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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In an age of high-stakes education, standardized testing linked to federal funding, and teacher performance assessments, it is important to examine the current means by which both students and educators are assessed. For the music performance classroom (i.e., performing ensembles), identifying fair, valid and reliable measures to assess student progress and teacher effectiveness is essential. Historically, one such measure used as an indicator of an ensemble’s performance quality has been Large Group Adjudicated Event (LGAE). Although LGAE provides an assessment of a group’s performance, as a whole, many often view this assessment as an indicator of the quality of instruction these groups are receiving. Indeed, some states (e.g., Kentucky, Texas) have utilized results from LGAE, in part, to classify the overall merit of a high school or middle school performance program (KMEA, 2012).

Although such uses of the results from LGAE appear to be extreme, new initiatives to define teacher effectiveness by student success (e.g., Value-Added Assessment Models, Ohio Teacher Evaluation System, etc.) could ultimately give more credence to LGAE results. Consequently, it becomes necessary to examine LGAE and clearly articulate the potential benefits that participation in such events brings both for
teachers and for students. Additionally, if administrators of public schools should decide to incorporate adjudicated event scores into teacher assessments or as a condition for merit-based pay, the educational system must, in the interest of students and teachers alike, identify and resolve any potential risks to the proposed policy.

A Construct for Understanding Competition and Contest

In order to fully understand large-group adjudicated events, it is necessary to clearly define the notions of “contest” and “competition” in music. Concrete definitions for each term as used in this document can be found at the end of this chapter; however, the primary distinction between contest and competition is, thus: competition requires, as Kohn (1986) suggests, mutually exclusive goal attainment. That is, one succeeds only as the result of another failing, i.e., participants are ranked in a way that normally precludes two participants from achieving the same outcome (e.g., first place). Conversely, contest in music utilizes a graded scale (rubric) in which the goal is not to win, but achieve the highest level possible. In such a system, all participants have the potential to achieve the “highest” rating. No rank ordering is employed and all participants have the possibility of achieving the highest outcome.

Musical competition and contest in Ohio, governed by the Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA), will be discussed later in this chapter; however, the following example may serve to illustrate the differences between contest and competition: OMEA marching band adjudicated events are competitions where groups are rated and then rank ordered on their performances from “best” to “worst”; OMEA solo and ensemble and
large-group adjudicated events (LGAE) are contests, where each individual or group has the potential to earn the highest score, despite how other individuals and/or groups perform.

**Competitive and Contest Formats in Ohio**

The Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) offers its members a number of formats for competition and contest. All information presented in this document regarding the contest and competitive formats for musical ensembles in Ohio was obtained from either the OMEA website (www.omea-ohio.org) or the official OMEA Rulebook for Adjudicated Events (2008).

Philosophically, OMEA presents the following rationale for the hosting of adjudicated events:

For music to be indispensable to learning and life, it must be more than a shallow, passing experience for the student. Increased proficiency increases enjoyment, and competence begets respect for competence. Quality is not a limiting factor for the individual, but puts within his or her grasp an otherwise inaccessible treasure store of the world’s cultural riches. Archibald T. Davidson has written: “Zeal for fine music...grows out of an experience of the satisfactions that spring only from association with the highest manifestations of musical art.” (OMEA, n.d.)

The principle vehicle for competition in Ohio is marching band adjudicated events. These events are held frequently throughout the early school months (generally August through October) and are open to student ensembles under the direction of OMEA members. As reflected in the aforementioned discussion of “competition” and “contest,” these competitive events produce a rank ordered list where a winner is determined. Scores are calculated on multiple 100-point scales, and various aspects of the
performance are judged by a panel of judges. Judges' scores correspond to an overall rating system that resembles the rating formula for contest adjudicated events. The required numeric score for each rating is defined, according to OMEA, as: I = 80 – 100; II = 70 – 79.9; III = 60 – 69.9; IV = 50 – 59.9; V = 40 – 49.9. The panel of judges and calculations for marching band competitions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.1

Marching Band Competition Judging and Scoring Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Music 1</th>
<th>Music 2</th>
<th>Percussion</th>
<th>Marching Execution</th>
<th>Marching General Effect</th>
<th>General Effect 1</th>
<th>General Effect 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points Possible</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>(90 + 90)/2 + 10 = 100</td>
<td>50 + 50 = 100</td>
<td>(100 + 100)/2 = 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. “Method” refers to the calculation needed to arrive at the final score.

Contest formats in Ohio include Solo and Ensemble and Large-Group Adjudicated Events. All contest formats are evaluated on a scale from “Superior” (I) to “Poor” (V). Additional ratings include “Excellent” (II), “Good” (III), or “Fair” (IV). No “winner” or “loser” is declared at these events, instead each contestant attempts to earn the highest score possible. High school and junior high contests are held for both formats. Contest judges are provided with a copy of the musical score and leave written and verbal comments via adjudicated forms and digital recording devices, respectively. Unique features of OMEA's contest formats will be presented, henceforth.

Solo and Ensemble events are limited to no more than 24 performers and are
adjudicated by a single judge. Each contestant is required to perform a piece of music literature (save for junior high, in which any solo or small ensemble work is acceptable) and scales from a list of selections.

LGAE events employ a panel of three adjudicators. Each ensemble is required to perform between 25 and 30 minutes (depending on class) and at least one piece from a list of preselected pieces. Classifications of literature are designed to reflect the inherit difficulty of the music, and are arranged in order of difficulty from most difficult to least, as follows: AA, A, B, C. Additionally, ensembles have the option of Class D participation in which no rating is assigned and the participant is provided with written and verbal comments only. The OMEA Required List is updated annually. Finally, all high school LGAE contestants must engage in a sight-reading component, adjudicated by a fourth judge and accounting for one quarter of the overall score. Junior high LGAE does not have a sight-reading component.

**Efficacy and Philosophy in Adjudicated Events**

To date, little research has been conducted regarding teachers’ perceptions of the efficacy of large group adjudicated events. Philosophical debates concerning the merits of competition in music, however, have existed since its inception (Fay, 1925; Krone, 1937; Maddy, 1931; McAllister, 1933; Stehn, 1947). Several sources (e.g., Barry 2009/2010; Brandt, 1995; Kohn, 1986, 1994, 2006) have suggested that a number of factors may disincentivize participation and confound the efficacy of this evaluative measure. To illustrate confounded efficacy via a philosophical lens, Barry (2009/2010) argues that
“performance evaluation in the arts presents a conundrum... artistic performance is inherently subjective – a matter of individual taste” (p. 246). Furthermore, “just as it's possible to raise standardized test scores as long as you're willing to gut the curriculum and turn the school into a test-preparation factory, so it's possible to get a bunch of people to agree on what rating to give an assignment as long as they're willing to accept and apply someone else's narrow criteria for what merits that rating” (Kohn, 2006, p. 13).

Some caution against the use of competition in education and the arts by noting that, in order to conform to the criteria for success, students sacrifice their innate interests in learning and may suffer from loss of intrinsic motivation, seeking instead only the extrinsic reinforcement (Brandt, 1994; Kohn, 2006). Kohn (1994) has also suggested that the Old School (i.e., back-to-basics classroom structures), which touts competition and fear of failure, is least likely to benefit students. Specific to music, Battisti (1989) weighed in on the philosophical concerns of contest/competition, citing that academic content is often sacrificed: “Unfortunately, there are currently high school band programs that are geared toward entertainment and the short-term reward of competitive recognition rather than toward the development of musical skills, understanding, creativity, and the long-term appreciation of great music” (p. 23).

Buyers (2005), however, has espoused the benefits of competitions, citing “positive and educational benefits, such as establishing goals, instilling motivation, and providing feedback” (p. 30). The competitive format, Buyers argues, is motivating for students (in the desire to “be the best”) and offers instant constructive feedback “in the form of tapes and written comments” (p. 30). In his opinion, contest further reinforces
“life skills such as hard work, preparation, confidence, commitment, consistency, attitude, leadership, teamwork and focus” (Buyers, 2005, p. 30).

Subjectivity in Performance Assessments

Concomitant factors influencing contest evaluations will be discussed in greater detail in chapter two; however, it is important to note here that literature from corresponding areas of inquiry has investigated the benefits of LGAE, influences of outside agencies and stakeholders, and the equitability of such events. Austin (1988), for example, showed that attendance at adjudicated events may lead to improved self-concept and significant advancements in musical achievement in students. For this study, he used a pretest/posttest design and examined the musical performances of fifth and sixth grade students, comparing those who received written comments only (control group) and those receiving comments and ratings (treatment group). Findings showed that both groups reported an increase in self-concept (i.e., the beliefs one has about oneself), whereas only the treatment group showed significant gains in musical achievement. Additionally, 76% of participants indicated their desire to participate in a rated evaluation format in the future.

In spite of these findings, the seemingly arbitrary assignments of contest scores may also be leading to a trend on the part of music educators to not participate in adjudicated events, whether for philosophical or practical rationales (Meyers, 2011). Moreover, Hash (2012) has found evidence that judges will grade only the moments in a performance that best reflects their predetermined overall rating. Additionally, the lack of
data demonstrating reliable assessments by adjudicators may discredit LGAE and illustrate a lack of adjudicator impartiality (King & Burnsed, 2009). Extra-musical factors do appear to influence an adjudicator’s perception of a musical performance, including the ability level of the performing ensemble and the adjudicators’ expectations thereof (Cavit, 1997), the inflation of grades on the traditional I-V scale (Boeckman, 2002), and time of day and sequence of performers (Bergee, 2007).

The preference for larger ensembles in adjudicated events is reflected in a variety of studies. For example, larger marching bands received significantly higher marks in contests in Virginia and Arizona than did smaller ensembles (King & Burnsed, 2009; Rickels, 2009). Choirs in Texas performing more advanced repertoire (in many states, this would be indicative of a larger ensemble) received higher ratings than choirs performing more “accessible” selections (Baker, 2004). Sullivan (2003) revealed that the apparent bias against smaller ensembles does affect the decision to participate in competition. Further, band directors have questions about the fairness and lack of consistency of judging towards smaller ensembles.

Other extra-musical factors also seem to influence how ensembles are judged. For instance, Morrison, Price, Geiger, and Cornacchio (2009) examined the effect of conductor expressivity on the evaluation of ensemble performance. Here, participants were asked to rate the perceived expressiveness of a performing ensemble on a Likert scale. Using the same recording for both “performances,” ensemble members were asked to mimic performing Grainger's *Walking Tune* for two different conductors - one demonstrating high expressivity, the other low. Findings showed that the conductor using
high-expressivity techniques (e.g., facial expression or left hand exaggeration) received significantly higher ratings than did the conductor exhibiting low-expressivity.

Such findings demonstrate inherent problems with the adjudicating process employed by LGAE and other such events. Although all would undoubtedly hope for an unbiased and accurate evaluation when attending these events, research in this area seems to indicate that several factors stand in the way of this ideal.

**Teacher Attitudes Towards Contest**

Although little research could be found examining teacher attitudes towards concert band large-group adjudicated events, some studies have investigated teacher perceptions of other contest formats, such as Solo and Ensemble contests (Meyers, 2011; Sullivan, 2005) and marching band competition (Rogers, 1985; Sullivan, 2003). Solo and Ensemble contest – an adjudicated event designed for single or small groups of performers – has been examined in multiple studies. Sullivan (2005) examined the attitudes of Arizona music educators towards Solo and Ensemble adjudicated events, finding that music educators have relatively positive views towards the event. In his study, views towards Solo and Ensemble were quantified according to a Likert scale where participants indicated their experiences at the event, whether or not they encourage students to participate, and teachers’ feelings of competency to coach the performers. Findings indicated small(er) school districts in Arizona sent an equal number of students to Solo and Ensemble events as did their larger counterparts. Additionally, Sullivan's (2005) findings illustrated the presence and gravitas of extra-musical factors affecting
directors’ decisions to participate (e.g., monetary concerns, time commitment, and finding piano accompaniment.)

Similar to Sullivan (2005), Meyers (2011) surveyed music educators’ attitudes about Solo and Ensemble events on a national scale, sampling school districts from all fifty states. Again, results indicated homogeneity in positive attitudes towards Solo and Ensemble adjudicated events; however, there was a significantly lower mean for the statement, “my students are aware of the benefits of participating in solo and ensemble activities.” This finding perhaps indicates a lack of communication between directors and students concerning the purpose of the event. Additionally, while attitudes toward solo and small-ensemble performance preparation were high, many respondents recorded a significantly lower view of the formatting, operation, timing, and adjudication of such events. No significant differences in teaching experience or education level were reported, although demographic responses did indicate an overwhelmingly large male populace.

Competitive events, such as marching band contests, have been examined by Sullivan (2003) and Rogers (1985). Sullivan examined the factors influencing Arizona band directors' participation in regional and state marching band competitions. Findings revealed that school district setting (i.e., rural, suburban, or urban) and ensemble size (i.e., small, medium, large) plays a part in contest participation, with those from rural and urban schools participating less frequently due to concerns regarding fairness, consistency of judging, and judges' bias towards ensemble size. Additionally, band directors from smaller, rural schools had many concerns regarding the equitability and
inconsistency of judging practices. Validation of the perceived injustice towards smaller ensembles was evidenced as larger bands often received higher scores. Additional findings demonstrated that smaller schools were often concerned with the lack of resources (physical and monetary), confusion regarding the scoring rubric and procedure, and the effects of such shortcomings on adjudicators’ evaluations.

Rogers (1985) also examined the attitudes of high school band directors and principals towards marching band competitions. Participants were asked to evaluate the value of six aspects of marching band competition on a seven-point scale (1 = no value, 7 = greatly valuable). Participants were categorized according to job title (i.e., band director or principal) and geographic region (e.g., Midwest). Results indicated principals responded consistently higher in mean scores and most positively towards the public relations aspect of competition. Band directors, however, responded most positively towards the public relation and extra-musical benefits (e.g., discipline and responsibility) their students gained from participating in marching band competition.

**Reliability of Adjudication**

In addition to the extant research on perceptions of competition and contest, other researchers have directly explored the factors that influence performance evaluation (Bergee, 2003, 2006, 2007; Cavit, 1997; Morrison et al, 2009; Hash, 2012; Norris & Borst, 2007). Perhaps most notable among these studies, Bergee (2003, 2006, 2007) and Hash (2012) have examined inter rater reliability and found that judges tend to be very consistent amongst themselves (i.e., strong intra-rater reliability) as raters of collegiate
music major jury performances and Solo and Ensemble contests. However, adjudicators tend to be widely disparate in their reliability as a panel (i.e., inter-rater reliability). In most cases, the smaller the panel of adjudicators, the wider the variance of remarks and scores (Bergee, 2003). Amongst collegiate faculty, Bergee (2003) recommended that a panel of no-less-than four adjudicators be used for musical performance evaluation. In high school band contests (i.e., LGAE), Hash (2012) concluded that two-panel formats are as equally consistent as three-panel; however, the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha via Spearman-Brown) was unacceptably low (.70). The highest reliabilities as recorded by Hash (2012) were recorded amongst sight-reading judges and may be explained by the repeated exposure of the adjudicator to the performance literature or perhaps the lack of variability in these scores (i.e., raters usually judge these performances as a I or II).

The effectiveness and reliability of the forms employed for traditional adjudication has also been called into question, often due to their lack of specificity and their propensity toward adjudicator subjectivity (Barry 2010; Cavit, 1997; Morrison et al, 2009; Norris & Borst, 2007; Sullivan, 2003). In examining the traditional, open-ended judge's comment sheets, Norris and Borst (2007) found that rubrics with highly specific grading criteria rendered lower standard deviations. This suggests that while the dependent measure (i.e., the more specific form) is not comprehensive, it holds the greatest potential for higher agreement amongst judges. Addressing specificity in adjudication forms, Barry (2010) noted, “a rubric achieves the same basic purpose as a rating scale, but the rubric provides more detailed information by including specific
descriptions of each level along the achievement continuum” (p. 252). Here, Barry refers to graded rubrics in which clear descriptions for each rating are provided for the adjudicator, contrasting with the traditional, open-ended comments only forms.

Need for Study

Although many studies have examined contests and competitions from various perspectives, few, if any, have directly investigated band teachers’ opinions about large group adjudicated events for concert band. Given the findings from the extant research discussed above (Bergee, 2003, 2006, 2007; Cavit, 1997; Hash, 2012; Morrison et al, 2009; Norris & Borst, 2007) as well as the philosophical arguments posed by Barry (2009/2010), Battisti (1989), Brandt (1994), Buyers (2005) and Kohn (1986, 1994, 2006), the possibility exists that extra-musical/mediating factors could potentially influence band directors’ perceptions of the value and outcomes of participating in LGAE. Although mediating factors have been shown to influence directors’ perceptions of solo and ensemble and marching band events, no studies could be found that examined concomitant factors that could have an effect on directors’ perceptions of LGAE. Thus, the following factors were considered in this study: school setting (i.e., rural, suburban, urban), band size, teaching level (i.e., middle school, high school), and the band directors’ years of teaching experience.

The present investigation will add to the research based knowledge concerning LGAE in two significant ways: (a) by focusing on the perception and beliefs of current band directors towards LGAE in Ohio, and (b) by examining and comparing band
directors’ beliefs about LGAE in light of factors that could directly influence these perceptions (e.g., years of teaching experience, school setting, level of teaching, and size of band).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of Ohio band directors towards Large Group Adjudicated Events (LGAE), especially those concerning the benefits, merits, and perceived gains (i.e., personal and professional) as a result of participation. Special focus was given to factors with the potential to influence directors’ perceptions of LGAE. Specifically, band directors’ years of experience, level of teaching assignment (i.e., middle vs. high school), size of band program, and teaching setting (i.e., rural, suburban, rural) were considered.

Specific research questions were as follows:

1. What are band director's perceptions of large-group adjudicated events (LGAE)?
2. Do teachers’ perceptions of LGAE differ based on their years of teaching experience?
3. Do high school band teachers’ perceptions of LGAE differ from middle school band teachers?
4. Do teachers differ in their perceptions of LGAE based upon the setting in which they teach (e.g., rural, suburban, urban)?
5. Do teachers' perceptions of LGAE change based upon the size of their ensemble?
6. What reasons do teachers give for participating in LGAE?
7. What reasons do teachers give for not participating in LGAE?

8. Do factors such as school setting, years of experience, teaching level, and ensemble size affect whether or not teachers participate in LGAE?
Definition of Related Terms

All definitions are either provided by the author or were retrieved electronically from www.merriam-webster.com, in January of 2014.

1. **Adjudicate**: I. (verb) to make an official decision who is right in a dispute.
   1. (transitive verb) to settle judicially
   2. (intransitive verb) to act as judge

2. **Competition**: The act or process of trying to acquire or win something (such as a prize or a higher level of success) that someone else is also trying to acquire or win.

3. **Contest**: In adjudicated events, “contest” refers to the performance of musical repertoire according to a graded rubric. Contest involves a rating and, unlike “competition,” does not have a specified winner.

4. **Extra-musical Factors**: Influences, conditions, or outside agencies that affect the final score of an adjudicated musical performance (e.g., time of day, sequence, validity of judges’ comment/scoring sheet, etc.)

5. **Large-Group Adjudicated Event**: A means of evaluating and scoring the performance of a music ensemble. Adjudicated events, generally, feature a list of required performance literature from which a director may choose one piece from the required list, a “traditional” piece of literature (e.g., a march or ballad), and one piece of the director's choosing. Ensembles are classified according to size and/or ability and are rated on a five-rating system and point scale (i.e., scores of I, Superior, through V, Poor). Additionally, a sight-reading portion may be
included in the adjudication process.

6. **Inter-rater Reliability**: The ability of a panel of judges to accurately assess a performance so that others might, under the same conditions, yield similar results. Or, the degree to which a judging panel is consistent amongst themselves in rating a group of performers.

7. **Solo and Ensemble Adjudicated Event**: A means of evaluating and scoring the performance of a single-performer or small musical ensemble. The performer usually chooses performance literature from a list of acceptable pieces. Performer(s) is/are classified according to technical difficulty of the literature and is/are rated on a five-rating system and point scale (i.e., scores of I, Superior through V, Poor).
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will review and analyze pertinent literature as it relates to the thesis topic and research questions. Following a description of the historical context of band contests, a brief history of the school band contest and the early critiques thereof will be presented. Lastly, a detailed overview of research relating to specific factors influencing contest adjudication is presented.

A Historical Context of School Band Competitions

Competition in music is nothing new to the profession. Issues concerning concert and marching band competitions have been discussed by a variety of authors for decades (Austin, 1988; Baker, 2004; Bergee, 2006; Boeckman, 2002; Buyer, 2005; Cavit, 1997; Fay, 1925; Hash, 2012; King & Burnsed, 2009; Krone, 1937; Maddy, 1931; Meyes, 2011; Rickels, 2009; Stehn, 1947; Sullivan, 2003; Sullivan 2005). Central to the understanding of band contests in the United States is the historical and social contexts in which these contests are held. Literature focusing on contests or competitions in music can be fractionalized according to historical context (specifically, the time and societal
milieu in which the literature was written). A review of relative literature illustrates two bodies of work regarding contest and competition: early (roughly, those starting in 1925 through ca. 1950) and modern writings (those written ca. 1990 through the present day).

Early literature on competition (ca. 1925 - 1950) is a reflection of the society in which it was written – band competitions were gaining popularity and momentum as local contests were evolving into large, regional and state competitions. Professional discourse of this time, relating to school band competitions, centered on the concerns or limitations of the professionals involved (i.e., the band directors or adjudicators). Student-focused research did not emerge until nearly the close of the century. Topics of interest in the early literature included quality of and over-concentration on selected repertoire (Fay, 1925; Stehn, 1947), costs vs. reward for the school music program and community expectations (Maddy, 1931), and the formatting of competitions (Stehn, 1947).

Contemporary literature on competition dating from 1990 to the present day has two distinguishing aspects when compared to its antecedents: (a) nearly a century of wind band competitions precede the literature, including the pitfalls, recurring limitations, and consequences of successes or failures resulting from participation; and, (b) a shift towards student-focused topics and interests. Additionally, the tradition of band competitions has led some to be staunch advocates for the practice (e.g., Buyer, 2005), others to be opponents (e.g., Battisti, 1989; Campbell, 1974), while others, still, simply caution the practice in the best interests of the children involved (e.g., Burdett, 1985; Gallops, 2005; Green & Hale, 2011; Ruben, 1981). The benefits of and educational
opposition to competition will be discussed later in this chapter.

A Brief History of the School Band Contests

The history of school band contests is varied and sporadic. Lowell Mason's introduction of singing classes in the grammar schools of Boston in 1838 did little to proliferate music activities falling within public school education (Holz, 1962). After the end of the Civil War, mass urbanization and migration from agrarian to urban localities increased, placing societal pressures on the public school systems to incorporate activities once reserved for home and church settings (Holz, 1962). However, the majority of areas in the United States were unprepared to incur the expense of public school music education, some citing that instrumental music education was too “worldly or profane” (Zorn, 1989, p. 21).

Zorn (1989) elaborated on the American tradition of instrumental music (especially, bands), explaining the military significance of bands predating the Revolutionary War. In the nineteenth century, town bands and touring bands (such as those led by Gilmore, Creatore, Liberati, and Sousa) strengthened the American band tradition, and, as Holz (1962) expresses, would aid in the eventual manifestation and proliferation of national band contests.

The focus of the early school band programs, therefore, was not so much to educate youngsters in musical experience, but accommodate a growing populace and foster school and community spirit. Emil Holz (1962) describes the quality of such ensembles and their place in society at the time as:
Early school bands were usually organized in response to social demands, the quality of instrumentation and repertoire – to say nothing of performance – was often abysmally low. Marches, waltzes, two-steps, 'smears,' and ragtime, played badly but enthusiastically by a dozen boys, represented school band music. (p. 4)

With the onset of the First World War, many school music programs were put on hiatus. At the same time, the chief musical export of the United States was military bands, which served the purpose of raising the morale of troops overseas (Silvey, 2009) and assisting in rallies to raise money for the war effort via War Bonds (Zorn, 1989). The popularity and unifying effect of military bands encouraged many school administrators to institute military-esque bands into the school curriculum, with military-style uniforms, music, and precision (Zorn, 1989).

After the end of the First World War, the popularity of professional touring bands waned. Holz (1962) illustrates:

By 1920 many [touring bands] had succumbed under the simultaneous attacks of jazz, the automobile, the moving picture, and the phonograph. The great concert bands ceased touring and village bandstands stood deserted. (p. 5)

While professional touring bands declined, school bands provided job opportunities for returning veterans who were often tasked with recreating a military-style school band, complete with inspections and discipline (Zorn, 1989). Consequently, the role of school band programs needed to be redefined. Notably, the Music Supervisors National Conference met to bolster the support for instrumental music in the public school during this time, and, subsequently, formed the Committee on Instrumental Affairs in 1922 (Koch, 1990).

It is interesting to note that the growing disinterest amongst the American
populace towards professional bands threatened to deflate the burgeoning instrument manufacturing business (organized as the Band Instrument Manufacturers Association). Needing to stimulate interest in their product, the Band Instrument Manufacturers Association turned to band contests in an effort to reinvigorate the industry. Holz (1962) notes:

> With the decline of professional and amateur bands the band instrument industry was in danger… Quantity production methods, necessary for economic health, required a large and growing market. From at least as early as the 1870s manufacturers had established bands, advised novice leaders, helped barber-baritone players and tannertrombonists find work in communities with town bands, and offered instruments as prizes in band contests. The propagandizing efforts of individual companies within the industry had stimulated the growth of school band contests, led to the organization of school bands, and introduced instruction manuals and class instruction books. (p. 5).

Thus, at the winter 1923 meeting of the Chicago Piano Club, the suggestion for a national band contest was proposed that would be held at the summer convention of the Music Industries Chamber of Commerce (Silvey, 2009). The expenses of the 1923 Schools Band Contest of America would be covered by the C.G. Conn Company, promising $10,000 towards venue costs, promotion expenses, prizes and trophies (Burdett, 1986).

The Schools Band Contest of America featured 30 bands from across the country and employed a single judge, William H. Santelmann, who was director of the U.S. Marine Corps Band at the time (Holz, 1962). The Fostoria, Ohio band, directed by John W. Wainwright, won the “tournament” and an impressive $1,000 prize (Silvey, 2009). Despite a number of shortcomings, Silvey (2009) points out the importance of the 1923 contest, “Irrespective of the promotional exaggerations, the lack of participating
ensembles, or the blatant commercialism, the 1923 Schools Band Contest of America
served as a catalyst in the development and longevity of bands and instrumental music in
the public schools” (p. 61).

Subsequent band contests grew in popularity and were held annually throughout
the 1920s and 1930s (excluding 1932), pausing briefly from 1941 through 1946 due to
the United States' involvement in the Second World War (Zorn, 1989). “When the
contests resumed, they were regulated by the National School Band and Orchestra
Association (NSBOA), which had be founded in 1933” (Zorn, 1989, p. 22).

The proliferation and popularity of the early school band contests promoted the
notion that contests were, as Silvey (2009) states, “an acceptable educational enterprise
for public school bands” (p. 61). The developing “winner-take-all” milieu of contests
resulted in many students being heavily discouraged and/or denied participation in
musical ensembles due to their “weak” abilities – a potentially devastating liability for a
competitive group (Zorn, 1989). In an effort to alleviate ill-will towards the competitive
format, the NSBOA reformed the rating system in 1933 towards a “contest-festival
descriptive” rating – superior, excellent, good, poor (Zorn, 1989, p. 22). Despite the
efforts of the NSBOA, the tournament-style of musical competitions (i.e., one winner,
multiple losers) persists in the form of marching and jazz band adjudicated events (Zorn,
1989).

1936 saw the first “Standards for Adjudication” - a report of the Committee on
Adjudication of the American Bandmasters Association. At that time, the committee
included A.R. McAllister, Joseph Maddy, and William D. Revelli, and reported directly
to the National School Band Association. Within the report are judges’ evaluation sheets, general guidelines for festival administration, and a rationale for the inclusion of school band contests in the music curriculum.

Stehn (1947) noted that, after the Second World War, many band programs were recovering from necessary cessations caused by the war effort. He concluded that the contest movement was again in need of being evaluated:

It is quite obvious that many of the directors who have spent years in school music have welcomed the relief from the pressures attendant on contest participation - rehearsal of contest music, planning trips, raising money for entrance fees and travel expenses, worrying about countless non-musical details, etc. Many of these directors have concluded that the time and effort spent on contest participation could be utilized to much better advantage in other ways. We must all realize that the contest movement had gone too far in the prewar days; it had become the tail that wagged the dog. Now the problem before us, if the contest has value, is to set up a reasonable and well-planned contest program which will exert a positive influence toward the continuance and further development of good music instruction. (p. 48)

The launch of Sputnik in 1957 thrust the United States into a cold war with the Soviet Union. As a result of this, new scrutiny was placed on public school education, with the federal government taking a more active role in monitoring and guiding school curricula. Music education was not exempt from this scrutiny, and the profession undertook several initiatives (e.g., Yale Seminar, Julliard Project, Tanglewood Symposium, etc.) to critically analyze its purpose and define its future in public schooling. One such undertaking was The Contemporary Music Project (CMP), originally founded by the Ford Foundation in 1959. CMP provided grants for composers to be artists in residence in public school music programs in the 1950s and 1960s. The
impetus for this program, in part, grew out of a necessity to monitor and develop the music being performed by school bands of the day. Perhaps because of the contest/competition focus of many school band programs, literature selection had become a growing concern of leaders in the profession. Moreover, the project identified a number of deficiencies in music educators at the time that resulted in a reevaluation of teacher preparation programs.

Given the swell in music enrollment from baby-boomers and interest in public school music by the music industry, CMP was a great success and lasted several decades (Zorn, 1989). Zorn (1989) illustrates the emerging focus of instrumental music education as a result of the CMP:

As a result of CMP grants, dozens of composers went into the schools to determine young performers' abilities and compose music for them. Their legacy is a significant body of band, orchestra, and ensemble music, tailor-made for young performers, and the idea that young people, too, could be composers. With a market of thousands of school bands, other contemporary composers followed suit and published music for school musicians. (p. 22)

The 1950s and 1960s have been labeled as the Golden Age of school band programs (Zorn, 1989). It was at this time that the development of school concert bands, jazz ensembles, and marching band developed, allowing school administrators, players, and directors to “strut[ing] proudly, backed by a surge of parental interest and community pride” (Zorn, 1989, p. 23). However, the social revolution resulting from the United States' engagement in the Vietnam War, coupled with political distrust and financial complications, caused many school band programs to be cut. Schools with shrinking budgets returned to “core” class models (e.g., Math, Science, and History) – unable to
fiscally support the school band programs (Zorn, 1989). Zorn (1989) illustrates the
dilemma of instrumental music education following the Vietnam War: “they [school
administrators] often deserted the arts without considering the rich contributions those
programs made to the education of the individual. Although most of the weakened
programs have recently revived, many have not” (p. 23).

*Early Critiques of School Band Contests*

Despite the relative success of band contests, not all were convinced of their
educational value (Fay, 1925; Krone, 1937; Maddy, 1931; McAllister, 1933; Stehn,
1947). Fay (1925) reported on the success of the 1923 competition, but noted that the
sophomore attempt at a national school band contest yielded only 13 contestants, with
“interest shown by entries from many other states who were unable to meet the
conditions requiring a minimum number of contestants” (p. 46). In order to “inject an
educational element” (Fay, 1925, p. 47), a list of selected repertoire was instituted prior to
the 1925 contest. Fay notes that this effort was spearheaded in order to promote music
deemed of acceptable merit for future competitions, which, presumably, had not been
evidenced in the 1923 or 1924 contests. When comparing transcriptions of classical
masterpieces to popular band pieces of the day, Fay (1925) indicates, “they
[transcriptions] are often less difficult than the trashy and ephemeral pieces written to
order for school bands, and invariably easier than the tortuous and complicated jazz
figures of the popular music of today” (p. 48).

After several years of school band contests, Joseph Maddy (chairman of the
National Committee on Instrumental Affairs at the time) warned of the growing influence of the competitive mindset. According to Maddy (1931), “Competitive contest ideals, as now carried on in practice, are in direct violation of a very fundamental principle of American education, namely, that the citizens are supporting public education for the purpose of equalizing opportunity” (p. 45).

Of additional concern for Maddy was the social, physical, and economic failings of contest participation, as well as the educational soundness of the event(s) in general. Social limitations cited by Maddy (1931) included: expensive chaperonage for students far from home, splitting an ensemble's members across multiple housing locations, and the “anti-social instead of social and unifying feelings” that immature pupils develop as a result of the experience (p. 45). Economic and physical concerns regarding early contest participation included the costs of uniform dress, travel expenses, student anxiety, hazards of transporting large number of students, and the resulting fatigue from traveling long distances (Maddy, 1931). Additionally, Maddy (1931) points out the psychological and philosophical effect of contest participation:

When such organizations fail to win, the disappointment is much keener than if the contest were merely an incident in the school work, likewise a community which has been kept tense over contests will react abruptly when a losing streak occurs. (p. 45)

In a separate vein, Krone (1937) presents concerns about contests from the perspective of the adjudicator. In particular, Krone addresses the limitations of adjudicators in large contest settings, citing fatigue from constant writing on forms, the ennui associated with frequently used, universal critiques of performance, and the lack of
sufficient time in which to write commentaries of performances.

**Benefits of Competition**

Competition in music has been present in the American educational psyche since the inception of school band programs (Zorn, 1989). It is no wonder, then, that this topic has been approached both philosophically (Belfour, 1935; Buyer, 2005; Long, 1943) and empirically (Arnwine, 1996; Austin, 1988; Burnsed & Sochinski, 1983; Hurst, 1994; Rogers, 1985). Although the benefits of competition/contest can be a matter of contention for many, many state organizations believe that LGAE is central to the educational development of music students. Ohio is no exception.

**Contest Philosophy in Ohio**

It is clear that the Ohio Music Education Association (OMEA) believes in the benefits of adjudicated events such as contest and competition. According to the OMEA Website, “The Mission of OMEA is to advance music education by encouraging the study and making of music by all. To achieve this mission, OMEA provides various resources for its members, including over 100 adjudicated events each year” (www.omea-ohio.org). Currently, OMEA is in the process of hiring a Director of Adjudicated Events, and has had a Chair for adjudicated events for decades. Additionally, OMEA dedicates a portion of their journal, *Triad*, to issues surrounding adjudicated events. The following philosophy statement is found in the OMEA Marching Band Handbook:
For music to be indispensable to learning and life, it must be more than a shallow, passing experience for the student. Increased proficiency increases enjoyment, and competence begets respect for competence. Quality is not a limiting factor for the individual, but puts within his or her grasp an otherwise inaccessible treasure store of the world's cultural riches. Archibald Davidson has written: 'Zeal for fine music...grows out of an experience of the satisfactions that spring only from association with the highest manifestations of musical art.' It is to these ends that the Ohio Music Education Association sponsors adjudicated events each year. (OMEA Marching Band Handbook, p. 1)

Extant Literature on the Benefits of Competition

Several interest articles and research studies were found that indicate positive outcomes of music competition. In an opinion article on the subject of marching band competition, Buyer (2005), for example, argues that the feedback provided at competitive events can be both motivating and beneficial. He goes on to purport that the extrinsic motivators of music competition indirectly encourage the concurrent development of necessary life skills, “such as hard work, preparation, confidence, commitment, consistency, attitude, leadership, teamwork, and focus” (Buyer, 2005). These perceptions of competitive events permeate the teaching profession and are often cited as primary goals and rationales for bands to compete. Moreover, Buyer (2005) points out that the effort put forth in competition is its own reward, citing “we must understand that we have no control over how another band performs” (p. 30).

Although Buyer’s comments are important, others have examined the outcomes of competition more objectively in empirical research. In 1983, the Band Committee and Research Committee of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), Southern Division, held a joint session on the attitudes towards marching band competition. Here, Burnsed, Sochinski, and Hinkle (1983) presented a paper on the attitudes of high school...
band students toward marching band competitions. Notably, high school students viewed competition favorably, and strong correlations were found between successful competitive band programs and high school band enrollment. Similar findings were evidenced in a recent study by Collins (2012) in which preservice music education majors were surveyed about their attitudes toward competition and contest. Again, both events were considered to be important in the development of band students.

In a different line of research, Austin (1988) has examined the outcomes of performance adjudication on students’ musical ability. In this study, he used a pretest/posttest design comprised of fifth and sixth grade music students. Randomly assigned students were placed into one of two groups and were evaluated using the Music Achievement Test (MAT) and the Self-Concept in Music Scale (SCIM). The control group received evaluative written comments only, while the experimental group received written comments and contest ratings. Findings indicated that students from the group receiving ratings made significant gains on both the MAT and the SCIM. Students in the comments-only group made significant gains on the SCIM, but not on the MAT. It should be noted, however, that elementary students do not exhibit the internalizing behaviors of “failure,” but rather praise the effort. Such behavior does not generally manifest itself until the age of 11, making generalizations to older populations difficult.

Arnwine (1996) examined student participation in band competitions and continuing musical endeavors (e.g., performing music past high school instruction). Of the high school band students surveyed in his study, competition participation in high school did not negatively affect future musical participation – students were as likely to
continue in music performance regardless of competitive music experiences. Such findings led Arnwine to speculate that the feedback, clear objectives, and motivating milieu of competition can be valuable in guiding the development of student participants.

Furthermore, the positive public relations aspect of successful competitive band programs may be viewed favorably. Rogers (1985), for example, found that high school principals felt that marching band competitions improved public relations for their schools. Moreover, he noted that both band directors and principals believed that competition helped develop student dispositions relating to discipline, responsibility, and intrinsic motivation. Likewise, Howard (1994) found that the motivation and drive students exhibit honing their musical skills may also be linked to contest participation. Surveying band students only, Howard found positive student attitudes toward concert band contests, including the highest motivational and increased musicianship values.

Summary of the Benefits of Competition

Positive attitudes towards competition can be linked with increased administrative (Rogers, 1985) and parental (Burnsed & Sochinski, 1983) support. Extra-musical benefits may also promote desirable student behaviors (Buyer, 2005; Howard, 1994) and participation in competition does not diminish the likelihood of students participating in music past their school-aged years (Arnwine, 1996). Supplemental increases in music achievement and self-concept have been shown as a result of competitive formats (Austin, 1988). With such findings, it is understandable why some might conclude that a band program's success and longevity can be inextricably linked to the successes or
failures in competitive settings. As Sullivan (2003) sums, “today's band competitions have become important not only to the participants and spectators but to the success of band programs throughout the country” (p. 2).

**Arguments Against Competition**

*Alfie Kohn's Case Against Competition in Education*

Perhaps the most outspoken dissent towards competitive formats in the educational environment comes from Alfie Kohn. For Kohn (1986), competition in the United States has grown to an alarming proportion. In a conversation with Ron Brandt for *Education Leadership*, Kohn stated that extrinsic motivators, such as the assignment of grades or ratings, “are not merely ineffective over the long haul, but counterproductive with respect to the things that concern us most: desire to learn, commitment to good values, and so on” (Brandt, 1995, p. 2). Moreover, intrinsic motivators have a tendency to “trail off sharply” as students transition from elementary school formats (without focus on ratings or grades) to middle school and secondary levels. It is in this regard that Kohn sharply disagrees with “traditional” views of competition, such as those put forward previously by Buyer (2005).

Additionally, Kohn (2006) takes issue with the use of rubrics (found in many adjudication formats), and argues that the standardized way in which many students are evaluated may compromise learning. As Kohn states: “the fatal flaw in this logic is revealed by a line of research in educational psychology showing that students whose attention is relentlessly focused on how well they're doing often become less engaged
with *what* they're doing” [original emphasis] (p. 13). The quagmire between *how* one is assessed often diminishes the reasons *why* we are assessed, according to Kohn.

*Musical Arguments Against Competition*

Previous musical experiences influence the degree to which students continue in valuing and participating in musical activities beyond school years (Green & Hale, 2011). Given that enrollment in a performance group (e.g., band) drops more than 50 percent between grade 7 and the completion of high school, an often unspoken goal of music educators is fostering a lifelong love for music. If previous musical experience were viewed negatively, students may be more likely to disengage from musical activities later in life. Green and Hale posit that “these declines stem from an emphasis on competition and performance techniques that are not relevant to students, especially after they finish high school” (p. 46). Echoing the belief stated by Kohn (Brandt, 1995), Green and Hale state, “band and choirs often place competition at the heart of success. The result is motivation that comes from extrinsic rewards, such as moving up in chair assignments or winning competitions, rather than from intrinsic rewards and love of music.” (p. 46). Green and Hale promote orienting classroom tasks around meaningful participation (i.e., challenging tasks rewarding student efforts and centered on the National Standards for Music Education) in order to foster a lifelong love of music. Excessive focus on competitive formats are believed to be factors for students to disengage from musical performance.

Lifelong appreciation of music is at the heart of Frank L. Battisti's (1989)
argument against competition, as well. By focusing on what he calls the “short-term
rewards of competitive recognition,” (p. 23) students do not develop a long-term
appreciation for musical experiences. Additionally, Battisti takes aim at the concert band
literature that is, perhaps, associated with contest required lists:

Even in the concert band one often hears music calculated to make bands 'sound
good' as opposed to music that has the potential to assist students in developing
listening and performance skills and in attaining a deeper understanding and
appreciation of high-quality musical art. (p. 24)

Politics and Pitfalls of Music Performance Evaluation

Nancy Barry (2009/2010) offered her opinions, including the political aspects and
various pitfalls, of music performance assessment. One confounding aspect of music
evaluation, according to Barry, revolves around the subjective nature of musical arts:
performance includes a matter of taste that does not lend itself to adjudication; however,
the demonstrable skills involved in musical performance can be measured. Additionally,
high stakes educational models in which outside agencies exhort control over school
organizations with expectations for results (such as those band programs driven solely by
competitive success) may lead to students who are motivated by extrinsic rewards rather
than the desire to learn.

Furthermore, in order to avoid confounding influences on music performance
evaluation, Barry touts the advantages of rubrics over traditional rating scales:

A rubric achieves the same basic purpose as a rating scale, but the rubric provides
more detailed information by including specific descriptions of each level along
the achievement continuum. While more challenging to develop, the level of
specific detail provided by the rubric offers very useful feedback to students. A
well-written rubric is also quite useful as a way of communicating performance
Summary

Although competition in music has existed in school band programs since their beginnings (Zorn, 1989), many have taken issue with the nature of these competitions, questioning the practice in terms of logistics (Maddy, 1931), educational philosophy (Brandt, 1995; Kohn, 1986; Kohn, 2006), or on philosophical grounds (Barry, 2009/2010; Battisti, 1989; Green and Hale, 2011). Regardless of tradition or competition as an institution, considerable opposition exists regarding music performance evaluations.

Factors Influencing Adjudication

The remainder of this chapter will focus on empirical studies related to factors that influence adjudication in musical performance. Specifically discussed will be inter-rater reliability, grade inflation, adjudicators' forms, adjudicator bias, and extra-musical factors (such as sequence, order, and conductor expressivity).

Although several studies have examined factors influencing solo, small-ensemble, or collegiate jury adjudication (Bergee, 2003; Bergee, 2007; Bergee & McWhirter, 2005; Bergee & Westfall, 2005; Cavit, 1997; Hewitt & Smith, 2004), only a few have examined large-group contest settings (Hash, 2012; Groulx, 2010). Additionally, influences on adjudication and musical evaluation have been examined using prerecorded performances (Kinney, 2009), effect of conductor expressivity (Morrison, Price, Geiger & Cornacchio, 2009) and analyses of adjudicators' form (Norris & Borst, 2007). For clarity, this emerging body of literature will be discussed according to over-arching themes, rather
than on an individual basis.

**Inter-rater and Intra-rater Reliability**

Reliability, in the context of performance adjudication at contest, refers to the degree to which adjudicators are consistent with themselves (intra-rater reliability) and as a group (inter-rater reliability). The importance of consistency amongst judges in music competition (or any competition) cannot be overestimated. In order for competition to be equitable and valid, adjudicators must be consistent (i.e., reliable) in their evaluations – what constitutes a “superior” rating must always do so.

In comparing performer, rater, and performer by rater in solo and ensemble adjudicated events, Bergee (2007) employed a theoretical framework to estimate variance in rating outcomes. Although variability was low for performers, a high variability was found between performer and rater. Bergee explains the significance: “Rater variability, which ideally should have been zero, was quite high” (2007, p. 353).

Bergee has also conducted studies examining how the size of an adjudication panel affects inter-rater reliability. In his 2003 study, for example, he examined rater consistency amongst college student juries with adjudication panels of various sizes. Findings showed that inter-rater reliability decreased when fewer than four judges were employed and that a five-judge increased inter-rater consistency to an acceptable level (specifically, 80%), although the associated study was conducted with solo and ensemble judges and examined multiple variables (i.e., rater, occasion, and sequence of performer). Additionally, Bergee (2003) found that “variability and range consistently decreased as
panel size increases,” and proposed that the three-judge model used by many states (including Ohio) “should be reconsidered” (p. 147).

Both inter-rater and intra-rater reliability were examined by Hash (2012) for concert band competitions in South Carolina between 2008 to 2010. Evidence was found suggesting grade inflation (discussed later in this chapter) and significantly low adjudicator reliability. Inter-rater reliability achieved only moderately high ($r = .75$) levels of agreement, failing to meet the benchmark of .80. Additionally, results showed two out the three judges did not consistently score performances from one ensemble to the next when compared for reliability (the highest degree of reliability evidenced was $r = .48$). Higher intra-rater reliability was observed for sight-reading judges, supporting the findings of Kinney (2009), discussed below.

Of additional interest, greater evaluator internal consistency (i.e., intra-rater reliability) has been witnessed in tandem with increased excerpt familiarity and adjudicator expertise (Kinney, 2009). Using student evaluators of various musical experience (from no experience to music faculty and graduate students) and prerecorded piano performances, Kinney (2009) studied evaluators' perceptions of musical expression and accuracy. Findings revealed that greater familiarity with stimuli (i.e., performance) and musical expertise showed linear tendencies in increasing internal consistency. The implications of these findings may be related to the greater consistency evidenced in sight-reading judges, who are more familiar with the stimuli due to repeated exposure (Hash, 2012).
Grade Inflation

“Grade inflation” refers to the tendency of adjudicators to over-evaluate (i.e., score higher than the performance merits) in order to encourage future attendance at adjudicated events, or in an attempt to spare the feelings or self-efficacy of performers. The decision to inflate ensemble ratings, whether explicit or not, affects both the credibility and accuracy of large group adjudicated events (Hash, 2012).

Adjudicators have demonstrated great reluctance to evaluate performers below a certain level. Boeckman (2002) performed a trend study on the Ohio Music Education Association State Band Contest starting from 1951 and continuing until 2000. Results of Boeckman's (2002) study showed evidence of grade inflation between 1971 and 2000; on a five-point scale (with “I” being the highest ranking), judges did not often critique ensembles below a “II” rating (95% of participants received either a “I” or “II” rating). Citing the Boeckman (2002) study, Hash (2012) states, “These findings call into question the validity of individual caption scores and suggest that judges may grade captions to fit the overall rating they intend to issue” (p. 85).

Extending from Boeckman (2002), Hash (2012) examined inter-rater reliability and the distribution of ratings for high school concert bands participating in the South Carolina Band Directors Association (SCBDA) between 2008 to 2010. Results showed moderate uniformity in final ratings with 40.8% of bands receiving a I rating and 45.9% receiving a II. One possible solution offered by Hash is that adjudicators purposefully inflated final ratings to encourage directors and students to attend future contests.

Similarly, King and Burnsed (2009) found evidence of grade inflation in
marching band competitions. Although judges were in close agreement regarding final ratings, the lack of variation in ratings may suggest a predetermined rating for participants. King and Burnsed explain:

Analyses revealed that the caption ratings were so closely related that they really did not represent distinct categories. One general factor accounted for eighty percent of the variance in ratings. This might suggest that judges are really giving a global final rating without much consideration for individual caption ratings (p. 29).

Most concerning, some choral adjudicators have admitted to grade inflation when they know that directors will eventually see the written comment sheets (Norris & Borst, 2007). Norris and Borst's 2007 study, discussed in the next section, included an admission by choral adjudicators to grade inflation. The authors elaborate: “the candor of the subjects, coupled with the typical distribution of ratings at choral festivals, implies that festival scores often do not reflect the descriptors assigned to the actual ratings” (2007, p. 248).

*Adjudicators' Forms*

Adjudication forms have traditionally been, as in the case of Ohio, based on assigning a rating via anecdotal written comments. Such practices have led to the examination of adjudicators' forms in contemporary research (Barry, 2009/2010; Bergee, 2003; Norris & Borst, 2007).

When comparing the value and effectiveness of traditional contest/competition rating systems to a more categorical grading rubric, some authors have advocated the
latter (Barry, 2009/2010; Bergee, 2003; Norris & Borst, 2007). For instance, Bergee (2003) determined the benefits of an itemized and categorical assessment rubric by examining collegiate music juries. In his study, Bergee (2003) discovered greater interrater reliability when using a categorical rubric; additionally, collegiate faculty expressed appreciation for the rubric due to its ease of use and ability to “[get] them thinking” (p. 147) beyond arbitrary assignments of ratings. Individual performance elements were grouped into broader musical concepts (such as intonation or tone). When evaluating college jury performances, adjudicators (faculty) noted that an organized, criterion-based rubric was easier to use, more time efficient, and provided a checklist for performance elements that might not ordinarily be considered. Bergee concluded from his findings that, “criteria-specific rating scales… are more comprehensive [than anecdotal written comments], encouraging attention to all aspects of the performance and providing balanced feedback to performers” (2003, p. 147).

Additionally, higher mean scores and lower standard deviations have been noted when using criteria-specific rubrics for choral adjudication (Norris & Borst, 2007). Employing four reputable choral adjudicators, Norris and Borst (2007) compared a traditional, anecdotal adjudicator form with a detailed, criteria-specific rubric form. When using the criteria-specific rubric, Norris and Borst discovered greater reliability on adjudicators’ forms for all evaluated categories (specifically, Tone Quality, Diction, Blend, Intonation, Rhythm, Balance, and Interpretation) save for rhythm. Of additional interest, judges felt that both forms encouraged them to evaluate performances in a stricter manner, especially when final ratings were of a hierarchical nature (i.e., superior,
excellent, good, fair, poor).

**Additional Extra-musical Factors Influencing Adjudication**

Multiple extra-musical factors have been examined for their impact on and influence over ratings in competitive musical settings. Here, “extra-musical factors” refer to the circumstances and events beyond the quality of performance that affect the ratings of musical competitions. Such factors include: time of day, time of performance, sequence of performers, number of performers (i.e., soloist vs. small-ensemble), size and reputation of school district (e.g., large, well-funded programs have students who are more successful at adjudicated events), and adjudicator expectations (Bergee, 2006; Bergee, 2007; Bergee & McWhirter, 2005; Bergee & Westfall, 2005).

**Bias Towards Ensemble Size or Reputation**

Adjudicator bias for ensemble size or reputation has been found in multiple studies (Bergee & Westfall, 2005; Hash, 2012; King & Burnsed, 2009). Students from metropolitan-areas or well-funded school districts were also more likely to succeed in competitive settings (Bergee & Westfall, 2005), although the causes for such phenomena are uncertain. It is readily possible that these students have access to individualized instruction and are therefore more apt to succeed in competition. However, it may also be plausible that large, well-known districts send students to competitions with an advantage – that is, the reputation of excellence precedes the student, regardless of ability level.

Results from the above studies underscore Sullivan's (2003) findings that urban
and rural band directors' with small(er) ensembles tend to have reservations regarding contest participation. Here, many report feeling that the experience is a negative influence on students, and desire marching band competitions to be divided according to ensemble size. Furthermore, issues regarding the fairness of the adjudication process manifested in responses from band directors in rural and urban school settings.

Additionally, larger marching bands (i.e., those with a large number of student members) were shown to receive significantly higher ratings than bands with fewer members (King & Burnsed, 2009). According to King and Burnsed (2009), this bias is inherent but as of yet unexplained, although the authors posit one possible explanation that smaller marching ensembles are more ineffective, displaying error in a more noticeable way. These findings may reinforce tendencies of bias towards larger, well-funded ensembles as observed by Bergee and Westfall (2005), as well as validate the feelings of directors surveyed by Sullivan (2003).

Conductor Expressivity

Morrison, Price, Geiger, and Cornacchio (2009) determined that the “expressivity of the conductor had a significant and powerful bearing on how listeners judged the expressivity of a music-performance” (p. 45). In this study, video recordings of a musical ensemble using the same audio output, but different conductors, were evaluated by collegiate music students. Conductors were asked to direct the canned performances in two different ways: one, with high expressivity, and one with low expressivity (i.e., facial expression, left and right arm/hand exaggerations, and body movement). Evaluations of
the highly expressive performances were significantly higher. Such findings demonstrate that music evaluation can be swayed significantly by nonmusical information.

Bergee's Model of Extra-musical Influences on Solo and Ensemble Ratings

Occasion (time of day) and sequence (place of performer order) were examined as part of an ongoing series of studies (Bergee & Platt, 2003; Bergee & McWhirter, 2005; Bergee, 2006; Bergee, 2007). Bergee and Platt (2003) found a positive linear trend between time of day and evaluations tending towards a Superior (I) rating. Specifically, afternoon performances tended to receive significantly higher ratings than morning performances. Furthermore, all performer classifications (solo, small-ensemble, large small-ensemble) followed the aforementioned trend, except for large small-ensembles.

Replicating the Bergee and Platt (2003) model, Bergee and McWhirter (2005) applied a logistic regression model in an attempt to predict performer ratings. Again, performance occasion (specifically, afternoon performances) was a strong indicator of higher ratings. Possible explanations for this tendency were presented – adjudicator fatigue, cross-referencing with morning performances, and/or loss of standards as day progresses (Bergee & McWhirter, 2005).

Bergee validated the model of extra-musical factors on contests in 2006, although, as he noted, “work remains to specify the model more completely” (p. 254). Performers and raters in one-on-one settings yielded dismal results in consistency (Bergee, 2006). Again, occasion was a statistically significant predictor of rating, with afternoon performances receiving higher ratings than morning performance. Of additional interest,
the underspecification in performance evaluation complicated findings. Such underspecificity carries implications on the future of adjudication. Bergee (2006) remarks:

> Researchers in other areas of music performance assessment – for example, those developing music performance rating scales – should guard against making specifications errors of their own by not accounting for extramusical variables' demonstrated influences. (p. 255)

Generalizability theory (G theory) was at the heart of Bergee's 2007 examination of extra-musical factors on adjudication. Neither occasion nor sequence seemed to have a significant effect on performance rating. However, high variability was associated with judges' ratings and rank order of performers as perceived maturation levels of the students varied (Bergee, 2007). This trend seems to confirm earlier findings (Bergee & Platt, 2003; Bergee & McWhirter, 2005; Bergee, 2006) in which extra-musical factors influenced ratings at adjudicated events.

*Summary of Extra-musical Factors on Adjudication*

The breadth of literature related to extra-musical influences on music performance assessments suggests inherent deficiencies in the adjudication process. Sufficient evidence exists to suggest the influences of adjudicator bias regarding preference for large ensemble sizes or school reputation on performance evaluations (Bergee & Westfall, 2005; Hash, 2012; King & Burnsed, 2009; Sullivan, 2003). Further, Morrison, Price, Geiger, and Cornacchio (2009) concluded that conductor expressivity influences music evaluation. Finally, the Bergee series (Bergee & Platt, 2003; Bergee & McWhirter,
2005; Bergee, 2006; Bergee, 2007) established rater, occasion, sequence, and time of day as factors influencing solo and ensemble adjudication.

**Summary**

Historically, competition and contests have roots in the very beginnings of school music education. Band directors, in many ways, owe their livelihoods to the fertile opportunities provided by school music contest proliferation. Military traditions of early music ensembles persist today in the form of marching band uniforms and concert marches. The competitive and contest formats have remained largely intact from their inception early in the 20th century to the present day. Many school band programs continue to thrive in competitive environments, perhaps in an effort to justify or complement their efforts in the classroom. Evidence for such practices has been seen in a few states where the merit of school music ensembles is linked to contest and competition ratings. Authors supporting competition have promoted extrinsic rewards and demonstrable student dispositions, such as discipline and leadership, as justifications for the practice.

Some empirical evidence in recent decades has demonstrated some of the positive outcomes of competition. These findings suggest benefits to students' musical achievement and positive community perceptions of school band programs through contest/competition.

Although competitions and contests were important to the early music education landscape, this chapter showed that many took issues with the logistics and philosophical
issues associated with marrying music to competition. Naturally, as some have supported competitive events in music, others hold an opposing view of its value, believing that students are not intrinsically motivated through competition. Further, questions about students' aesthetic growth and the artistic dilemma of music as a sport are often cited to discourage musical competitive formats.

In addition to philosophical debates on competition and contest, a burgeoning body of empirical evidence suggests that music performance assessments are susceptible to outside influences and factors beyond the control of the performer. Findings of these studies presented above reveal evidence of grade inflation, low inter-rater reliability, and validity of adjudicators' forms (amongst others) influencing the process of music performance assessments. Further research suggests that band directors are aware of such challenges, whether consciously or subconsciously, and adjust their attendance at competitions and contests, according to past experiences.

As empirical evidence continues to mount revealing inherent biases and inconsistencies in music performance evaluations, it is imperative that educators and professional organizations examine the process and procedures by which ensembles are assessed. This need is additionally critical if teacher evaluations are to become linked to such formats (e.g., LGAE) in the future. The present investigation will add to the empirical based knowledge in this line of research by investigating teachers perceptions toward concert band LGAE in Ohio.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will describe the methods by which data were gathered and analyzed for the study. After a restatement of the study’s purpose, information regarding the construction and validation of a survey instrument is provided. Then, I describe the target population, sampling frame, and sample for the study. Specific methods for survey distribution and collection are then provided, followed by a brief discussion of treatment of collected data. All relevant tables are either provided in this chapter or are located in the appendix, as indicated.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of Ohio band directors towards Large Group Adjudicated Events (LGAE), especially those concerning the benefits, merits, and perceived gains (i.e., personal and professional) as a result of participation. Special focus was given to factors with the potential to influence directors’ perceptions of LGAE. Specifically, band directors’ years of experience, level of teaching assignment (i.e., middle vs. high school), size of band program and teaching setting (i.e., rural, suburban, rural) were considered.
Specific research questions were as follows:

1. What are band director's perceptions of large-group adjudicated events (LGAE)?
2. Do teachers’ perceptions of LGAE differ based on their years of teaching experience?
3. Do high school band teachers’ perceptions of LGAE differ from middle school band teachers?
4. Do teachers differ in their perceptions of LGAE based upon the setting in which they teach (e.g., rural, suburban, urban)?
5. Do teachers' perceptions of LGAE change based upon the size of their ensemble?
6. What reasons do teachers give for participating in LGAE?
7. What reasons do teachers give for not participating in LGAE?
8. Do factors such as school setting, years of experience, teaching level, and ensemble size affect whether or not teachers participate in LGAE?

Development of the Survey Instrument

In order to develop a survey instrument centering on Ohio band directors’ perceptions of LGAE in Ohio, I first conducted a pilot study with a small number of Ohio band directors (Hoffman, 2013). The pilot study was a qualitative analysis of a small number of band directors’ (N = 5) opinions about LGAE. Emerging themes from this pilot study, combined with extant literature about LGAE discussed in Chapter 2, guided the construction of the initial survey instrument. Perceptions of the sight-reading portion of LGAE were not sought for this study due to differences in contest formatting. In Ohio,
the middle school LGAE does not require sight-reading; rather, the middle school portion
utilizes a festival format in which ensembles have the opportunity to work with an
adjudicator immediately following their performance.

The original survey instrument consisted of 36 items. Including instructions, the
instrument contained 20 Likert scale items, closed and open ended demographic items,
and several open ended items for the purpose of allowing respondents to share further
opinions about LGAE not appearing on the survey.

To further enhance face and content validity of the survey, I distributed the
instrument to several music education faculty and graduate students in music education at
The Ohio State University, as well as instrumental music educators currently teaching in
the field. These experts reviewed the survey for item relevance/validity, clarity, brevity,
and duplication of, or extraneous, content. The survey instrument was then refined and
expanded to consist of 37 closed and open-ended questions with 11 Likert scale items.
This draft was then reviewed using the same procedures and amended accordingly.

The next draft of the survey expanded to 46 closed or open-ended questions based
on suggestions of the experts, with 25 Likert scale items. A “no opinion” (0) option was
added to the Likert items in order to provide an additional response option for
participants. Further clarifying the Likert scale with this option was done in an effort to
minimize non-responses for items, and also increase the validity of responses on the scale
(ranging 1 to 5). Questions regarding OMEA district location, teachers’ highest
education level, and ensemble classifications were also added. In regard to the latter,
OMEA classifies groups according to the difficulty of the required repertoire. For
example, as of 2014, a director choosing to perform selections from William Schuman's *Chester (Overture for Band)* would enter competition in class AA (OMEA, 2014). The remainder of the concert program is expected to be commensurate in caliber and difficulty to the required selection.

After all appropriate approvals were garnered from OSU’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), pilot testing the survey commenced by administering the instrument to five in-service instrumental music educators through GoogleDocs (www.docs.google.com). During this voluntary pilot test, respondents were instructed to critique each question for relevance to the topic and clarity, as well as time themselves in taking the survey. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to determine the internal consistency of the survey instrument using the responses of those participating in the pilot study. Again, the survey instrument was tweaked nominally for wording and clarity based on suggestions of those participating in the pilot.

The final version of the survey can be found in Appendix A. On average, it took respondents approximately 10 minutes to complete. Likert scale items were organized according to the following themes: fairness and accuracy of LGAE evaluation (Likert items 1 and 2), influence of outside agencies or stakeholders (Likert items 4, 5, 10, and 21), benefits to self and students (Likert items 6 and 7), impact on curriculum (Likert items 16 and 17), student growth and professional development (Likert items 14, 19, 23, 24, and 25), and requirement for career advancement (Likert items 4, 8, 15, and 21). Additionally, the theme “Other” was added for the remaining Likert items that did not necessarily align with the previous themes but were congruent with open-ended survey
response items (Likert items 3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 18, 20, 22).

**Validity and Reliability of the Survey Instrument**

As noted above, face and content validity of the survey instrument was established through a previous qualitative exploration of this topic with selected band directors (Hoffman, 2013), the review of literature, and peer review from music education experts. Internal consistency of the survey instrument for Likert scale items was calculated using SPSS and determined to be excellent, and within acceptable parameters, according to Cronbach's Alpha coefficients. Positively worded Likert items had a reliability coefficient (α) of .88. Negatively worded Likert items also had an acceptable reliability coefficient (α = .83).

**Sample**

The target population for this study consisted of both high school (senior high) and middle school (junior high) band music teachers currently teaching in the state of Ohio. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) delineates school districts within the state into one of four strata: Urban, Suburban, Small-Town, and Rural. Furthermore, ODE typology sub-categorizes school districts into one of eight strata, according to demographic and geographic similarities (Appendix B). Currently, there are 614 school districts in the state of Ohio.

A random number generator was used to select a sample from each demographic stratum in order to minimize selection bias. As the number of suburban (123) school
districts nearly doubles those classified as urban (55), and whereas small-town (200) and rural (231) districts nearly double in number when compared to their suburban counterparts, non-proportionate quota sampling procedures were employed to increase the probability of a representative sample from each stratum. The number of randomly selected participants from each ODE typology is represented in Table 3.1 below. By endeavoring to evenly divide each ODE school district type and by seeking to survey nearly one quarter (24.4%) of the target population, a high confidence level was established.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ODE Typology</th>
<th>Number of Randomly Selected Participant Districts</th>
<th>Sample Population Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Town 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n = 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Town 4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>n = 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban 6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>n = 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Implementation

Data collection in this study utilized a mixed-mode method of survey distribution (i.e., paper and electronic). Miksza, Roeder and Biggs (2010) have found that electronic
instruments have higher response rates, especially when administered with traditional 
paper-and-pencil forms. Therefore, a GoogleDocs survey was created, identical to the 
“traditional” paper hard copy. From each randomly selected district, contact emails and 
addresses were obtained for the high school and middle school band music educators via 
school district websites.

Participants were sent an introductory “cover letter” via electronic mail (email) to 
their school district addresses notifying them of their selection in the study and their right 
to refuse participation at no penalty, risk, or obligation. Attached to each email was the 
survey cover letter (Appendix C), link to the electronic survey instrument, and option to 
have a traditional survey instrument mailed via the United States Postal Service. 
Participants opting to receive a traditional instrument were also given a self-addressed, 
stamped envelope without return address (to maintain anonymity). Participants were 
asked to complete and return the survey within two weeks (14 days) time.

The initial contact email was as follows:

Subject: OSU Research Participation Request

“Dear Band Director,

My name is Kenneth Hoffman and I am a graduate student in Music Education at 
the Ohio State University. I am writing you today to ask for your participation in my 
research study regarding OMEA large group adjudicated events. Whether you participate 
in LGAE or not, I would greatly appreciate hearing your opinions.

All participants in this research study are kept anonymous and the responses are 
confidential. You may decline to participate at any time without risk or penalty. All 
relevant information can be found in the cover letter (attached).

Should you choose to participate in the study, please follow the link below to the 
online form. If you would like a paper copy of the survey, please respond to this email
and you will be mailed one soon.

Please complete the survey by March 1, 2014. You will receive a reminder email in about a week's time.

[LINK TO LIVE FORM]

Thank you!”

Approximately one week after initial receipt of the introductory email, participants received a reminder notification (Appendix D). After the end of the two-week period, a final reminder email was sent to participants, and the link to the survey was closed a week later.

Data Treatment and Analysis

All data gathered electronically were automatically populated in a digital spreadsheet that was then input to SPSS statistical analysis software. Data gathered via traditional paper-and-pencil method were also input to SPSS. Descriptive and inferential statistics (where appropriate) were calculated for all Likert scale items with respect to each individual research question. These results may be found in Chapter 4. Open-ended survey questions regarding LGAE decisions and rationales for attendance at LGAE and influences exerted via outside agencies and stakeholders were collated for themes and patterns. These themes were then collapsed into frequency counts, which are also presented in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter will report the results of the data gathered and place the data in the context of the research questions. I will begin with a review of the purpose of the study and research questions followed by a description of respondent demographics. Next, I will present specific findings organized by each research question.

Review of Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of Ohio band directors towards Large Group Adjudicated Events (LGAE), especially those concerning the benefits, merits, and perceived gains (i.e., personal and professional) as a result of participation. Special focus was given to factors with the potential to influence directors’ perceptions of LGAE. Specifically, band directors’ years of experience, level of teaching assignment (i.e., middle vs. high school), size of band program and teaching setting (i.e., rural, suburban, rural) were considered.

Specific research questions were, as follows:

1. What are band director's perceptions of large-group adjudicated events (LGAE)?
2. Do teachers’ perceptions of LGAE differ based on their years of teaching experience?
3. Do high school band teachers’ perceptions of LGAE differ from middle school band teachers?

4. Do teachers differ in their perceptions of LGAE based upon the setting in which they teach (e.g., rural, suburban, urban)?

5. Do teachers' perceptions of LGAE change based upon the size of their ensemble?

6. What reasons do teachers give for participating in LGAE?

7. What reasons do teachers give for not participating in LGAE?

8. Do factors such as school setting, years of experience, teaching level, and ensemble size affect whether or not teachers participate in LGAE?

**Respondent Demographics**

The survey instrument was sent to 150 Ohio band directors. The target population included both high school and middle school band directors. The overall response rate for the survey was 38.6% (N = 58). Of those who responded, 75.8% were high school band directors (n = 44), while 22.4% were middle school band directors (n = 13). It should be noted that the response rate of middle school directors was low. Although several attempts were made to target this population in order to increase response rate, only 13 responded to the survey. Such a low response rate makes generalizations about this population tentative, at best. Future studies might target only this population of teachers to determine if there are concomitant factors that make this subject less important to middle school directors or if there were other reasons for their lack of response.
Respondents self-reported the setting in which they currently teach. These areas were identified as urban ($n = 16$, 32% response rate), suburban ($n = 23$, 46% response rate), and rural\(^1\) ($n = 18$, 36% response rate).

Gender of respondents was, as follows: male 76.7% ($n = 46$), female 16.7% ($n = 10$). Teachers’ years of experience ranged from 1 to 39 years, and averaged 19.5 years. The following classifications were created for years of experience: novice teachers with 1-5 years of experience (33.3%, $n = 20$), mid-career teachers with 6-14 years of experience (35.0%, $n = 25$), and experienced teachers with 15 years or more teaching experience (28.3%, $n = 17$). These strata were employed in order to answer research questions relating to years of experience. Additionally, highest levels of teacher education were reported, as follows: bachelor’s degree 25.0% ($n = 15$), master’s degree 68.3% ($n = 41$), and doctorate 1.7% ($n = 1$). Respondents were also asked about their LGAE attendance/participation with their student ensemble(s): 85.0% ($n = 51$) of directors had taken their ensembles to LGAE contest at least once in their careers, and 56.7% ($n = 34$) had taken their ensembles at least four out of the last five years. Stratifying by teaching level, 70.6% ($n = 41$) of high school band directors and 69.3% ($n = 9$) of middle school directors had taken their ensemble to LGAE at least once.

\(^1\) “Rural” and “small-town” respondents were grouped together in the “rural” category because of low response rates for these groups.
Research Question 1: What are band director's perceptions of large-group adjudicated events (LGAE)?

Participants were asked to respond to statements regarding LGAE indicating the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each. Likert scale items were based on a 1 through 5 scale, with 1 equaling “Strongly Disagree” and 5 equaling “Strongly Agree”. A “No Opinion” (0) option was also provided in an attempt to make a 3 on the Likert scale (i.e., “Neither Agree or Disagree”) a more valid indicator of opinion. For clarity, Likert scale items were examined based on thematic groupings, as discussed in Chapter 3 (i.e., fairness and accuracy of evaluation, influence of outside agencies/stakeholders, benefits to self and students, impact on teaching/curriculum, student growth/professional development, and other). Table 4.1 presents band directors' opinions about LGAE for each Likert scale item.
Table 4.1

Respondents’ Means and Standard Deviations for All Likert Scale Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fairly judged</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is accurately judged</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for me [director]</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my career</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my students</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my career</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my students</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is necessary for me to succeed in my job</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil for my students</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required of my job</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for me [director]</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for my students</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to me [director]</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an incentive for my students to work harder</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required for me to advance my career</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE guides my teaching</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE influences my teaching</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is in need of improvement</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE meets the needs of my students</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for my students</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil in my career</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to my students</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a form of professional development</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a means of assessing my student's achievement</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teacher</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert-scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree.
Fairness and Accuracy of Evaluation

In terms of Likert items centering on the fairness and accuracy of adjudication in LGAE, band directors, on average, somewhat agreed that LGAE is fairly ($M = 3.42, SD = .99$) and accurately ($M = 3.44, SD = .94$) judged.

Influence of Outside Agencies and/or Stakeholders

Band directors also tended to agree that little outside influence existed in their decisions to take groups to LGAE. While the importance of LGAE to students was more strongly felt ($M = 3.36, SD = 1.23$), band directors generally felt that LGAE participation was not a job requirement ($M = 1.53, SD = 1.03$) or a necessary evil for students ($M = 2.18, SD = 1.14$) or for their careers ($M = 2.25, SD = 1.22$).

Benefits to Self and Students

Band directors agreed that LGAE participation was beneficial for their students ($M = 3.77, SD = 1.01$) and their careers ($M = 3.19, SD = 1.15$), although it should be noted that the mean score was lower for the latter and exhibited somewhat higher variance.

Impact on Curriculum

Directors were somewhat neutral when reporting if LGAE influenced the nature of their curriculum ($M = 3.19, SD = 1.30$), and generally disagreed that LGAE guided their teaching ($M = 2.53, SD = 1.23$).
Student Growth and Professional Development

Band directors agreed that LGAE encouraged student growth. Directors felt that students worked harder ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.13$), student needs were met from the experience ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.01$), and appropriate assessment took place ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 1.26$). However, disagreement was evidenced when asked if LGAE was an appropriate measure of teacher accomplishments ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 1.29$).

Requirement for Career Advancement

Band directors' generally disagreed with items that focused on LGAE as a requirement for their career advancement. Here, band directors felt that LGAE was not a requirement to advance ($M = 1.95$, $SD = 1.26$), important to ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.38$), or a necessary evil in ($M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.22$) their careers.

Other (e.g., Opinions about Improving, etc.)

Moderate agreement was witnessed regarding LGAE as motivation for directors and students ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.38$ to $M = 3.53$, $SD = 1.29$), although high deviation was present in responses. Additionally, band directors' responses were relatively neutral about the item, LGAE is a fun experience for students ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 1.07$).
Research Question 2. Do early career teachers’ perceptions of LGAE differ from mid and late career teachers?

As noted above, the average years of teaching experience amongst respondents was 19.5 years, ranging from 1 to 39 years. In order to investigate research question two, teachers’ years of experience were grouped into the following categories: (a) novice (1-5 years of experience); (b) mid-career (6-14 years); and (c) experienced (15+ years).

Table 4.2 presents means and standard deviations for Likert scale items based on teachers' years of experience. Again, these means were examined based on thematic groupings of Likert scale items.
Table 4.2

Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Likert Items by Years of Teacher Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teacher Experience</th>
<th>Novice (1-5)</th>
<th>Mid-career (6-14)</th>
<th>Experienced (15+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fairly judged</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is accurately judged</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for me [director]</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my career</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my students</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my career</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my students</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is necessary for me to succeed in my job</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil for my students</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required of my job</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for me [director]</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for my students</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to me [director]</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an incentive for my students to work harder</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required for me to advance my career</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE guides my teaching</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE influences my teaching</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is in need of improvement</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE meets the needs of my students</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for my students</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil in my career</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to my students</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a form of professional development</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a means of assessing my student's achievement</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teacher</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Likert-scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree.*
Fairness and Accuracy of Evaluation

An interesting trend was noted when comparing novice, mid-career and experienced teachers for the items, “LGAE is fairly judged” and “LGAE is accurately judged.” For each item, mean scores are higher for novice teachers, dip for mid-career teachers, and then climb again for experienced teachers, indicating agreement with the aforementioned items early in teaching career, relative disagreement in mid-career, and agreement again for experienced teachers (see Table 4.2).

Influence of Outside Agencies and/or Stakeholders

Inversely, mid-career teachers recorded the highest mean scores for questions centered on adjudicated events as a necessary career evil \( (M = 2.66, SD = 1.61) \), “LGAE is not important to me [director]” \( (M = 2.92, SD = 1.31) \) and “LGAE is not important to my students” \( (M = 2.91, SD = 1.38) \). Although the means of the mid-year teachers were highest, all teachers disagreed that LGAE participation is influenced by outside agencies and/or stakeholders, regardless of how long they had been teaching.

Benefits to Self and Students

Experienced teachers rated the item, “LGAE is beneficial to my students” highest \( (M = 4.00, SD = 1.02) \), although all agreed with this assertion. Interestingly, novice teachers had the least amount of variance for this same item \( (M = 3.80, SD = .45) \).

Perceptions of LGAE as a career benefit were highest in novice teachers \( (M = 4.00, SD = .71) \) and gradually waned for experienced teachers \( (M = 3.04, SD = 1.08) \).
Impact on Curriculum

All teachers generally disagreed with the item “LGAE guides my teaching” ($M = 2.40$, novice; $M = 2.42$, mid-career; $M = 2.73$, experienced). Interestingly here, though, is that means increased as years of experienced increased. In regard to the item, “LGAE influences my teaching,” teachers were relatively neutral, yet again, a similar trend was evidenced, with experienced teachers tending to agree more ($M = 3.20$, novice; $M = 2.83$, mid-career; $M = 3.50$, experienced).

Student Growth and Professional Development

Band directors were relatively uniform in their disagreement with the Likert item “LGAE is an appropriate measurement of my accomplishments as a teacher”: novice teachers responded with the lowest mean score ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.00$) while experienced teachers responded the highest ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.35$).

Mid-career and experienced teachers somewhat agreed that LGAE is a form of professional development, while novice teachers tended to disagree ($M = 2.40$, novice; $M = 3.17$, mid-career; $M = 3.54$, experienced). All experience levels generally agreed that LGAE was an appropriate means of student assessment, although mid-career teachers were more neutral in their responses ($M = 3.80$, novice; $M = 3.08$, mid-career; $M = 3.38$, experienced).

Respondents also disagreed that “LGAE is an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teacher,” regardless of their years of teaching experience ($M = 2.00$, novice; $M = 2.33$, mid-career; $M = 2.69$, experienced).
Requirement for Career Advancement

Younger teachers, overall, slightly agreed when asked if participation in large-group adjudicated events was required to advance their careers, although relatively high variance in their scores should be noted ($M = 3.20, SD = 1.48$), while experienced teachers disagreed more strongly with this notion ($M = 1.42, SD = 0.76$).

Band directors agreed that LGAE was important to students, although mid-career and experienced teachers expressed slightly more neutrality ($M = 4.00$, novice; $M = 3.33$, mid-career; $M = 3.35$, experienced). However, novice band directors' agreed with Likert item “LGAE is important to my career,” while experienced teachers disagreed and mid career teachers were neutral ($M = 4.00$, novice; $M = 3.00$, mid-career; $M = 2.58$, experienced).

Participants disagreed with the statement, “LGAE is a necessary evil in my career” ($M = 1.80$, novice; $M = 2.66$, mid-career; $M = 2.04$, experienced). It should be noted, however, that novice teachers reported the lowest mean score for the aforementioned survey item.

Other (e.g., Opinions about Improving, etc.)

No significant differences were noted between teacher experience level and the need for improvement in LGAE, although it should be noted that novice and mid-career teachers responded with the highest mean scores on this particular survey item ($M = 4.20, SD = .83$ and $M = 4.33, SD = 1.23$, respectively). Moreover, novice teachers strongly agreed that LGAE was motivating for them and their students ($M = 4.40, SD = .55$ for
each item), whereas mid-career teachers tended towards indifference ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.54$ to $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.41$, respectively), and means for these items rose for experienced teachers ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.32$ to $M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.19$, respectively).

**ANOVA Analyses**

To determine if significant differences existed based upon years of teaching experience, a 1 x 3 analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run comparing novice, mid-career, and experienced teachers' mean scores on each Likert scale item. The following items manifested significant differences: (a) “LGAE is required for me to advance in my career,” $F(2, 57) = 6.79$, $p = .00$, $\eta^2 = .25$; (b) “LGAE is accurately judged,” $F(2, 55) = 5.01$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .23$; and (c) “LGAE is fairly judged,” $F(2, 55) = 3.70$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .16$.

Post hoc Scheffe analyses were employed to explicate significant differences evidenced by ANOVA analyses. Here, post hoc analyses revealed that mid-career teachers' ($M = 2.66$) mean scores were significantly lower than experienced teachers' ($M = 3.73$) for the item, “LGAE is accurately judged.” Further, post hoc Scheffe analysis showed that significant differences occurred between mid-career ($M = 2.92$) and experienced ($M = 3.81$) teachers for the item, “LGAE is fairly judged.” And finally, Scheffe analysis revealed significant differences between experienced teachers ($M = 1.42$) and novice ($M = 3.20$) teachers for item “LGAE is a required for me to advance my career”.
Research Question 3. Do high school band teachers’ perceptions of LGAE differ from middle school band teachers?

Table 4.3 presents means and standard deviations for Likert scale items based on teachers' primary teaching assignment (i.e., high school or middle school). Findings are discussed below in relation to survey themes.
Table 4.3

**Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Likert Items by Primary Teaching Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGAE is fairly judged</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/Senior High</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is accurately judged</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for me [director]</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my career</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my students</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my career</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my students</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is necessary for me to succeed in my job</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil for my students</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required of my job</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for me [director]</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for my students</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to me [director]</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an incentive for my students to work harder</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required for me to advance my career</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE guides my teaching</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE influences my teaching</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is in need of improvement</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE meets the needs of my students</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for my students</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil in my career</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to my students</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a form of professional development</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a means of assessing my student's achievement</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teacher</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Likert-scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree.*
**Fairness and Accuracy of Evaluation**

In terms of adjudication accuracy, band directors' perceptions of LGAE were largely homogenous. Both middle school and high school band directors tended to agree that “LGAE is accurately judged” ($M = 3.38$ to $M = 3.44$, respectively). However, findings showed some disagreement between middle school and high school directors regarding the statement “LGAE is fairly judged” ($M = 3.25$ to $M = 3.56$, respectively). Here, although both groups tended to agree with the statement, middle school directors were slightly more neutral in their response.

**Influence of Outside Agencies and/or Stakeholders**

Perceptions of “LGAE in important to my students” were similarly judged by middle school ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.41$) and high school ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.10$) band directors. Furthermore, band directors did not view LGAE as a necessary evil for students ($M = 1.50$, middle school to $M = 2.35$, high school) or their own career ($M = 1.86$, middle school to $M = 2.36$, high school). Neither did band directors viewed LGAE as a required part of their jobs ($M = 1.25$, middle school to $M = 1.56$, high school).

**Benefits to Students and Self**

The item, “LGAE is beneficial to my students,” was largely agreed upon by both middle school ($M = 3.75$) and high school ($M = 3.85$) band directors alike. However, middle school band directors tended to agree more strongly with the Likert item “LGAE is beneficial to my career” ($M = 3.75$) than high school respondents ($M = 3.03$).
**Impact on Curriculum**

Both middle school and high school directors agreed that LGAE participation did not guide their teaching ($M = 2.63$ to $M = 2.62$, respectively), but slightly agreed that it influenced their curricular teaching ($M = 3.25$ to $M = 3.32$, respectively).

**Student Growth and Professional Development**

Middle school directors rated the item, “LGAE is an incentive for my students to work harder,” somewhat lower (and more neutral) than high school directors ($M = 3.13$ to $M = 3.71$, respectively).

Both groups tended to agree that LGAE served as a form of professional development ($M = 3.38$, middle school to $M = 3.24$, high school), although it should be noted that middle school directors’ means scores were somewhat higher. Furthermore, responses indicated that both groups viewed LGAE as an appropriate means of student assessment ($M = 3.38$, middle school to $M = 3.29$, high school).

Both groups had low mean scores and high standard deviations for the item, “LGAE is an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teacher” for both middle school ($M = 2.38$, $SD = 1.41$) and high school band directors ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.33$).

**Requirement for Career Advancement**

Each group agreed that participation in LGAE was not a requirement for career advancement. Middle school and high school band directors' mean scores were low, but
congruent for the following survey Likert items, respectively: “LGAE is required to advance my career” ($M = 2.25$ to $M = 1.71$); “LGAE is a necessary evil in my career” ($M = 1.86$ to $M = 2.36$); “LGAE is necessary for me to succeed in my job” ($M = 2.13$ to $M = 2.03$).

Other (e.g., Opinions about Improving, etc.)

The largest discrepancy of opinion occurred for the item, LGAE is important to my career. Here, middle school directors tended to agree with this statement, whereas high school directors did not agree on average ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.60$ to $M = 2.76$, $SD = 1.30$, respectively).

ANOVA Analyses

To determine if significant differences existed based upon teaching level, a $1 \times 2$ analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run comparing high school and middle school teachers' mean scores on each Likert scale item. Perhaps because of the low response rate of middle school directors ($n = 13$), no significant differences manifested for any Likert scale item.
Research Question 4. Do teachers differ in their perceptions of LGAE based upon the setting in which they teach (e.g., rural, suburban, urban)?

As discussed in Chapter 3, the survey sample population ($N = 150$) was randomly selected according to Ohio Department of Education school district typologies: urban, suburban, small-town, rural. Participants were asked to identify the school district in which they worked. Because of low response rate (38.6%), small-town and rural respondents were grouped together into the category “rural” for analysis. Table 4.4 presents the means and standard deviations of each survey Likert item by school district setting. Responses are discussed by themes below.
Table 4.4

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Survey Likert Items by School District Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District Setting</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fairly judged</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is accurately judged</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for me [director]</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my career</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my students</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my career</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my students</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is necessary for me to succeed in my job</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil for my students</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required of my job</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for me [director]</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for my students</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to me [director]</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an incentive for my students to work harder</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required for me to advance my career</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE guides my teaching</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE influences my teaching</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is in need of improvement</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE meets the needs of my students</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for my students</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil in my career</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to my students</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a form of professional development</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a means of assessing my student's achievement</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teacher</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert-scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree.
**Fairness and Accuracy in Evaluation**

Respondents, despite setting, tended to agree that “LGAE is fairly judged” ($M = 3.15$, urban; $M = 3.83$, suburban; $M = 3.36$, rural) and “LGAE is accurately judged” ($M = 3.08$, urban; $M = 3.66$, suburban; $M = 3.45$, rural). Noteworthy is that suburban directors had the highest mean for both items, while urban teachers’ responses trended toward neutral on the Likert scale.

**Influence of Outside Agencies and/or Stakeholders**

Band directors' showed some variation of opinion based on school setting for the Likert items: “LGAE is important to my students” ($M = 2.08$, urban; $M = 3.11$, suburban; $M = 3.45$, rural); and “LGAE is beneficial to my career” ($M = 2.54$, urban; $M = 3.27$, suburban; $M = 3.73$, rural). Here, urban directors had the lowest means for these items and disagreed with these statements, whereas suburban and rural teachers agreed with these items.

Despite setting, band directors were relatively uniform in their disagreement with the following Likert items: “LGAE is a necessary evil for my students” ($M = 1.69$, urban; $M = 2.33$, suburban; $M = 2.55$, rural); and “LGAE is a necessary evil in my career” ($M = 1.62$, urban; $M = 2.50$, suburban; $M = 2.64$, rural).

**Benefits to Students and Self**

Band directors uniformly agreed with the Likert item “LGAE is beneficial to my students” ($M = 3.38$, urban; $M = 4.00$, suburban; $M = 4.09$, rural), irrespective of school
district setting. Noteworthy, urban directors recorded the lowest mean score. However, more discrepancy of opinion between school settings occurred for the Likert item “LGAE is beneficial to my career” ($M = 2.54$, urban; $M = 3.27$, suburban; $M = 3.73$, rural). Here, urban directors disagreed with this item, whereas their rural and suburban counterparts tended to agree.

**Impact on Curriculum**

Respondents uniformly disagreed with the statement “LGAE guides my teaching” ($M = 2.38$, urban; $M = 2.88$, suburban; $M = 2.45$, rural), but differences of opinion were evidenced for “LGAE influences my teaching” ($M = 2.77$, urban; $M = 3.72$, suburban; $M = 3.27$, rural). Of note, suburban and rural directors agreed that LGAE influenced curricular teaching, while urban band directors disagreed.

**Student Growth and Professional Development**

School setting played a part in band directors’ opinions about the item, “LGAE meets the needs of my students” ($M = 2.77$, urban; $M = 3.27$, suburban; $M = 3.45$, rural). Here, urban teachers did not agree with survey item above, while suburban and rural directors tended to agree. Furthermore, band directors were uniform in their disagreement with the statement “LGAE is an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teachers” ($M = 2.23$, urban; $M = 2.89$, suburban; $M = 2.27$, rural).

All band directors, despite setting, agreed that, “LGAE is a form of professional development,” although urban directors were more neutral about this ($M = 3.08$, urban;
Likewise, general agreement occurred for items, “LGAE is a means of assessing my student's achievement” ($M = 3.08$, urban; $M = 3.39$, suburban; $M = 3.45$, rural) and “LGAE is an incentive to work harder” ($M = 3.08$, urban; $M = 3.66$, suburban; $M = 4.09$, rural), although it is mentionable that the urban directors' means score was considerably lower.

**Requirement for Career Advancement**

Band directors' opinions varied for the statement, “LGAE is important to my career” based on their school setting ($M = 2.08$, urban; $M = 3.11$, suburban; $M = 3.45$, rural). Rural directors tended to agree with the statement, while suburban directors were neutral and urban directors disagreed.

Notable differences among school setting were found for the following survey items, although all means fell into the disagree portion of the Likert scale: “LGAE is necessary for me to succeed in my job” ($M = 1.62$, urban; $M = 2.11$, suburban; $M = 2.45$, rural); “LGAE is required to advance my career” ($M = 1.62$, urban; $M = 1.55$, suburban; $M = 2.45$, rural); “LGAE is a necessary evil in my career” ($M = 1.62$, urban; $M = 2.50$, suburban; $M = 2.64$, rural).

**Other (e.g., Opinions about Improving, etc.)**

Of additional interest, participants, irrespective of teaching setting, agreed with item the “LGAE is in need of improvement” ($M = 4.15$, SD = 1.07, urban; $M = 3.66$, SD = 1.45, suburban; $M = 3.91$, SD = 1.38, rural). Suburban directors recorded the lowest
mean score, while urban teachers noted the most agreement.

ANOVA Analyses

To determine if significant differences existed based upon school district setting (i.e., urban, rural, or suburban), a 1 x 3 analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run comparing mean scores on each Likert scale item. The following items were statistically significant: (a) “LGAE is important to my career,” $F(2, 42) = 3.99, p = .03, \eta^2 = .17$; and (b) “LGAE is beneficial to my career,” $F(2, 42) = 3.99, p = .03, \eta^2 = .17$.

Post hoc Sheffe analyses indicated that these significant differences occurred for item “LGAE is important to my career” between urban ($M = 2.08$) and rural directors ($M = 3.45$), and between urban ($M = 2.54$) and rural directors ($M = 3.73$) for the item, “LGAE is beneficial to my career”.
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Research Question 5. Do teachers’ perceptions of LGAE change based upon the size of their ensemble?

Participants were asked to provide the size of their ensembles for their last three appearances at LGAE, if applicable. Of the 58 survey participants, 43 (74.1%) elected to provide ensemble size information. For unification, the top (i.e., most advanced) ensemble's size was used for each response. Ensemble sizes were grouped by number of student musicians, as follows: (a) Small, 1 – 49 (n = 18), (b) Medium, 50 – 74 (n = 22), (c) Large, 75+ (n = 3). Table 4.5 presents means and standard deviations for Likert scale items based on top ensemble size.
Table 4.5

Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Likert Items by Top Ensemble Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Ensemble (No. of Student Musicians)</th>
<th>1 -49</th>
<th>50 – 74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fairly judged</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is accurately judged</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for me [director]</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my career</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is important to my students</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my career</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is beneficial to my students</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is necessary for me to succeed in my job</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil for my students</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required of my job</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for me [director]</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is motivating for my students</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to me [director]</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an incentive for my students to work harder</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is required for me to advance my career</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE guides my teaching</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE influences my teaching</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is in need of improvement</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE meets the needs of my students</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is fun for my students</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a necessary evil in my career</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is not important to my students</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a form of professional development</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is a means of assessing my student's achievement</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAE is an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teacher</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert-scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree.
Fairness and Accuracy of Evaluation

Band directors' perceptions of the item, “LGAE is fairly judged,” were similar, irrespective of top ensemble size (\( M = 3.40 \), small; \( M = 3.77 \), medium; \( M = 3.66 \), large). Teachers also were relatively uniform in their agreement for the item, “LGAE is accurately judged” (\( M = 3.46 \), small; \( M = 3.55 \), medium; \( M = 3.66 \), large).

Influence of Outside Agencies and/or Stakeholders

All band directors strongly disagreed with the statement “LGAE is required of my job” (\( M = 1.33 \), small; \( M = 1.72 \), medium; \( M = 1.66 \), large), despite size of top ensemble.

Benefits to Students and Self

Teachers were uniform in their agreement with the following survey items, despite band size: “LGAE is beneficial to my students” (\( M = 3.73 \), small; \( M = 4.05 \), medium; \( M = 3.66 \), large); and “LGAE is beneficial to my career” (\( M = 3.33 \), small; \( M = 3.44 \), medium; \( M = 3.33 \), large).

Impact on Curriculum

Some discrepancy arose for band size for the item, “LGAE guides my teaching.” Here, small and large ensemble disagreed with this item, while those with medium size ensembles were relatively neutral (\( M = 2.33 \), small; \( M = 3.11 \), medium; \( M = 2.00 \), large). More uniformity among differing band sizes was evidenced for the item, “LGAE influences my teaching” (\( M = 3.33 \), small; \( M = 3.61 \), medium; \( M = 3.33 \), large).
Interestingly, band directors with medium sized ensembles recorded the highest mean score for the influence of LGAE on their curricular teaching.

**Requirement for Career Advancement**

Participants tended to disagree uniformly with the following Likert items: “LGAE is necessary for me to succeed in my job” ($M = 2.13$, $SD = 0.99$, small; $M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.24$, medium; $M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.00$, large); “LGAE is required for me to advance my career” ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 1.18$, small; $M = 1.88$, $SD = 1.23$, medium; $M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.73$, large); “LGAE is a necessary evil in my career” ($M = 2.13$, $SD = 1.06$, small; $M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.38$, medium; $M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.23$, large).

Additionally, band directors’ perceptions were slightly different for survey item “LGAE is important to my career” based on the size of their ensemble ($M = 3.06$, $SD = 1.39$, small; $M = 3.16$, $SD = 1.25$, medium; $M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.15$, large). Here, a trend is evidenced with means increasing slightly as size of ensemble increases.

**Other (e.g., Opinions about Improving, etc.)**

Directors strongly agreed that LGAE was motivating for them regardless of ensemble size ($M = 3.86$, small; $M = 3.83$, medium; $M = 4.00$, large). An increase in degree of agreement from small to medium ensembles was seen for the item “LGAE is motivating to my students” ($M = 3.53$, small; $M = 3.94$, medium), while a decrease is strength of agreement was witnessed from medium to large ensembles for this survey item ($M = 3.33$).
Additionally, strong agreement occurred between directors of all ensemble size classifications regarding item, LGAE is in need of improvement ($M = 3.73$, small; $M = 3.94$, medium; $M = 4.00$, large). Notably, the strength of agreement for the previous survey item increased in a positive linear trend as ensemble size increased.

ANOVA Analyses

To determine if significant differences existed based upon the size of ensemble, a 1 x 3 analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run comparing ensemble size mean scores on each Likert scale item. No significant differences manifested for ensemble size on any of the Likert scale items.
Research Question 6. What reasons do teachers give for participating in LGAE?

In order to answer Research Question 6, the survey included the open-ended question, “What are the top three factors in order of importance that influence your decision to participate in LGAE?” Responses to this open-ended survey item were coded and grouped into researcher-developed themes. For example, the comments, “assessment of our group for future improvement” and “comments from judges,” were grouped into the larger thematic heading “Feedback and Evaluation.” Frequency counts were then tabulated for each theme (see Table 4.6).

The highest frequency counts occurred for the following themes: Feedback and Evaluation ($n = 36$); Outside Influences/Job Requirement ($n = 22$); Student Motivation ($n = 19$); and Quality of Required Literature ($n = 11$). Additionally, the lowest frequency counts were observed for the following themes: Opportunity for Sight-Reading ($n = 4$); Quality of Experience ($n = 1$); and Student Growth ($n = 1$).
Table 4.6

*Reasons for Attending LGAE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and Evaluation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Influences/Job Requirement</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Motivation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Required Literature</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Director Motivation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Recognition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Performance Opportunity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Sight-Reading</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Factors Influencing Participation in LGAE.*
Research Question 7. What reasons do teachers give for not participating in LGAE?

In order to answer Research Question 7, the survey included the open-ended question, “What are the top three factors in order of importance that influence your decision not to participate in LGAE?” Responses to this open-ended survey item were coded and grouped into researcher-developed themes. As an example, the comments, “bias against smaller bands” and “elitist judging” were grouped into the larger thematic heading “Adjudicator Bias.” Again, frequency counts were tabulated for each theme as in research question 6. This procedure was followed for all comments and results are presented in Table 4.7.

The following thematic groupings recorded the highest frequency counts: Scheduling and Logistics ($n = 26$); Philosophical Discord ($n = 18$); Adjudicator Bias ($n = 16$); Incomplete Ensemble Instrumentation ($n = 14$); and Cost of Participation ($n = 14$).

Conversely, the following thematic groupings recorded the lowest frequency counts: Lack of Interest ($n = 4$); Grade Inflation ($n = 1$); and Poor Past Experiences ($n = 1$).
Table 4.7

Reasons for Not Attending LGAE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and Logistics</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Discord</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudicator Bias</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Ensemble Instrumentation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Participation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Repertoire List</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudicator Inconsistency</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics/Bureaucracy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Interest</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Inflation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Past Experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Factors Influencing Not Participating in LGAE.
Research Question 8. Do factors such as school setting, years of experience, teaching level, and ensemble size affect whether or not teachers participate in LGAE?

In order to answer Research Question 8, chi-square analyses were conducted based on respondents' demographic factors and their reported attendance at LGAE. Findings are presented below based on years of experience, school district setting, primary teaching assignment, and ensemble size.

Year of Experience

Results indicated that, of the experienced teachers who responded ($n = 34$), all had taken an ensemble to LGAE, while 78.6% of mid-career teachers and still fewer (60.0%) of novice teachers had done so. Frequency counts for each level of teacher experience can be found on Table 4.8. A chi-square analysis revealed that significant differences occurred between novice and both mid-career and experienced experience levels, $\chi^2 (2, N = 60) = 12.17, p = .001$.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>1 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 14</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey responses indicated that regular attendance at LGAE was highest amongst experienced teachers (67.6%) and lowest amongst novice teachers (30.0%), possibly because they had not taught enough years to fit the definition of frequent attendance. Mid-career teachers reported a 50.0% regular attendance rate at LGAE, as defined by 4 out of 5 years of attendance.

Three novice teachers (30%) reported regular attendance at LGAE, while eight mid-career (57%) and 23 experienced teachers (67.6%) did the same. Chi-square analysis determined no significant differences between years of experience and frequent LGAE attendance.

**School Setting**

Frequency counts for attendance at LGAE for each school setting (i.e., urban, suburban, or rural) can be found in Table 4.9, below. A chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences between school district setting and LGAE participation.

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGAE Participation by School District Setting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School District Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that all participants responded to the question regarding participation in LGAE. Also noteworthy here, the majority of respondents reported attending a large-group adjudicated event at some time in their teaching career (87.7%). Additionally, 95.6% of suburban band directors that responded had attended LGAE, which was higher than both urban (81.2%) and rural (83.3%) respondents. Additionally, 46% of urban (n = 6), 82% of suburban (n = 18), and 75% of rural (n = 10) teachers who had participated in LGAE reported regular attendance.

A chi-square analysis revealed significant differences in frequent LGAE participation related to school district setting for suburban band directors, $\chi^2 (2, N = 57) = 6.69, p = .035$. Noteworthy, urban school districts attend LGAE with less frequency (37.5%) than their suburban (78.2%) and rural (55.5%) counterparts.

*Primary Teaching Assignment*

Frequency counts for LGAE participation by band directors' primary teaching assignment are presented in Table 4.10. Responses revealed that 82.0% of the high school and 42.8% of middle school band directors surveyed had taken an ensemble to LGAE. A chi-square analysis revealed significant difference in LGAE attendance for teaching level, $\chi^2 (1, N = 57) = 5.34, p = .02$. 
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Table 4.10

*LGAE Participation by Primary Teaching Assignment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey responses indicated that 65.9% of high school directors ($n = 29$) routinely take an ensemble to LGAE, while only 38.5% middle school directors ($n = 5$) do the same. No significant differences were determined by a chi-square analysis.

*Ensemble Size*

Table 4.11 presents the frequency counts for LGAE participation by top ensemble size, specifically small (1-49), medium (50-74), and large (75+) ensembles. Results showed that all (100%) of surveyed band directors with either medium or large ensembles had attended LGAE. Additionally, 95.0% of small ensemble directors had participated in LGAE. A chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences between ensemble size and LGAE attendance.

Table 4.11

*LGAE Attendance by Top Ensemble Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensemble Size</th>
<th>Small (1-49)</th>
<th>Medium (50-74)</th>
<th>Large (75+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey responses indicated that 63% of directors with small ensembles ($n = 12$) routinely take an ensemble to LGAE, while 77% medium ($n = 17$) and 75% of large ($n = 3$) ensemble directors do the same. A chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in frequent LGAE attendance by top ensemble size.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine Ohio band directors' perceptions of concert band large-group adjudicated (LGAE) events. High school and middle school band directors of various experience levels, ensemble sizes, and school district typologies (i.e., urban, suburban, and rural) participated. Participants completed an online survey (GoogleDocs) that evaluated various aspects of adjudicated events, from the perspective of the band director.

A review of literature revealed philosophical debates regarding the purposes and values of contest or competition participation. Positive philosophical views promoted the benefits of competition, including skills not inherently musical, such as discipline and responsibility. Conflicting philosophical arguments argued that competition was neither educationally sound nor beneficial to students over time. The literature review also presented findings from studies examining the extra-musical factors that influence contest adjudication. Amongst these influences were biased expectations of performance, the size of the performing group, and grade inflation.

In this study I solicited Ohio band directors to see if philosophical views or extra-
musical factors influenced their perceptions of LGAE. Further, I examined demographic variables to see if directors’ opinions about LGAE differed based on ensemble size, years of teaching experience, school setting, or teaching assignment (i.e., middle school vs. high school). Participants (\(N = 58\)) for the study were high school (\(n = 44\)) and middle school (\(n = 13\)) band directors; of those, 76.7% were male (\(n = 44\)), 16.7% were female (\(n = 40\)). Additionally, 16 urban directors (32% response rate), 23 suburban directors (46% response rate), and 18 rural directors (36% response rate) responded to the study. Teacher experience levels ranged from 1 to 39 years and averaged 19.5 years.

A summary of findings related to each research question is presented below, followed by a discussion of findings and recommendations for future research. Conclusions are presented at the end of the chapter.

**Research Question 1. What are band directors’ perceptions of large-group adjudicated events?**

Overall, band directors felt that LGAE is fairly and accurately judged. Furthermore, contest participation was considered beneficial and motivating for students, although a larger variance was evidenced for items relating to these issues.

Despite the positive aspects of LGAE participation, band directors agreed that LGAE is in need of improvement, especially in terms of scheduling and logistics, which were noted in open-ended responses as being a point of concern. Additionally, band directors did not feel that LGAE is an appropriate measure of teacher accomplishment.
Research Question 2. Do early career teachers' perceptions of LGAE differ from mid and late career teachers?

Some significant differences manifested for Likert scale items when comparing teachers by their years of experience. Specifically, mid-career teachers significantly disagreed with experienced teachers regarding the accuracy *and* fairness of contest adjudication. For each of these items, means for mid-career teachers’ opinions were significantly lower than their experienced counterparts.

Significant differences between experienced teachers and novice teachers occurred for the item, LGAE is a requirement for career advancement. Here, experienced teachers tended to disagree with this item, whereas novice teachers showed more agreement. This difference is likely explained by the place the teachers are in their career – experienced teachers have likely risen to the highest level in their careers.

Although not a significant finding, it should be noted that novice and mid-career teachers strongly agreed that LGAE is in need of improvement, whereas experienced teachers did not feel as strongly about this issue.

Research Question 3. Do high school band teachers' perceptions of LGAE differ from middle school band teachers?

Although no significant differences for Likert scale items were evidenced for primary teaching assignment (perhaps because of the low response rate of middle school teachers), several interesting findings deserve note. Middle school band directors believed that LGAE is beneficial to their career, whereas high school directors were
relatively neutral about this. Additionally, high school directors did not believe LGAE participation was important to their career, whereas middle school directors did.

Both high school and middle school directors agreed that their students work harder when participating in LGAE, although high school directors tended to agree more. Neither high school nor middle school directors felt LGAE was an appropriate measure of teacher accomplishments.

Research Question 4. Do teachers differ in their perceptions of LGAE based upon the setting in which they teach (i.e., rural, suburban, urban)?

Several significant differences occurred when examining Likert scale items based on teaching setting. In regard to the importance of LGAE to the teachers’ career, urban directors’ means were significantly lower than their rural counterparts. More importantly, urban directors disagreed with this item, whereas rural directors agreed. Similar opinions existed regarding LGAE being beneficial to the teacher’s career. Here again, differences were significant with urban teachers strongly disagreeing with the item and rural agreeing.

Although not significantly different, LGAE participation did not manifest as being important to students in the opinion of urban band directors; however, suburban and rural directors agreed that LGAE was of important for their students. Further, LGAE did not meet the needs of urban students according to urban directors. Regardless of school district setting, band directors felt that LGAE is in need of improvement, although this opinion was more strongly felt by urban teachers.
Research Question 5. Do teachers' perceptions of LGAE change based upon the size of their ensemble?

No significant differences were found on any Likert scale item based on the size of teachers’ ensembles. A difference of opinion was found between directors with medium-sized ensembles (i.e., 50 – 74 students) and both smaller and larger ensembles regarding LGAE guiding classroom teaching. Here, mid-sized ensemble directors slightly agreed that LGAE guides their classroom teaching, whereas those with small and large ensembles disagreed. Analogous trends were evidenced regarding LGAE influencing teaching; however, in this case all directors agreed with this item despite band size. Such a trend may indicate that LGAE exerts a stronger influence on the curricular teaching of directors with medium-sized ensembles.

A small, but positive linear trend was seen from directors with smaller ensembles to larger ones regarding the importance of LGAE on career. While means from all these responses trended toward neutrality on the Likert scale, the increase in mean scores across ensemble size suggests a correlation between ensemble size and the perceived importance of LGAE participation on career.

Research Question 6. What reasons do teachers give for participating in LGAE?

The opportunity for student feedback and evaluation was the most frequent reason given for band directors participating in LGAE. The presence of outside influences, including community and school administration wishing directors to take ensembles to
contest, was the second-most indicated reason given for LGAE participation. Other motivations for attending LGAE included the setting of student goals and impetus for achievement, the opportunity to perform quality or advanced literature, and the opportunity for students to engage in sight-reading activities.

**Research Question 7. What reasons do teachers give for not participating in LGAE?**

Difficulty in scheduling and logistics (often due to the Ohio Graduation Test) were the most cited reasons for directors to *not* participate in LGAE. Secondly, philosophical discord with either the current contest format or competition conceptually manifested as the second most frequently cited reason for not participating. Other reasons for not participating included: perceived adjudicator bias, being penalized for not having complete instrumentation, and the costs of participation including contest registration fees and travel expenses. Of additional note, some of the band directors surveyed reported a lack of interest from students or themselves, or poor past experiences as reasons for not participation in LGAE.

**Research Question 8. Do factors such as school setting, years of experience, teaching level, and ensemble size affect whether or not teachers participated in LGAE?**

Significant differences in LGAE participation were observed between novice and both mid and late career teachers. Novice teachers attended LGAE in fewer numbers (60.0% of those surveyed) than both mid (78.6%) and experienced teachers (100%). Additionally, 67.6% of the experienced teachers who responded attended LGAE with
frequency (i.e., 4 out of 5 years).

LGAE participation was highest amongst suburban teachers (95.6%) with a wide gap in participation percentage to urban (81.2%) and rural (83.3%) teachers. Suburban and rural teachers reported the most frequent attendance at LGAE (82% and 75%, respectively). Only 46% of urban teachers frequently attended LGAE.

High school directors reported the highest percentage of LGAE participation (65.9%), while only 38.5% of middle directors did the same.

Ensemble size did not manifest as a significant factor in LGAE participation as all medium and large sized ensemble directors reported attendance; 95% of small-ensemble directors surveyed attended LGAE at least once in their career. Frequent attendance was highest amongst medium-sized ensembles (77%), while 63% of small and 75% of large ensemble directors did so.

Discussion

Results of this study suggest conflicting views of large-group adjudicated events. Generally, Ohio band directors tend to view LGAE as an equitable practice that benefits their students. On the other hand, there is strong agreement that the current contest format is in need of improvement. Such findings perhaps suggest the relative discord in the literature about contest from both philosophical and empirical lenses. Although Bergee (2003; 2007), Hash (2012) and others (Bergee & Westfall, 2005; Cavit, 1997; Sullivan, 2003) have shown that music performance adjudication practices can be influenced by extramusical factors and sometimes render unreliable outcomes, teachers seem to agree
overall that the benefits of this experience are important for them and their students, and possibly outweigh the potential negative factors.

These directors’ perceptions of benefits to students may confirm Austin’s (1988) findings that competitive formats increase student achievement. Indeed, some teachers cited this as among their top three reasons for attending LGAE. The motivating incentive of competition perceived by band directors echoes the opinions of Buyer (2005) in which students gain extra-musical life skills in search of competitive success. Clearly, such ideas are not new, but are in need of further empirical investigation to see if students actually reap the benefits these directors and theorists espouse.

Band directors in this study generally disagreed that outside stakeholders influenced their decision to participate in LGAE. Thus, the positive attitudes school administrators have toward LGAE that Rogers (1985) found appeared to have little considerable influence over Ohio band directors' decision to participate in contest. Despite the findings for this Likert scale item, seemingly contradictory opinions were shared in open-ended responses. Here, responses to the open-ended survey items revealed a considerable amount of external pressure to participate in LGAE from both school administrators and the supporting school community. Outside agencies' pressure in encouraging LGAE participation was viewed unfavorably by directors. One response best encapsulates this sentiment: “We are expected to. That is it. I would like to do some chamber groups, alternative performances, etc., but we don't have the time due to preparing for LGAE.” Because these were open-ended items, it may be that these sentiments are felt by only a minority of directors. However, such responses revealed
passionate concerns when they did appear.

Ohio band directors reported that LGAE participation somewhat influences their curriculum and teaching style. Although the influence of LGAE was felt on the curriculum, it was not sufficient enough to be a guiding factor for the day-to-day lessons of the respondents. Directors reported in open-ended responses that the opportunities for students to play selections from the required music list and sight-reading activities were influential in their decision to participate in LGAE. Perhaps such responses are reflective of a more deep seeded reason for participation in LGAE. Specifically, directors might use the event’s format to reinforce values they have concerning literature selection and skill development in the band classroom. By participating in an event that reinforces these values, directors can reify their curriculum and rely on the event to lend credibility about their program to principals, students, and their community. Although the present investigation did not specifically target these opinions or outcomes, future researchers may wish to pursue these ideas more thoroughly.

Another external influence cited as major factors for not participating in LGAE, were the financial burden and logistics of the event, as well as directors’ own philosophical discord with the event itself.

Scheduling conflicts with the Ohio Graduation Test or sporting events, as well as the travel expenses and contest registration fees, were considerable factors negatively impacting the decision to participate in LGAE.

Some responses to open-ended items indicated that philosophical discord was strongly felt by at least some Ohio band directors. In accordance with Kohn (2006),
Brandt (1995) and Maddy (1931), the use of standardizing rubrics and the belief that competition undermines the educational foundation of school education were echoed as reasons for not participating in LGAE. The following survey response illustrates the general antagonism towards contest:

“Music should be its own reward and I feel many directors do the State route more for their egos than for musical reasons. I want my students to enjoy music for music’s sake and enjoy the 'reasonable' effort to bring a piece to performance rather than nit picking the minutia all the time. I didn't get into music to bring home a trophy or plaque or so I can strut around think I am better than others – wrong motivation as far as I am concerned. I feel we need to instill the love of music in students rather than 'music as sport'.”

Additional comments reinforcing the philosophical discord of competitive and contest formats included the following:

“In today's arts world, everyone has to be superior or there must by a problem. Contesting takes precedence over the development of the band as a purely artistic outlet.”

“Classroom learning can be compromised when simply preparing for large group contest. Your focus as an educator needs to be more on teaching musical concepts and creating literate musicians, not 'robots' capable of churning out a I at contest. When I've put my focus more on helping my students to learn about music rather than focusing on simply preparing literature for contest, I have found that they become better musicians and readers of music. Contest preparation severely limits the literature the students read on a yearly basis.”

Moreover, adjudicator bias and the penalizing effect of incomplete instrumentation were also referenced as a deterrent to contest participation. Many directors related similar stories in which the contest adjudicator purposefully lowered a final rating due to incomplete instrumentation regardless if the part itself was covered by another instrument. Middle school and small-ensemble directors reported such instances of adjudicator bias, and indicated that they purposefully decline to participate in contests,
feeling disadvantaged. Similar to Sullivan (2003), respondents in the present investigation with small ensembles also perceived disadvantages and discrimination from adjudicators. As these schools are from smaller districts with more funding issues, Bergee and Westfall's (2005) findings seem to be confirmed.

Some important findings in this study relate to the differences of opinion held by rural, urban and suburban band directors regarding LGAE. Specifically, urban directors often reported more concerns and discord about LGAE than their rural and suburban counterparts. Specifically, urban directors significantly differed from suburban and rural teachers, feeling that LGAE was neither important to students nor beneficial to the directors' career. In addition, urban directors did not feel that the current LGAE formatting met the needs of their students. The survey instrument employed in this study revealed apathy towards LGAE from urban band directors. Moreover, strong disagreement was found for survey items pertaining to the requirement of LGAE participation for urban directors.

These findings reveal that LGAE participation is of little importance to students and teachers in urban school settings. Further, current LGAE formatting is not felt to be conducive to urban school students' needs nor a benefit to urban school band directors' careers. Such a disconnect is problematic for a state association charged with unifying efforts in music education across the State. Although certainly not the intent, it may be that LGAE, which in these respondents’ opinions reward full instrumentation, larger ensembles and more traditional bands, further serves to marginalize teachers and students in urban settings. More investigation is needed here before definitive conclusions can be
made; however, investigating this population should be a priority for researchers and state organizations wishing to provide equitability in educational opportunities for all children.

Lastly, views regarding the fairness and accuracy of LGAE adjudication significantly lowered for teachers classified as mid-career (i.e., 6-14 years of teaching experience). Most interestingly, mid-career teachers also reported the greatest influence from outside agencies and stakeholders influencing their decisions to participate in LGAE, although these results were modestly strong. Such findings indicated a dip in favorable opinions of LGAE for mid-career teachers, especially regarding the equitability of adjudication and the benefits to students and self.

**Implications**

Although many directors see positives in the LGAE event in its current form, a reevaluation of both the philosophy for, and formatting of, LGAE is called for based on some of the findings of this study. Regardless of school setting, years of experience, ensemble size, or teaching assignment, Ohio band directors strongly agree that competitions and contests need improvement. In addition to the reported findings, some band directors felt unable to participate in LGAE due to “lack of academic attitude” or exclusion from the “old boys' club.” These responses point to a larger issue of exclusionary practices and/or preferential treatment at LGAE. The marginalization of some directors and students were of notable concern, especially in addition to the numerous other concerns adduced by participants.
For many directors in Ohio, especially those charged with smaller ensembles, in mid-career, or located in an urban setting, LGAE is not viewed favorably. Urban directors, in particular, report that LGAE is not congruent with the needs of their students and programs. Further, directors perceived bias towards themselves and their students for circumstances beyond their control. Such reports are concerning, and speak to the need for a closer analysis of the philosophical and practical ideologies guiding LGAE. If groups are to be adjudicated based on complete instrumentation, for example, those in charge of LGAE must realize that this requirement serves to marginalize those who may be teaching in circumstances where this ideal is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve (e.g., inner city or rural, high poverty areas).

The philosophical concerns of many directors regarding bureaucracy, politicking, and competitive formats, in general, might better be addressed through a true festival format. Such a format might include a festival in which each group has the opportunity to listen to each other perform, as well as have meaningful interactions with their adjudicators. In this way students could be offered the best experience possible – one that is capable of nurturing growth as young musicians in addition to gleaning the insight of the judges. Recalling there was some disagreement and much variance in the findings of this study related to professional development, directors, themselves, might find this type of event more congruent with their own needs for growing as teachers.

Another suggestion for future adjudicated events would require contests to be held on a larger scale and in a true festival setting. In such a format, ensembles would arrive for a weekend at a hosting institution (say a local college or university or other large
community building). During the weekend, students would be able to listen to a large number of other ensembles perform as well as receive private instruction (perhaps on an individual or homogenous basis), and have time as an ensemble to work with professionals and practitioners in the field. This would replace the current in-and-out performance culture with one that is educationally sound and conducive to student growth as musicians and audiences.

Limitations

It is important to note that the present study suffered from a low response rate, especially from middle school directors. It is unclear as to why such low response rates occurred; however, the lack of middle school directors' responses should be considered when extrapolating from the results of this study. With such a low response rate, caution is recommended when generalizing from results. With this in mind, it is still interesting that several differences occurred between high school and middle school band directors in regard to their perceptions of LGAE. Moreover, it appears that middle school directors are not participating in LGAE nearly as frequently as high school band directors. Such findings deserve replication with a larger sample in order to determine if these differences are substantial or simply represent sampling error in the present study.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings of this study, certain areas of inquiry are recommended for future study: (a) the relationship between ensembles with incomplete instrumentation and
LGAE ratings; (b) the challenges and views of urban directors related to LGAE participation; (c) the challenges and views of novice teachers related to LGAE participation; (d) an examination of adjudicator bias favoring large and/or suburban contest participants; and (e) perceptions of LGAE by Ohio band directors, relating to gender.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be made based on the findings of this study:

1. Ohio band directors generally believe that LGAE adjudication is fair and accurate.

2. OMEA large-group adjudicated events do not meet the needs or expectations of teachers working in urban school settings.

3. Teachers working in the urban school setting do not attend LGAE regularly, nor do these teachers report that LGAE is important for their students.

4. The costs associated with registration fees and student transportation, along with scheduling difficulties, are some of the reasons Ohio band directors do not participate in LGAE.

5. Ohio band directors do not believe LGAE is an appropriate measurement of teacher achievement.

6. Ohio band directors strongly believe that LGAE is in need of improvement.

7. Perceptions of the fairness and accuracy of LGAE adjudication changes based on years of teaching experience. Specifically, mid-career teachers’
perceptions are lower than experience and novice teachers.

8. Novice teachers tend to feel that LGAE participation is required for career advancement.
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APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Ohio Band Directors' Perceptions of Concert Band Large Group Adjudicated Events

Dr. Daryl W. Kinney  
The Ohio State University

Kenneth L. Hoffman, Jr, M.M.  
The Ohio State University

Survey

This survey examines band directors' perceptions of their concert band large group adjudicated event experiences. Participation in this survey is completely voluntary and all answers are both anonymous and strictly confidential. Your honesty and candor while participating is greatly appreciated. All questions regarding age, gender, etc. are for demographic purposes only.

This survey will take about 15 minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation.

* * *

1. Are you an instrumental music educator? (circle one)
   - YES
   - NO

2. Have you ever taken your concert band(s) to large group adjudicated events (LGAE)? (circle)
   - YES
   - NO

3. Have you taken your concert band(s) to LGAE at least 4 out of the last 5 years? (circle one)
   - YES
   - NO

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement below, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). If you have no opinion, please circle “0”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGAE is/are:</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. fairly judged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. accurately judged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. fun for me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. important to my career</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. important to my students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. beneficial to my career</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. beneficial to my students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. necessary for me to succeed in my job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. a necessary evil for students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. required of my position</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. motivating for me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. motivating for my students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. not important to me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. an incentive for my students to work harder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. required for me to advance my career</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. guides my teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. influences my teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. in need of improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. meets the needs of my students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. fun for my students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. a necessary evil in my career</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. not important to my students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. a form of professional development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. a form of assessing student achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. an appropriate measure of my accomplishments as a teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. How would you describe the ability level (tone/technique/etc.) of your instrument music ensembles? (please check the appropriate box for each ensemble).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensemble/Ability Level</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Developing (below average)</th>
<th>Beginning/Remedial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Concert Band/8th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Concert Band/7th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. A) On average, in which classification (i.e., difficulty level) does your concert band participate at LGAE? (circle one). If you do not participate in LGAE, skip to question 32.

AA  A  B  C  Festival/Comments Only

B) Please list your ensembles' size and overall score (excluding sight-reading) for your three most recent appearances at LGAE, if applicable. If you do not remember scores for previous years, please leave the appropriate line blank.

**MOST RECENT LGAE APPEARANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensemble</th>
<th>Overall Score/Rating (I - V)</th>
<th>Approx. Size of Ensemble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Concert Band/8th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Concert Band/7th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2nd MOST RECENT LGAE APPEARANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensemble</th>
<th>Overall Score/Rating (I - V)</th>
<th>Approx. Size of Ensemble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Concert Band/8th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Concert Band/7th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3rd MOST RECENT LGAE APPEARANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensemble</th>
<th>Overall Score/Rating (I - V)</th>
<th>Approx. Size of Ensemble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Concert Band/8th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Concert Band/7th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. A) What are the top three (3) factors (in order of importance) that influence your decision to participate in LGAE? If you do not participate in LGAE, skip to question 32.

Most Important ______________________________________________

2nd Most Important ___________________________________________

3rd Most Important __________________________________________

B) Are there any additional factors that influence your decision to participate in LGAE? Please list them below.

32. A) What are the top three (3) factors (in order of appearance) that influence your decision to **not** participate in LGAE? If you do participate in LGAE, what are the top three (3) factors that **negatively** effect your decision to participate in LGAE?

Most Important ______________________________________________

2nd Most Important ___________________________________________

3rd Most Important __________________________________________

B) Are there any additional factors that influence your decision to **not** participate in LGAE? Please list them below.
33. A) Do you feel that participation in LGAE is a required part of your job, whether stated implicitly or explicitly? (circle one)

YES          NO

B) If you answered “yes” to 33A, why do you feel this way?

34. A) Do you feel that LGAE is important to your professional development? (circle one)

YES          NO

B) If you answered “yes” to 34A, why do you feel this way?

35. A) Do you believe that LGAE benefits your students? (circle one)

YES          NO

B) If you answered “yes” to 35A, why do you feel this way?

36. What suggestions for improvements or changes, if any, would you like to see instituted in LGAE? Why? (Remember, your opinions are entirely anonymous and confidential).

The following questions are for demographic purposes only.

37. Please indicate your gender: (circle one)

MALE          FEMALE

38. How many years of teaching experience (including the current academic year) do you
have teaching instrumental music, as a licensed teacher?

____________

39. How many years have you been at your current position?

____________

40. What is your primary teaching assignment?

High School _____  Middle School _____  Elementary _____

41. Do you have any additional music teaching duties? Please specify.

42. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (circle one)

Undergraduate  Graduate  Doctorate

43. How would you describe the school district in which you work?

Urban _____  Suburban _____  Rural _____

44. Are you currently a member of the National Association for Music Education? (circle one)

YES  NO

45. Are you currently a member of the Ohio Music Education Association? (circle one)

YES  NO

46. In which OMEA district is your school located?

____________
APPENDIX B: ODE TYPOLOGIES
2013 School District Typology Overview

The Ohio Department of Education classifies public school districts by typology for research purposes based on a statistical analysis of shared demographic and geographic characteristics. In 2013, the department took advantage of new data and created a new typology for districts to replace the typology created in 2007.

There are four major groupings in the 2013 typology: Rural, Small Town, Urban and Suburban. There are two classifications within each major grouping for further differentiation. This makes for a total of eight typology classifications, one more than in the 2007 version. A new typology classification was created to accommodate the outlying towns and county seats that share many characteristics of Urban districts despite their rural locations. As a result, the typology codes and descriptors have been modified.

The statistical method used to create the classifications is similar to the previous typology versions and is aligned to the “similar districts” used for comparisons on the Local Report Card. It is important to note that while a district may different than its typology in some ways. However, on the whole, that district is more similar to its typology classification than any other typology classification.

### 2013 School Districts Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Typology Code</th>
<th>Major Grouping</th>
<th>Full Descriptor</th>
<th>Districts Within Typology</th>
<th>Students Within Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural - High Student Poverty &amp; Small Student Population</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural - Average Student Poverty &amp; Very Small Student Population</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>Small Town - Low Student Poverty &amp; Small Student Population</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>Small Town - High Student Poverty &amp; Average Student Population Size</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Suburban - Low Student Poverty &amp; Average Student Population Size</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Suburban - Very Low Student Poverty &amp; Large Student Population</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Urban - High Student Poverty &amp; Average Student Population</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Urban - Very High Student Poverty &amp; Very Large Student Population</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 29, 2013
Dear Band Director,

My name is Kenneth Hoffman and I am a graduate student at The Ohio State University. My thesis research is focused on Ohio band directors' perceptions of Large Group Adjudicated Events (LGAE) with their concert bands. Because you are an instrumental music educator (i.e., band director) working in the public schools, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached survey.

The following questionnaire will require approximately 15 minutes to complete. There is no compensation for participating in this study, nor is there any known risk. All of you answers will be kept strictly confidential. Your participation is anonymous. Please do not include your name, school name, students' names, or any other piece of information that might be able to identify you as a participant. Secure copies of your responses will be provided to my instructor and colleague, Dr. Daryl W. Kinney. If you choose to participate in this study, please answer all questions honestly. You may refuse to participate at any time, without penalty or question.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this study. By completing and returning the survey (via United States Postal Service or Google Docs submission), you indicate your willingness to participate in this study. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Dr. Kinney or myself by phone or email (below).

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at The Ohio State University, 1-800-678-6251.

We know how busy you are and truly appreciate your time in completing this survey.

Sincerely,

Kenneth L. Hoffman, Jr., M.M.
(740) 517 – 5780
hoffman.458@osu.edu

Daryl W. Kinney, Ph.D.
(614) 247 – 6151
kinney.61@osu.edu
APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT REMINDER
25 February 2014

Dear Band Director,

Last week, you received an invitation to participate in a survey regarding large group adjudicated events. Once again, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached survey.

The following questionnaire will require approximately 15 minutes to complete. There is no compensation for participating in this study, nor is there any known risk. All of your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Your participation is anonymous. Please do not include your name, school name, students' names, or any other piece of information that might be able to identify you as a participant. Secure copies of your responses will be provided to my instructor and colleague, Dr. Daryl W. Kinney. If you choose to participate in this study, please answer all questions honestly. You may refuse to participate at any time, without penalty or question.

Thank you for your time and assistance in this study. By completing and returning the survey (via United States Postal Service or Google Docs submission), you indicate your willingness to participate in this study. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Dr. Kinney or myself by phone or email (below).

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at The Ohio State University, 1-800-678-6251.

We know how busy you are and truly appreciate your time in completing this survey.

Sincerely,

Kenneth L. Hoffman, Jr., M.M.
(740) 517 – 5780
hoffman.458@osu.edu

Daryl W. Kinney, Ph.D.
(614) 247 – 6151
kinney.61@osu.edu

126