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The purpose of this study was to determine attitudes of high school band directors and students regarding Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) Large Group Adjudicated Events. Subjects were high school band directors \((n = 11)\) and students \((n = 214)\) from 12 bands in OMEA District I, which consists six counties in Northwest Ohio (Defiance, Fulton, Lucas, Napoleon, Williams, and Wood). Subjects represented each of the OMEA performance classifications (AA, A, B, C, and D) and three geographic regions (rural, suburban, and urban). Participants completed the OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Events Survey, which consisted of three sections: (a) background information, (b) personal opinion, and (c) free response. Based on data collected from survey responses, both directors and students agree that Large Group Adjudicated Events are an important part of high school band programs. Subjects also agree that, although the rating earned at contest is important, making music and receiving comments from adjudicators are of higher importance.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Throughout the nation, many high school band students annually participate in various adjudicated events. These include marching or concert band festivals sponsored by corporations such as the Six Flags Music in the Park competitions and large group adjudicated events sponsored by their state music associations. Still others go beyond marching or concert band, participating in solo and ensemble contests in which individuals and small groups of students perform and receive a rating. Each of these competitions requires hours of preparation and rehearsal both during and outside of regular school hours. There is also a need for financial support in order to defray the cost of participating in events. Expenses for participation in contests and festivals include transportation for students, instruments, uniforms or costumes, and other large equipment, such as sideline percussion instruments, field props, or flag and color guard equipment, that may be necessary for performance.

Since the inception of the School Band Contest of America in 1923, debates have been held over the value of participating in contests. “Some cite increased public exposure and community support as positive benefits from competition; others cite pressure to win and nonmusical goals as negative aspects of competition” (Burnsed & Sochinski, 1983, p. 25). Several opinions regarding competition in music education were published in the October, 1983 edition of the Music Educators Journal, in an article entitled, “Winners & Losers: Points of View on Competitions.” In this early article, but one that is important to the topic of this study, one educator in favor of contests said, “Competitions are great motivators. Kids are naturally competitive and a contest gives them a goal to work toward that keeps students on task” (Schouten et al., 1983, p. 29). Another educator in the same article, but who was not in favor of...
contests said, “If I had to call the shots, I would ban contests, or at least strongly discourage students from entering them” (Schouten et al., 1983, p. 29).

Currently in the state of Ohio, the Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) regulates school band contests, which are known as Large Group Adjudicated Events. The same term relates to school choir and orchestra contests in the state as well because ensembles in all three genres are scored using a five-rating plan, and are not ranked based on their performance as in an actual contest. The five rating plan outlined in the Ohio Music Education Association Rules and Regulations for Adjudicated Events is as follows (OMEA, 2008, p.3):

- **Rating I:** An outstanding performance with very few technical errors and exemplifying a truly musical expression. This rating should be reserved for the truly outstanding performance.

- **Rating II:** An unusual performance in many respects, but not worthy of the highest rating due to minor defects in performance, ineffective interpretation, or improper instrumentation.

- **Rating III:** An acceptable performance, but not outstanding. Showing accomplishment and marked promise, but lacking in one or more essential qualities.

- **Rating IV:** A poor performance showing many technical errors, poor musical conception, lack of interpretation, incomplete instrumentation, or lacking in any of the other essential qualities.

- **Rating V:** A very poor performance indicating deficiencies in most of the essential factors, and indicating that much careful attention should be given to the fundamentals of good performance. This rating
should be used sparingly and only when it is possible to cite major faults.

Large Group Adjudicated Events for band at the district level are held annually in March, with school bands performing in their OMEA district. The state currently has 17 districts, which consist of grouped counties throughout the state. Bands perform for a panel of three adjudicators who each assign the ensemble a rating, I-V. After their performance, each band goes to a sight-reading room, where they read a piece for one adjudicator, and are again assigned a rating, I-V. When the sight-reading portion is complete, and all four adjudicators’ scores have been averaged, each band is given an overall rating, I-V. Those bands receiving a I rating at the district level are eligible to participate in the State Large Group Adjudicated Event held in April or May. At the state level the performance and sight-reading process is repeated similarly to the district level for a different panel of adjudicators, and each band is again assigned a rating, I-V.

Ensembles may perform at OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Events in one of six performance classifications: AA, A, B, C, D, or Festival. Performance classifications are determined by the level of difficulty of the repertoire performed by the ensemble, with AA being the most difficult. The Festival classification is for ensembles performing and receiving adjudicators’ comments, but no rating.

Statement of the Problem

Of the research that exists about band contests and adjudicated events, very little has focused solely on concert band. Much of the research that has been done regarding school band contests has focused on marching band or a combination of concert and marching band. Sweeney (1998) noted this issue and suggested that the problem may be “due to the visibility of marching band versus concert band” (Sweeney, 1998). Sweeney’s study is one of the most
recent involving high school band directors and students, and their attitudes toward concert band competition. Sivill (2004) completed a study regarding director and student attitudes about all types of music competitions (i.e., concert band, marching band, jazz band, and solo and ensemble), and discussed the lack of available research: “Although some thorough, meaningful studies have been carried out by reputable researchers, this subject has not been as fully researched as other subjects in the music education profession” (Sivill, 2004, p. 4).

The decision to participate or not in adjudicated events can be difficult for some directors if pressure is felt from individuals outside the classroom, such as school administrators and parents. Without current or sufficient research regarding adjudicated events to utilize as evidence and support for their choice, the director’s decision is based on opinions, which may be unfounded or unreliable. “School administrators are sometimes more likely to consider the point of view of directors if their positions are supported by data” (Sivill, 2004, p. 3). Too often the decision to participate in adjudicated events is automatic for directors, and made without consideration for any of the other parties involved in preparation for performance.

Participation in music festivals or contests should not be a matter of blindly following tradition, but rather should relate to your personal philosophy of music education and whether it is in the best interest of your band or orchestra students (Cooper, 2004). In some instances, directors who decide to participate spend much of their school year rehearsing a limited amount of musical literature. Some directors require extra sectionals outside of the regular rehearsal time to make sure students are learning and practicing their parts to the three or four pieces being worked on in full rehearsal. The lack of exposure to repertoire in some cases, and the intensity of preparation make some question the value and educational benefits of adjudicated events. Kirchhoff (1988) saw the limited exposure some students had to repertoire
as a problem with high school band programs throughout the country: “The academic year begins and sometimes ends with the preparation of three or four pieces from the concert repertoire that will be performed at contest in April or May” (p. 266). In band programs where this was the case Kirchhoff found students had difficulty reading new music because, “…they spend an inordinate amount of time performing a few pieces and thus have little opportunity for sight-reading” (p. 266). Howard (1994) also noted this issue in her research: “Some directors spend the entire year working only on the contest pieces, thus minimizing actual musical learning and inadequately preparing students in the basic fundamentals of music” (Howard, 1994, p. 5).

In addition to questioning the value and educational benefits of adjudication, some members of the profession question the value of the rating given to ensembles at adjudicated events. For many band programs, a high rating at contest is what determines the program’s level of success by administrators, parents, and community members. The ratings earned at adjudicated events have also been used, in some instances, to determine whether directors remain employed or not in a school district.

Unfortunately, the band contest has become the means of assessment most often used by administrators to evaluate the effectiveness of an instrumental music program. In some school districts the rating achieved by ensembles is used by administration and by the community as a barometer of their educational success or failure (Kirchhoff, 1988). In discussing festivals and contests, Cooper (2004) included advice for directors and other individuals associated with performing ensembles at contest to consider.

The evaluation of the performance is very important; but it is essential for director, students, parents, and administrators to remember that it is only an evaluation by three or
four adjudicators of one performance by your ensemble on one day (Cooper, 2004, p. 164).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine attitudes of high school band directors and students regarding Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) Large Group Adjudicated Events. Through the use of a survey for directors and students, this study intended to provide evidence of director and student attitudes, which could be used to help directors in making the decision to participate or not in adjudicated events. Additionally, this study compared the responses of band directors and students who participate in each of the OMEA performance classifications, and from three geographic regions (rural, suburban, and urban). In some cases an ensemble was not available in a particular geographic region.

Definition of Terms

The terms used to discuss adjudicated events in music are often used interchangeably, and can create confusion. For the purposes of this study eight terms are defined as follows:

*Adjudicated Event* refers to a performance by a soloist or ensemble in front of a single adjudicator or a panel of adjudicators. The adjudicator(s) give performers constructive criticism in the form of written comments and/or an audio recording, and determine a score for the soloist or ensemble based on a rubric provided by the sponsor of the event.

*Adjudicator* refers to an individual who listens to a performance of a soloist or ensemble at an adjudicated event and provides feedback for the performers in the form of written comments and/or an audio recording. The adjudicator also determines a rating based on a rubric provided by the sponsor of the event.
Competition is defined in Webster’s New World College Dictionary (2008) as a contest or match; rivalry; official participation in an organized sport (Agnes, 2008, p. 298). With respect to music, competition refers to an event where performing ensembles such as concert bands perform for the same panel of adjudicators and receive a score. In a contest using a ranking system, the ensemble receiving the highest score would be deemed the champion. In a contest using a rating system, all ensembles have the opportunity to earn the highest rating, and no one ensemble is named the overall winner.

Contest is defined in Webster’s New World College Dictionary (2008) as any race, game, debate, etc. in which individuals or teams compete with one another to determine the winner (Agnes, 2008, p. 315). In dealing with music, contest is often synonymous with competition. It refers to an event where performing ensembles such as concert bands perform for the same panel of adjudicators and receive a score. In a contest using a ranking system, the ensemble receiving the highest score would be deemed the champion. In a contest using a rating system, all ensembles have the opportunity to earn the highest rating, and no one ensemble is named the overall winner.

Festival refers to an event where performing ensembles may or may not perform for a panel of adjudicators, and participate mainly to perform for ensembles from other locations, and listen to those ensembles in return. At some festivals, performing ensembles all receive participation awards rather than any award they might earn in a ranking or rating system. The term festival is also sometimes used in reference to a performing ensemble that is participating at a large group adjudicated event and not receiving a score or rating. Instead the ensemble receives adjudicators’ comments only.
Large Group refers to a full performance ensemble such as a concert band, orchestra, or choir. The Ohio Music Education Association refers to their state sanctioned full ensemble music competitions as Large Group Adjudicated Events.

Ranking is defined in Webster’s New World College Dictionary (2008) as the act or an instance of listing persons or things in order of importance, achievement, quality, etc. (Agnes, 2008, p. 1187). With respect to adjudicated events in music, ranking refers to the system used by adjudicators of placing performing ensembles in order from best to worst. The order is often determined by the overall score performing ensembles earned from adjudicators based on their performance.

Rating is defined in Webster’s (2008) as a placement in a certain rank or class (Agnes, 2008, p. 1190). In regard to music and adjudicated events, rating refers to the overall score assigned to a performing ensemble by a panel of adjudicators. In the divisional rating system, such as the system utilized by OMEA, there are five ratings ensembles may earn based on their performance. Each ensemble has the opportunity to earn the highest rating though, unlike in the rating system, and no ensemble is declared the overall winner.

Limitations of the Study

The band directors and students were drawn from various schools in OMEA District I, which is comprised of six counties in Northwest Ohio (Defiance, Fulton, Lucas, Napoleon, Williams, and Wood). Schools were selected from each of the OMEA performance classifications (AA, A, B, C, and D) and from different geographic regions (rural, suburban, and urban) throughout the district. The selected schools were chosen from the schools that participated in OMEA District I Large Group Adjudicated Event in March 2008. For the purpose of this study, a population of less than 15,000 constituted a rural geographic region, a
population greater than 15,000 and less than 50,000 was considered suburban, and a population greater than 50,000 was regarded as urban.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Much of the existing research regarding adjudicated events has been done in four areas: the history of band contests, the attitudes of band directors regarding band contests, the attitudes of band directors and school administrators regarding band contests, and the attitudes of band directors and students regarding band contests. Additional relevant literature regarding band contests has been included in the conclusion of this chapter.

History of Band Contests

Schleuter (1997) discussed the band contest as one of four contributing factors in the increase of school instrumentalists in the twentieth century. The contest movement among school band programs began with the School Band Contest of America in 1923. The first contest was organized and intended to serve as a promotional device by the manufacturers of musical instruments. “In the same year, the Committee on Instrumental Affairs of the Music Supervisors National Conference took control of the contest and reorganized the rules and format, with the first national school band contest occurring in 1926 in Fostoria, Ohio” (Schleuter, 1997, p. 5).

In 1937, the tournament changed from one location to 10 regional locations. At a meeting of what was then called the National School Band Association (NSBA), the regional plan was presented, and divided the country into ten regions. Each region consisted of several states, and held a competition under the national rules and standards of adjudication. The regional plan was officially adopted by the NSBA in January, 1937 (Burdett, 1985). The expansion of the national school band contest would soon come to a halt though, due to the outbreak of World War II. “With the momentum interrupted, they were never scheduled again
following the war” (Schleuter, 1997). A new format would come to fruition though at the district and state level, which thrived because of cheaper transportation costs (Burdett, 1985).

In the first years of competition, bands would perform for a panel of judges and be given a score and upon completion of all performances, a ranked order of the groups was determined. The band receiving the top rank would then be declared the winner of the contest. The system of ranking bands however was changed to a divisional rating system almost 10 years later. Nearly 200 band directors from 20 states decided to adopt the divisional rating system at the Urbana (IL) Band Clinic, in January, 1932 (Burdett, 1985).

Schleuter (1997) noted several benefits of the band contest movement. One of the benefits was that contest helped to delimit the instrumentation of school bands, and direct attention to the issue of appropriate literature for school ensembles. Another benefit of contest was the number of individuals that were involved. Thousands of students represented their schools and communities by participating in competitions. Consequently, the public support for school music programs increased to new levels, as well as the number of school instrumental music teachers and the quality of music instruction. Finally, the level of performance by school bands and the amount of published music both increased, and issues of instrumentation improved due to contests (Schleuter, 1997, p.5).

Band Director Attitudes Regarding Band Contest

Banister (1992) sought to determine the attitudes of band directors of both marching and concert band competition, as well as additional aspects of their overall band programs. She sent a questionnaire to 200 randomly selected high school band directors in Ohio, of which 133 (66.5%) were returned. From the data collected, Banister found that directors who participated in marching band competitions or marching and concert band events had a more positive outlook
regarding marching band competitions than those directors who participate solely in concert band contests. All directors were found to have a positive attitude toward concert band competitions. The consensus among band directors was that concert band contest participation improves students’ musicianship, builds character, and helps to sustain a successful and viable instrumental music program (Banister, 1992).

Band Director and School Administrator Attitudes Regarding Band Contest

Rogers (1985) surveyed high school band directors and principals regarding their attitudes toward marching band contests. He sent surveys to 421 randomly selected high schools from all 50 states, and received responses from both the band director and principal at 284 (67%) of those schools. From the responses collected, Rogers found that principals view marching band contests as a way to improve public relations for their schools. Band directors responded that marching band contests were a way for students to gain personal benefit in terms of self-discipline, responsibility and pride. The musical benefits of marching band contest (e.g., improving playing skills, knowledge of music) were rated lower by band directors than by principals. Both groups were also encouraged to include additional comments on the survey. Comments from band directors included concerns about the overemphasis of competition and the educational benefits of seeing other bands perform. While comments from principals included praise for the public relations value of marching band contests, some questioned the educational benefits and expense associated with traveling to competitions.

Band Director and Student Attitudes Regarding Band Contests

Sweeney (1998) examined the attitudes of directors and students exclusively in regard to concert band competition. Students and directors were placed into one of two groups based on the number of competitions they participated in annually; the high-competition group (four or
more per year) or the low-competition group (two or less per year). Participants in the study were given a survey, and responses were placed into one of four categories: ratings aspects of competition, musical aspects of competition, social/travel aspects of competition and student-dependent responses. Based on the responses collected (N = 191), high-competition bands reported valuing winning a competition to a higher degree than low-competition bands. Low-competition bands placed a higher value on performing well and receiving a good rating than high-competition bands. They also indicated preparation for competition was more important than high-competition bands. Both groups agreed that while ratings are important, receiving a high rating is not the sole indication of a successful band program. Students in both high and low-competition bands were found to value the social and travel aspects of competition more than directors in the two groups.

Howard (1994) investigated the attitudes of high school students toward four separate types of music contests (concert band, marching band, small ensemble, and solo). A questionnaire and a Music Attribution Orientation Scale were given to 1,591 Iowa high school band students. From the responses collected, students rated concert band and solo contest the highest for motivating students and improving musicianship. When grouped by gender, female students deemed solo contests the most stressful, and valued small ensemble and solo contest ratings more than their male colleagues. Male students were found to assign higher levels of cooperation to concert band, marching band, and small ensemble contests than female students. Based on these findings, Howard concluded that contest type, gender, and the interaction of contest type by gender had a significant effect on students’ attitudes about music contests (Howard, 1994).
Sivill (2004) surveyed band directors and students from 700 schools across seven Midwestern states in order to examine their perceptions of instrumental music competitions. Each of the 700 schools was sent one director survey, and two student surveys to be completed by one male student, and one female student, for a total of 2,100 surveys. Of those sent out, 366 surveys were returned; 159 from directors and 207 from students. The surveys contained open ended questions, which were analyzed and sorted into three categories: positive, neutral, and negative. Positive and negative statements were then sorted further into 10 categories: motivation, self-esteem, achievement/enrichment, real world concepts, teamwork, publicity/support, social benefits, travel, winning/ranking/outcome, and other for positive comments. Negative comments were categorized under winning/ranking/outcome, diminished self-esteem, diminished motivation, diminished achievement/enrichment, poor/improper judging, time consumption, expense, ego-enhancement, distortion of music education, and other. The majority of positive director comments were placed in the categories of motivation and achievement/enrichment. Negative director statements were more equally distributed among the ten categories. The highest percentage of positive student comments was in the category of achievement/enrichment, and highest percentage of negative student comments was in the category of diminished motivation.

Responses to other questions showed that the type of band contest students participated in most was marching band competitions. Solo and ensemble contests were directly after in regard to participation by students. In terms of enthusiasm for participation, students were found to be more enthusiastic about competitive events than directors; although all were found to be enthusiastic with a mean of 1.97 (1 was the strongest enthusiasm on a 1-5 scale). The survey was also designed to find how directors and students define success in competitions. Band
directors defined success firstly by the quality of the performance at competitive events, then by the amount of fun students have at the events, and thirdly by the amount of community/school support that is generated by participation in competitive events. Students defined success similarly to band directors in the first two categories, but the third category for students is the ranking or placement they receive at competitive events. No statistical significance was found based on gender in comparing definitions of success.

Additional Relevant Literature

Additional studies have been completed regarding band contests that do not fall into one of the categories discussed earlier in this review of literature. Although the years in which they were published are not recent, they are relevant to this study because of the frequency with which they are cited in current research regarding band contests.

Temple (1973) investigated the sight-reading ability of high school band students in Ohio who did and did not participate in OMEA adjudicated events. The purpose of his study was to determine if students who play in a band rated consistently superior in state OMEA competition would score higher on Test 4 of the Colwell Music Achievement Test and Form B of the Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale, than would students of bands that did not compete in the competitions but have been recommended as outstanding bands by a panel of experts (Temple, 1973, p. 8). Temple contacted 63 schools in the state of Ohio (39 competitive and 24 non-competitive) and asked for their participation in his study. Of the schools contacted 47 (75%) responded (23 competitive and 19 non-competitive). Based on the received responses, 24 schools were put into pairs (12), which were determined by their classification. With the schools determined, the tests were administered to students individually, recorded on audio tape, and mailed to The Ohio State University, where the tests were scored by expert scorers. Based on
the data collected, Temple found that students who were members of bands rated consistently superior at OMEA band competitions did not sight-read better than students of non-competitive bands (Temple, 1973, p. 107).

The effect of the classroom environment on contest ratings has been of interest of some in the field of music education. Hamann, Mills, Bell, Daugherty, and Koozer (1990) designed a study to assess classroom environments, as measured by the Classroom Environment Scale, Form R (CESR) (Moos & Trickett, 1987) and as perceived by high school instrumental and vocal students and teachers (Hamann et al., 1990). Subjects for the study came from a random sample of Colorado high school instrumental and vocal programs that participated in the 1988 Colorado High School Activities Association’s (CHSAA) sanctioned Colorado State Ensemble Contest Festival. CESR forms were distributed to 2,036 subjects, and 1,843 (90%) were completed and returned (51 teachers, 1,792 students).

Based on the information collected from subjects, the researchers found that high school music subjects experience higher levels of achievement in classroom environments that are perceived to be high in involvement, affiliation, teacher support, and order and organization, but tend not to perform as well in classrooms where high levels of task orientation are perceived (Hamann et al., 1990). Music teachers were found to have generally higher perceptions than students regarding their classrooms.

Researchers report that teachers’ classroom perceptions tend to be higher than those of students because people who have more authority and responsibility in a setting tend to see it more positively. Teachers have a mental concept of what their classroom environments should be and see classrooms conforming to their mental concepts more readily than do students” (Hamann et al., 1990, p. 222).
The success of music students was determined to be higher in classrooms: (a) in which students believe that the teacher cares for them and helps them achieve their individual goals; (b) in which assignments and activities are organized; (c) in which students can participate in discussions, work on their own, and are motivated by and interested in class activities; and (d) in which friendships are fostered through classroom activities (Hamann et al., 1990, p. 223).

The effect of contest on younger music students has also been of interest to some researchers in music education. Austin (1988) conducted an experimental study to determine the effect of two adjudication formats on the music achievement, self-concept, and achievement motivation scores of elementary band students. The two adjudication formats utilized were the rating system and comments only. Subjects for the study were 38 fifth- and sixth-grade students from a school district in Iowa, who all had at least 10 months of experience playing an instrument. The subjects did not however have prior experience participating in formal music contests. Students were randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups: (a) students receiving contest ratings and written comments, and (b) student receiving written comments only.

The researcher utilized two measurement devices in the experiment: the Music Achievement Test (MAT), Level One, to measure music achievement, and the Self-Concept in Music Scale (SCIM) to measure self-concept. Both devices were used as pretest and posttest measures. After completion of the pretest materials and an open-ended attribution survey, students were randomly assigned to either of the two treatment groups. Students spent one month preparing solo literature for contest in their weekly lessons. The literature prepared was selected by the band director, and deemed the appropriate difficulty level for each student. At the end of the month, students performed for an adjudicator. The adjudicator was given a form
with each student’s name and an identification number. They were not made aware of what treatment group students belonged to. The adjudicator assigned ratings and provided written comments for each student regardless of treatment group. After each student performance, the adjudication form was collected, and the rating was removed from the forms of students in the comments-only group. Posttest assessment was completed by students one week after the contest.

Austin found through the posttest survey that 66% of the students participating in the study believed that band members who compete for ratings work harder on their solos than do those who received comments only. Therefore, 34% of students felt that the rated students performed their solos better. Additionally, 82% of the students who participated felt that students who receive ratings generally feel better about themselves when compared to students who receive comments only. Lastly, when students were asked whether they would like to compete for ratings or comment only in the future, 76% of the participants chose ratings (Austin, 1988).

Sheldon (1994) also observed the effect competition has on students who participate in them. The purpose of her study was to examine the effect of competitive versus noncompetitive performance goals on music students’ ratings of a band performance (Sheldon, 1994). Subjects for this study were 226 high school band students from three high schools in central Illinois. Of the three schools represented, one was considered highly competitive (participating in more than six adjudicated events each school year), one was considered moderately competitive (participating in between two and six adjudicated events each school year), and one was considered non-competitive (participating in no more than one adjudicated event each school year).
Testing of the subjects took place at each of the three high schools, where students were divided into two groups: Concert Rehearsal ($n = 116$) and Contest Rehearsal ($n = 110$). Both groups listened to a recording and were asked to rate several musical elements based on their listening. Ratings were done using a 10-point Likert-type scale, with 1 being the lowest possible score and 10 the highest. Six categories were developed for students to rate each performance: correct notes, correct rhythms, tone quality, intonation, expressiveness, and overall rating.

Students in the Concert Rehearsal group were told they were listening to a dress rehearsal prior to a Spring Concert. Students in the Contest Rehearsal group were told they were listening to a dress rehearsal prior to state contest. The same recording however was played in both groups. From the data collected, Sheldon found that subjects in the Contest Rehearsal group consistently rated the recording significantly higher in every category than subjects in the Concert Rehearsal group. “That music students would consistently rate identical performances differently dependent upon whether they believed the performance was in preparation for a competitive or noncompetitive event may suggest that students perhaps attach a different degree of importance to the event” (Sheldon, 1994, p. 37).
CHAPTER III.

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to determine attitudes of high school band directors and students regarding Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) Large Group Adjudicated Events. Specifically, this study compared the responses of band directors to those of students who participate in each of the OMEA performance classifications (AA, A, B, C, and D), and from three geographic regions (rural, suburban, and urban).

Band Selection

In selecting the high school band directors and students to participate in this study, it was determined that the schools should be located relatively close to the university so the researcher could recruit subjects personally. The campus of Bowling Green State University (BGSU) lies within OMEA District I, which is comprised of six counties in Northwest Ohio (Defiance, Fulton, Lucas, Napoleon, Williams, and Wood). Using a performance program from the 2008 District I Large Group Adjudicated Event, a list of participating high school bands was compiled. The bands were then grouped by their OMEA performance classification and divided based on geographic region. For the purpose of this study, a population of less than 15,000 constituted a rural geographic region, a population greater than 15,000 and less than 50,000 was considered suburban, and a population greater than 50,000 was regarded as urban.

Based on the list of high school bands grouped by performance classification and geographic region, the researcher contacted band directors, asking for their consideration and possible participation in the study. The researcher contacted band directors via telephone, email, or through personal conversation. When communication with directors was completed, the directors of 12 bands ($n = 11$; one band director served as director for two bands) agreed to
participate and grant the researcher permission to visit their classrooms and recruit student subjects. The directors who agreed represented each of the performance classifications and geographic regions, with the exception of three (there were no Urban AA, Urban D, or Rural D bands).

The researcher made personal visits to the classrooms of directors who agreed to participate in this study. During each visit, the researcher was introduced to the students by the band director, and was given time to speak with them about participation in the study.

Survey of Band Directors and Students

A survey was developed for this study and distributed to each of the participating high school band directors and the members of their respective ensembles. The survey was modeled after those used in previous studies (Howard, 1994; Sivill, 2004; Sweeney, 1998), but focused specifically on band director and student participation in OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Events.

The survey consisted of three sections. The first section contained questions regarding the background information of participants. Questions in the first section specifically dealt with the gender of both directors and students, the years of teaching experience and degrees held by band directors, and the grade level and amount of participation in adjudicated events for students. The second section of the survey consisted of a series of questions or statements in which participants determined their level of agreement or like/dislike using a 5-point Likert-type scale. The final section of the survey included three open-ended questions, to which directors and students could respond however they wished. The questions were in regard to what directors and students liked and disliked about preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated
Events, and what participants would change about Large Group Adjudicated Events if given the opportunity.

Accompanying each survey were two letters: one for students, and one for parents of student participants. The student letter explained the purpose of the study, what their participation in the study entailed, and contact information if they had any questions or concerns. The parent letter was similar to the student letter in content. Students and parents were also both given consent forms to sign and return with completed surveys. Only those surveys with signed student and parental consent forms were included in the results of this study.

Surveys were given to 11 high school band directors and 712 high school students. The number of students, when grouped by OMEA performance classification and geographic region, was: 66 students from Rural AA, 89 from Rural A, 63 from Rural B, 71 from Rural C, 65 from Suburban AA, 60 from Suburban A, 55 from Suburban B, 60 from Suburban C, 28 from Suburban D, 66 from Urban A, 45 from Urban B, and 44 from Urban C. Surveys were collected by band directors and returned to the researcher for analysis. From the returned surveys, the researcher received 11 (100%) director surveys and 214 (30%) student surveys. When grouped by OMEA performance classification and geographic region, the returned student surveys were as follows: 29 Rural AA, 21 Rural A, 15 Rural B, 28 Rural C, 23 Suburban AA, 18 Suburban A, 18 Suburban B, 8 Suburban C, 4 Suburban D, 22 Urban A, 5 Urban B, and 23 Urban C.
CHAPTER IV.

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) Large Group Adjudicated Events Survey. Responses were collected from 11 high school band directors and 214 high school students in OMEA District I, which represents six counties in Northwest Ohio (Defiance, Fulton, Lucas, Napoleon, Williams, and Wood). The participants also represent each of the OMEA performance classifications (AA, A, B, C, and D) and three geographic regions (rural, suburban, and urban), with the exception of three (there were no Urban AA, Urban D, or Rural D bands).

Table 1, presents the number of students in grades 9-12 who participated in this study by their geographic region. Based on the numbers presented in the table, students in grade 12 participated the most with 64 respondents. Students in grade 9 participated the least with 42 respondents. Participants in grades 10 and 11 were very similar in their amount of responses with 55 and 53 respectively. When looking at the geographic regions, rural students responded the most with 93 participants in grades 9-12, while the urban region had the fewest with 50 participants in grades 9-12. Students in the suburban region fell between the rural and urban regions with 71 participants.

Table 2, displays the number of students in grades 9-12 who participated in this study by their OMEA performance classification. The total number of students in each grade in Table 2 is identical to the total number of students in each grade in Table 1. Most of the participants according to Table 2 came from Class A \( (n = 61) \) and Class C \( (n = 59) \). The fewest student participants came from Class D \( (n = 4) \), but only one of the geographic regions had a Class D band (Rural D).
Table 1

*Grade of Students by Geographic Region*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Grade of Students by OMEA Performance Classification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Band Director and Student Survey Responses

Tables 3 - 15 display student responses to questions and statements in the OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Event Survey. For each question or statement, participants determined their level of agreement or like/dislike using a 5-point Likert-type scale. The numbers included in each table represent the mean response for each OMEA performance classification by geographic region.

When subjects were asked how important it was to participate in Large Group Adjudicated Events (Question 5), responses from band directors indicated that participation was important, with ten out of the eleven selecting 4 on the 5-point scale (1 being “Not Important” and 5 being “Very Important”). Mean responses from students in all 12 ensembles fell between 3.0 and 4.0 on a 5-point scale. As shown in Table 3, the highest mean came from the Rural A band with a mean of 3.91. The lowest mean came from the Suburban B band with a mean of 3.11. Based on the means, it is somewhat important to students in each performance classification and geographic region to participate in Large Group Adjudicated Events.
Table 3

*How important is it for you to participate in Large Group Adjudicated Events?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6 on the survey asked participants about the importance of the rating they receive at Large Group Adjudicated Events. Ten out of eleven band directors responded by circling 3 or 4 on a 5-point scale (1 being “Not Important” and 5 being “Very Important”). One director responded by circling 5. As shown on the next page in Table 4, the mean response for this question ranged from 3.17 (Suburban B) to 4.6 (Urban B), again using a 5-point scale. Seven bands had a mean response under 4.0, five bands had a mean above 4.0. The results indicate that the rating received at Large Group Adjudicated Events is somewhat important to directors and students.
Table 4

*How important for you is the rating you receive at Large Group Adjudicated Events?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When directors were asked how much they enjoy participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events (Question 7), responses ranged from 2 to 5 on a 5-point scale (1 being “Not Enjoy” and 5 being “Enjoy”). Eight out of the eleven directors circled 4 or 5 to indicate they enjoy participating. Two directors selected 2, to indicate they do not enjoy participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events. Table 5 displays the mean student responses for the same question posed to directors. Mean responses for students ranged from 3.33 (Suburban A) to 4.27 (Urban A) on a 5-point scale. Three ensembles had a mean of 4.0 or higher, with the other nine having a mean between 3.33 and 4.0. These results indicate that on the average, directors and students somewhat enjoy participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.
Table 5

*How much do you enjoy participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next item on the survey (Question 8) was a statement about stress and anxiety from participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events. Participants circled the number (1-5), which represented their level of agreement or disagreement (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”). All 11 band directors selected 4 or 5 in response to the statement, indicating their agreement that stress and anxiety are caused by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events. Table 6 displays the mean responses of students, which range from 2.25 (Suburban D) to 3.33 (Rural B). Seven bands had a mean response under 3.0, and five bands had a mean of 3.0 or higher. This would indicate that most students tend to disagree with the statement about stress and anxiety being caused by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events. Therefore, directors and students tend to disagree about the level of stress and anxiety caused by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.
Table 6

*Stress and anxiety are caused by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 represents how well students agree with the statement, “Students are motivated to improve their playing by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events” (Question 9). Mean responses ranged from 3.11 (Suburban B) to 4.4 (Urban B) on a 5-point scale (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”). Nine bands had a mean response between 3.11 and 4.0, and three bands had a mean response above 4.0. The means indicate that students agree they are motivated to improve their playing by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events. Responses from band directors ranged from 3 to 5, with all but one selecting 4 or 5. Band directors and students then both agree with the statement.
Table 7

*Students are motivated to improve their playing by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 displays student responses to the statement, “The standards of band performance are raised by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events” (Question 10). Mean responses ranged from 3.74 (Urban C) to 4.6 (Urban B). On a scale from 1 (Disagree) to 5 (Agree), six bands were between 3.74 and 4.0; the other six bands had a mean between 4.0 and 4.6. The means seem to indicate that all of the students tend to agree that the standards of band performance are raised by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events. Band director responses once again ranged from 3 to 5, with six of the eleven directors selecting 5. Directors and students agree that the standards of performance are raised by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.
Table 8

*The standards of band performance are raised by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student responses to the statement, “Adjudicators’ comments are more important than the rating our band receives,” (Question 11) are shown in Table 9. Means for the level of agreement students have with this statement ranged from 3.0 (Suburban B) to 4.25 (Suburban D), on a 1-5 scale (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”). The means indicate that all students agree that the comments they receive from the adjudicators at Large Group Adjudicated Events are more important than the rating their ensemble receives. Band director responses ranged from 3 to 5, with seven directors selecting 5. Band directors and students all agree then that comments from adjudicators are more important than the rating a band receives.
Table 9

*Adjudicators’ comments are more important than the rating our band receives.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of agreement with the statement, “When our band participates at Large Group Adjudicated Events, making music is more important than the ratings,” (Question 12) is shown in Table 10. Mean responses ranged from 3.22 (Suburban B) to 4.0 (Suburban D), on a 5-point scale (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”). The numbers presented in Table 10 indicate that students from each performance classification and geographic region agree with the statement. Responses from band directors once again ranged from 3 to 5, with eight of the eleven directors selecting 5. All subjects agree that making music is more important than the ratings.
Table 10

*When our band participates at Large Group Adjudicated Events, making music is more important than the ratings.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next statement on the survey for participants to consider their level of agreement was, “Too much emphasis is placed on participation at Large Group Adjudicated Events” (Question 13). Band director responses to this statement ranged from 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”). Eight of the directors agreed with the statement, while one chose 1, and one chose 2 as their response. Mean responses, shown in Table 11, ranged from 2.48 (Urban C) to 3.25 (Suburban C), on a 5-point scale. Seven bands had a mean response between 2.48 and 3.0, while the other five had mean responses between 3.0 and 3.25. The numbers indicate most band directors who participated in the study agree too much emphasis is placed on participation in Large Group Adjudicated Events, while most students who participated in the study disagree.
Table 11

*Too much emphasis is placed on participation at Large Group Adjudicated Events.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were then asked to consider their level of agreement with the statement, “The ratings a concert band receives are the only indication of a successful program” (Question 14). Responses from band directors ranged from 1 to 3 on a 5-point scale (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”). Nine of the directors selected 1 as their response, while one director selected 2, and one selected 3. As shown on the following page in Table 12, mean responses for students ranged from 1.4 (Urban B) to 2.75 (Suburban C), on a 5-point scale. With all of the means for students being below 3.0, students are shown to believe ratings are not the only indication of a successful band program. Band directors and students agree that ratings are not the only indication of a successful band program.
Table 12

_The ratings a concert band receives are the only indication of a successful program._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked to consider if preparing for Large Group Adjudicated Events increases group spirit (Question 15), mean student responses ranged from 3.06 (Suburban B) to 3.82 (Urban A), as shown in Table 13. With responses falling between 3.0 and 4.0 on a 5-point scale (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”), the numbers in Table 13 show that students tend to agree that participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events increases the spirit of their band. Responses from band directors ranged from 2 to 4 on a 5-point scale, with ten directors selecting 3 or 4. Directors and students agree that group spirit is increased while preparing for Large Group Adjudicated Events.
Preparing for Large Group Adjudicated Events increases group spirit.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 displays the mean level of agreement for students with the idea of participating at an event where there is one winning ensemble rather than an event where every ensemble earns a rating (Question 16). Mean responses for students ranged from 1.52 (Rural AA) to 3.75 (Suburban D), on a 5-point scale (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”). Eleven of the bands had a mean response below 3.0, and one had an mean response above 3.0. This means that the majority of students would like to participate at an event where each ensemble earns a rating, rather than an event where there is one ensemble selected to win. It is interesting to note in the overall mean responses, the mean becomes greater as the performance classification descends from Class AA to Class D. All directors responded to this statement by selecting 1, indicating their disagreement with the statement. Band directors and the majority of students therefore would not prefer an adjudicated event in which there is one winning ensemble.
Table 14

*I would rather participate in an adjudicated event in which there is one winner rather than one in which every band receives a rating.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last statement in the survey for participants to consider was, “Band would be more enjoyable without Large Group Adjudicated Events” (Question 17). Using a 5-point scale (1 being “Disagree” and 5 being “Agree”), director responses ranged from 1 to 3, with ten of the eleven directors selecting 2 or 3. Mean student responses, evidenced in Table 15, ranged from 1.4 (Urban B) to 2.46 (Rural C). With means for all 12 bands falling under 3.0, students disagree with the idea that band would be more fun without Large Group Adjudicated Events. Directors and students therefore both tend to agree that band would not be more enjoyable without Large Group Adjudicated Events.
Table 15

*Band would be more enjoyable without Large Group Adjudicated Events.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only disagreements among directors and students, according to responses on the survey, were in regard to two statements: “Stress and anxiety are caused by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events,” and “Too much emphasis is placed on participation at Large Group Adjudicated Events.”

The final section of the survey contained three open ended questions for participants to respond however they wished. The first of the three questions asked subjects what their favorite aspect(s) of preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events were. Common responses from band directors to this question were: exposure to quality literature, hearing other bands perform, and receiving comments from adjudicators. Examples of student responses to this question included: hearing the band from the moment they receive their music to the final performance, learning new techniques, listening to other bands, increased group spirit, and the chance to travel to other schools and meet students from other bands.
The second open-ended question asked of band directors and students was what their least favorite aspect(s) of preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events were. Responses from directors included things such as: conflicts with other things in school and personal calendars, limitations of the required music list, a lack of equality among adjudicators, and the stress caused by participation. Student responses to this question included things such as: the stress and pressure caused by participation and directors, receiving a poor rating, extra practice time, lack of commitment from individuals in the ensemble, the lack of variety among pieces selected to be performed and playing the same three pieces for months at a time, sight-reading, and too much focus being put on the rating the band receives.

The final question of the survey was what respondents would change about Large Group Adjudicated Events. Responses from directors included: blind adjudication, a clinic set-up where adjudicators would listen to bands and then give them a clinic on things to improve, changing the rating system, more consistency among adjudicators, broadening the required list to meet the educational needs of students, and altering or removing sight-reading from the process. Students included changes such as: having adjudicators comment at the performance rather than on tape, changing the rating system or get rid of a scoring system all-together and going to comments only for everyone, getting rid of sight-reading, giving students a say in the literature selection, and changing the location of the event every few years so students get to experience different performance halls. Some students even mentioned getting rid of the rating system, and moving to a ranking system with one overall winning ensemble.
CHAPTER V.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine attitudes of high school band directors and students regarding Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) Large Group Adjudicated Events. Specifically, this study compared the responses of band directors to those of students who participate in each of the OMEA performance classifications (AA, A, B, C, and D), and from various geographic regions (rural, suburban, and urban).

Data for the study were collected from high school band directors and students using the OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Event Survey. The survey consisted of three sections: background information, personal opinion, and free response. Surveys were distributed to 11 directors and 712 high school students in OMEA District I, which represents six counties in Northwest Ohio (Defiance, Fulton, Lucas, Napoleon, Williams, and Wood). Completed surveys were returned by 11 (100%) band directors and 214 students (30%). Subjects for this study represented each of the OMEA performance classifications and geographic regions, with the exception of three (there were no Urban AA, Urban D, or Rural D bands).

Discussion of Survey Responses

The personal opinion section of the survey consisted of 13 questions and statements for directors and students to respond to by circling the number that best represented their attitude on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Responses from high school band students were averaged according to their OMEA performance classification and geographic region, and then compared to the responses of high school band directors.

In comparing the responses of high school band directors and students to questions and statements in the personal opinion section of the survey, subject responses differed in only two of
the 13 items. When asked to consider their level of agreement with the statement, “Stress and anxiety are caused by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events,” (Question 8) directors agreed with the statement, while students did not (see Table 6). Similarly, when subjects considered the statement, “Too much emphasis is placed on participation at Large Group Adjudicated Events,” (Question 13) the majority of directors agreed with the statement, while the majority of students did not (see Table 11).

The disagreement from students with each of the previous statements may be because students do not view adjudicated events in the same way as band directors. Students may not realize that when a band performs at Large Group Adjudicated Events, the band is evaluated not only by a panel of adjudicators, but directors are judged and criticized by their colleagues and other professionals in the audience as well. The literature selected to be performed, the appearance of the ensemble on stage, the overall performance, and the ratings an ensemble earns lead members of the profession to form opinions about a band director’s professional capabilities. Those opinions may positively or negatively affect a band director’s reputation. Knowing this information, it is understandable why directors and students would not agree with the two previously mentioned statements.

The final section of the survey contained three open-ended questions where subjects had the opportunity to discuss what they liked or disliked, and what they would like to change about Large Group Adjudicated Events. In discussing what subjects liked (Question 18), directors and students both responded liking the opportunity to hear other bands. Directors also included in their responses the opportunity to be exposed to quality literature and receiving comments from adjudicators. Not surprisingly, students included more social responses in what they liked with increased group spirit and the opportunity to travel and meet students from other bands.
In comparing band director and student responses to what subjects did not like about Large Group Adjudicated Events (Question 19), directors and students agreed most on the stress and pressure caused by participation. This contradicts what was shown earlier in responses from the personal opinion section of the survey when subjects were asked to consider their level of agreement with the statement, “Stress and anxiety are caused by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.”

Although directors and students disagreed in the personal opinion section of the survey (Question 8), the response from students in the open ended section indicates that students acknowledge a level of stress and anxiety does exist from participation, but it may just affect them differently than directors. As discussed earlier, directors may have stress and anxiety because of the professional implications from participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events. The stress students experience may come from performing for a panel of adjudicators, performing in a strange space that they don’t have the opportunity to rehearse in, and in front of groups of their peers from other area schools. As compared to directors, the stress students experience may affect them in a different way, and at a different level, which could have influenced their responses to the survey.

Other items directors disliked included: conflicts with other things in school and personal calendars, limitations of the required music list, and a lack of equality among adjudicators. Additional items students disliked included: receiving a poor rating, extra practice time, lack of commitment from individuals in the ensemble, the lack of variety among pieces selected to be performed, playing the same three pieces for months at a time, sight-reading, and too much focus being put on the rating the band receives.
When asked what they would change about Large Group Adjudicated Events (Question 20), band directors and students agreed on: having adjudicators clinic or speak with ensembles after they perform, altering the rating system, and altering or removing sight-reading from the process. Other responses from directors included: having a blind adjudication, more consistency among adjudicators, and broadening the required list to meet the educational needs of students. Additional changes students would make included: giving students a say in the literature selection, and changing the location of the event every few years so students get to experience different performance halls.

Implications for Music Education

Results from this study indicate that directors and students agree that Large Group Adjudicated Events are an important aspect of high school band programs. Both subject groups also agree that while the ratings ensembles receive are important, making music and receiving comments from adjudicators are of more importance. The results from this study will hopefully serve as an additional source for band directors in making their decision to participate in Large Group Adjudicated Events, and additionally clarify any previous misconceptions about student attitudes.

Suggestions for Further Research

Based upon the procedure and results of this study, the following recommendations for further study are offered:

1. This study was completed with high school band directors and students from OMEA District I. Expanding the study to include high school band directors and students from all 17 OMEA districts may produce more varied results.
2. The OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Events Survey was distributed to 11 high school band directors and 712 students. Student subjects were required to have parental permission to participate in the study through a parental consent form, which parents were to sign. Surveys were returned by 11 (100%) high school band directors and 214 (30%) of students. A higher return rate may be attainable if students were able to complete the survey while the researcher was at their respective schools. This would require that students be at least 18 years of age, or have parents grant permission in advance so surveys could be collected after completion.

3. The OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Events Survey was distributed to high school band directors and students in the months of December and January. For some schools the process of preparing for Large Group Adjudicated Events had not begun, while others were in the early stages. It may be more valuable to complete a two-part survey before and after subjects participated in Large Group Adjudicated Events. A pre- and post-measurement could be used to compare if director and student responses changed due to the results of performance.

4. Subjects for this study were high school band directors and high school students in grades 9-12. It may be valuable to complete a similar study with college freshman who participated in Large Group Adjudicated Events in their high school band programs. In doing so, subjects may all have four years of experience participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events. Subjects would also be of age to participate without parental permission, and be able to complete the survey for the study in one setting.
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APPENDIX A.

LETTER TO STUDENTS
January 2009,

Dear High School Band Students:

My name is Ryan Yahl and I am a graduate student in music education at Bowling Green State University. I am writing this letter for you to consider your participation in a study for my masters thesis. The purpose of my study is to determine attitudes of high school band directors and students regarding the Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) large group adjudicated events.

I am asking the cooperation of high school band directors and students in completing a survey for this study. The survey consists of three sections. The first section asks for background information regarding levels of experience as teachers and students participating in OMEA adjudicated events. The second section consists of questions and statements for directors and students to consider and respond by circling the number which best represents their opinions. The third section of the survey contains open ended questions in which directors and students are free to respond however they wish. The entire survey should take no more than 25-30 minutes to complete.

All students must have parental consent in order to participate in this study. You will find a letter to parents on the third page of this packet, and a parental consent form on the fourth. Students who are granted permission, and decide to participate must also sign the student assent form on the second page of this packet. Signed parental consent forms, student assent forms, and completed surveys should be returned to your band director. No names or personal information will be collected for the purpose of this study. All surveys will remain confidential and no identities will be revealed. Surveys must be returned with both the parental consent form and the student assent form. When surveys are returned with both forms, the forms and surveys will be separated and kept in a locked file cabinet.

This study could benefit preservice, novice, and experienced band directors, specifically in the state of Ohio, by providing them with insight regarding large group adjudicated events and how their students feel about it. The results from this study may provide something for directors to consider before they decide to participate in large group adjudicated events. The anticipated risks to participants are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

Note: your grade in band will not be affected; participation is entirely voluntary, and participants are free to withdraw at any time. If you have any questions concerning this study, feel free to contact the following people:

Ryan M. Yahl                       Dr. Kenneth W. Thompson  
Graduate Assistant, Music Education Assistant Professor, Instrumental Music Education  
3154 Moore Musical Arts Center 1005 Moore Musical Arts Center  
College of Musical Arts College of Musical Arts  
Bowling Green State University Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403 Bowling Green, Ohio 43403  
(419) 372-5087 (419) 372-8104  
ryahl@bgsu.edu thomken@bgsu.edu  

If you have questions regarding the conduct of this study or about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).  

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ryan M. Yahl  
Graduate Student in Music Education  
Bowling Green State University
Student Assent Form

I am willing to participate in the research study on the attitudes of high school band directors and students regarding the OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Event.

I have been informed that my participation in this study is voluntary, that I will be free to withdraw at any time, and that leaving the study will not result in any penalty.

Student signature ____________________________________  
Date __________________________

If you have questions concerning this study, feel free to contact the following people:

Ryan M. Yahl
Graduate Assistant, Music Education
3154 Moore Musical Arts Center
College of Musical Arts
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
(419) 372-5087
ryahl@bgsu.edu

Dr. Kenneth W. Thompson
Assistant Professor, Instrumental Music Education
1005 Moore Musical Arts Center
College of Musical Arts
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
(419) 372-8104
thomken@bgsu.edu

If you have questions regarding the conduct of this study or about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).
APPENDIX B.

LETTER TO PARENTS
January 2009,

Dear Parents of High School Band Students:

My name is Ryan Yahl and I am a graduate student in music education at Bowling Green State University. I am writing this letter for you to consider your son or daughter’s participation in a study for my masters thesis. The purpose of my study is to determine attitudes of high school band directors and students regarding the Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) large group adjudicated events.

I am asking the cooperation of high school band directors and students in completing a survey for this study. The survey consists of three sections. The first section asks for background information regarding levels of experience as teachers and students participating in OMEA adjudicated events. The second section consists of questions and statements for directors and students to consider and respond by circling the number which best represents their opinions. The third section of the survey contains open ended questions in which directors and students are free to respond however they wish. The entire survey should take no more than 25-30 minutes to complete.

If you agree that your son or daughter may participate, please sign the parental consent form found on the next page of this letter. Students who are granted permission, and decide to participate must also sign the student assent form on the second page of this packet. Signed parental consent forms, student assent forms, and completed surveys should be returned to your child’s band director. No names or personal information will be collected for the purpose of this study. All surveys will remain confidential, and no identities will be revealed. Surveys must be returned with both the parent consent form and the student assent form. When surveys are returned with both forms, the forms and surveys will be separated and kept in a locked file cabinet.

This study could benefit preservice, novice, and experienced band directors, specifically in the state of Ohio, by providing them with insight regarding large group adjudicated events and how their students feel about it. The results from this study may provide something for directors to consider before they decide to participate in large group adjudicated events. The anticipated risks to participants are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

Note: your son or daughter’s grade in band will not be affected; participation is entirely voluntary, and participants are free to withdraw at any time. If you have any questions concerning this study, feel free to contact the following people:

Ryan M. Yahl  
Graduate Assistant, Music Education  
3154 Moore Musical Arts Center  
College of Musical Arts  
Bowling Green State University  
(419) 372-5087  
ryahl@bgsu.edu

Dr. Kenneth W. Thompson  
Assistant Professor, Instrumental Music Education  
1005 Moore Musical Arts Center  
College of Musical Arts  
Bowling Green State University  
(419) 372-8104  
thomken@bgsu.edu

If you have questions regarding the conduct of this study or about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ryan M. Yahl  
Graduate Student in Music Education  
Bowling Green State University
Parental Consent Form

I approve of my son/daughter’s participation in the research study on the attitudes of high school band directors and students regarding the OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Event.

I have been informed that my son/daughter’s participation in this study is voluntary, that they will be free to withdraw at any time, and that leaving the study will not result in any penalty.

Parent signature _____________________________________

Date __________________________

If you have questions concerning this study, feel free to contact the following people:

Ryan M. Yahl  
Graduate Assistant, Music Education  
3154 Moore Musical Arts Center  
College of Musical Arts  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403  
(419) 372-5087  
ryahl@bgsu.edu

Dr. Kenneth W. Thompson  
Assistant Professor, Instrumental Music Education  
1005 Moore Musical Arts Center  
College of Musical Arts  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403  
(419) 372-8104  
thomken@bgsu.edu

If you have questions regarding the conduct of this study or about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).
APPENDIX C.

BAND DIRECTOR AND STUDENT SURVEY
OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Event Survey

The purpose of this survey is to find how high school band directors and students feel about the Ohio Music Education Association Large Group Adjudicated Event. Your responses will remain completely anonymous. Please respond according to how you usually feel, not just today or on rare occasions.

Please wait to begin until the directions have been explained.

Choose only one response for each item, and be sure to respond to every item on the survey. Take your time and consider each item, but do not spend too much time on any single one. There are no right or wrong answers.

When you are finished, please check to see that you have answered each item, and turn in your survey.

I. Background Information

1. Gender (Please circle) M F

2. Please select what applies to you.
   Director _____

   Years of teaching experience _____

   At the same school? Y N
   If no, what other schools have you taught at, and for how long? (Please include the state if not in Ohio)
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

   Do you teach band at the high school level only? Y N
   If no, what other grades or courses do you teach?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

   What degrees do you hold? (Please include the specialization)
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

   Student _____ (Please circle your grade) 9 10 11 12
3. Which classification do you participate in at the OMEA Large Group Adjudicated Event? (Directors please circle all that apply. Students please circle one.)

   AA     A     B     C     D     Festival

(Directors, please skip to section II.)

4. How many times have your participated in each of the following events? (Place a number on the line provided)

   Marching Band Adjudicated Events  _____
   State Marching Band Adjudicated Events  _____
   District Concert Band Adjudicated Events  _____
   State Concert Band Adjudicated Events  _____
   Solo & Ensemble Adjudicated Events  _____

II. Personal Opinion

For the following questions and statements, please circle the number that best represents how you feel.

   Not Important    Very Important

5. How important is it for you to participate in Large Group Adjudicated Events?  1  2  3  4  5

6. How important for you is the rating you receive at Large Group Adjudicated Events?  1  2  3  4  5

   Not Enjoy    Enjoy

7. How much do you enjoy participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events?  1  2  3  4  5

   Disagree    Agree

8. Stress and anxiety are caused by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.  1  2  3  4  5
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Students are motivated to improve their playing by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The standards of band performance are raised by participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Adjudicators’ comments are more important than the rating our band receives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>When our band participates at Large Group Adjudicated Events, making music is more important than the ratings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Too much emphasis is placed on participation at Large Group Adjudicated Events (by directors, parents, administrators, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The ratings a concert band receives are the only indication of a successful program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Preparing for Large Group Adjudicated Events increases group spirit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I would rather participate in an adjudicated event in which there is one winner rather than one in which every band receives a rating.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Band would be more enjoyable without Large Group Adjudicated Events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. **Free Response**

Please provide a written response to the following questions. You may write on the back of this page if additional space is needed. (Please write legibly.)

18. What is (are) your favorite aspect(s) of preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events?

19. What is (are) your least favorite aspect(s) of preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events?

20. If you could change at least one thing about the Large Group Adjudicated Events process, what might it be?

Thank you for your time in completing this survey.
APPENDIX D.

SAMPLE BAND DIRECTOR OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES
18. **What is (are) your favorite aspect(s) of preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events?**

Getting closer, growing closer to fine literature, and sharing that experience with young musicians. Performing for adjudicator panels is always a “pay your money…take your chances” thing for me. My real joy comes from the process more than “one performance.”

The selection of literature may be the most critical aspect of playing the contest game. One must choose music that “fits” one’s group. And the program of literature must show some sensitivity to offering a range of musical expression that is substantive and meaningful to ALL.

Improving sight-reading skills and hearing weekly progress.

I enjoy the sight-reading preparation and performance because the students get immediate feedback about their performance. Sight-reading is a true test of the band’s musicianship, not solely what the director can craft over months of preparation on prepared pieces. Sight-reading answers the questions, “Can the band apply the fundamental concepts of large ensemble performance to any piece? What do they really know?”

The opportunity to prepare quality literature with feedback from experienced colleagues.

It seems to give the ensemble a “tangible” goal (rating).

I enjoy hearing my colleagues’ groups.

The challenge of preparing and performing high quality music, to the best of your ability.

When preparing for contest, the attention towards the music is more comprehensive, or preparing for contest requires a more thorough preparation of each piece.

It’s rewarding when their hard work is paid off with a successful performance and good judges comments. The rating doesn’t hurt though.

Choosing literature that fits each group, and demonstrates a wide variety of styles.

Having the students set goals and achieve them.

Individual responsibility to the group.

Receiving comments from qualified adjudicators.

Through Large Group Adjudicated Events, we obtain valuable feedback about our progress as individuals and as a program. Although we never “live or die” by any one
judge or panel’s opinions of our performance, it is important that we learn the value of
giving maximum effort and standing by the results as our best possible effort that day.

Seeing new literature.

Good results if you get them.

Performing quality literature.

Getting to see other school and groups.

19. **What is (are) your least favorite aspect(s) of preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events?**

Coordinating schedules so that everyone is able to perform, and doing so sufficiently in
advance so that instrumentation is secure.

Limitations of the “required” list. While it is far improved from 1974, it still is too limiting, in my opinion. I would almost prefer that groups be required to select music from a standard repertoire listing such as the NBA list. Or the Texas Interscholastic League list.

Knowing that kids could practice and save the band lots of time!

Poor parental showing at the OMEA event.

Conflicts with other school events.

I don’t like trying to guess what the judges want to hear. I want to implement my musical interpretation as conductor without this element being criticized (unless it is grossly inappropriate).

Traveling with a large group always adds to the stress factor. Having to rely on teenagers to have all uniform parts, music, percussion materials, etc., is a constant worry. Even at a 98% success rate, a few key mistakes can be devastating to the way the group looks or performs.

I do not enjoy the experience when judges contradict each other. This takes away validity from the event, and makes the director’s job harder.

Stress and personal pressure, even though I know that’s not what its purpose is, it’s difficult to look past.

Feeling as if it’s a game, with a bag of tricks or a name needed to be successful.
The inequity of adjudication. Standards are different from judge to judge, from year to year, and from school to school.

I don’t like the “games” we have to play. For example, which march we pick. Unless you’re a top notch band; bringing a Sousa march is a bad idea. Another example: excluding individuals so we can meet the dynamic we’re needing so the judges are pleased.

The sight-reading, while an important aspect, is not one of my favorite parts.

Sometimes not rehearsing enough music during the time of preparation (3 pieces vs. 5-6 in a regular concert).

The literature list that is required for each class can be limiting.

Students feel like they have not succeeded if they do not receive the top rating (even if they were happy with their performance and played their best).

Stress and anxiety caused by preparing and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events.

Over-zealous judges.

Threat of low score or negative comments.

Not having the best performance on stage.

Lack of parity between judges.

20. **If you could change at least one thing about the Large Group Adjudicated Events process, what might it be?**

Bands are judged behind a screen so the judges don’t know who is playing.

Your final rating is either “I” or nothing. No more II, III, IV, or V.

The judges could talk to the band after the performance.

I would change the rating system to be a rubric where bands get credit for specific aspects of their performance instead of the judge trying to approximately fit the band’s performance into one of the rating descriptions.

More consistency among adjudicators. At times ratings do not reflect comments, and vise versa.

Adjudicators better prepared on consistent expectations.
Possibly a “blind” adjudication.

I would like to see the sight-reading process changed. I would like the students to have more opportunity to succeed at this portion. Maybe more time with the conductor coaching them.

I prefer the time schedule in Indiana over Ohio, with district and state contests only being 3 weeks apart. Having district and state at least 8 weeks apart can dominate the entire Spring semester.

Not have solo and ensemble, and district contest so close together. Makes it difficult to prepare for both effectively.

To make sure that the literature selected challenges our students musically and intellectually.

Broaden the list to meet the educational needs of all our students.

Eliminate the expectation that certain groups go every year.

Eliminate the district-state two-step process, and make it one event.

Reconfigure ratings to seem less competitive.

No sight-reading.

Larger, more encompassing lists or no list at all.
APPENDIX E.

SAMPLE STUDENT OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES
18. What is (are) your favorite aspect(s) of preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events?

My favorite aspects are the time preparing specific pieces and getting musically deep into the music so that those little chills run down your spine when you know you played it just right.

My favorite aspect of preparing is the increased attention to detail. The band pays more attention to all the markings in the music.

Being able to make music.

Seeing how far we’ve come from the start to the end.

The comments we receive from the adjudicators. It’s always good to hear opinions from others about your musical growth.

My favorite part is the final product. There is a sense of triumph when the band plays in front of the audience.

I enjoy the selections that we prepare for adjudicated events, as well as the process of breaking down each piece in order to perfect the whole.

Being able to travel to different schools for contest and meeting new people.

I enjoy the growth we make as an ensemble. I like to hear the comments from the judges on what they liked and what they thought we could improve upon.

The repertoire required to prepare introduces us to a broader aspect of band literature.

I enjoy studying new music, especially music that our band director has not done repeatedly so that the music is new for everyone and we are able to create a new or original sound.

Improving practice/performance techniques.

Being able to hear the growth of the band as a whole and as an individual as well.

Reading, interpreting, and perfecting the pieces of music that we play for the events.

My favorite aspect is putting the final touches on a piece to make it an amazing performance.

Socializing and the sense of team/school spirit and unity between students.

The challenge of preparing the music and the final performance.
I like the feeling of a job well done at the end, and the togetherness we feel while preparing. It really raises the bar for your playing, and stresses the importance of practice.

Learning to play better by pushing ourselves to play more difficult music.

Looking back on all the hard work we do and see how much we have improved as a band, and the satisfaction of feeling our best when we play on stage.

The drive to conquer a piece of music that once seemed impossible.

Going to the school building of the hosting school, and meeting friends in the band of other schools.

Getting to know my part and getting to learn how to play “music” not just blow through it.

The playing ability and camaraderie level of the band increasing.

Competing with other schools to see where we compare. It’s also nice to see our hard work pay off and get recognition.

You get to hang out with your fellow band members and play music, which all of us love doing. Also participating in these events make us strive to make ourselves better.

To strengthen my skills and push to a harder level.

The feeling that I get when the band comes together as one sound and we bring the music off the page.

The feeling when you know you gave a good performance.

Playing harder music that challenges the band and myself.

How the vent encourages you to practice and play better.

I like comparing our first day of practice with our final performance and seeing how far we have come. I also think its great to come together and do something with the whole band.

I feel it helps out the band to work together.

Making music.

Hearing and seeing different bands.
I think that it is fun to see how much better our songs sound when we perform than when we start practicing.

My favorite aspect is the final performance because that is when all the time and work we have put into the piece pays off.

My favorite aspect is being able to see/hear our band improving and coming together.

The excitement of playing the music.

I like the adrenaline rush before you go to contest.

My favorite aspect is the long bus ride to the event, and playing in front of crowds.

The environment; everyone is excited and ready to play their best.

The satisfaction; there’s nothing like celebrating a superior rating.

I love how the music is challenging, and when we perform well, we have an amazing feeling of accomplishing something great and working together to make a piece of music come off the page and come alive.

Hearing the music and musicianship from day 1 to the contest.

The feeling of accomplishment after the performance.

Performing and hearing the judges comments.

I enjoy seeing/listening to the other bands.

I like the people the most. Great memories and jokes are made during rehearsal.

My favorite aspect of preparing for Large Group is the fact that the event provides a good drive to work harder and take things more seriously.

I enjoy sectionals. This gives more one on one time.

Playing a new piece that we have never seen before.

Listening to what the judges have to say about our playing.

The challenge of playing difficult music and being judged on it.
I believe preparing and participating in large group is good because they give the band something to look forward to; something to work for. Also while working on our contest pieces it gives us techniques to work on and makes us better players.

Playing challenging and competitive music, and getting a good rating as well as experience different musical styles.

Learning different genres.

Group connection.

Large group adjudicated events are interesting in providing a drive. Performing for a rating provides a thrill that cannot be achieved after a job well done unless the audience is someone other that parents or relatives.

It gives the band more of a set goal than preparing only for a concert, and challenges us with the required difficulty of the pieces.

Actually participating in the event. The atmosphere is just kind of fun.

You get to learn how to work together and create a magical experience for either the audience or the judges.

Having fun traveling with the band. I like having a break from normal concert band and going somewhere to have judges tell us how we are playing rather than the usual band directors and our parents.

I like knowing that everyone must play their part well, unlike a regular concert where you don’t necessarily always have to play and it won’t make a difference in the concert, but in large group you’re being judged by professional judges as opposed to just parents watching.

It pushes everyone to do their best.

I enjoy the challenge of a new piece of music in which it requires practice for a few weeks to get to the point where you are comfortable playing it.

Challenging ourselves to play more musically, getting an unbiased opinion of how we sound as an ensemble.

I like being part of a group that comes together to achieve a common goal.

I like hearing the transformation from noise to music.

Being able to talk and to listen to other school’s bands.
I enjoy having a goal to work for, and being able to “show-off” our talents for other schools. I also enjoy being able to try new and challenging music.

We get to have guests come in and help us prepare, and find out how good other bands are in the area.

The variety and challenges the music brings.

Learning new techniques and sight-reading new materials to help improve many different skills you need for the performance music.

Learning to play difficult and fun new music, along with getting high ratings.

Working hard and seeing everything come together.

Becoming a better musician.

Raising band spirit and more of the band becoming one.

Preparing together and seeing the rating after the performance. I enjoy the good feeling you get after you perform well.

Getting to play more challenging music and in front of the judges.

Knowing that we could get a good rating.

Improving my playing and being graded on it.

To show people that when we work together then we can accomplish something beautiful.

19. What is (are) your least favorite aspect(s) of preparing for and participating in Large Group Adjudicated Events?

My least favorite aspects are the stress it causes students and directors, section leaders yelling at sections, and directors yelling at the band. It makes the environment extremely unwelcoming.

My least favorite aspect is going over a part over and over, and not quite getting it. It is frustrating when the band works hard to get it but it never works.

When we receive a poor rating it feels like we’ve let out director and ourselves down, even if we tried our hardest.

The repetitiveness of everyday rehearsal. After awhile, it just becomes the same thing everyday and I lose interest.
The pressure to be perfect.

When an ensemble attempts a program that is not within their means.

I do not enjoy all the pressure that is sometimes put on the band by the conductors. Especially when working in a higher class of music, the pressure can get to be overwhelming and stressful.

Probably the extra practice time for contest. Despite the fact it is necessary, I’m not a fan of scheduling other things because of conflicts with band.

The unnecessary pressure it puts on me.

Taking extra time to practice and rehearse for it.

When some parts of a song aren’t corrected before the performance because of the players and lack of time.

When the other players in the band don’t put the effort in or take it seriously.

The stress nearing the end of the preparations is the worst. Getting all the kinks out and coming to band knowing you have an important performance coming increases stress tremendously.

Too many people don’t practice enough so we spend too much time rehearsing at school.

The stress and the last minute corrections.

I think too much focus is put on a rating.

Playing the same songs over and over again.

Everyone gets stressed out by trying to get a good rating.

Playing the same few pieces over and over again for months on end. It just gets repetitive.

Every part of the music has to be perfect or the judges will take off even if its something like we were playing too loud.

People who don’t try.

Getting the less serious band members to straighten up, so they don’t ruin the competition for everybody.
I wish there was a greater variety of music, because many of the selections, though difficult, are not interesting or engaging.

I don’t like the tediousness. It is especially annoying to sit and do nothing a whole band period because another section needs work.

Your success is dependent upon others. One can play his/her part to perfection, but if the majority of individuals cannot, the individual that excels is frequently disappointed.

I don’t like how some teachers are very uptight at the events.

Elongated sectionals after school and during lunch periods.

Stress and the emphasis on everything being right.

I think that too much emphasis is placed on the required piece.

Getting nervous.

If we get a poor rating.

My least favorite part would be sight-reading. I know judges need it to have a full idea of how our band ranks but by the time we read the sight-reading music, most students do not care and they do not try. Most think the performance and judgement only matters when we play the known pieces and so they do not put effort into sight-reading.

It’s stressful to think about and do the best we can when we know we’re being judged on everything.

Trying to get everyone in band to listen and remember everything with and about their music. I do not like not having much time at contest to meet other bands or watch other bands perform.

I don’t like it when our instructors take out their stress for the big event on us when we are just trying to do our best.

When some members of the band do not respect how important the event is to other members of the band.

Being judged.

When preparing for contest, it cause too much stress during the band period and it makes band no fun to be in.

The emphasis put on getting the highest score possible, band gets less and less enjoyable as an adjudicated event gets closer.
I dislike the stress and repeating parts to get them just right, even though I know we need to.

Getting yelled at when people talk/don’t practice. Being nervous about playing for the judges.

That some band members refuse to actually try, and that leads to our band receiving a lower rating than if all of us put forth our best effort.

We pour hours, days, and months into large group and we do not get the score we were aiming for. The directors pressure us just a little too much.

A lot of stress and anxiety is created to each person. Also a lot of the fun is taken out of band because the directors are so serious. Sometime with all the pressure I wish that I could just drop band.

Getting low ratings or not learning all the music in time/not being prepared.

The time directors take on just one piece of music.

The stress of doing well and the pressure of others. Playing music should be fun, but others tend to make it a competition to do the best and be the best. To some the stress and pressure is too much.

20. **If you could change at least one thing about the Large Group Adjudicated Events process, what might it be?**

The adjudicators could have more time to help correct errors a band makes while they are playing, rather later when reading the comments or listening to tapes.

Maybe only have comments only because your group may try really hard, but it isn’t “good enough” to earn a superior rating. It feels like all your hard work was for nothing.

I would change the judging process. I believe that comments are more important than the grade.

Practice more during school and less after school and on weekends.

Sight-reading. Some years C pieces end up being harder than A pieces.

I would change the amount of emphasis that people put on the rating that bands receive. I think that even if you don’t get what you think is a great rating, you should be happy knowing that you can use the experience to grow.

Getting rid of sight-reading.
The scoring system and classes of bands.

I would like to hear feedback from peers from other schools.

I would change the negative feelings some individuals have toward the band when we score low.

To let the players decide or vote which piece to play.

I would like to see other groups to see how we compare.

I would try and find a way to reduce stress as much as possible.

I would give the students some sort of award for their participation and success in the events at contest.

I wish there was more feedback on each section of the band so we can improve together.

I would change the attitude towards the event. I always see it as a serious event that includes a lot of hard work when I think it should be more about having fun while playing music.

A live recording of the event free of comments for each band member.

I would include a national event to compete in.

To have only one winner and longer than a one day competition.

I would like it if all of the bands got to perform in an auditorium rather than a gym.

Don’t play in a gymnasium.

Have the bands ranked. Maybe add a 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} kind of thing.

Every few years change the location so band students can experience different areas.

Get rid of sight-reading.

Students have more choice in the songs they play.

I would change the prizes so there are podium finishes and trophies awarded.

Too many people get worked up over a number. I feel the comments are what’s worth getting. Also, removing the score would reduce the pressure of having to get a I. Then band can be more about playing for fun, and for an audience, not getting a number.
The amount of time needed to succeed.

Greater variety of music.

I would add a little more time for sight-reading.

I would like to see a top winner, or a number one rated band.

More judges.

The judges should be more equal. There’s no reason for one adjudicator to give a III while others give I’s.

I would change the composition selection process so that directors would decide, since one would hope they are competent to make the decisions without a list.

I would change the rating system to go to ten to give the band a more developed view of where they stand.

I would like if it would be a more “friendly” event. Sometimes everyone takes it too seriously in my opinion.

I would give options to the students about the piece to perform, and let them choose so they could enjoy learning it.

Maybe practicing more with sectionals in the band to make sure everyone is able to play their part.

People using the ratings as a judgement of the band.

More praise upon the band and less pressure before they perform. They are likely to do better; too much pressure can break them down.

How fast you have to do stuff and not having time to watch other band and compare yourself to them.

Make it more about fun instead of ratings.

Play for fun, not for scores.

It would be to make it more about the music being played. Music is all about emotion, so if players are stressed out about playing a piece flawlessly, then stress comes through in place of the emotion the music needs. Because too much emphasis is put on scores, students become stressed out like they would around the time of a huge exam.
To not be as serious all the time. We work hard everyday and some days it would be nice to relax a tad and just enjoy the music we are creating.

How hard the judges are.

I would change it so that all bands saw it as something fun to do, and work at to better your skills, not just to receive a good rating.

I would change it so the bands did not know each other’s score. If playing music is supposed to be a wonderful thing, why ruin it with the pressure of having to be the best?