform and record *Miniature March* (as recording D). Once again, a metronome established the tempo ($\frac{\text{bpm}}{\text{bpm}} = 120$), and no conductor was used during the performance. Upon completion of the recording session, each member of the ensemble evaluated the band’s performance of march style on the Performance Style Evaluation Form (Appendix E).

All audio recordings were then imported from the Roland R-09HR recorder into iTunes on a MacBook Pro using a Universal Serial Bus (USB) 2.0 cable and port. The raw wave files
where subsequently imported directly from iTunes into GarageBand for editing. Upon review of each audio file, it was determined that only a portion of the recordings would be necessary for evaluators to provide assessments. The first eight measures of recordings A, B, and C, and the last eight measures of recording D were selected because they were rhythmically similar.

**Evaluators**

Eight hundred forty-four high school and middle school band directors in Alabama, Florida and Georgia were invited to participate in the study as music evaluators. Institutions employing the directors were selected from (a) the Alabama Department of Education (https://www.alsde.edu/Home/SchoolInfo/Default.aspx), (b) the Florida Department of Education (http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org), and (c) the Georgia Department of Education (http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/Pages/Contact-Us.aspx). Each department of education website provided an alphabetical listing of middle schools and high schools within its respective state. Only schools listed on the website directories were used in the study. Participating school band directors were randomly selected by assigning each school a number. *Research Randomizer,* a web-based randomizer was then used to determine the order in which schools would be contacted (Urbaniak & Plous, 2013). Middle schools ($n = 150$) and high schools ($n = 150$) were randomly selected from each state. Each school’s public website was examined to collect contact information for faculty members listed as band directors. Band directors were selected from Alabama, Florida and Georgia because the music evaluation form used in this study was similar to music adjudicator comment sheets used in these three states.

In addition to in-service teachers, 258 music majors enrolled in music education courses at four comprehensive universities in the United States were invited to participate as evaluators. Approval was granted from each university’s institutional review board before the study took place (see Appendix A). The sample of evaluators was drawn from multiple locations and a variety of geographic regions in an attempt to represent the diverse populations found across the country.

**Dependent Measure: Music Performance Assessment Scale (MPAS)**

Evaluators in the study completed an online version of the researcher-designed Music Performance Assessment Scale (Appendix D) to provide evaluations of five ensemble music
performance characteristics: tone, intonation, technique, balance, and musicality. The evaluation form featured a nine-point Likert-type scale, where $1 = \text{Very Bad}$ and $9 = \text{Very Good}$, for each of the five music performance characteristics evaluated. The instructions directed participants to select a number on the provided scales that best reflected their assessment of each musical performance characteristic. Demographic information related to each evaluator’s gender, level of study in school (for collegiate evaluators) or level of employment (for in-service evaluators) was also collected. Space was also provided for evaluators to provide additional comments. Students in the performing ensemble used hard copies of the form to provide self-evaluation ratings. Demographic information collected from each member of the performing ensemble included the student’s gender, grade level, and experience with private instruction. Furthermore, space was provided below the Likert-type scales for students to provide additional comments. The evaluation form was adapted from the state music educator association adjudicator comment sheets described in part one above.

**Dependent Measure: Performance Style Evaluation Form (PSEF)**

In order to evaluate the level at which students performed with appropriate musical style after receiving instruction guided by assessment criteria, evaluators used an online version of the Performance Style Evaluation Form (Appendix E) to provide ratings for recordings C and D. The form featured an 11-point differential scale that ranged from negative five to positive five and was anchored by the word BALLAD on the negative end and MARCH on the positive end. Evaluators were instructed to place a slider anywhere on the horizontal scale in order to indicate how closely the ensemble’s performance reflected the provided styles. Students in the performing ensemble again used hard copies of the form to provide self-evaluation ratings.

**Pilot Study 2**

Prior to making the online evaluation forms available to in-service teachers and college music majors, a pilot study was conducted to ensure all links and embedded audio files functioned as intended, and to confirm the Qualtrics survey software used to present the study was capable of collecting all of the necessary data. Participants in the pilot group consisted of graduate music majors ($n = 7$), undergraduate music majors ($n = 3$), and in-service music educators ($n = 2$). Four participants were randomly assigned to each of the three experimental
conditions. The results of the pilot study indicated no adjustments to the online evaluation forms were necessary.

**Evaluation of Stimulus Recordings**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which criterion-referenced instruction may affect the performance of student musicians. It was designed to do so by evaluating the performance of student musicians influenced by three instructional conditions that sequentially increased in content specificity and alignment with evaluative criteria. The study was developed such that groups of evaluators could provide ratings for audio recordings of a student ensemble performing with prior knowledge of the specific evaluative criteria used by adjudicators, immediately after receiving instruction focused on and guided by one of the stated evaluative criteria, or 48 hours after experiencing the two aforementioned instructional strategies. A recording of the ensemble performing prior to receiving any instruction was also utilized as an experimental control.

Three of the four unique stimulus recordings (A, B, and C) were produced using a single musical excerpt. In an attempt to avoid inherent serial learning effects, three evaluator groups were created. Evaluators in each group were asked to assess two performances. Groups one and two used the Music Performance Assessment Scale (MPAS) to provide ratings for recordings A and B respectively. Group three provided ratings for recording C on the Performance Style Evaluation Form (PSEF). All three groups also used the PSEF to provide evaluations of recording D. To control for order effects, the groups were divided such that one half of the participants in each group were presented with one of two presentation orders (i.e., AD/DA, BD/DB, or CD/DC). A sample of the combined measurement instruments is provided in Appendix F. Additionally, Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the number of evaluators assigned to each group and experimental condition respectfully.

Students in the performing ensemble also provided two self-evaluations of their performance. Immediately after creating recording B, students used the MPAS to evaluate their performance of five music performance characteristics: tone, intonation, technique, balance, and musicality. Upon completing recording D, the students used the PSEF to evaluate the ensemble’s
All self-reported data was used to make comparisons between evaluations from members of the performing ensemble and those of outside observers.

Table 1

*Number of Evaluators by Group Assignment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Order</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Majors</td>
<td>A/D 11</td>
<td>D/A 15</td>
<td>B/D 18</td>
<td>D/B 13</td>
<td>10 16 10 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teachers</td>
<td>28 19</td>
<td>35 24</td>
<td>40 19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Each evaluator listened to recordings from two experimental conditions except those in the A2 condition who only heard one.

A – baseline  
B – recording with knowledge of evaluative criteria  
C – recording after lesson on march style  
D – transfer task recording  
A2 – baseline evaluated for style

Table 2

*Number of Evaluators by Experimental Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>A 26</th>
<th>B 31</th>
<th>C 36</th>
<th>D 83</th>
<th>A2 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teachers</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, each stimulus recording evaluated with the PSEF was imported into Adobe Soundbooth CS4 to examine the shape of its waveform. A screenshot of each waveform was created and side-by-side visual comparisons were made. This information was used to supplement the statistical analysis completed to compare the differences between the instructional conditions.
Materials

All audio recordings for this study were made in the same band room at a local high school. The room was equipped with acoustic wall panels and ceiling tiles, as well as a carpeted floor. A Boss DB-90 Dr. Beat metronome was used to establish the required tempo for each recording. The performances were recorded using a Roland R-09HR high-resolution wave/mp3 recorder. The recorder provided 24-bit resolution and a sampling frequency of 96 kHz for high-resolution and low-noise recording. It also featured a high-quality and highly sensitive built-in stereo condenser microphone. All audio recordings were transferred to a MacBook Pro using a Universal Serial Bus (USB) 2.0 cable and port, edited with GarageBand, and saved as MPEG-3 (.mp3) files.

Evaluative criteria were presented to the performing ensemble using a Dell Optiplex 990 desktop computer, NEC high-definition projector, and an SB580 SMART Board. Students in the performing ensemble heard an audio performance of the United States Army Concert Band played from iTunes on an iPhone 4S. The iPhone was connected to a Peavey PV14 compact mixing console using a standard 3.5mm to RCA stereo audio cable. The audio signal was sent from the mixing console to a Peavey IPR1600 power amplifier capable of transmitting 800 watts per channel at 2 ohms, before the audio was heard from two Peavey PR15 speakers.

Procedure

In order to collect data from college music majors and in-service teachers, online versions of the stimulus recordings and evaluation forms were created using Qualtrics survey software. The following script was then emailed to potential online evaluators:

Good afternoon,

My name is Mark Belfast, and I am a doctoral candidate in the College of Music at The Florida State University. I would like to invite you to participate in a research study that deals with how instructional methods may affect ensemble performance ratings. Data collected in this study will be anonymous, and participants will not be identifiable in the final paper.

If you agree to be in this study, you will listen to two brief concert band performances and provide ratings for each performance. The entire task will take approximately five
(5) minutes to complete. If you would like to participate, please click the link below to access the online consent form and evaluation materials. After reading the consent form, you may choose to participate or withdraw from the study before starting the evaluation procedure. Your participation is completely voluntary.

The link below will be available until next Friday, April 12 at 12:00 noon. I sincerely appreciate your time and consideration during this busy time of year. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Six different Qualtrics surveys were created to correspond with the three evaluator groups and performance orders. Uniform resource locators (URLs) were obtained for each Qualtrics survey and divided evenly among the individuals invited to participate online. Upon navigating to the provided URL, evaluators were presented with text from an approved consent form (see Appendix A). Consenting evaluators were then presented with instructions, audio samples and rating scales.

Five days after the initial invitation to participate had been sent, the following reminder message was emailed to each potential evaluator:

Good afternoon,

Last week you were invited to participate in a research study that is investigating the effects of different instructional methods on ensemble performance evaluations. This message is simply a friendly reminder that the online evaluation materials will only be available until this Friday, April 12 at 12:00 noon (EDT).

If you have already participated, thank you! If you have not yet had an opportunity, please click the link below to participate. The evaluation should take no more than five (5) minutes to complete. Of course, participation is voluntary and anonymous.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

At the conclusion of the initial data collection period (seven days), it became clear that some in-service music educators did not receive the invitation to participate because their schools had been closed for Spring Break; therefore, the online surveys remained active for an additional seven days. At that time, all data were collected for analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This study was designed to examine the effects various instructional methods might have on student musical performance as measured by large ensemble performance evaluations. Two hundred seventy instrumental music majors \((n = 93)\) and in-service music educators \((n = 177)\) served as evaluators. The sample included 96 females and 174 males. Eighty-six evaluators were undergraduate college students and seven were graduate students, while 177 evaluators were in-service instrumental music educators. Of those in-service music educators who participated, 56 taught in middle schools, 86 taught in high schools, and 35 taught in schools that combined middle and high school grades. The study utilized an operational definition of 

*teaching to the test* in music education as instruction that focuses on the specific criteria used to evaluate ensembles in adjudicated events such as state music performance assessments. The instructional methods used in this study ranged from no direct instruction to a detailed lesson that focused on one specific criterion found on ensemble adjudication comment sheets (i.e., style).

**Prior Knowledge of Evaluative Criteria**

To examine the effect that prior knowledge of evaluative criteria might have on student performance, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures was computed for conditions A and B. Instructional condition (no instruction or evaluative criteria provided) served as the between-subjects variable, and performance characteristic (tone, intonation, technique, balance, and musicality) was the within-subjects variable. Mean scores for each performance characteristic were calculated and examined for significant differences between the two instructional conditions (Table 3). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated the assumption of sphericity had been violated, \(\chi^2(9) = 67.05, p < .001\); therefore, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied \((\epsilon = 0.85)\). The main effect of performance characteristic was significant, \(F(3.4, 547.54) = 26.43, p < .001\), but was not directly related to the research hypothesis. The main effect of instructional condition, \(F(1, 161) = .02, p > .05\), and the characteristic by
condition interaction effect, $F(3.4, 547.5) = .361$, $p > .05$, were not significant. Awareness of evaluative criteria had no significant effect on student performance.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicality</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A – baseline
B – knowledge of evaluative criteria

Criterion-Referenced Music Instruction

To examine the effects of a criterion-referenced lesson that focused on one specific evaluative criterion (style), an independent samples $t$-test was performed to compare the mean scores of two instructional conditions. The results revealed a significant effect for condition, $t(105) = 2.69$, $p < .01$. The ensemble received significantly higher ratings after receiving the criterion-referenced instruction ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.07$) than the ratings it received before receiving instruction ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.40$).

Transfer Task

To examine the effects of a criterion-referenced lesson on students’ ability to transfer musical knowledge from one task to another, an independent samples $t$-test was computed to compare the mean ratings given to the ensemble performance after participating in a criterion-referenced lesson on march style, with ratings provided after the group performed a similar musical selection 48 hours later. The results indicated a significant effect for condition, $t(266) = 8.18$, $p < .001$. The ensemble received significantly lower ratings on the transfer task ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 1.94$) than the ratings it received immediately after participating in a criterion-referenced
lesson \( (M = 3.43, SD = 1.07) \). Additionally, an independent samples \( t \)-test was performed to compare the ratings given to the transfer task with the stylistic evaluations given to the ensemble before it participated in the criterion-referenced lesson. No significant differences were found between the two conditions, \( t(268) = 1.54, p > .05 \).

**Evaluator Differences**

To investigate differences between student performer self-evaluations and subsequent music major and in-service music educator ratings on the MPAS, an ANOVA with repeated measures was computed for condition B. Evaluator (student performer, college music major, or in-service music educator) served as the between-subjects variable, while performance characteristic (tone, intonation, technique, balance, and musicality) was the within-subjects variable. Once again, Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity indicated the assumption of sphericity had been violated, \( \chi^2(9) = 27.66, p = .001 \); therefore, degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity \( (\varepsilon = 0.86) \). Main effects of performance characteristic \( F(3.42, 249.75) = 13.69, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .16 \), and evaluator, \( F(2, 73) = 73.37, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .67 \), were qualified by an interaction between characteristic and evaluator, \( F(6.84, 249.75) = 4.27, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .12 \) (Table 4). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated the student performers’ self-evaluations were significantly higher than evaluations provided by music majors and in-service music educators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \eta_p^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Evaluator Group</td>
<td>884.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.37</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Characteristic</td>
<td>78.29</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B (interaction)</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (within groups)</td>
<td>417.42</td>
<td>249.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: df were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity \( (\varepsilon = 0.86) \).*
A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was then calculated in order to investigate differences between evaluator groups for each performance characteristic. The results revealed the evaluator variable had a significant effect on ratings for each performance characteristic (Table 5). The student performers’ self-evaluations were significantly higher than all other evaluators for each characteristic. Furthermore, in-service music educators’ evaluations were significantly lower than music majors (\( * = p < .01 \)).

**Table 5**

*MPAS Evaluator Group Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and MANOVA Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \eta_p^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performers</td>
<td>7.13**</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Majors</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teachers</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performers</td>
<td>6.39**</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Majors</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teachers</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performers</td>
<td>7.78**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Majors</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teachers</td>
<td>4.26*</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performers</td>
<td>6.87**</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Majors</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teachers</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performers</td>
<td>7.61**</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Majors</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teachers</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The main effect of evaluator was significant for each performance characteristic. Student performers rated each characteristic significantly higher than music majors and in-service teachers (\( ** = p < .001 \)). In-service teachers also rated technique significantly lower than music majors (\( * = p < .01 \)).
of the ensemble’s technique were significantly lower than ratings provided by the student performers and music majors.

Differences in stylistic performance scores provided on the PSEF were also investigated. An independent samples $t$-test was computed to compare the ratings received by student performer self-evaluations ($M = 2.44, SD = 1.11$) and subsequent music major and in-service music educator ratings ($M = 2.05, SD = 1.94$). No significant differences were discovered, $t(266) = .89, p > .05$ (Table 6).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Baseline</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) March Lesson</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D$_{mi}$) Transfer</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D$_{s}$) Transfer</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x D$_{mi}$</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x D$_{mi}$</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D$<em>{s}$ x D$</em>{mi}$</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Recording C was rated significantly higher than recording A. Recording D was rated significantly lower than recording C. $s$ = student performers. $mi$ = music majors and in-service music educators.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of criterion-referenced instruction on music performance. Essentially, this study was an investigation of transfer. It examined the extent to which students in a music ensemble were able to use knowledge of evaluative criteria and acceptable performance of march style to improve the performance of a musical excerpt. The study applied the instructional concept of teaching to the test to a music ensemble rehearsal. For the purposes of this study, the instrumental music performance assessment festival organized by many state music educator associations in the United States served as the test for which the ensemble was preparing. A student ensemble performed a short musical excerpt under several instructional conditions ranging from no instruction to instruction focused on a single evaluative criterion. Each performance was evaluated, and differences between ensemble member self-evaluations and evaluations provided by music majors and in-service music educators were examined.

McPherson and Thompson (1998) opined that awareness of evaluative criteria used by music adjudicators might be “an important component of improving performance, and of alleviating some of the conflicting perceptions that can occur between evaluators and musicians, and also between teachers and their students” (p. 21). The researcher hoped to determine whether cognitive mediation, initiated by knowledge of the evaluative criteria used by music adjudicators, would have a measurable affect on student musical performance. Therefore, the first instructional condition of this experiment provided students with assessment criteria commonly found on state music performance evaluation forms. After creating a baseline recording of a musical excerpt, the assessment criteria was projected on a large screen in front of the ensemble, and the students were given time to carefully consider how their performance might be affected by each criterion. A second recording of the excerpt was then created as posttest material.
Accepting Mager’s (1975) definition of a criterion as “the standard by which performance is evaluated” (p. 71), and utilizing a method of criterion-reference instruction that promoted an experiential learning environment, the second instructional condition presented in this study provided a music lesson focused on one specific criterion: style. Since style had previously been presented within the larger category of musicality, the objective for the second condition was to focus the students’ attention on one specific and obtainable goal—to perform with appropriate style for a concert march. The use of a scripted lesson, in concurrence with a professional audio sample, offered a detailed description of the necessary stylistic considerations for appropriate performance and an aural stimulus by which the students could model their performance.

The third condition served as a transfer task. During the 48 hours immediately following the criterion-referenced instructional episodes, the student ensemble received no additional instruction on performing with appropriate march style. A new musical selection, titled *Miniature March*, was then presented to the musicians. The researcher hoped to determine whether the criterion-referenced instructional methods previously discussed had a consequential affect on the student musicians in order to facilitate transfer of musical knowledge.

An important characteristic of criterion-referenced instruction is that it provides opportunities for students to practice independently or collaboratively to improve deficient skills. Upon receiving instructions to begin preparing the music, the student musicians in this study immediately began a wide variety of musical activities. The researcher and ensemble director observed some students begin by simply playing through the excerpt, while many of their peers formed collaborative groups and discussed topics such as the key signature, time signature, or tempo of the music. One group of students prepared their music by clapping and counting the rhythm of the melody. Others took turns performing while their peers listened, evaluated, and provided constructive feedback before performing the excerpt themselves.

The relatively small size of the participating ensemble, and the organization of the rehearsal space, provided an appropriate environment to implement independent and collaborative practice during the rehearsal. Students were able to move about the room to engage in different rehearsal strategies without disrupting their peers. However, classroom
management may be a concern for directors of larger ensembles who wish to provide their students with segments of individual practice time. Requiring students to remain seated and restricting their performance to lower dynamic levels may assist directors of large ensembles in maintaining a manageable and effective learning environment that promotes individualism and creativity.

**Answers to Research Questions and Implications of Findings**

1. **If students are aware of the primary and secondary categories used by evaluators to assess music ensemble performances, to what extent will their performance be affected without additional instruction.**

   Previous research suggested awareness of evaluative criteria might be an important factor in improving student performance (McPherson & Thompson, 1998; Webster et al., 2000). In the present study, students were shown a list of commonly evaluated performance characteristics found on state music performance assessment adjudicator comment sheets. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the ratings they received before and after they were shown the evaluated performance characteristics.

   One reason the students performed similarly before and after they knew the evaluative criteria might have been due to their failure to make the appropriate transfers. Similar results were also found for the transfer task (condition D), which will be discussed later in this chapter. Education researchers have noted students might not make positive transfers unless they are taught how to do so (Geringer & Madsen, 1987; D. W. Perkins & Allen, 1991; Thorndike & Woodworth, 1901). The findings of the present study provide additional evidence that positive transfer might not occur automatically.

2. **To what extent does criterion-referenced instruction, in the form of a music lesson focused on performing with appropriate style, affect ensemble performance evaluations?**

   Evaluators in the study rated the ensemble performance that occurred immediately after a criterion-referenced lesson on march style significantly higher than the baseline recording. These results suggest that utilizing a criterion-referenced music lesson may be an effective method of teaching individual music performance characteristics. Unlike simply providing students with the evaluative criteria by which they were being measured (condition B), the
results of condition C showed that a lesson focused on one specific criterion might produce noticeable changes in student performance. Menken (2006) noted teachers often attempt to prepare their students for high-stakes examinations by specifically teaching the material included on the test. If state music performance evaluations can be considered high-stakes tests, and if the evaluative criteria employed by state music performance assessment adjudicators is representative of that which is necessary to identify quality music performance, criterion-referenced music lessons that focus on these evaluative criteria may be beneficial for performing ensembles.

The evaluative criteria used by many state music performance assessment adjudicators include fundamental performance characteristics that are applicable to all musical performance situations (e.g., tone quality, intonation, balance, etc.). Although some argue that teaching to the test promotes a narrow curriculum in which student learning experiences are limited to items included on high-stakes tests (Lavy, 2007), the results of the present study indicated the use of criterion-referenced music lessons that focus on state music performance assessment criteria may assist in the development of fundamental performance skills. Therefore, the instructional flexibility and student-centered approach of criterion-referenced music instruction may assist with improving ensemble performance evaluations as well as the musical growth and development of individual ensemble members.

3. To what extent does criterion-referenced instruction affect performers’ abilities to transfer specific musical knowledge over time and to new musical selections?

Butterfield and Nelson’s (1989) definition of positive transfer highlights an ability to appropriately apply knowledge gained in one situation to another. The present study attempted to provide students with opportunities to make transfers from a lesson on march style to the performance of a new musical selection that contained the march characteristics discussed in the lesson (e.g., the word march in the title, a tempo of $\frac{\text{j}}{\text{e}} = 120$, etc.). However, although the ensemble members were given time to study the music and collaborate on its performance, data indicated the group failed to apply the concepts of march style discussed in a criterion-referenced lesson 48 hours earlier. Stylistic performance evaluations provided for the march style transfer task (condition D) were significantly lower than condition C, and were not significantly different.
from baseline evaluations. It was clear that many ensemble members were aware of the title and tempo of the new music because they read them aloud upon receiving the excerpt. Although these two items were intended to serve as stylistic clues, the results of the study suggest they did not function in that capacity. All evaluators in the study, including members of the performing ensemble, rated the transfer task performance (D) significantly lower than the performance that occurred immediately after a criterion-referenced lesson on march style (C). These results support previous research that found students must be taught to make transfers before positive transfer will occur (Geringer & Madsen, 1987).

Thorndike and Woodworth (1901) found that learners were most likely to make transfers when identical elements were presented in different situations. The results of the current study seem to contradict this conclusion. The two excerpts used in this study contained identical key signatures, articulations, tempi, and number of measures. They also featured similar melodic ranges, phrase structures, and rhythmic values. Finally, the title of the transfer task (Miniature March) was intended to serve as an additional indicator of the expected performance style for the piece. Nevertheless, despite the inclusion of identical elements, similar elements, and visual cues, the students did not appear to make positive transfers from their previous lesson when performing the new music.

Upon receiving Miniature March, the ensemble was given an opportunity to practice the music before the recording was made; however, the students’ director did not make the march elements of the excerpt explicit. The extent to which positive transfer would have occurred had these elements been systematically identified for the ensemble is unknown and should be considered in future studies. A simple verbal cue might have been sufficient to foster positive transfer. Furthermore, it is likely the brevity of the criterion-referenced instruction utilized in this study may have mitigated its effects on knowledge transfer. Additional research that investigates transfer in music performance is necessary to test this hypothesis. Future studies might employ multiple criterion-referenced lessons focused on a single performance characteristic prior to investigating the effects on positive transfer.

4. To what extent do differences exist between student performers’ perceptions of their performance and subsequent evaluators’ assessments?
A MANOVA was used to examine differences between student performers’ self-evaluations and assessments provided by music majors and in-service music educators for performance condition B (knowledge of evaluative criteria). The results revealed the student performers rated themselves higher than the other evaluators for each performance characteristic. These results may provide an explanation for the insignificant differences found between conditions A and B. Music majors and in-service music educators found no significant differences between these two conditions. The student performers considered their condition B performance to be *somewhat good* and provided a mean rating of approximately seven on a nine-point scale. If they also believed their initial performance (A) to be *somewhat good*, the students might not have believed adjustments were necessary before recording condition B. Since student self-evaluations were not collected after recording condition A, it is impossible to accurately determine how the performers would have evaluated their initial performance. Future research investigating the effects of prior knowledge of evaluative criteria might consider using a pretest-posttest model in order to compare differences between the two conditions. Such a model would also provide opportunities to compare individual self-evaluations to determine whether students perceived their performance had changed from one condition to the next.

The instrument used to assess the transfer task (D) required evaluators to consider the performance style demonstrated by the ensemble. The results of an independent samples *t*-test found no significant differences between student performers’ self-evaluations and all other evaluators’ ratings of condition D. These results were encouraging when compared to the MANOVA results discussed earlier in this section. Style was included as one of the items in the musicality performance characteristic category viewed by the ensemble prior to performing under condition B. The student performers rated their musicality relatively high and no less than four points higher than other evaluators for that condition. However, when the students were asked to focus specifically on their stylistic performance in condition D, their ratings were relatively low and similar to music majors and in-service teachers. The results seem to suggest student performers’ self-evaluations may be more reliable when they are focused on specific performance characteristics, such as style, rather than broad categories like musicality.
Additional Findings

A review of the comments written by each evaluator revealed that extraneous variables might have affected their evaluations. First, many in-service music educators seemed to form opinions concerning the age or experience level of the performing ensemble. Comments such as “the recording was obviously a group of young musicians” were common. There was also evidence that evaluators might have scored the ensemble differently had information concerning the performers’ experience level been provided. After listening to the baseline recording, one music educator wrote,

This recording sounded like a beginning band or intermediate band rehearsal. With that being observed, the band was not very bad. The sound has some positive attributes. If this were an advanced band, they definitely would have a lot more work to do to get the more accomplished sound characteristic of the more advanced bands.

Other comments concerning the experience level of the ensemble included “it sounded like a beginning band, where aspects like style, phrasing, and expression are lower on the list of things to accomplish,” and “the level of performance for a first year band would be rated much higher than if this was a high school group.” These comments support previous research that showed evaluators’ judgments of a musical performance might be affected by their expectations of a performer’s ability level (Cavitt, 1997; Silvey, 2009). These results may also explain some of the differences between the student performer self-evaluations and those provided by other evaluators. It is likely the students’ ratings were based on their perceptions of a good performance for their ensemble; however, since the performing ensemble was not identified, the other evaluators’ assessments might have utilized different standards.

Unfortunately, the standards upon which evaluators develop their expectations may vary depending on their musical experiences. One evaluator simply stated, “I think any evaluation like this depends on the quality of the best bands that you have heard on that level.” This is a particularly insightful comment considering the Preparation for Future Learning (PFL) model proposed by Bransford and Schwartz (1999). Their methodology provided opportunities for learners to develop skills while achieving learning objective by successive approximations. The PFL model encourages multifaceted forms of assessment, as well as evaluations that occur
during the learning process rather than at its expected conclusion. This approach accounts for variability in the students’ experiences and abilities, and it identifies learning by way of individual development rather than achievement of universal goals. When applied to ensemble performance, the PFL methodology might provide a means of assessing the development of student musical performance and knowledge during the learning process.

One characteristic of the PFL method is the utilization of qualitative data to provide additional evidence of learning. Similar to criterion-referenced instruction, the PFL method promotes a collaborative learning environment where students are able to work with their peers to discover methods of achieving learning goals. Student performers in the present study provided comments for their performances in conditions B and D. Although the performers rated themselves significantly higher than did music majors and in-service teachers, a review of their comments revealed they shared many of the same concerns as the other evaluators. Where an in-service music educator commented, “some of the articulation styles were different between sections,” a student performer noted, “only some of us had the articulation, but it wasn’t that beautiful.” When considering the balance of the ensemble, an in-service teacher stated, “balance was constantly shifting based on range and tone quality issues”; meanwhile, a student performer with a slightly different view of the ensemble’s balance issues commented, “I believe we weren’t balanced, like Tom Cruise on heels.” These students’ comments seem to suggest that although the performers awarded themselves relatively high ratings, they were not unaware of the deficiencies in their performance. Participation in a criterion-referenced lesson that focused on one specific performance characteristic had an effect on students in this study. Additional instruction guided by the deficiencies identified by the student performers might also be beneficial for the ensemble.

Limitations

This study evaluated the effects of a single criterion-referenced lesson on musical performance. The brief exposure to this instructional method served as a limitation of the study. One characteristic of criterion-referenced instruction is the iterative nature of evaluation, feedback, and practice found in the model. The methodology utilized in this study did not provide opportunities for teacher feedback and subsequent student practice for improvement.
before being evaluated. Future studies that investigate the use of criterion-referenced instruction in music education should attempt to incorporate episodes of teacher feedback, as well as individual student exploration and practice. A longitudinal study that examines the effects of criterion-referenced instruction on music performance might provide valuable information to the field of music education.

This researcher’s experience as an instrumental musician and music educator has revealed that performance characteristics such as tone quality often develop over longer periods of time, while others such as ensemble balance and phrasing may be obtainable with only minor adjustments in performance. However, although the students in the participating ensemble were given an opportunity to carefully consider the evaluative criteria, the evaluations of condition B indicate the musicians made no significant adjustments to their performance. Therefore, music educators ought not assume that simply making students aware of how they will be evaluated will provide enough of an impetus to encourage a change in their performance. Ensemble directors might design lessons that incorporate national standards number six (listening to, analyzing, and describing music) and seven (evaluating music and music performances), by allowing students to hear recordings of their ensemble’s performance before providing self-evaluations measured against predetermined evaluative criteria. Students might then identify ensemble strengths and suggest methods of improving ensemble deficiencies in order to achieve more positive evaluations. Such instructional methods would closely resemble Robert Mager’s model of criterion-referenced instruction, which included iterative episodes of identifying student achievement of stated objectives, as well as providing feedback and opportunities for practice and development (Mager & Beach, 1967).

An additional limitation of this study was the inclusion of a single performing ensemble. As can be expected with any scholastic group, it is likely the students’ performance was influenced by their daily interaction with their classroom teacher, peers, and the culture of their school. The results of this study might have been mitigated by the relatively strong performance habit strength developed by the ensemble members; therefore, multiple criterion-referenced lessons in a variety of performing ensembles are necessary to validate the results. Furthermore, future studies might consider the daily ensemble experiences of in-service evaluators as an
additional variable, since evaluator comments in this study indicated these experiences might influence their expectations of a performance.

The detailed criterion-referenced lesson implemented in this study focused on performance style. Future research should investigate the effects of this type of instruction on other performance characteristics such as ensemble balance. Additionally, the effects of this investigation might have been mitigated by the use of two excerpts from the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale. It is unknown whether students in the performing ensemble would have performed differently had polyphonic concert band literature been utilized. Longitudinal studies that include criterion-referenced instruction and feature published concert band literature may provide valuable information concerning music students’ abilities to make performance transfers.

The results of this study indicate that criterion-referenced instruction focused on a single evaluative criterion may be an effective method of producing significantly different results in student performance; however, these results might not have enduring or transferable effects without additional instruction. Students in this study seemed to improve their performance immediately following a criterion-referenced lesson. Forty-eight hours later, however, they did not demonstrate the ability to make transfers from the criteria used to evaluate their performance, or knowledge gained during a criterion-referenced lesson, in order to demonstrate appropriate performance technique. It appears a single criterion-referenced lesson is not sufficient to enable students to overcome the performance habit strength they develop throughout the school year. Nevertheless, ensemble directors might capitalize on the immediate, albeit transient, effect of a brief criterion-referenced lesson during daily warm-up sequences or just prior to a major performance. Perhaps significant and persistent improvements in ensemble performance and knowledge transfer habits might be achieved through daily exposure to criterion-referenced instruction on such fundamental performance characteristics as tone quality, intonation, balance, and phrasing, in addition to a concerted effort from music educators to teach for transfer. Additional research investigating the effects of criterion-referenced instruction on ensemble performance and transfer tasks seems warranted.
The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the research proposal referenced above has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Committee at its meeting on 01/09/2013.

Your project was approved by the Committee.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 01/08/2014, you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing, any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Steven Kelly, Advisor
HSC No. 2012.9594
Mark,

Per the IRB chair you can have access to our students. Please see his comments below.

Thank you,
Jill

Jill Combs
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Vice Provost for Research
Office: 254-710-3708

From: Schlueter, David
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 3:34 PM
To: Combs, Jill A.
Subject: RE: IRB Approval

HI Jill,

Mark can have access to our students. I’m assuming he is working with a Baylor professor to secure participants.

Best,

Dave

---------------------------------------
David W. Schlueter, Ph.D.
Chair
Department of Communication
Baylor University
From: Combs, Jill A.  
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 11:09 AM  
To: Schluter, David  
Subject: FW: IRB Approval  
Importance: High

From: Mark A. Belfast, Jr.  
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2013 7:35 PM  
To: Combs, Jill A.  
Subject: Re: IRB Approval  

Ms. Combs,

Attached, please find the stamped informed consent form.

Thank you,

Mark A. Belfast, Jr.  
Doctoral Candidate  
Graduate Teaching Assistant  
College of Music  
Florida State University

Mark,

Please see the statement below from our IRB chair:

He needs to send us his stamped informed consent form. I will look it over, and if it’s a minimal risk study, I will let the PI have access to Baylor students. With studies involving more than minimal risk, or studies of topics contrary to the mission of Baylor, I will need to get approval from another office at Baylor.

Please let me know if you have further questions.

Thank you,

Jill Combs  
Administrative Assistant  
Office of the Vice Provost for Research  
Office: 254-710-3708

From: Mark A. Belfast, Jr.  
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2013 11:48 AM  
To: Combs, Jill A.  
Subject: IRB Approval

Good afternoon,

I am currently conducting research for my dissertation at The Florida State University, and one of the music faculty members at Baylor has agreed to assist me with recruiting participants. I am simply asking participants to listen to four short (less than thirty seconds) musical excerpts and provide a performance evaluation on Likert-type scales. The excerpts and rating scales will be provided in an online format using Qualtrics online survey construction software. The Baylor faculty member will simply share the study's URL with his students, but he will not collect any data, answer any questions, or conduct any research. He will also not be paid for passing my study's link along to his students. I have already received IRB approval from FSU’s Institutional Review Board. Will I also need to submit for Baylor’s IRB review?
Mark-

Given what you just indicated, no, you will not have to go through the UK IRB. Again, as long as our employee is only passing along your materials for you, and directs study related questions back to you, they are not engaged in your research.

You may proceed under these conditions.
Thank you for inquiring,
Andrew

Andrew Hedrick, M.P.A.
IRB Coordinator (Non-medical)
University of Kentucky
Office of Research Integrity

Please consider the environment before printing this email

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT
The contents of this E-mail message and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for the addressee(s). The information in this transmission may also be legally privileged. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient(s). If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction or dissemination in this message is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, immediately notify the sender by reply E-mail, or call [phone number] and delete this message and its attachment(s).

From: Mark A. Belfast, Jr.
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Hedrick, Andrew
Subject: Re: IRB Approval

Mr. Hedrick,

I have not discussed the details of the study with anyone at your institution; therefore, no one at UK will be answering questions about the research. I have simply asked one of your faculty members to forward my study's URL along to his students. Upon navigating to the online tool, participants will have an opportunity to read about the purpose of the study and provide consent.

If a UK faculty members forwards my study's URL along to his class, will I need to submit for a UK IRB review?

Thank you,

Mark A. Belfast, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Graduate Teaching Assistant
College of Music
Florida State University
On Mar 6, 2013, at 9:00 AM, "Hedrick, Andrew" wrote:

Mark-

Donna forwarded your request to me. Can you clarify for me what exactly our faculty member will be doing for you? If they are actively recruiting subject on behalf of the research then our university is engaged with you on the project and thus may want to review your project.

If however our faculty member is only passing along your study link, as you indicate, and is not answering questions about the study on your behalf or actively encouraging students to enroll, then you should be fine to proceed.

Can you confirm?
Thanks,
Andrew

Andrew Hedrick, M.P.A.
IRB Coordinator (Non-medical)
University of Kentucky
Office of Research Integrity
304 Kinkead Hall

Please consider the environment before printing this email

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT
The contents of this E-mail message and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for the addressee(s). The information in this transmission may also be legally privileged. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient(s). If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction or dissemination of the information in this message is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, immediately notify the sender by reply E-mail, or call and delete this message and its attachment(s).

From: Dickenson, Donna
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2013 3:35 PM
To: Hedrick, Andrew
Subject: FW: IRB Approval

Andrew,

Could you please help with the inquiry below?

Thanks,

Donna
Good afternoon,

I am currently conducting research for my dissertation at The Florida State University, and one of the music faculty members at the University of Kentucky has agreed to assist me with recruiting participants. I am simply asking participants to listen to four short (less than thirty seconds) musical excerpts and provide a performance evaluation on Likert-type scales. The excerpts and rating scales will be provided in an online format using Qualtrics online survey construction software. The University of Kentucky faculty member will simply share the study's URL with his students, but he will not collect any data or conduct any research. I have already received IRB approval from FSU's Institutional Review Board. Will I also need to submit for UK's IRB review?

Thank you,

Mark A. Belfast, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Graduate Teaching Assistant
College of Music
Florida State University
Mark,

Thanks for clarifying.

OSU is not considered to be engaged in research per the federal regulations and therefore IRB oversight at OSU is not required.

Thanks for checking-in.

Best,

Candi

The IRB Office has moved to B308 Kerr Administration Building.

Candi Loeb, CIP
IRB Coordinator

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including all attachments, may contain information that is confidential, proprietary, privileged or otherwise protected by law. It is to be viewed only by the intended recipient(s). If you are not intended recipient(s), please notify the sender of this information and delete your copy. Your cooperation is appreciated.

From: Mark A. Belfast, Jr. 
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2013 9:59 AM 
To: IRB 
Subject: Re: Research Assistance

No ma'am. The employee is simply passing my information along to his students. He will not be paid.

Thank you,

Mark A. Belfast, Jr. 
Doctoral Candidate 
Graduate Teaching Assistant 
College of Music 
Florida State University
On Mar 6, 2013, at 11:58 AM, IRB <irb@oregonstate.edu> wrote:

Dear Mark,

Thank you for the email.

Can you please confirm that the OSU employee is not being paid to assist with recruitment?

If the OSU employee's involvement with this project is limited to passing on recruitment information, and he is not being paid to assist with recruitment, than OSU is not considered "engaged" in research and IRB oversight at OSU is not required.

Any clarification you can provide is greatly appreciated.

Best,
Candi

Candi Loeb, CIP
IRB Office
Oregon State University

From: Mark A. Belfast, Jr.  
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2013 10:57 AM  
To: IRB  
Subject: Research Assistance

Good afternoon,

I am currently conducting research for my dissertation at The Florida State University, and one of the music faculty members at Oregon State has agreed to assist me with recruiting participants. I am simply asking participants to listen to four short (less than thirty seconds) musical excerpts and provide a performance evaluation on Likert-type scales. The excerpts and rating scales will be provided in an online format using Qualtrics online survey construction software. The Oregon State faculty member will simply share the study's URL with his students, but he will not collect any data or conduct any research. I have already received IRB approval from FSU's Institutional Review Board. Will I also need to submit for OSU's IRB review?

Thank you,

Mark A. Belfast, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Graduate Teaching Assistant
College of Music
Florida State University
Instructional Methods Study

My name is Mark Belfast, Jr., and I am a PhD candidate from the College of Music at Florida State University. You are invited to be in a research study about effective instructional methods for music ensembles. I am asking that you take part because you are a music student at your institution. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before indicating whether you want to take part in this study or not.

The study: The purpose of this study is to investigate whether or not criterion-referenced instruction is an effective method of music instruction. You will provide demographic information and rate several band performances on a questionnaire. This study should not take longer than five minutes to complete. No other time or commitment from you will be required.

Risks and benefits: There are no risks or benefits in this study to you if you take part in the study. The participants will not be identified in any portion of this study.

Compensation: There is no compensation for this study.

Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept confidential, to the extent permitted by law. No identifiable information will be collected. All data collected in this study will be anonymous, and participants will not be identifiable in any future reporting of results. Research data will be kept in a locked cabinet and a secured office.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to take part will not affect your current or future relationship with Florida State University or your educational institution. If you decide not to participate in this study, your decision will not have any negative consequences. If you decide to take part, you are free to stop the study at any time. You may skip any session that you do not feel comfortable completing. You are also free to withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with Florida State University or your educational institution. The researcher for this study is Mark Belfast who is overseen by Dr. Steven Kelly, the faculty advisor for this study. You may reach Dr. Kelly at (850) 644-4069 or skelly@admin.fsu.edu. You may reach Mark Belfast at (850) 644-3507 or mab10h@my.fsu.edu. Please feel free to ask any questions you have now, or at any point in the future. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the FSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (850) 644-8633 or you may access their website at http://www.fsu.research.edu. You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.

I ACCEPT this offer to participate in this instructional methods study.

Your name (print):___________________________________________

Your signature:____________________________________________

Date:___________________________

Dear Parent/Guardian:

I am a graduate student researcher under the direction of Dr. Steven N. Kelly in the College of Music at The Florida State University. I am asking your permission to create an audio recording of your child performing with his/her band for use in my dissertation. The research will examine the effects of specific instructional methods on ensemble performance evaluation and transfer tasks.

Your child’s participation will involve recording three short excerpts from the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale. Mr. _______________ has given his permission to make this recording during one of your child’s regularly scheduled band classes. Individual students will not be recorded. Only recordings of the entire band performing will be made. Your child will not be identified in any manner. The risks involved are minimal and pose no more physical or mental harm than performing with his/her band class. No personal information will be requested. Your child’s participation is strictly voluntary and will have no effect on his/her classwork or grade.

Upon completion of the recording session, students will be asked to complete a voluntary and anonymous questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire is to collected data on each student’s perception of his/her personal performance of the recorded excerpts. As mentioned above, no personal information will be collected, and participating students will not be identifiable in the final paper. The total time commitment will be one session of no more than 30 minutes and will take place in your child’s classroom.

Although there may be no direct benefit to your child, the possible benefit of your child’s participation might involve the identification of more effective methods of music teaching and learning. These methods will add to the canon of educational best practices. Additionally, the results of this research may help to develop valid, reliable, and unbiased methods of student and teacher performance assessment.

If you have any questions concerning this research study or your child’s participation in the study, please e-mail me at mbelfast@fsu.edu. You may also contact Dr. Steven N. Kelly at skelly@admin.fsu.edu.

Please sign the consent form below and have your child return it to Mr. Buckley at Florida State University High School. Attached, please find an additional consent form that you may keep for your records. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Belfast, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
College of Music
Florida State University

________________________________________
Parent’s Name: ______________________________________
Parent’s Signature: ___________________________________ Date: ________________

If you have any questions about your child’s rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel your child has been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of Research at (850) 644-8633 or you may access their website at http://www.fsu.research.edu.

By signing this form, The [High School Band] High School Band voluntarily agrees
to participate in the dissertation study entitled The Effect of Criterion-Referenced
Instruction on Ensemble Performance Evaluation and Transfer Tasks, conducted by
Mark A. Belfast, Jr. from The Florida State University. The study will attempt to
determine if specific instructional methods have an effect on ensemble performance
ratings or an ensemble’s ability to transfer musical knowledge.

An audio recording will be made of the band performing three excerpts from the
Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale. In order to collect data on the students’ perceptions
of their performance, a brief, voluntary, and anonymous evaluation form will be issued to
ensemble members upon completion of the audio recording session. Parents of the
participating children will have been informed and given their consent. The total amount
of time for the ensemble to record the excerpts and complete the evaluation form will not
exceed 30 minutes. Participation in the study is voluntary and anonymous. The results
of the research may be published, but participants will not be identifiable in the final
paper or any dissemination of the final results.

If you have any questions concerning this research study, please e-mail me at
[mbelfast@fsu.edu]. You may also contact Dr. Steven N. Kelly at [skelly@admin.fsu.edu]
or [850] 644-4069.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, or if you feel
you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects
Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of
Research at (850) 644-8633 or you may access their website at http://
www.fsu.research.edu.

________________________________________________
Signature of Ensemble Director or other Authority Figure

________________________________________________
Title

________________________________________________
Date

APPENDIX B

EVALUATED MUSIC PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

TONE (beauty, blend, control)

INTONATION (harmonic parts, melodic line)

TECHNIQUE (articulation, facility, precision, rhythm)

BALANCE (ensemble, sectional)

MUSICALITY/MUSICAL EFFECT (expression, phrasing, style, tempo)
The focus of today’s lesson will be on musicality, since musicality or musical effect is one of the specific areas evaluated at district and state level Music Performance Assessment. Specifically, we will focus our attention on the interpretation of march style. Please listen carefully to the following description of appropriate march style performance technique:

- The melody of a march is easily identifiable and singable. Those without the melody should serve a supporting role by playing soft enough for the melody to be heard.

- A march has a distinct up-beat accompaniment. In a 2/4 march, counted 1 and 2 and, the accompaniment usually plays on the and of 1 and the and of 2.

- A march is generally played in a light and detached style. Space should exist between all notes except those found in a legato trio section.

- The traditional military march tempo is $\dot{=} 120$ beats per minute, or two beats per second.

Listen to this example of the United States Army Concert Band performing with appropriate march style.

(START RECORDING)
APPENDIX D

MUSIC PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT SCALE

Participation in this survey is voluntary and anonymous.

Circle your gender: Female | Male

COLLEGE STUDENTS ONLY: Circle your level of study: Undergraduate | Graduate

IN-SERVICE TEACHERS ONLY: Circle your level of employment: Middle School | High School | Combined

Circle the number that best reflects your evaluation of each musical performance characteristic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance #1</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Somewhat Bad</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TONE (beauty, blend, control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTONATION (harmonic parts, melodic line)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNIQUE (articulation, facility, precision, rhythm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE (ensemble, section)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSICALITY (expression, phrasing, style, tempo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation in this survey is voluntary and anonymous.

Circle your gender: Female | Male

Circle your grade level: 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12

Have you ever taken private lessons? _________________ If yes, for how long? _________________

1. Circle the number that best reflects your evaluation of each musical performance characteristic you heard today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Somewhat Bad</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TONE (beauty, blend, control)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTONATION (harmonic and/or melodic lines)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNIQUE (articulation, precision, rhythm)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE (ensemble, sectional)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSICALITY (expression, phrasing, style, tempo)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In the space below, please provide additional comments that may be helpful in justifying the above ratings.

Thank you for your participation!!
APPENDIX E

PERFORMANCE STYLE EVALUATION FORM

Participation in this survey is voluntary and anonymous.
Circle your gender: Female | Male
COLLEGE STUDENTS ONLY: Circle your level of study: Undergraduate | Graduate
IN-SERVICE TEACHERS ONLY: Circle your level of employment: Middle School | High School | Combined

1. Indicate the style of music for each performance by placing a tick mark on the provided scale.

BALLAD

MARCH

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5
Participation in this survey is voluntary and anonymous.

Circle your gender: Female | Male

Circle your grade level:  7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12

Have you ever taken private lessons? ______________ If yes, for how many years? ____________

1. Place an X anywhere on the line below to indicate how closely the ensemble’s performance reflected the indicated styles.

   BALLAD

   | -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

   MARCH

2. In the space below, please provide additional comments to help justify your assessment of the performance style used by the ensemble.

   ____________________________

Thank you for your participation!!
APPENDIX F

COMBINED EVALUATION FORM

Participation in this survey is voluntary and anonymous.

Circle your gender: Female | Male

COLLEGE STUDENTS ONLY: Circle your level of study: Undergraduate | Graduate

IN-SERVICE TEACHERS ONLY: Circle your level of employment: Middle School | High School | Combined

1. Circle the number that best reflects your evaluation of each musical performance characteristic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance #1</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Somewhat Bad</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Somewhat Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TONE (beauty, blend, control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTONATION (harmonic and/or melodic line)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNIQUE (articulation, precision, rhythm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE (ensemble, sectional)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSICALITY (expression, phrasing, style, tempo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In the space below (or on the back of this sheet), please provide additional comments that may be helpful in justifying the above ratings.

3. Indicate the style of music for the performance by placing a tick mark on the provided scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance #2</th>
<th>BALLAD</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In the space below (or on the back of this sheet), please provide additional comments that may be helpful in justifying the above ratings.
APPENDIX G

STATE MUSIC PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FORMS

ALABAMA BANDMASTERS ASSOCIATION
MUSIC PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT
ADJUDICATOR’S COMMENTS AND RATING FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Date of Appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Appearance</th>
<th>Time of Appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Organization ___________________________________________________________

School ___________________________ City ________________________________

Adjudicator will grade principal items for each selection by inserting A, B, C or D in each of the squares opposite the items. Comments must deal with fundamental principles and be constructive. Minor details may be marked on music furnished to adjudicator.

ADJUDICATOR’S COMMENTS

TONE (Beauty, Control, Smoothness, Intensity, Solidity, Refinement) ____________________

INTONATION (Harmonic Parts, Melodic Line) ____________________________________________

TECHNIQUE (Accuracy, Precision, Fluency, Control, Staccato, Legato, Stability, Articulation) __________

RHYTHM (Accuracy, Stability, Appropriate choice of tempi, Precision) __________________

BALANCE ______________________________________________________________________

MUSICIANSHIP (Interpretation, Phrasing, Tempo, Style, Dynamics, Expression, Artistry, Fluency) ______

GENERAL FACTORS (Stage deportment/appearance, Posture, Choice of appropriate literature, Discipline) ___

Signature of Adjudicator _______________________________________________________

May be continued on other side
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Florida Bandmasters Association
Adjudicator’s Comment Sheet

CONCERT BAND

School:________________________________________________________________________________________

Classification:________   Performance Time:____________  Date:___________________

Selections:  1._______________________________________________________________________________

2._______________________________________________________________________________

3.___________________________________________________________________________

---

**PERFORMANCE FUNDAMENTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone Quality</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blend</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Sonority</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Artication</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TECHNICAL PREPARATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note accuracy</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Accuracy</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrainces</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Releases</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Articulation</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Articulation</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of Pulse</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics Observed</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MUSICAL EFFECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping of Line</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasing</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Expression</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Officials will include a + or – by the subdivisions, which mean they are noticeably good or noticeably needing improvement as related to the letter grade assigned. The absence of any marks indicates a performance consistent with the letter assigned. After completing the previous, enter an A, B, C, D, or E to indicate the level of performance in each category. Average the three letter grades in each category to arrive at a final letter grade. Average the three final grades to arrive at the FINAL RATING.

**COMMENTS**

(INCLUDING: Stage Presence, Discipline, Posture, Instrumentation, Strong Points, Weak Points – Continue on Reverse Side)

---

Recommended For: ________________________
(Superior, Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)

Write out Final Rating

Adjudicator’s Signature

Rev 12/10
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# Band Large Group Performance Evaluation

**Date:** __________  **Classification:** _______  **No of Players:** _______

**School and Name of Performing Group:** _______________________________________

**Selection:**
1. ______________________________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________________________

Adjudicator will grade principal items A, B, C, D or E or numerals in the respective squares for each selection. Comments must deal with fundamental principals and be constructive. Minor details may be marked on music furnished to adjudicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TONE</strong> (beauty, blend, control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTONATION</strong> (chords, melodic line, tutti)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNIQUE</strong> (articulation, facility, precision, rhythm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE</strong> (ensemble, sectional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUSICALITY</strong> (expression, phrasing, style, tempo, artistry, fluency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*May be continued on other side

**Overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other Factors**

*Not included in the graded evaluation*

Choice of music, appearance, stage presence

Signature of Adjudicator: ____________________________
KENTUCKY MUSIC EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION OFFICIAL EVALUATOR’S COMMENT SHEET

TIME OF APPEARANCE:   EVENT NO:   EVENT:   GRADE:   DIV:
SOLOIST OR ENSEMBLE:   SCHOOL:   DIRECTOR:

Comments must deal with fundamental principles and be constructive. Minor details may be marked on the music.

TONE
- Quality
- Breath support and control
- Blend
- Balance (section)
  (ensemble)

INTONATION
- Individual
- Ensemble

INTERPRETATION
- Tempo
- Phrasing
- Expression
- Style
- Dynamic Variation

TECHNIQUE
- Note Accuracy
- Articulation
- Precision
- Rhythm
- Posture/Playing Position

OTHER FACTORS
- Overall effect
- Choice of music
- Stage presence

CIRCLE RATING OF THIS PERFORMANCE:

I DISTINGUISHED Represents A Superior Performance. All basic elements performed on an exceptional artistic level with a nearly flawless performance and technical presentation.

II PROFICIENT Represents An Excellent Performance That Is Outstanding In Some Respects. All basic elements performed on an adequate artistic level with limited, but noticeable and obvious, performance and technical inconsistencies.

III APPRENTICE Represents A Good Performance, But Not Outstanding. Areas within one or more of the basic elements are noticeably inconsistent and inadequate.

IV NOVICE Represents A Below Average Performance. Several areas within two or more basic elements are inadequately demonstrated, with several obvious technical inconsistencies.

COMMENTS ONLY

DECISIONS OF THE EVALUATORS SHALL BE FINAL

EVALUATOR’S STATEMENT SUBSTANTIATING RATING (include suggestions for improvement use back if necessary)

________________________________________EVALUATOR’S SIGNATURE
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**North Carolina Bandmasters Association**

**Music Performance Adjudication**

**Stage Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Ensemble</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>No. of Members</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Performance Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjudication Scale – By Rating:**
- I = Superior
- II = Excellent
- III = Average
- IV = Below Average
- V = Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selections: Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjudicator will grade principal items A, B, C, D, or F in the respective boxes. Comments must deal with fundamental principles and should be constructive. It is acceptable to use +/− in the individual captions.

**Tone Quality:** (characteristic sound, clarity, consistency, control, likeness of qualities, resonance)

... (fill in the blank)

**Intonation:** (adjustments are made, chords, initial pitch, individual, melodic line)

... (fill in the blank)

**Technique:** (articulation, attacks, facility, note accuracy, releases, precision)

... (fill in the blank)

**Rhythm:** (accuracy, meter, precision, steadiness, tempo)

... (fill in the blank)

**Balance:** (blend, ensemble, melodic, section)

... (fill in the blank)

**Musicianship:** (artistry, dynamics, energy, expression, interpretation, phrasing, style, dynamic contrast)

... (fill in the blank)

**General Factors:** (attitude, choice of appropriate literature, confidence, discipline, instrumentation, posture, stage appearance)

... (fill in the blank)

**Signature of Adjudicator:**

...
# OSAA / OBDA Band and Orchestra Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Order of Appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selections 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Quality of Sound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Sound</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blend/Balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm &amp; Precision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation and/or Bowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Musicality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musicality</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation/Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Factors</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points are awarded at the professional discretion of the judge.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>General Comments and Suggestions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adjudicator may use back if needed)

RATING

ADJUDICATOR

Note: This form should be 14 inches long

Enlarge 130%
## Concert Band Adjudicating Form

**Performance Event**

**Time**

**Event No.**

**Date**

**Name of Organization**

**Director**

**Selections:**

1. **GR** Composer

2. **GR** Composer

---

*Use A, B, C, D, or F in squares to indicate the quality of performance. The letter grades correspond to the Roman Numeral Ratings I, II, III, IV and V. The final Rating should correlate directly with the appropriate distribution of letter grades allotted to the squares. (For example, a predominance of “A” in the squared categories would tend to indicate a 1 Rating. “B”, a II, etc.) Use space below and/or reverse side for constructive criticism and comments, which should serve to justify the final rating.*

### TONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTONATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melodic line</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENSEMBLE EFFECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blend</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal Balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Dynamic Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>Phrasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TECHNIQUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhythmic Accuracy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Adjudicator is encouraged to use (+) or (-) to show strength or weakness beside those items which have no boxes.*

### OTHER FACTORS

- Instrumentation
- Choice of Music
- Stage Deportment
- Appearance

### STRONG POINTS:

### WEAK POINTS:

### SUGGESTIONS for IMPROVEMENT

*May be continued on other side.*

---

**Adjudicator’s Signature**

---

je/c/band/adjform.pm5
APPENDIX H

STUDENT PERFORMER COMMENTS

Condition B (Knowledge of Evaluative Criteria)

I felt as though we had the right rhythm but that only some of us had the articulation but it wasn’t that beautiful but it was controlled. In addition to that, I believe we weren’t balance like Tom Cruise on heels.

The band has trouble blending into one sound. The style of playing somewhat differs. Likewise, the balance was off, and the base was covered with higher voices. Phrasing was eh.

Nothing changed in the way we played it. People just played it to get through with it.

Unison intonation was off. Rhythmical accuracy was very good for most parts. Upper voices stuck out above lower voices.

I have made these choices because, the ratings that I have picked describe how the ensemble played as a while.

I could have personally done better with technique. Balance (with 2 Ls) was pretty alrightish. Musicality I could not sense much of a difference beautiful. Tone was giganticly somewhat good.

The band was not balanced. There were instruments sticking out that needed to blend. The movement of the notes was also poo because we stayed at a constant level of sound and didn’t vary any of the notes.

Tone and Balance: We were pretty good here. Intonation: Could’ve been better I couldn’t here flutes or clarinets. Tech & Musicality: Great I guess.

Personally I don’t think the band blended as well as it could have. The overall technique sounded very precise. Intonation was just a slight bit off.

Our tone was alright the deeper voices stood out. Our rhythms were pretty good except some of the mistakes. Balance and blending were alright. The group sounded pretty good as an ensemble

Practice, listen, adjust.... the only things needed to make an excellent band superior.
Not very in-tune. Didn’t have great balance. Some sections were overpowering.

Due to our lack of a low brass section today, the ensemble had no one to listen down to. Therefore we lacked in basic performance-fundamentals such as intonation.

Tuba’s were the loudest like there supposed to be. Everyone pickup the tone fairly quickly.

We could blend more and have more control.

The articulation, tone, and how it sounded was good, there are a few kids who didn’t play correctly who held the band as a while back.

There was some things we could have worked on. Our intonation and balance was not that great. I believe we did well on tone, technique, and musicality.

We don’t have very good intonation. We were very rhythmically accurate. Decent balance. I felt we did pretty good phrasing and styling the excerpt.

Quality of hearing articulated notes was somewhat unclear. Blended well. Not the whole ensemble was heard equally. Not a lot of intonation issues.

Clarinets heard (could be because I am directly in front of them). No saxes heard : (. Trombone stuck out a bit. Weren’t together at a few points.

Over all I think we did well. We stayed on tempo.

It sounded like people were playing individually at the same time.

I put those numbers because I feel that we did pretty good at those things on the piece.

**Condition D (Transfer Task)**

I thought it was a lot closer to a march than a ballad.

It sounded fairly strong. The spacing, to me, seemed fairly accurate. However, if just listening to it, I don’t think one would be able to pinpoint that it was a march.

Hey jack, you know what I’m talkin ‘bout. It got no march in da notes jack. Aka: The band did not play the song very march style, the notes weren’t short enough.

Quarter notes became lengthy at times. Bouncy march feel was present most of the time. Slur notes confused some. March style was played very well overall, especially on the 8th notes.
We were very close to a great march ensemble. We just need to balance more and listen to each other.

I thought it resembled a march more than a ballad. Emphasis on certain beats, and mostly everything was articulated as a march. More details on back.

Bouncy notes that were somewhat separated.

Many articulations in marches seemed to be forgotten (not many played in march style)

Our groups notes were separated at some points, but at others they were slurred as I could hear from the woodwinds.

Didn’t hear much of a march style, but not anywhere close to a ballad. Some individuals played march style with accented notes, most didn’t.

Today, our ensemble had a tuba player, so everyone was able to listen down to their (his) style (march-like).

We didn’t accent enough

It had to rhythm of a march. Staccato notes, wasn’t pretty and smooth. It was a march.

There was spacing between notes like a march, but some were putting not a lot of spacing, sounding like a ballad

The piece stated it was a march, the articulation was off. Some rhythms were not performed correctly, but over all it had a march feel and blended well.

Articulation was heard (very well done) but low brass, particularly trombone, was too heavy (bottom heavy, if you will) not enough mids.

March tempo

All of the notes were separated and vary on the beat. Sounded like a march

Mostly staccato notes, not much slurring.
APPENDIX I

MUSIC MAJOR AND IN-SERVICE MUSIC EDUCATOR COMMENTS

Condition A (Baseline PSEF)

Music Majors

It was clearly written in a march style, notably because of the snare rhythms and tempo; however, articulations were not marcato, but more legato, limiting its score to a 2.

There was definitely a strong 2 feel but the notes did not correspond with the requirements of a march. It wasn't a ballad though as there was a definite metrical feel.

It was obviously a piece written in the march style, however the band played all notes legato and did not play with the correct articulation or phrasing to be associated strongly with a march.

It sounded like a march because because of the tempo and percussion part in the background. But the articulations that were being performed by the ensemble weren't that convincing of a march.

Although the notes were a bit connected, players played with heavy articulation.

Lighter style, separate notes

The notes were not as short as they could be for a march style, but they were definitely separated and a little forceful. It could just be a whole lot more.

Pretty consistent quarter-note beats. Not very expressive.

The articulations made the excerpt seem very march like which is why I put it more on the march side of the scale, but the line of the excerpt was somewhat melodic and lyrical making it seem less like a march. But it was not lyrical enough to be more of a ballad.

Weak articulations. Little separation between notes, but snare sounds like traditional march style.
**In-Service Music Educators**

Short, somewhat separated, upbeat and quicker tempo

Marcato style with plenty of separation in the with notes. There was no connection of notes or slurred/legato phrasing

Their length and shape of notes indicate a march style, but their lack of clarity in articulation makes it less effective.

Separated notes and snare drum rhythm suggests a march style.

It was demonstrated that the students had instruction on march style.

Separation of notes, articulations were marcato, percussion gave strong pulse

This group played with a staccato style.

This is not a march nor a ballad. This sounds more like a band exercise from a class method book designed to work on scale patterns and arpeggios. If you were to slow down the tempo to 80 beats per minute or slower and eliminate the percussion parts, it would sound more like a ballad.

It could be March style

If you contrast marcato (march style) with legato style, this would definitely be toward the plus side of march. Notes for the most part are detached with mostly consistent articulation. Releases of the notes are not consistent and there are several wrong notes.

Consistent tempo and very structured indicates a march style.

**Condition A (Baseline MPAS)**

**Music Majors**

It sounds like a young band.

It sounds like a pretty good performance for a young group. They sound like a solid ensemble and are able to stay in tempo. There are definitely precision errors.

I didn't hear much in terms of dynamics, and it sounded as if the excerpt was notes being played, not music. There were a couple of note issues, but the majority kept on trucking and didn't let it stop them.
There are some members of the ensemble who meet the criteria above at a fairly high level. There are enough people in the ensemble to make tone, intonation, and balance suffer below an acceptable level. Phrasing and musicality is almost non-existent, but would say that their technique is their best quality.

Intonation is rough, so if there is good tone, it's covered up by it. There's a lot of trombone, but I prefer that to having too much treble. Tempo was steady for the most part and they pushed through the phrase after longer notes instead of breathing.

In particular, one trumpet stands out, and, while this is an obvious issue for the balance, this performer's articulations are of detriment to the whole as their inaccuracy is highlighted. There is an overall closed tone, though the ensemble keeps time well with the metronome.

This sounds like a beginning band so of course most of those qualities are not really there. If I knew that this was a college group for example, I would rate almost everything (except maybe balance, which is ok) as "somewhat bad" to "bad" but since it sounds like a very inexperienced group I am not really comfortable giving it that rating.

It is hard to answer these questions without an understanding of the level of musicians being assessed. For example, if this is a beginning band class, it's pretty damn good. But if this is a high school, not so much.

It's rather difficult to evaluate a performance without knowing the age/experience of the performers. A tone that is considered bad for a high schooler/college student could be rather good for a younger musician.

Sounded like an average beginning band. Typical lack of attention to anything but notes and rhythms. Expected too much oboe and spread tuba sounds not in balance.

missed notes, not really blended much at all, the different voices are sticking out, overall sounds like a bunch of beginners.

Because every pitch was in unison, individual mistakes were more prominent. Individual mistakes brought down the overall quality of the performance, and because there was no uniform agreement concerning technique and musicality, both areas were not persuasive.

No blend, articulation was not together, releases of notes did not always agree.

This is not a great recording. There are a ton of intonation issues. The tempo keeps steady, but the articulation is muddy. You can barely hear anything besides the melody, creating lots of balance issues.
The tone in different instrument sections is often not characteristic of that instrument. There is not much blend between many different sections. There are intonations issues throughout the excerpt. Rhythm for the most part is aligned and precise. Ensemble balance is not too bad. That is, the upper voices are not overpowering the lower voices all that much. Finally, essentially the whole excerpt is played at the same dynamic level with little to no musical direction in the music.

They don't blend at all- each instrument somehow manages to stick out. The intonation is also pretty bad. They don't seem to be missing a lot of notes, though their tempo is steady and rhythm seems fine. The balance was pretty bad. There was not much going on musically.

It seems to be one dynamic, balance is all over the place. As for intonation it sounds as if a trumpet is have trouble just hitting notes!

Sounds like a middle school band or lower high school band so the technique is what should be emphasized. I think with more musical instruction, the other facets will come with time.

There was no real sense of blend or balance; the oboes stuck out of the ensemble sound. Wrong notes were played, and minimal phrasing was present.

Tone - very inconsistent. Some moments of nice tone, but overall very unstable.
Intonation - Ranging all across the board from sharp to flat. Even within sections.
Technique - Note need to be looked at. Fairly large amount of simple mistakes. The beginnings of the concept of articulation can be heard, though.
Balance - There really wasn't any difference dynamically between harmony and melody, or sections.
Musicality - Ok for a start, but there really can't be a discussion on musicality until the noes are under the ensembles fingers.

I believe that there are some wrong notes, or if there aren't then the notes are out of tune. The technique is alright-it matches at least, with short notes and all of the correct rhythms. The tone and balance of the ensemble is the next thing to work on.I believe this is a young ensemble based on the music and the tone and balance issues. Everything is blatty and loud all the time.

The intonation was inconsistent throughout the ensemble. The balance was not very good. It was pretty easy to pick out individuals, especially because some people held notes longer than the rest of the ensemble.

This is probably a middle school band

The tone was not bad but not great--just sounded like a middle school band. There were some huge intonation problems especially at the beginning. Technique was fine, articulation was good.
and precision and rhythm were good too, though slow. Balance was okay but it sounded boring, and that also goes to musicality.

It was good for a young ensemble, but if you were to rate on a higher level, it could have been better.

I just did not find the overall ensemble to be filling the role that they should be filling.

**In-Service Music Educators**

Non characteristic tone qualities

I feel the tone is uncontrolled. It sounds like the players are young and require extensive work on building a good tone. The intonation wasn't that bad but there were missed notes and some notes that were grossly out of tune. The technique in terms of articulation sounded very muddy. The mid voices seemed to dominate the sonority, there was no sense of balance as an ensemble. I heard no sense of musicality in terms of phrasing, dynamics or even an attempt to put any type feeling into the music.

The group is young and most of the notes were correct, however the tone quality and musicality were very poor. Control of the instrument immediately stuck out because of the squeaks and "fracks" heard. Also, the band was very top heavy (trumpet and clarinet especially). Tempo was okay, but there was a lack of phrasing, style, expression, balance, and blend.

Tone quality of individuals, but obviously could be better. The intonation and balance are off, thereby not creating a characteristic band sound. If the intonation was and balance/blend were fixed, I believe that the tone quality would automatically improve.

Tone- lack of control in the tone, especially at the ends of the notes
Intonation- clear intonation fluctuations between the clarinet especially
Technique- precision is one of the weakest points- the note lengths are clearly not matching across the group, and there are a couple wrong notes
Musicality- Tempo is relatively good, no phrasing, style is lacking in precision (note lengths), and no expression apparent

The recording was obviously a group of young musicians, but that is not an excuse for bad quality sounds, wrong notes, or poor intonation.

The excerpt contained missed partials by brass players and the occasional squeak from reed players. Thus affecting pitch accuracy. The passage was technical in nature and was generally played correctly with most of the pitches and rhythms correct. The ensemble seemed to be devoid of the bass voice as well. This excerpt didn't provide much opportunity for playing with musicality or expression.
Sounds like a mixture of middle and high school students reading an exercise. A student played a wrong note. It was kind of a short excerpt to determine how well musical differentiation would have been, but I did not hear much from what was played.

Releases are staggered / not all breathing together and playing or cutting off together
Key signatures / accidentals missed many times
Swelling of notes indicate lack of musicality as well as no dynamics or horizontal flow in the music
Brass was heavy, percussion was actually too soft for my tastes(!)
Of those playing stronger the technique and tone was good so that is why it is rated higher

The brass were too strong and covered up the woodwinds. There were a few notes that were either out of tune or incorrect pitches. There was an overall lack of expression and dynamic phrasing.

Playing in unison requires that everyone in the ensemble play with exact phrasing and articulation. Rhythms did not line up. Not all instruments were heard (tubas, bass clarinets, bassoons), so the balance seems to also be an issue. Instruments had a somewhat characteristic tone, but with the intonation issues, it was distracting.

Wrong notes in low brass. releases not together. Upper winds tone is ok., tone, intonation, blend (balance) work together to produce quality.

No comments.

Positive comments from judges at two festivals with very little negative commentary.

I hear what I assume would be a first year type beginning band exercise. What I don't know is how old the students are, how long they have been playing, the amount of time they get to play as a group in this recording. Depending on that information, as ams band director, if this was very early in the beginning band process, I would be pleased-I hear overall progress and appropriate wind/percussion sound.. If this was toward the middle of the first year, it would be what I expect, with work to do. If this was my 2nd or 3rd year group, I would be making some adjustments to my pedagogy.

While tone and balance were "somewhat characteristic," and rhythm "recognizable," the inherent wrong notes and lack of musical direction negatively effected the entire performance.

It seemed everyone was playing as loud as they could and were not listening to each other. There were some wrong notes /partials in the excerpt.
Ensemble balance question may be invalid given instrumentation.

A unison example is difficult to rate in balance. No one instrument tone was overpowering. The musicality lacks expression when practicing with the metronome.

The balance could have been better. I could barely hear the percussion. Also, since the majority of the piece was somewhat unison, the players who didn't know their part as well or couldn't keep up really stuck out with wrong notes and rhythms. The intonation was a little rough, but it sounded like a middle school band.

Sound like a young group. Articulation was sloppy, with good intonation lacking, and beauty of tone sounding very immature or bad in general.

The blending of sound is not apparent. It is really easy to hear individual sounds stick out.

Sounds like pour tone production and a ba recording.

Musicality: I chose a lower rating b/c of expression, phrasing, and style. Tempo alone would have a higher rating.

Notes were missed. Tone was bright. Balance towards upper instruments no phrase shaping. Precision/vertical alignment was poor.

You can tell its a beginning band.

The tone is not bad. Could be more defined. Intonation was a bit spotty some notes were really out of tune. More air should help with the tone and pitch. Articulations did not line up with the upper and lower brass. Seemed the lower brass were connecting each note and the upper were articulating with more clarity. The balance was off. I could barely here the snare drum part, the lower brass seemed to want to over power. There was little to no musicality. The tempo was good.

Tone Quality suffers due to very poor breath support. Characteristic tone quality is almost nonexistent.

At certain points voices are playing wrong notes and not blending. Lower voices could come out more and help the ensemble sonority. There is no indication of dynamic expression.

Some of the articulation styles were different between sections.

Balance, intonation and tone quality are major concerns here. While rhythm, tempo seemed to be ok, it is the fundamental of sound (Balance, tone quality, blend) that makes this performance weak.
This sounded like a very beginner ensemble. Some tones were spread, most of the technical aspects were sloppy and the overall balance and intonation were unrefined and unclear.

The tone quality affects the intonation issues. There was not much of an attempt at musicality. Mostly right notes and the band was making an attempt at articulating the same.

Same as before.

Piece seems to be a little bit bottom heavy (lows - low brass) but overall each part is distinct and can be determined aurally. Effect could be the relationship to the recording device location or location of the participants in the performance space.

Wrong notes were being played. I concentrate a lot on listening, I think that would help this group tremendously. Listen to those around you, make sure you are fitting in to the ensemble sound.

Many missed notes and poor intonation in the high voices (especially trumpet). Tubas and other low voices could barely be heard. The rhythms and articulation were accurate across all parts but lacked stylized execution. I heard no dynamics or expression.

Students sound as if they are just starting this piece or have not been working on it for a long time.

Dynamics overplayed, tone is spread, note lengths aren't matching - especially the ends, wrong notes in clarinet/trumpet, baritone is not balancing, clarinet/trumpets not blending.

There a instruments in the ensemble that are playing wrong notes. There is a general lack on precision and inconsistent articulation within the group.

More contribution needed from the lower voices. Precision is an issue at times. Tempo was ok but the other elements of musicality (expression, phrasing, etc.) were of concern. Phrases were not really shaped and the performance sounded too "vertical" an not "horizontal" enough.

The overall performance lacked uniformity and continuity with regard to style and overall musical effect.

Tone is not consistent.

There are many issues present with the above listing. It sounds as if the group is sightreading the exercise. Better air support would help this ensemble. More specific, warm, fast, steady air would most likely improve or correct the other areas.
Maybe it is the speakers on my computer?

The tone was pretty good as was intonation. I do hear a few wrong notes. In terms of balance, I could use more of the lower voices such as tuba, trombone, and baritone. Musicality was pretty good in terms of articulation, style, and tempo.

Several individuals sticking out of the sound.

**Condition B (Knowledge of Evaluative Criteria)**

**Music Majors**

Overall, you can tell what melody they are playing, but it sounds like a few ensemble members are completely lost, and being covered up by ones who know what they are doing.

The group sounded together, but the tone was not very good.

The recording sounded like a very young ensemble. For the most part all rhythms seemed decent, as well as a majority of correct notes. Some intonation problems, and tone quality issues.

The ensemble had very weak articulation. The tone was not too bad, every instrument's timbre was uniquely identifiable. The intonation was a little better than 50%. The balance and musicality were both below average.

It's obvious that the performers are beginners or amateurs; there isn't much going on with the tone quality. Intonation isn't quite there and the technique wasn't awful, but it was a fairly easy rhythm. Balance was opposite of what it should be, and there wasn't much musicality, they just seemed to be playing what was on the page.

Tone was lacking in trombones and many out of tune notes in trumpets. Incredibly vertical musical phrasing with some okay accents.

It sounds like a beginning band, where aspects like style, phrasing, and expression are lower on the list of things to accomplish.

Rhythms were more or less correct. Top melody line wasn't bad. But not enough of low sounds. Very bright. No dynamics or sense of musical line, but tempo was good. Also, way too many wrong notes and intonation problems in inner line.

The musicality was pretty low in terms of expression, but the phrasing was good, and the style didn't seem wrong. The overall tone of the band was lacking, but the blend wasn't too bad.

I didn't hear a recording
The metronomic beat in the background was probably distracting from the actual music and the occasional missed notes greatly interrupted the continuity of the line as well as the balance/blend.

Sounds like a middle school band. The articulations appeared to be there, but the intonation, balance, and tone were all pretty bad. Simply a beginning level sound.

I think the band in this recording sounds young and inexperienced. Their tone wasn't bad, so much that I couldn't stand listening to it, and is good, if the group is, indeed, a beginning level band. If it is not, however, the tone is not terrible, but could definitely improve. Intonation is all over the place. Technique is good, as I don't hear lots of wrong rhythms or major disagreements in articulation. The balance of the group is bottom heavy, and I can't really hear the top parts well. Sectionally, think balance is good, and I don't hear individuals stick out aside from a few times.

For tone, some instruments stood out more than others because they were harsher and more brash. Intonation was off in my opinion because I can hear "beats" when certain notes were played together. Technique is pretty good because the ensemble is steady. Again, the balance needs just a little bit of work. There was no phrasing or expression within the excerpt in my opinion.

The intonation was pretty close, with a few off notes. There were instruments that stuck out of the texture, though, and the main sound I heard were trumpets.

This ensemble is obviously a elementary or middle school quality band. They are good at playing unison lines together, but their balance and blend could use some work.

Tone was okay, but seemed more like individuals playing together instead of a band playing together.
Intonation was fairly good, nothing was really obvious.
Technique had individual inconsistencies.
Balance was way off, too much mid/alto/tenor lines, ot enough bass.
Musicality was not really there at all, no shape to the line, there were people breathing when some weren't, but tempo was good.

The matching of the tones were no where near good. The intonation may have been alright, but I could not tell because of the bad tone. The articulations and rhythms sounded right for the most part, but the balance didn't fit very well. At certain points certain instruments stuck out. The tempo also stayed pretty solid throughout. There seemed to be not musical phrasing to it though.
It sounded really off, like a middle school band just getting used to their instruments. The tonality was not great, the balance kept wavering, and individuals came in early or missed notes altogether.

This sounds like a very young band, and thus may of the problems you would expect have arisen.

It appears to be an amateur tone in my opinion. Perhaps this is because of the audio recording itself? Intonation was attempted but I would not call it up to par just yet. The ensembles technique was much more precise rhythmically and articulatively. Overall balance seemed better after I listened to the recording more and more. The overall musicality of the piece was just sub par.

Setting aside the missed notes, the musicians seemed to be simply reading the notes and not expressing the message the music was sending and the melody was a little too prominent, not allowing any harmony or bass to come through.

There was some source of note error however for the most part they played well together and had good tone, and balance was adequate.

Intonation was not all there. The blend of this ensemble was not quite together. They did a fairly good job of sticking to the designated tempo.

lack of definition in the lower parts, lack of balance and blend.

Sounded ok, rhythms were most exact,

Not together in beginnings of phrases or ends of phrases. Individuals stuck out of texture. Don't have control over sounds of instruments.

The note lengths were not together and there was poor intonation. Many botched notes in the trumpet part. The percussionist playing the snare seemed to have good technique and I think the band should have been listening to that percussionist for rhythm an articulation.

Tempo was consistent. Tone sounded very immature, perhaps about a 7th or 8th grade level. Trumpet and trombone voices buried the woodwinds, articulations did not line up. Intonation left a lot to be desired. No phrasing or changes in dynamics.

The tone was average, lacking in blend and control however. Intonation suffered as well as technique and musicality.

A lot of wrong notes, trumpets dominated, no matching tones. The rhythm was mostly accurate.
In-Service Music Educators

It is difficult to "score" this excerpt without any context. If this is a beginning group, they are doing some very good things. If a high school band, they are way off the mark. Many missed pitches, thin unsupported sound. There is little effort to phase or play with expression.

Hard to judge when you don't know what age level the group is or how long the musicians have been playing. Their bad tone lead to bad intonation. Articulation and precision was the worst part of "Technique", but the rhythm was not bad.

The individuals in this recorded example were playing as individuals - what I tell my students is "accidentally playing the same song at the same time". They are not listening and matching tone, intonation, technique, or trying to balance the sounds they are creating with the other musicians. The individual tone that students were able to create was somewhat good. There were too many wrong notes - or missed notes; it seemed they were playing the excerpt faster than they are capable. There was not evidence of shaping the phrase or musical expression.

Articulation seemed consistent, as did the steadiness of the pulse. Wrong notes occasionally, and a few slips in pitch. It was hard to hear if this was a fully instrumented concert band or not.

Overall quality of sound lacks focus and support. Intonation is a major issue. Note lengths and clarity of articulation not always matching throughout the ensemble. May wrong notes from individuals.

The group has individuals with non-characteristic tones which leads to intonation and blend problems. The non uniformity of articulation creates precision issues throughout. The clip was too short to really evaluate phrasing, expression or style. Without knowledge of the level of experience of the performers it is hard to place this performance on this scale. The level of performance for a 1st year band would be rated much higher than if this was a high school group.

Tone production is generally uncentered and unsupported, causing multiple issues with each of the five characteristics.

1.) Tone lacks maturity and beauty across sections, however some control is demonstrating moving through tessitura.
2.) Intonation lacks at certain spots. Top and bottom of melodic phrase segments suffer most.
3.) Technical demands appear met.
4.) Balance - a darker, bottom balanced sound would be preferred. Trumpet (middle) are dominating at present.
5.) More information about the selection would be desired to make critical statements regarding phrasing.
This recording sounded like a beginning band or intermediate band rehearsal. With that being observed the band was not very bad. The sound has some positive attributes. If this were an advanced band then they definitely would have a lot more work to do to get the more accomplished sound characteristic of the more advanced bands.

The tempo was followed but intonation was non existent. Articulation was poor due to the lack of heard tonguing and precision was off. There was a lack of balance in the ensemble; the brass were overpowering the ensemble. In a concert setting woodwinds are just as important and need to be heard. The tone was more of a marching band tone as opposed to a concert tone which should be balanced, blended with each section being heard.

Percussion is way too loud, as well as trumpet. Need to watch the articulations. Work on a more characteristic tone.

You can tell that there are players taking breaths in many different places and especially at the end of phrases. More constant air will also help with the intonation and tone problems. Musicality is hard to judge, since I am not sure what is written on their sheet music... articulations, style, etc. However, tempo seemed to lock in with the metronome.

Generally ok at times, but balancing the ensemble sound, blend, notation, harmonic and melodic line were not as good through this section of the music.


Moving parts not together at times in low brass lines especially. Flute and clarinet intonation was lacking characteristic sound, and overall balance and blend was affected by this. Technique was flawed - articulations did not match throughout the ensemble, and the ensemble lacked control.

There are wrong notes being played, there are precision problems, and there is not a full instrumentation in the group. There are no expressive elements present.

Some have decent tone, but others do not, and different instruments tend to stick out for inconsistent balance. Some breathe very early while others hold the notes full length. Some musicians are not using their tongues to articulate.

Balance needed work and a fuller tone.

This band does not have an overall picture of what tone production should be. Without good tone intonation will always be an issue for this group. Students are not using their tongue to articulate, therefore all rhythms will sound imprecise. Students are not listening down to the low
woodwinds and low brass. The band director needs to achieve success on the 1st four items (tone, intonation, technique, and balance) in warm-up everyday before the students will be able to achieve proper musicality. However, it is never too early to add musicality.

There are a few individuals who can create characteristic tone, and the others aren't blending and playing together.

Tone is hit or miss - some decent players, but some bad tone quality as well. As a whole it's pretty poor. Intonation is also poor. Wrong notes, trumpets sticking out.

Tone changed among individuals. There was no harmonic intonation...it was a unison exercise. Technique was stronger than other categories. Balance was constantly shifting based on range and tone quality issues. Basic notes and rhythms. No apparent shape, phrasing, or unification of style.

tone slightly poor
technique and balance o.k.
musicality blah

The evaluation terms are not adequate, e.g., how can tone neither be bad or good. 9 steps from very bad to very good is fine, just create better descriptive terms for these levels

There is very little evidence of characteristic tone on any of the instruments represented. It is a great example of every player for themselves/lets not listen to each other and blend our parts!

In the recording, there were some discrepancies among the musicians. Some of the players played with accurate technique for example, while some did not. This difference in many categories caused the overall group to sound lacking in most categories.

I find it hard to define a couple of these with the metronome going.
It sounds like a young band in their first or second year, so I am probably less critical than I might be otherwise.

cut offs weren't always together, no phrasing or dynamics but tempo was good

The band has a good foundation. The fundamental tone quality is still being developed. As regards to balance it sounds like individuals are playing. They could be more expressive but the phrasing for this group is pretty good.

I think any evaluation like this depends on the quality of the best and best bands that you have heard on that level.

No comment.
Incorrect pitches in trumpet and trombone. Tone not supported by fast air and firm embouchure. Balance issues--no alto sound heard.

the instrumentation was not complete

No low voices so sectional/balance concerns are a problem. Mid voices are missing notes and rhythms. Technical concerns are apparent in the ensemble. Good tempo maintained but individuals are not ready to perform at a consistent tempo

Attacks and releases are all over the place. Wrong notes and pitch is not good.

Tone quality was relatively characteristic for a scholastic group. Intonation was acceptable (obfuscated by wrong notes/missed partials). It was better melodically than harmonically. Precision of attack of pitch and rhythm was not good. Lots of missed notes or students not changing together. The group was acceptably balanced for where I imagine the microphone was. There was not an emotional connection conveyed in the line to indicate musicality.

There sounds like there can be a lot of potential with this group but there was just not a lot of consistency. This performance was on the slightly below average side.

Lots of missed notes. Invest in lessons.

They are demonstrating a fairly decent approach to tone production. There is nothing overtly offensive here. However, it is also not overtly good or excellent. Perhaps the weakest part is the ensemble precision, followed closely by phrasing within the ensemble. Phrase endings are very ragged for this group and there is no consensus regarding note length, particularly at phrase endings.

It would be helpful to know the experience level of these players. Expectations vary great from 1st year to 3rd/4th year musicians. I rated it based on a late 7th Grade-mid 8th Grade level. If the student are younger, I would be more lenient. If they are older, I would be more demanding.

Most characteristics seemed unattended to

Woodwinds were not as precise as brass in regards to rhythm, articulation and pitch. In regards to balance, trumpets and flutes could have been softer. There were a few wrong notes toward the end. Some brass players need more control in slurring lower notes.

Trumpet very over balanced to the ensemble. Some very weak and uncertain playing in the inner voices mars overall tone quality.

Again, terrible!
Using the recording as the sole basis of the evaluation produced low ratings. It may be possible the ratings would change with more information about the group.

It is difficult to assess this group due to lack of information. If this is a beginning band in the first semester, than it is fairly characteristic. This is not good for an advanced middle school band class.

Releases and attacks are not good. Individual sounds concepts are not there. Pitch control on low notes are not good.

At times the band played wrong note creating an issue with harmony and the melodic line.

It would help to know the level of the group. IF this is a 6th grade band, I would rate the tone quality as good. If it is a high school group, it is poor. There is not any musicality to this piece but I think that is the nature of the music.

Articulation and precision was very weak, and intonation was a concern on longer notes. Ensemble had a pretty good sound, although could have more blend and balance. The fundamentals need more work.

Tone - Seems to have a middle school level of control (some missed partials in the low brass), and trumpets were the primary voice in the sound. Intonation - right rhythms were being played, but articulation didn't always match, along with some players not being as precise in control over their instruments so notes would speak late. Balance is ok within sections, but as I stated earlier the trumpet voice is overpowering. Ensemble is still at notes and rhythms phase so there is not much musicality (except tempo is good).

Too heavy in the low brass, no real expressiveness represented... tone was nice through most of the instruments. Too many chipped notes or just wrong notes.

Many missed notes/pitches. Sounds like all instruments should be playing in unison but are not rhythmically clean or balanced for sound. No blending of the musical phrase, everyone playing at their own choice volume. All notes were played the exact same, o difference in articulation.

The instruments that were playing all had characteristic tone quality. Intonation was ok. The flute and trumpet were having some trouble in the upper registers. Technique was pretty good. There were a couple of missed notes. The balance was ok.. I couldn't tell if there were inner voices being played. I didn't really hear any dynamic contrasts.

Poor intonation with-in the sections of the ensemble, balance in the brass over-powers the w.w., percussion - balance with the ensemble, shape the musical line more (rise and fall of the melodic line), phrasing could be worked out better?
Tone: Bright sounding, unblended, lacks control of partials in brass.
Intonation: Reasonable intonation except in cases of missed accidentals/key signature.
Technique: Articulation and rhythm are acceptable but the precision and accuracy of the group are lacking.
Balance: Instrumentation seems limited and does not represent the "concert band" sound.
Musicality: Phrasing and expression are non-existent, tempo is constant, style sounds undefined.

The tone is not as warm sounding as it could be. I heard a few wrong notes in the middle and low voices. There are also voices sticking out of the band sound.

Tone was fair, though a bit bright. Many wrong notes. Edgy sound caused intonation issues. If this is supposed to be a band, where are the woodwinds?

Lots of wrong notes.

**Condition C (Criterion-Referenced Lesson on March Style)**

**Music Majors**

The attempts at "bouncy" rhythms and the tempo helped my analysis.

Identified by the meter of the music

Articulated, attack oriented, clear sense of time, march-like

There was a strong 4/4 beat, which was emphasized by the snare drum part.

It was very strict with time.

Clearly a march, though style could have been improved through improved techniques.

even though it was at march tempo and the band played it with articulations used for a march, there was intonation problems and stylistic issues throughout some sections of the band

The style is separated, helping to indicate a march. Along with that, the snare drum is beating a march-like beat.

Articulations were short and separated, in a march style. The tempo of the performance was also relatively moderate.

I thought it had the correct style, with separation and bounce, but it could have been done better.
the music on the page seems to be of march style. also the snare drum part is very rudimentary as a march style would be. however I still feel that not all of the performers are achieving the correct style

The articulation and tempo used by the ensemble sounded march-like. The articulation was separated and the tempo was fast.

Snare drum part was in a very traditional march style

The quarter notes were shaped, even though there were several wrong notes and the tone suffered.

Match articulations. Style could use more accents and separation between notes. Very little phrasing.

Again, snare drum was suggestive of a march. The articulation in the winds was a bit legato for this style.

I think this performance demonstrated the march style of playing with the way some of the rhythms were articulated within the ensemble.

This excerpt seemed to be slightly more exaggerated in the march style.

Accents and spaces were audible, and there was more forward motion. Even though there were more wrong notes than the first example, this was more clearly a march.

This except is markedly better than the previous, but still with plenty of room for improvement. The style of the piece was much more characteristic of the style trying to be portrayed and the clarity of the ensemble improved. However, there were some obvious intonation issues in the ensemble and the ends of phrases were muddied by missed releases.

The first half of the excerpt was very together, both in terms of the lengths of notes and the style, and I would've rated that more like a 3. They also did a better job accenting notes, which was reflective of the march style. The second half was a littl sloppy, though, and I could hear clarinet(s) hanging over and less accents, which made it less like a march.

Orchestration is simple and reflects the equally simple theme. Duple meter and heavy emphasis on 1 and 3 makes it bounce like a march does

Steady, upbeat tempo

The articulation and energy was much more appropriate to a march than the last recording, but still not quite "marchish" yet.
This excerpt was also clearly intended to be performed in the March style. March style attributes were only slightly better executed in this excerpt.

The snare drum part, as well as the time signature and tempo, justify my assessment that the excerpt played was a march.

**In-Service Music Educators**

The attempt of March Style is present.

The ensemble is playing a basic march style. It is clear that some members of the group do not understand the proper articulation to use, while others are quiet adept.

Separated march style

The march style was present, but there were many wrong notes and rhythms. Is this just discussing style or their overall rating?

Notes were very separated, being more a march style than ballade. However, there was no other dynamic or articulated contrasts that you would often find in a march.

Sounds like a young band learning march style. Maestoso style and space between notes made me determine the style to be completely a march. There were no types of countermelodies or anything lyrical to make me consider ballad at all.

Quarter notes were treated with appropriate length and articulation. Good separation of eighth notes.

The ensemble played in the traditional opening march style with separations between the notes of the phrase.

The work is clearly intended to be of a separated "march" nature and some of the performers are developing that style. However, the lack of complete uniformity of style makes it sound less like a march then it should.

Even though there were severe intonations & balance problems, the march style was very clear because of the separation of notes and the articulations seemed to be fairly clear.

Style of the selection is related to a march, in that there is separation and a heavier articulated feel.

Because of the tempo of the piece and the march-like feel, it was the only choice.
Most of the notes were separated and the tempo was very strict.

There is some spacing and accenting of notes.

The articulations are shorter and more crisp than that of a ballad. The tempo was close to that of a march tempo. The melodic theme did not bring "March" to mind.

The marcato/staccato style of playing clearly indicated a march style. The form also seemed to indicate a march. The constant cowbell playing or similar instrument also indicated march to me.

It was more of a march than a ballad, but it lacked many of the usual characteristics of a march like separation of notes. Low brass were behind at one point and the middle voices were muddy.

The detached articulations, along with the percussion part is why I assessed this to be a march.

The articulation style demonstrated was lighter and separated. Only in isolated instances did the note lengths not match this style. The approach to note length and accent (slight weight but not heavy) seem more characteristic of a march style.

I'm not sure that the performance reflected a true "march" style, but the articulations that were executed by the ensemble were definitely representative of separated and detached, which would be closer to march style, as opposed to a ballad, which would be legato...smooth and connected.

The ensemble utilizes a detached marcato approach throughout. Syllables evident are "tee" and "tah"

Most of the notes and articulation were separated, but not all.

Most of the notes are performed in a staccato style.

The separated notes, marcato accents, and strong forward beat indicate march style. (Poor tone, technique, balance, etc, but still march style)

This recording sounds like a middle school band that might be a first year class at the spring concert or a second year class preparing for spring festival. At that level the indicators of a march style are heard even though there are some tone and technique weakness.

The ensemble used a detached separated style clearly defining it as a march style.

Not all marches are in this style. I would say that this is some sort of an etude or collection of notes rather than a march. Definitely not a ballad in anyway. Come on trumpets!!!
I could tell that there was some driving motion due to the percussion and tempo of the work, but there was very little separation or accents on the beats, especially strong beats.

Articulation and tempo were my primary reasons for setting the bar.

Inconsistent articulations across performing group, but a majority seem to be interpreting a more separate style.

It was obviously march style. Some individuals in the ensemble did not quite understand the length or shape of the articulation required.

The style was separated and the tempo quick.

more march-like. has a very constant tempo.

The notes were played in a spaced style (non touching notes). The tempo indicated a moderate march tempo. There was evidence emphasis being put on the front of the note at the start of the phrase. There was also an attempt by the ensemble to play each not in a lifted style (push at the front of the note while keeping each separated).

Dominant players have a sense of accent and separation needed for the march style in passages that are all tongued. They perform these concepts well. Other players trail behind the dominant players and these players do not have as firm a grasp on the concepts of articulation and note length that are needed to create the precision that is desired.

The notes were played in the bouncy, separated style that characterizes marches.

If this was a Middle School Ensemble it was well done. If this was a High School Ensemble much work is needed on intonation, articulation, and tone quality.

It reflected a Level 1 March Style because of the Tempo which was moderately fast and did not reflect a slow Ballad Style and because of the snare drum cadence. The theme was in unison and not graceful like a Ballad would normally be.

Notes were short but not necessarily accented or separated.

Steady march tempo - approx. quarter note = 120, notes were detached.

There is an attempt at separating notes which leans more towards the march style than the previous excerpt; the percussion part is still clearly in a march style. Missed notes/partials in the brass detract from the performance, as well as the poor tone quality and intonation. Attacks are generally clean, although releases are at times problematic.
Light style.

This performance had a nice tempo, and the style was much closer to the required style. The phrasing was a bit choppy and there were many wrong pitches but that doesn't have any affect on style.

short articulation, use of percussion

March style was more present in this recording, however vertical alignment suffered, along with missed notes and rhythm flaws. Still missing phrasing of musical lines. Balance issues.

The articulation of the ensemble was again not consistent, nor was the group's timing, and although the group did not achieve a true march style, the musical line was expressed vertically and not horizontally.

clearly not a ballad. Better example of marcato march-style.

Melody moved in a march like manner with a clear effort to play in a march style.

some better than the previous performance but not enough to justify a large increase in score

Not bad for march style. Could use a little more separation and punch to the notes.

Definitely felt like an ensemble etude(method book). Felt no resemblance of a ballad type exercise.

Better ensemble articulations help create space between the notes. Students were listening and trying to make their articulations sound the same. There was a "bouncey-ness" on the eighth and quarter notes, and attempted length on the half notes.

Tempo was steady and the style was better that the first recording.

It was closer to march style by playing the eighth notes short and bouncy

Separated style of articulation

As in the other excerpt, the articulation was in a ballad style. However, the tempo and other aspects would indicate a march.

more separation in the wind parts
Performance closer to march style-more separated.

This selection is much more march-like with separation and slightly accented notes so I give it a 3.

**Condition D (Transfer Task)**

**Music Majors**

It was a march played slowly.

It definitely had a march-style rather than a ballad style because of tempo, style, percussive drive, and orchestration.

The snare in the background makes me hear that this is a march, and the notes played are very much like that of a march. I didn't hear anything, besides the simple melody, that would resemble a ballad.

The musicians could play with more of an accented, lifted note length. They could also use phrasing to give more of a march-like, melodic drive. Their articulation is characteristic of a march style, but the long note length and lack of phrasing gives the lots of room to be more in a march style.

Tempo is close to that of a march taken under tempo. Articulations are "bouncier" than a ballad, although they could be lighter.

Though the musicality was limited, the strict tempo and necessity for clear, and, in this case, separational articulations indicated that the piece was a march.

Again, it sounds like a young group so they cannot be expected to fully show everything. However I do think they could display the stylistic features of a march better.

The style was not very march-like, but the music performed was definitely a march.

The snare and metronome helped push along the strictness of a march, but the winds were playing with a more legato style.

The notes are somewhat short and accented rather than connected and flowing. If it were sped up and articulated, it would sound much more like a march.

The piece and musicality made it sound more of a ballad than a march, but I only put it at 2 because the attack on the notes was more of a march characteristic.
Percussive emphasis and style on alternate beats would allude to a march. Although, instrumental emphasis was not present, keeping me from a definite conclusion.

The drum part and main melody makes it sound like a march, but the articulation does not reflect march style.

It was definitely a march, however the style wasn't as crisp and clear as you expect a march to be.

The supporting percussion parts would insist a march style. There are accents on the beginning of most notes. however, the note length is far too long to be considered true march style. The style is also not "bouncy" enough.

The tempo was a little slow for a march and the articulations weren't very crisp. It feels very slightly more march-like than ballad-like.

It has a 3 feel, but the tempo doesn't not seem slow enough to be a ballad.

Tempo and style were consistent with a march.

There is a lack of blend and balance conducive to a ballad style. There should be more fluidity and connection between notes, and more shaping of phrases. The performers executed the piece in a way that was more consistent with a march style.

You could tell by the snare drum part that it was a march because of the typical flams and such. However, I didn't give it a 5 because articulation wasn't as crisp as a march should be. Note shape was also lacking.

Short notes, snare drum, up-tempo, loud.

Notes were short and articulated clearly most of the time. The snare drum is typical of marches.

The snare drum

It sounded like a march at slow tempo.

It was march tempo. Style could have been better, though.

The ensemble attempted to make the articulations march like, but they were very sloppy.

The metronome might be making it sound more march like.
It was definitely not a ballad, but it seemed to be a slow march.

The recording by all means sounded like a march.

The snare drum part in the background suggested that this was intended to be a march but the other instrumentalists had very long articulation which is not characteristic of a march.

It was definitely more march-like, although it was a bit slower for a march.

It had too much energy for a ballad but not enough separation of notes and articulations to be a march. Quite broad.

The ensemble was able to have some semblance of a march. They were staccato and somewhat separated on certain notes. And the tempo indicated was a faster one, thus it sounded like a march more than a ballad.

Style was detached and articulated, but not quite light enough for a march.

The overall style was that of a march, but the playing did not have the specific stylings that make a good march.

Didn't hear the performance

Again, maybe the constant clicking was a distraction but the lines are not especially flowing and feel as if they are moving forward at a strict tempo as a march would.

It wasn't really in the march style, but it was much more march like then ballad like. It wasn't smooth or connected or lyrical, anything that ballad should be basically.

The quick tempo suggests a march rather than a ballad, as do the rhythms. However, in a march, I would expect the articulations to be shorter, more precise, and clearer. I might also expect an even faster tempo, with shorter length of notes compared to he way the band gave everything a very connected feel, like a ballad.

The snare in the background along with the duple feeling are two reasons why this may be a march. However, the tempo seems a little slower than an average march, and the articulations are not as crisp as they can be for a march. Overall, I will say that i resembles a March more so than a Ballad.

Although the articulations and technique does not sound like a march, the tempo and melody are that of a march.
The style in which this piece was played was march-like, but the melodic content sounded more like it could be performed in a ballad: given the fact that different orchestration would be needed to make it sound like a ballad. Thus the reason why I didn't totally move the slider all the way to the march setting.

Everyone is playing very connected which is very strange against the snare drum. Basically, everyone was playing way too long and connected for this to be in the correct style.

The staccato articulations make the style seem more like a march.

It sounded like a march due to the prominence of horns and percussion. The tempo was a bit slow for a march, which made it more ballad-like.

The woodwind sound was much more toward the ballad style, and note lengths were long. However, many of the 8th note lines in the lower-middle brass were shortened to a degree appropriate for a march, setting the style in the one range.

Sounds march like when taking into the account of the bass/snare percussion, and the unison rhythms of the rest of the ensemble.

Not the traditional Sousa march but too rigid and square to be a true ballad.

The style felt more march-like because of the snares in the background and the unison melody in the brass group. It was not very lyrical which eliminates the ballad style, in my opinion.

A steady tempo was provided and generally followed. The tempo was more upbeat as marches are (usually around 120), while I imagine a ballad being a lot slower.

very vertical alignment, despite lack of definition in articulations, with snare pattern.

The form was clearly a march form, and the style was as well, but the articulation wasn't quite "articulate" enough for a march.


The music was in the style of a march, but the performance was lackluster along with the unison melody.

Phrasing was very metric, little to no lyric qualities to the playing style. Percussion was little more than "boom-chucks".

The performance was very steady at around 120 bpm which is standard for a march. It was also strictly on the beat and left little for interpretation of the tempo.
Militaristic snare drum part, uptempo, rigid tempo.

Again, the tempo was somewhat brisk and the rhythms seem more appropriate for a march

Different meter

Articulated, emphasis on march rhythm in snare drum

The excerpt had a strong 4/4 beat, which to me indicates more of a march than a ballad.

It had strict time but no separation between notes. Fairly legato.

This performance revealed a lower level of technique compared to the previous performance, especially in terms of articulation.

You can tell that its a march because of the snare drum in the background. But the band could be more articulate with some of the accents. Overall though the intonation of the band was much better than the first excerpt

Still very march like, but more likely to be a portion of an extended piece that has many facets.

Note lengths were long and ran together (little to no separation between notes). Tempo was moderate.

I honestly couldn't tell what style they were going for.

It sounds like the notation on the page is more of a march style, however the performers in the ensemble are not playing with the correct style to communicate what seems to be on the page

The articulation used by the ensemble indicated a march-like style, along with the rhythms in the snare. The tempo also seemed appropriate for a march more than a ballad.

Not as lively and energetic as an opener or finale, has a clear melodic line with no battery

Some of the eighth notes were separated, but none of the quarter notes were shaped and most of the releases were not clean.

The ensemble needs to match note values/lengths across the entire band. Decide which notes to push through/which to cut off. There was no dynamic contrast whatsoever, which is essential to phrasing and musical shaping.
The click track and snare drum part were giveaways that it was intended to be a march. Style and articulation were a bit lacking.

I felt that the performance was of a march based on the rhythms played by the snare drum and the rhythms played by the ensemble. I put the slider at ~2 because stylistically, the ensemble was getting the rhythm and notes correct but not the style in which a march is typically played. Intonation was also poor in some places since it sounded as if the ensemble was playing in unison the entire time.

The notes are slightly separated, and it sounds as though they are trying to play with a march style. However if I were to critique this performance, I would say that the march style needs to be much more exaggerated. I could tell, however, that it was no legato or lyrically sounding, so it was not a Ballad.

I could tell that the band was playing a march, but they could have played with more style. There should be more separation between notes, and more distinct accents.

The tempo of the selection is strict and metronomic. The snare drum is a clear indication of the style of music that is attempted to be portrayed. However, the ensemble lacks clarity in style, articulation, and phrasing. There is also no dynamic contrast in this excerpt making it a mere note-reading rather than a musical performance.

The music was very in-time (there were no fluctuations in tempo which might've been expected in a ballad), which made it reflect a march style. However, the attacks and releases were not together and should've been crisper, and I didn't hear emphasis on ay downbeats, so that caused the performance to be a less accurate representation of a march.

Simple, scalar passages overlaid on a stable time signature is typical of a march. Marching snare also points to this style

Steady, upbeat tempo

The articulation was soft and smooth, almost mushy, where it needed to be a crisp punch. The tempo was too slow. Lacked energy.

The excerpt was clearly intended to be performed in a March style, but was not fully executed in such a manner.

The Snare Drum part was the first thing that I noticed -- this, as well as the general performance style of the ensemble, made me put the slider towards the "March" genre. The time signature and tempo also helped me discern that the piece was a march.
In-Service Music Educators

Eighth notes were separated, but quarters were not.

The style was not a ballad of any type, however the it was not a true march style. There was no sense of separation or to match articulation of any kind.

The excerpt was more march-like in style, but the group did not have split parts. I also noticed that several middle voices, I think a saxophone, held over longer than the rest of the ensemble.

Ensemble is approaching a march style. If they lighten up, listen down, and clean up the articulation and make it more crisp, they would be close to the 5.

Military style snare drum accompaniment; no legato treatment of the notes.....faster tempo

Tempo was approx. 120 bpm - standard match tempo.
The drum part was very "march-like."
The musicians were attempting to perform in march style.

The tempo and note lengths give this one away. Most ballads utilize much slower tempi than this excerpt. The note lengths were far too detached for this to be anything other than a march.

A march needs more separation.

Again, those playing more strongly had a good sense of style. I assume they were the principal players and thus had a good sense of style.

The rhythm and attack of the notes indicates more of a march style. However, the characteristic separation of march style is not present. The notes are long, but not played in a legato fashion as they would be for a ballad.

Based on the tempo and the melodic content, it is march music, but the style and interpretation did not lend itself to completely express the march style.

style/melody/tempo of the performance.

No comment.

March tempo, not completely performed in a "march style"

Based on tempo, percussion part and tonguing/marcato type style of playing, though inconsistent in this passage (as well as attack and release issues).
The style favored on the side of a march, but only a little because of the extended notes and lack of separation. The snare seemed to make my slider move more to the right than the wind parts.

Some people were playing long, some were separating. The attacks, releases, and volume/lack of dynamics indicates more of a march style, but it seems like it was written to be played long. There was no dynamic contrast, and no phrasing.

Performance technique issues make it difficult for the performer to achieve any possible style intent.

no marcato style, phrasing not together - No style at all really

Since everything was pretty staccato it seemed more like a march. If it had been slower and more legato it may have been a ballad by the melody alone.

Tempo and Style indicated it being a March and not a Ballad.

The style of the music is indicative of a march

March

tempo, technique, and style lean more towards a march style than a ballad.

some attempt at marcato but note lengths were not matched.

the tempo and the feel

It resembled more of a march due to the tempo and style and articulation.

The selection along with Dr. Beat (metronome) is most certainly a march based upon articulation style and tempo.

Based on the tempo and articulation it approaches march style but does not fully achieve a march style because notes are played legato

The performance resembled a march because of its attempt at playing short and detached was evident.

The ensemble was attempting to use march style by separation but the style was not correct. It was not a ballad but it was not correct march style. The notes needed to lift or "bounce" a bit more.
The ensemble played with some space and some accents. Articulation was not clearly defined, and note lengths varied, making it hard to distinguish style.

The articulation makes this feel more march-like then ballad. Also upbeat tempo for a ballad.

The snare part and the rhythms led me to believe that this should be a march, however the style is not separated nor accented enough to reflect correct march style.

Duration of notation seems to be rhythmically short allowing for a modified march tempo and feel.

They were attempting a march style. I would work on consistency of note length and playing more together "in tempo" as a group.

There were attempts made at march style dynamics and separation of notes.

Percussion is march related. This could be the trio section of a march.

Tempo, accents in articulation

The ensemble was playing in a style reminiscent of a standard march with strong steady beat and rhythms that indicate a march.

Sounds more toward a march because of the tempo taken and the involvement of the percussion parts. Note lengths were too long for accurate march style.

It was performed at a traditional march tempo however the articulation style was not of such. Furthermore, this selection did not reflect the ballad style.

Notes are legato-style but tongued.

The style is not really a march. However, there is evidence of separation somewhat on the 8th note passage.

More march than ballad but too legato for true march

The speed and rhythm of the snare gives this more of a march sound as opposed to a ballad. Style of the articulation also leads to this conclusion.

No legato articulations

More march like. However, the articulations and note lengths are not quite what you want to hear in a march.
Too much tongue to be a ballad.

It was hard to assess the articulation style of the musicians - as the metronome clicking was too loud and covered the initial sound of each note. The group did not demonstrate march style. They played notes too long, and the example was missing the accented (front of the) notes for a march.

The pulse was steady and within the range of tempo one would expect from a march. No lyricism was evident.

Note lengths throughout seem too long for a march style. Tempo and some staccato playing prevent the slider from being farther to the left.

The tempo and percussion parts make this recording lean toward a march. The lack of uniformity of articulation takes away from the march style.

The performed style is difficult to discern; although there are attempts to connect full length notes and phrases, articulation is generally harsh and there are many individual gaps in phrasing and little uniformity of style.

The previous performance utilized agogic accent patterns which are indicative of a march style rather than a ballad style. Also, the use of snare drum and character of the part lends further evidence towards naming of march style.

Was not in the ballad style. The style was more of a march style.

The tempo and rhythms heard indicate that his should be a march. Marches should be played crisply with an upbeat tempo and precise articulation. This was played more in the ballad style with notes being more blended together and smooth.

Articulations are too "choppy" for a ballad.

I thought that there was an attempt to perform a march.... definitely not a ballad. However, the quarter notes were performed to closely together. no bounce to them.... needed to be more separated if it was going to be a march style.

This sounds more like a march style song. Why , because I'm listen to the percussion section throughout the song, playing in a rhythmic style through the snare drum playing. The percussion in both songs were loud and rhythmic. The songs were played with uneven sounds in each section. But I think the second song played with fewer mistakes.

Not separated enough or accented to be a march.
Performance lacked march style - articulations were more of a ballad - "LA" or "DA" attacks were used, instead of an aggressive "TA" attack most often used in the march style. Moving notes - Quarter notes and eighth notes were connected much like a ballad March style they should be spaced.

There is a marcato quality to the melody most of the time. The percussion part is typical of a march style.

Based on the snare part and that it wasn't legato, I'd say it's more of a march. But there weren't marcato accents there to define the march style, so it's not very far over on the march scale.

Too long, needed to be short and separated.

This piece of music should sound more like a march than a ballad. However, the type of articulation and the lack of separation being used would indicate that it is being taught more in a legato style of articulation. Students are not in agreeing on entrances and releases. Matching is an issue with this band.

Although there isn't really a group defined style, it is being played closer to march style than ballad.

Quarter notes need more "bounce," eighth notes need to be more staccato to be a "march" style.

The articulation style, separation, and tempo were more indicative of a march than a ballad.

click annoying
separated notes
not legato

I can't really see that this type of evaluation is effective in determining how the music is playing two such different styles. You also must consider tempo, articulation, dynamics, instrumentation, percussion writing, etc. While not all instruments are performing an effective and precise marcato style, this music clearly is not of a ballad (and just what is a ballad?) style.

There is not much differentiation of articulation among the ensemble members making it hard for the audience to tell the style attempted.

The group played some of the shorter duration notes in a staccato fashion, bringing to mind a march style. However, the group did not accent the longer note values, which would be expected in a march style. The group did not convincingly play in a ballad style, as they did not connect different notes in a legato fashion or stagger breathe effectively to communicate the long phrases.
Based on parts and style, the group seems to understand many of the basic concepts of a march. However, some people were not as precise with style or articulation, or I would have given it a little higher.

tempo was good but articulation wasn't

The tempo given along with the articulation the performers are using help us understand it is a march

I would expect a ballad to be much slower and lyrical.

Phrasing, tonguing and precision issues make it difficult to tell much about what the composer intended.

It's difficult to determine the style achieved due to lack of details in the articulations. There is "sliding" but not slurring between pitches; no clear tonguing to dictate the march style. My assumption is that the piece is a ballad, however the tempo and lack of attention to detailed articulations and expression is deceptive to the ear.

the instrumentation was not complete

articulation is not consistent throughout the ensemble. The releases are not consistent - the length of the notes are not consistent with style

it is a march

Use of duple time signature, instrumentation (use of snare with rudimental passages). Passage was played legato/horizontally detracting from march style without the clarity or separation that march style articulations usually have.

You can tell that the written music is supposed to be a march but the articulations and style of the performance hindered the fact that it was actually a march.

Wind articulations were not consistent in style or between instruments. It was only clear that this was a march via the percussion patterns and melodic phrasing (not how it was played).

The ensemble is playing with spirit and fairly good tempo, but as for march style, it does not demonstrate appropriate separation between the notes. Marcato style is weak.

Note lengths were not at all uniform. Needed more space to be good march style

Use of percussion, steady tempo. wind articulations
Some players attempted a light staccato style but as a whole the group was not consistent. Note lengths did not match each other.

Steady tempo and orchestration is march-like. Articulation perhaps a little heavy to demonstrate a march style.

It was definitely played in a march style, but it was terrible!

The same drum part helped establish the march style.

The main issue with this piece was not style. Non-characteristic tone qualities do not reflect ballads or marches.

Low Brass separation and percussion material

The percussion I the back ground had a march feel but the wind players were playing the phrase smooth and connected in ballad style. The metronome click almost covered up the band.

Notes are articulated but not played very short

Separated notes and rudimental snare drum playing, as opposed to the legato, lyrical styles of a ballad.

Sounds like the trio of a march. More legato, but still the rhythmic ideas of a march including the snare.

I feel the tempo, weight of the notes added to my notion this is a march. Also the steady metronome sounds like a march rehearsal. While alto was playing longer notes than the rest of the ensemble their was consistent space between the notes like march style often calls for.

Tempo was the biggest indicator that it was supposed to be more of a march. Articulations were not there, but if you slowed the tempo it could be a ballad.

The tempo lends itself to closer to a march than ballad. The percussion idea does the same thing. The articulation could be looked at as march style if there were more separation of notes.

Need more separation of notes throughout for a clearer march style - pitch and balance of the ensemble needs to be addressed?

Not true march style, but also not smooth, connected, or flowing in the style of a ballad. Differences in note length between instruments.
It sounded like a march, however there was barely any musicality to the notes. The notes did not bounce or blend. I could hear TB/Bari over everyone else.

This is obviously intended to be played marcato, however, note lengths are somewhat inconsistent.

It was definitely a march, however everyone was in unison (no bass part). Also, it sounded like the trio since it was more smooth and connected, not marcato.

While it did not appear to be a ballad, it could have been with a slower tempo and legato style.

More march based on the articulation and percussion part. The ensemble is having a hard time sustaining at the end of phrases.

Still a march - just performed not that well. They used a legato style

This group, or perhaps the same group at a later date, played the notes and rhythms more accurately than the first recording and was definitely more pleasant to listen to. Is this supposed to be a march? The question reads "indicated styles". Am I supposed to assume what the style is?

Although the notes in this excerpt were longer than the previous excerpt, they were shaped in an accented manner and left more depth to each note. I believe this is why it is more along the style of a march. However, there could still be more articulated differences and dynamic contrast.

I felt like this should have been more of a ballad, but anytime a group is playing with a metronome they will alter the style slightly. The students are still playing with space between eighth notes but longer quarter notes. It could be something in a British march style. It wasn't as clearly a march as the first, but still used similar musical styles.

Eighth notes were less separated than the previous example. Articulations are too hard to be considered appropriate "ballad" style. Trombones particularly.

The ensemble played what seemed to be a march style piece with with tenuto articulations.

This excerpt seems to be more like a "ballad" due to the connected nature of the notes. However, the unison breathing and very metronomic tempo detract from the ballad feeling.

This sounded like it was supposed to be march style, but that the notes were slurred and/or not separated at all. Eighth notes should almost sound somewhat staccato.

Notes are connected much more than the first example.

again it had more of march feel-simple in meter and rhythm
It appeared the notes piece should have been played legato style as in a ballad but the style was not correct to fit the piece, much as in a march style.

There is no spacing of notes or accents. Excerpt is played too smoothly to be considered march style.

The style was slightly more lengthened than the previous excerpt....I would not consider it to be either a ballad or a march, but it leans more toward "March".

The articulations from this passage seemed more legato. This could be a march, but the playing style seemed more a ballad than a march. This really could be either.

This was closer to a typical trio section in a march with the sparse snare drum writing and the more legato section of playing.

The melodic content, and harmonic structure suggests this is a ballad. However, the articulation of the ensemble and tempo does not lend to justification of this statement.

The articulation style is legato and most notes receive full value, reminiscent of a ballad style. However, the tempo of this excerpt as well as the use of percussion (and style of the part) seem more characteristic of a march. Personally, I believe a ballad incorporates legato style at a slower tempo than this excerpt. As a result, the tempo makes me believe this is more of a march style, played w/a legato articulation.

Once again, I'm not sure that this is a well executed example, but this would be closer to a ballad than a march, as the articulations demonstrated were connected.

Again the march style is evident, the commitment level to note length is no higher than 80%

Not sure exactly what the style of "Ballad" is....but if it is meant to be legato or connected then -2 is fine.

I left the dial at 0 because while the notes were played somewhat legato, the tempo was too fast to be considered a ballad

The legato phrases suggest a ballad, though the heavy attacks might suggest otherwise.

Similar to the first recording, but the style is less defined and too fluid for a march. It could be called choppy in contrast at spots, but chopping is not March Style.

Even though the ensemble played nice long full notes, this was again clearly be defined as a march due to the tempo and the detached eighth notes within the passage.
Again this is a collection of notes and rhythms meant to improve skill, such as an etude. According to the student's note lengths, some are playing the excerpt as if it was a ballad and some are playing it as if it was a march. The clarinets are connecting their notes while the rest of the band is not. However, does connecting your notes constitute a ballad? No. Trios in marches are often played in this style. I think it could be either based on the performance. I am confused with the two music samples selected.

Same as before - the percussion gave the impression of a march, but the style was very legato and there were no accents on strong beats.

Tempo and use of very articulate "busy" snare drum weighed in my decision. The legato style of example 2 led to the lower number when compared to example 1.

Metronome gives the impression of a more articulated style. However, the articulation style of the group is more connected. Tempo suggests more of a march melody, but connected art. style suggest more lyrical passage - I chose a more neutral rating.

It was obviously supposed to be march style, but the majority of the ensemble played with a semi-legato articulation. The clarinets were definitely like a -4

Tempo was still quick. Even though it was slurred, the melody sounded related to the previous "march".

with the metronome the music is even more marchlike.

This was played more like a ballad. The notes demonstrated a legato style. The long slurred phrases is just the opposite of the march style. The tempo was the only characteristics that was not common to a ballad.

Overall precision among the group gives a clean sound. The group has a stable pulse stays together well rhythmically but the concepts of march style articulation are not strongly evident. Accented quarter notes and staccato eighth notes are not apparent. The separation between notes that is typical of the march style is not being executed well by the majority of the ensemble.

Thought the notes were more legato in this performance than the last, the rhythmic movement of the melody was still characteristic of a march.

Once again If this was a:
Middle School - keep making progress
High School - Need to focus on basics.
The ensemble played in a March Style because of tempo, moderately fast unison parts for the entire band, not smooth or legato style like a Ballad would normally be and the snare drum march cadence style.

Tempo was march style but note lengths were not accurate.

March tempo, but notes were not played precisely together and the length or ends of the notes were not detached.

The excerpt is written in a march style, however, no attempt at separating the notes to energize the performance is made. Attacks and releases are ragged at times, which also detracts from the stylistic interpretation, and the lack of characteristic tone quality and blend also make it difficult to listen to. The snare part is also clearly in a march style, with the off beats typical of standard march writing.

2/4 feel.

The piece sounded like a march with regards to tempo and melodic/harmonic elements but lacked the required, bounce, separation and articulation for a true march performance.

Short articulation, use of percussion

No attention to attacks/releases
March style not present - too smooth and connected throughout
I'm sure there were notated articulations, which were unheard
Unbalanced
No Phrasing

The music felt very choppy, as a result of inconsistent articulation (and not helped along by the relentless metronome click in the background) and lack of lyrical connection in the band. The music was expressed more vertically than it was horizontally.

Clearly not a ballad. Did not have much in the way of march "style" i.e., marcato articulation, bounce, separation, etc. but between the two styles given the choice was obvious.

Neither ballad nor a precise march style was demonstrated in the recording.

While the tempo and harmonic structure let you know it was a march, the performance of incorrect articulations and stylistic playing led to the score that was given.

Music not slow or legato for Ballad style. Not separated enough to be good march style.
With no reference to go on, selection sounded more like a ballad in 3/4 (metronome may have given it a march feel, however). Would assume rehearsal technique used for pitch accuracy, phrasing, and blend.

Ensemble mezzo forte dynamic level.
Players were articulating notes and attempting to put space between the eighth notes.

Musicians need a lighter style with more separation between the notes.

Resembles a march but does not reflect "March Style"

Separated style of articulation

The articulation was not in a march style. However, the tempo and other aspects of the excerpt would indicate a march.

Snare drum part was more indicative of a march

Articulation style was separated at times on shorter notes, yet inconsistent throughout. Quicker tempo, notes not connected like a ballad.

Unfortunately this excerpt is not truly indicative of either a ballad or a march style performance. It is too separated to be the normal basic concept of a ballad and it is not quite separated enough to be in true march-style. But since it is somewhat separated, I will lean toward a mediocre march-style interpretation.
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