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Abstract

This study was designed to explore the perspectives and experiences of current band directors in the field. Specifically, it was created to determine what methods and processes were used to teach musical expression to students and to discern if those methods varied in any way in relation to the assorted experiences and backgrounds of the band directors. The specific factors researched include band director years of experience, highest music education earned, ensemble type, ensemble size, and ensemble instrumentation. The participants in this study were directors from the North Carolina Bandmaster’s Association \( (N=75) \). These participants were e-mailed a survey to complete and return to the researcher. Once the surveys were returned, the results were compiled and analyzed using percentages, measures of central tendency, and qualitative means such as segmenting and coding. The results of the survey revealed that many directors taught musicality similarly in all but one factor. Results indicated that the years of experience a band director has taught may be a factor that affects the chosen methods of teaching musicality. The researcher determined that further research of the topic would be necessary. Keywords include: musicality, instrumental teaching methods.
Factors Affecting Teaching Musicality

Benjamin Britten once said, “It is cruel, you know, that music should be so beautiful. It has the beauty of loneliness and pain: of strength and freedom. The beauty of disappointment and never-satisfied love. The cruel beauty of nature and everlasting beauty of monotony” (Jackson, n.d.) The beauty that Britten describes is musicality. While musicality is generally understood to be a necessary part of music, it has many facets that have not been fully examined. This study seeks to define musicality, determine which methods are used to teach it to band students, and if any factors may affect the chosen teaching strategies.

Musical expression is defined as the minute changes in volume, timing, and other parameters that performers insert into a performance (Lehmann, Sloboda, & Woody, 2007). Shaw (2015) defines expression as the way in which sound translates meaning to a listener. More specifically, Shaw (2015) mentions dynamics, tempo alterations, articulations, tone color, timbre, vibrato, and visual presentation as elements of music expression. The tactics teachers used to teach music expression are as varied as the different forms of music expression. Some tactics commonly used include modeling, use of metaphors, and non-verbal gestures (Goolsby, 1999; Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015). Other methods include teaching score study (Burrack, 2005), conducting instruction (Kelly, 1997; Gumm, 2012), physical gestures (Goolsby, 1996; Bergeron & Lopes, 2009; Shaw, 2015) and singing in rehearsals (Robinson, 1996; Wolbers, 2002). Instructors from different backgrounds prefer varying methods. For example, Goolsby (1996, 1999) found that more experienced band directors used non-verbal gestures and modeling more frequently than those less experienced. Some strategies may differ in relation to ensemble type; Perlmutter (2013) discusses modeling and singing as methods for teaching musicality in jazz bands. Instrumentation and ensemble size are related concerns that may also affect the
instruction of musical expression (Rogers, 1991; Criswell, 2009). The purpose of this study is to define musical expression, verify research-based strategies for teaching it. In addition, this study will help determine if director experience, education background, ensemble type, ensemble instrumentation, and ensemble size affect the choice of methods directors use to teach musical expression. In this study, a review of existing literature provides deeper understanding of the definition of musicality, what methods are used to teach, and what factors may affect its instruction. Following this literature review is a presentation of the purpose, method, data analysis, and results of the current study. Afterwards, the results are examined and suggestions for future research are discussed.

**Review of Literature**

A primary focus of music education in large ensemble settings since its inception has been performance (Brame, 2011). Musicality, or musical expression, is a vital part of music performance instruction in order for student musicians to be completely prepared. Music educators can utilize an assortment of methods when teaching musicality (Goolsby, 1999; Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015). In order to better understand the instruction of musical expression and what factors may affect the methods used, musicality must first be defined, and methods used to teach musicality need to be identified. Then demographic information of band directors can be used to determine what correlations exist in relation to factors that affect the instruction of musical expression.

**Musicality Definition**

Factors that affect teaching musicality cannot be determined without first defining musicality. Musicality can also be known as musical expression. Musical expression is defined as changes in characteristics of a song without altering the designated music sequence (Lehmann,
Sloboda, & Woody, 2007). These authors later more specifically define musicality as the minute changes in volume, timing, and other parameters that performers insert into a performance (Lehmann, Sloboda, & Woody, 2007). The nuance of changing volume and altering timing are the clearly stated elements of musical expression that help establish a formal definition for musicality.

With a definition similar to that of Lehman, Sloboda and Woody (2007), additional elements help to create a more composite picture of musical expression. In an article related to the functions of conducting in music rehearsal, Gumm (2012) provides a definition of musicality that not only includes changes in tempo and dynamics, but also articulations. This additional listing corroborates the definition of Lehmann, Sloboda, and Woody (2007) and also provides some clarity to the “other parameters” they mentioned.

In a case study seeking to determine methods of teaching musical expression to school-age students, Brenner and Strand (2013) also developed a definition of music expression. Like Lehmann, Sloboda, and Woody (2007) and Gumm (2012), Brenner and Strand (2013) mention changes of tempo, dynamics and articulations. In addition to these elements of musicality, tone quality is also included (Brenner & Strand, 2013).

Shaw (2015) describes musicality as the way in which sound translates meaning to a listener. More specifically, he mentions dynamics, tempo alterations, articulations, tone color, timbre, vibrato, and visual presentation as elements of music expression (Shaw, 2015). His reference to dynamics and tempo alterations correspond with the definition provided by Lehmann, Sloboda, and Woody (2007) and his statement about articulations matches Gumm’s (2012) definition. In addition to these corresponding elements, Shaw (2015) mentions the use of
tone color, timbre, vibrato and visual presentation. The more detailed definition provided by Shaw (2015) contributes a more composite definition of expression.

Shaw (2015) mentioned that visual presentation corresponded to the presentation of musical expression; this perspective is supported by additional research (Bergeron & Lopes, 2009). In a literature review of recent music psychology studies, Bergeron and Lopes (2009) explained that there was an inseparable connection between the auditory and visual elements of musical expression. It was determined that body movement conveyed similar information to sound and that in fact the two functions enhanced one another (Bergeron & Lopes, 2009).

A comprehensive definition of musicality entails review of multiple sources. Many offer similar elements; however, a difference is occasionally present and causes a more complete result. While music expression does entail performance of dynamics, tempo adjustments, articulations, tone color, timbre, vibrato, and visual presentation (Bergerson & Lopes, 2009; Shaw, 2015), it can contain more. Brenner and Strand (2013) define musicality as controlling aspects of timing, dynamics, articulations, and tone quality. While tone color and tone quality are similar, they are distinguishable. Tone is defined as a specific pitch in sound (Randel, 2003). How commendable or detracting something can be is known as “quality” (Quality). When combined, tone quality is simply how good or bad a specific pitch is performed. Tone color, on the other hand, is the quality of sound in relation to how it distinguishes one instrument from another (Randel, 2003). Therefore, it is necessary to add tone quality (Brenner & Strand, 2013) to a comprehensive definition of musicality is necessary.

While the focus on defining musical expression has consisted of many different elements, one other characteristic of musical expression is important to its classification. Lehmann, Sloboda, and Woody (2007) indicated that tempo and dynamics were both elements of
musicality in addition to other parameters. However, one important word in their definition of musical expression is “change.” While each element of musical expression is important in helping compile a definitive description, it is essential to note that beyond music simply containing these music elements, musicality is the changes of adjustments of these music elements.

After combining all of the different perspectives related to defining musical expression, a complete definition can be created. With the seemingly universal inclusion of tempo alterations and dynamics (Lehmann, Sloboda, & Woody, 2007; Bergerson & Lopes, 2009; Gumm, 2012; Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015), the other characteristics of musical expression must be added to compile a specific characterization. Therefore, a complete classification of music expression, or musicality, includes the changes of tempo, dynamics, articulations, tone color, tone quality, timbre, vibrato, and visual presentation within a musical work. This definition is important when considering what methods directors may use to teach musical expression to their band students.

Methods of Teaching Musicality

After establishing a definitive description of musicality, teachers must consider what different methods are most effective in teaching musical expression to students. Some of the techniques commonly used include modeling, the use of metaphors, and verbal instruction (Goolsby, 1999; Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015). Other methods include teaching with non-verbal gestures (Goolsby, 1996; Bergeron & Lopes, 2009; Shaw, 2015), conducting instruction (Kelly, 1997; Gumm, 2012), score study (Burrack, 2005) and singing in rehearsals (Robinson, 1996; Wolbers, 2002). A deeper understanding of each tactic provides insight as to how they can be used to assist in teaching musical expression.
Modeling is an often used teaching strategy for musical expression. In their case study about music expression pedagogy, Brenner and Strand (2013) state that modeling was the most commonly and consistently used teaching strategy. Goolsby (1996, 1997, 1999) found a similar popular use of modeling among expert teachers. When describing modeling, it is important to understand that it is an aural example provided through singing and playing an instrument (Shaw, 2015). Haston (2007) classifies modeling as any action that a teacher performs to demonstrate a music element for students. Modeling can also involve physical gesture or motions (Brenner & Strand, 2013). Providing a vocal or instrumental example involves students aurally responding to a modeled performance of music and then interpreting that performance into something they can mimic (Shaw, 2015). Examples of how to use this strategy include playing an excerpt without any verbal comment, assigning the students a particular element of performance to listen to, or prompting for class or individual verbal answers (Shaw, 2015).

Within this strategy, Shaw (2015) also indicates that other more specific tactics can be used. For example, a teacher may use modeling to provide a correct and incorrect performance of musical expression (Shaw, 2015). Using this strategy, a teacher would explain that one of the two versions played did not portray the desired musical outcome while the other did. Shaw (2015) labels the “incorrect” version as “deadpan” (p. 245). This lifeless rendition is meant to imply a clear distinction. Another specific way to model aural performances to students is to offer a choice for which modeled excerpt was preferred by the students (Shaw, 2015). With this method, more educational authority is offered to the students.

Haston (2007) discusses the uses of modeling in the music education classroom. His article provides a description of the teaching strategy, uses for it in the classroom, and it even provides sample lesson plan ideas. The most common use for modeling is when a music director
is responsible for teaching a new concept (Haston, 2007). In addition, modeling can be used from live performance or from recordings (Haston, 2007). This article provides a well-rounded explanation of the uses and teaching techniques for modeling.

While modeling is a popular and very useful way to teach musical expression, it does have drawbacks. One of the primary disadvantages of modeling is that it is a temporary example (Shaw, 2015). Students are not able to retain and process an aural modeled example immediately. It may take multiple performances, and that may be time consuming. In addition, modeling may not be enough. Some students may need modeling in addition to other strategies to completely understand the musical expressive concept (Shaw, 2015). Nonetheless, modeling is a valuable strategy. The results from the teaching strategies by expert directors in Goolsby’s research indicate that the use of modeling may well have contributed to the quality of performance by the instructed ensembles (Goolsby, 1996 & 1999).

Modeling is a performance-based teaching strategy used to instruct music expression; a popular verbal method is the use of metaphors. In their case study of teaching methods for school-aged students, Brenner and Strand (2013) found that all five of the teachers from the study used metaphors. The teachers of the case study claim that metaphors developed creativity in the students by having them imagine age-appropriate material and attempting to represent them through musical performance (Brenner & Strand, 2013). While only five teachers participated in this particular study, the unanimous use of metaphors supports its usefulness in this form of music teaching.

The use of metaphors as an instructional strategy is also known as the use of imagery; this strategy focuses on how a performer mentally perceives a musical passage and then plays it (Woody, 2006). Woody also points out that the use of metaphor is often supplemented with aural
modeling (Woody, 2006). In his study, Woody sought to determine what actually occurred in the mind of students when imagery was used to describe a musical passage. His study focused on college-level students. The results of this study indicated that as long as the music was technically possible, and the imagery was age appropriate, then the metaphor used provided a strong aid for individual instruction (Woody, 2006).

While Woody (2006) was able to discern that the use of metaphor could assist in individual instruction, Persson (1996) determined that imagery could have drawbacks as an instructional practice. Persson performed a case-study on one particular teacher with no formal training and how that teacher taught her students. Many of the strategies used resembled those utilized by teachers with formal training, including the use of metaphor. However, Persson (1996) did report that some students struggled to understand the imagery used. This finding corroborates with Woody’s references to age appropriate imagery (Woody, 2006).

In a research article that provides additional information about the use of metaphor in teaching music expression, Schippers (2006) provides similar findings to both Persson (1996) and Woody (2006). Schippers (2006) defines metaphor pedagogy as a means of expressing a music concept that is difficult to describe in concrete terminology. Schippers (2006) discusses how metaphors can be used to assist with playing correct technique or even portraying certain aesthetic or expressive qualities of music. His research does contain warnings about imagery that might not be effective in music teaching. For example, he cautions about using imagery that is too simple or too complex when attempting to produce a particular result (Schippers, 2006).

Shaw (2015) also provides similar information about pedagogy with metaphors, and his discussion concerns the larger ensemble. During this portion of the chapter, Shaw (2015) discusses how imagery can be used to relate expressive characteristics of music to experiences
large ensemble students have had. These experiences may be representations of previous physical experiences. For example, Shaw (2015) uses an example of a chicken pecking at feed, or popcorn popping to represent the staccato articulation. Shaw (2015) warns that metaphors and imagery must be carefully chosen and worded because they can be confusing to students.

Another verbally-based instructional strategy is verbal explanation of musically expressive concepts. Throughout his studies, Goolsby (1996, 1997, & 1999) found that verbal explanation was a commonly used tactic among both novice and expert band directors. Within his study specifically about verbal teaching strategies, Goolby (1997) discussed that verbal instruction can take many forms. Some of these forms include description, positive or negative feedback, or questioning. Shaw (2015) agrees with the findings of Goolsby (1997). He states that verbal teaching is either a statement or question about a particular musical element (Shaw, 2015). This method is clear and direct and can prove to be very useful when seeking a distinct sound to be produced by students. Shaw (2015) points out that verbal instruction can be and effective strategy if used with beginning, intermediate, or even advanced musicians.

Non-verbal communication is a valuable tool when teaching music expression to students. As discussed earlier, musical expression is best demonstrated when both visual and aural elements are combined (Bergerson & Lopes, 2009). Blocher, Greenwood, and Shellahamer (1997) describe non-verbal teaching as eye contact, assistive gestures, facial expressions, body language, and conducting. This description was a part of their study to determine teaching behaviors of middle and high school band directors. Interestingly, the results of this study found that more high school band directors used non-verbal teaching strategies than middle school directors (Blocher, Greenwood, and Shellahamer, 1997).
In similar studies, Gooolsby (1996, 1997, & 1999) found that more experienced teachers used non-verbal teaching strategies more than less experienced directors. According to Goolsby (1996 & 1999) non-verbal strategies include modeling. However, they also include “teacher demonstrations” (Goolsby, 1996). These demonstrations could include additional actions such as fingering demonstrations or sticking strategies for percussionists. Regardless, the implications of these research studies support the popularity of using non-verbal instruction for teaching musicality.

Shaw (2015) explained that physical gestures, or non-verbal instruction, can be a helpful asset when teaching instrumental ensembles. He explains that one primary advantage of this strategy is that it can be administered simultaneously with an ensemble performance (Shaw, 2015). While conducting can be a form of non-verbal instruction, other cues such as pushing, leaning, jumping, or non-conducting-like arm motion can all be forms of non-verbal instruction (Shaw, 2015). Non-verbal instruction is viewed as a popular strategy because of its versatility and ability to be used during student playing.

A form of non-verbal teaching that is specifically part of music education is conducting; teaching conducting can assist with instructing music expression. Conducting can be used to visually represent musical expression. A conductor can use a pattern to portray musical shape, style, dynamics, tempo, and articulations (Gumm, 2012). These portrayals can be accomplished through adapting a pattern size, emphasis, and speed (Gumm, 2012).

Beyond simply using conducting as a form of non-verbal instruction, Cofer (1998) developed a study to determine if teaching students basic conducting techniques might help them to better understand certain elements of music expression portrayed in conducting. During his study, students were taught dynamic and tempo changes in conducting patterns (Cofer, 1998).
After learning the patterns, students were administered both a paper-and-pencil test and a performance test. Many students were able to identify the different conducting patterns correctly on the paper-and-pencil test and on the performance test, but some confusion and lack of performance accuracy was noted (Cofer, 1998).

In contrast, Kelly (1997) performed a similar study on beginning band students and found differing results. In Kelly’s study students were taught conducting patterns to assist with timing and expression. The results indicated that students in the experimental group did have a better understanding of timing than those in the control group (Kelly, 1997). However, the students in the experimental group demonstrated little, if any, better understanding of expressive gestures after conducting instruction (Kelly 1997). While conducting may be a necessary and useful physical gesture teaching tool, it may not be an effective tool for improving expressive music performance.

An additional strategy for teaching music expression is score study. This method centers on teaching the students how to read a score and then using the score to assist with students visualizing how elements such as melody, rhythm, form, and expression fit within a work (Burrack, 2005). Burrack’s references (2005) to using score study for teaching music expression are brief, but they involve introducing the score and perhaps additional diagrams or charts to assist students in understanding the desired expressive result.

A final strategy used to teach music expression in instrumental classrooms is singing (Robinson, 1996; Wolbers, 2002). Modeling and singing in rehearsal are similar teaching strategies (Robinson, 1996). However, beyond modeling to the students through singing, the strategy of singing in rehearsal is centered on the students participating in the singing activities. Robinson (1996) discusses the primary reasons teachers may avoid using the singing strategy in
rehearsal, and then rebuts these concerns by discussing benefits and suggested teaching examples. One of the benefits of singing in instrumental rehearsals is an improvement in music achievement and skill development (Robinson, 1996). Music achievement and skill development include articulation performance and intonation (Robinson, 1996), which are parts of musical expression.

Leenman (1997) wrote a commentary to Robinson’s article (1996) that expanded upon the benefits of singing in instrumental rehearsals. Leenman (1997) mentions that singing can help with phrasing, breath support, and musicality. With singing in rehearsal, instrumental students can more naturally comprehend some of these musical elements and better perform them on their instruments. Robinson (1996) mentions that teachers can use vocal methods in instrumental class to provide additional time for teaching music expression elements on instruments. Leenman (1997) argues that the vocal techniques used could help instruct music expression before instruments are even used.

Additional support for singing in rehearsal is provided by Wolbers (2002). In his article, Wolbers (2002) stresses how singing in rehearsal can assist with aural skills and intonation. While aural skills may not be directly related to music expression, intonation is a part of tone quality in ensemble performance. As the article continues, dynamics and phrasing with breaths are mentioned as other benefits of singing in band rehearsal (Wolbers, 2002).

recommended a similar system because it worked better with instrumentalists that might otherwise need to transpose. Bernhard (2003) found that the use of the movable-do technique and other vocal techniques in instrumental rehearsals correlated with better performance achievement and music understanding.

The assortment of strategies used to teach musical expression provides teachers a healthy variety of techniques to best instruct their students. As some of the research indicated, some methods are better used in combination with others (Goolsby, 1999; Woody, 2006; Bergerson & Lopes, 2009; Shaw, 2015). The use of such strategies will vary with band directors, and what causes those choices to be different may be considered factors as to how directors teach musicality to their students.

Possible Factors Affecting the Teaching of Musicality

Different considerations may affect why a band director chooses a particular teaching strategy for musical expression. Some of these factors can include band director experience (Goolsby, 1996, 1997, & 1999) or director educational background (Brame, 2011). Instrumentation and ensemble size are related concerns that may also affect the instruction of musical expression (Rogers, 1991; Criswell, 2009). Finally, some strategies may differ in relation to ensemble type; Perlmutter (2013) discusses modeling and singing as methods for teaching musicality in jazz bands. This assortment of factors helped design the survey instrument used in this study.

One factor researched in relation to teaching strategies is that of band director experience (Goolsby, 1996, 1997, & 1999). In this trilogy of research studies, Goolsby investigated time use of band directors, verbal instruction strategy use, and strategies used to teach the same piece of music (Goolsby, 1996, 1997, & 1999). In his method, Goolsby purposefully selected student
interns, novice teachers, and experienced directors to determine similarities and differences in
teaching strategies. Student interns were soon-to-be college graduates, and novice teachers were
listed as teachers in their initial or second year of teaching (Goolsby, 1996). Experienced
teachers were required to have taught a minimum of eight years, teach a wide-ranging
instrumental program, receive superior ratings at festivals, and be frequently responsible for
student teachers (Goolsby, 1996). In his studies Goolsby (1996, 1997, & 1999) found that
experienced teachers commonly used less verbal instruction and more non-verbal and modeling
strategies to get the same information across.

An additional study that investigated director experience in addition to other factors was
a dissertation by Brame (2011). Brame sought to determine awareness and use of the
“comprehensive musicianship” teaching techniques of directors in Wisconsin and Illinois. The
method and strategies used by Brame (2011) were foundational to the design of this study. For
example, he surveyed band directors in these two states with a similar on-line study. In addition,
some of his demographic considerations inspired items on the survey designed in this study.

Items on the survey created by Brame included: director experience, highest degree attained, and
band size or enrollment quantities. In relation to director experience, Brame (2011) found that
veteran teachers generally used more comprehensive musicianship techniques and a more varied
repertoire than novice teachers. Educational background was not used as a variable in Brame’s
research; however, he did find that over half of his participants held graduate degrees (Brame,
2011). Brame’s research provides support for items in the current study and also supports
indicators for this study’s hypotheses.

A third demographic element Brame (2011) considered a factor in instructing
comprehensive musicianship was ensemble size. In his study, Brame (2011) mentions that “small
programs” consist of between one and ninety-nine members, and that “large programs” have more than 100 members (p. 89-90). Brame (2011) found that directors of larger programs had a larger average of “comprehensive musicianship” awareness and use.

While “comprehensive musicianship” might not include musical expression instruction specifically, the factor of ensemble size should be considered; with ensemble size is also the consideration of instrumentation. Rogers (1991) discusses how instrumentation can affect ensemble balance and timbre. According to the definition of musical expression derived from the research above, concerns of balance and timbre are concerns of musical expression. Rogers (1991) spends much of his article discussing the causes and possible solution for instrumentation problems in an instrumental ensemble.

In a similar article, Criswell (2009) discusses how ensemble size can be a concern with balance and blend, which are elements of musicality. Criswell spends much of his article providing insight in techniques for accommodating instrumentation and ensemble size concerns. One of his primary suggestions is careful repertoire selection (Criswell, 2009). Other techniques he mentions include a strong focus on fundamentals and the use of technology (Criswell, 2009). The inclusion of ensemble size and instrumentation as concerns for the instruction of elements of music expression (Rogers, 1991; Criswell, 2009) and “comprehensive musicianship” (Brame, 2011) make them factors in the current study.

A final consideration for this study is the factor of ensemble type. Goolsby (1996, 1997, & 1999) sought directors with well-rounded programs. However, this broad criterion did not affect the study’s focus on the instruction of concert band. Perlmutter (2013) discusses strategies to help with teaching articulations in a jazz ensemble. In this article, Perlmutter (2013) specifically mentions using the strategies of singing, modeling, and non-verbal communication.
Verbal explanation, conducting, score-study and metaphor use are omitted from these suggestions.

In a similar article, Tolson (2012) discusses techniques for teaching jazz style and articulation; the suggestions Tolson make resemble those of Perlmutter (2013). In fact, Tolson (2012) specifically mentions both modeling and singing. He even goes to the extent of offering specific syllables to help produce particular articulations in the swing style (Tolson, 2012). The omission of verbal explanation, metaphor use, score study, and conducting in these articles may imply that certain ensembles require different strategies for teaching elements of music expression, such as articulations.

There is little research or no research that directly addresses defining musicality, identifying ways to teach it, and what factors may affect those ways at one time. There is research that helps define musicality (Randel, 2003; Lehmann, Sloboda, & Woody, 2007; Bergerson & Lopes, 2009; Gumm, 2012; Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015). There is also research that discusses the methods used and some possible factors (Goolsby, 1996, 1997, & 1999; Tolson, 2012). However, some research mentioned factors that could affect teaching methods, but did not relate them to the instruction of musicality within their results (Brame, 2011). The current study was designed to address this gap in the literature and provide evidence of factors that may or may not affect the chosen methods of teaching musicality in the band classroom.

**Purpose for Current Study**

Musicality, or musical expression, is a necessary part of any ensemble development. Without appropriate instructions of musicality, many intents of a composer are absent from a music performance. Therefore, it is vital that directors take an appropriate amount of time to
develop a deliberate and consistent understanding of musically expressive content. In order for teachers to develop such an important part of their curriculum, they must first establish a definition of musical expression. Afterwards, they should determine which research-based methods are most effective, and then implement those methods. Across the country, band directors proceed with this process on a frequent basis. However, there is little evidence as to which methods are used most often and why.

The purpose of this study is to establish a definition of musical expression, determine methods for teaching musicality, and through a survey of band directors to uncover any possible factors that may contribute to particular preferred methods. This study is designed to discern if ensemble size, instrumentation, and type do indeed affect chosen methods of teaching musicality by band directors. In addition, a band director’s educational background and amount of experience are also investigated as possible influences on chosen methods of teaching musical expression. These factors will be considered and further research will be suggested.

Method

Design

This study is designed to discover correlations between the instruction of teaching musical expression and factors such as band director experience, educational background, ensemble style, and ensemble instrumentation or size. Little or no research has attempted to specifically correlate all of these factors at one time. Therefore, a survey of current band directors based on the research provided was developed to discern if these factors are interrelated. The research study was a mixed-methods study consisting of a survey containing quantitative and qualitative questions (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). The survey began with demographic questions asking directors to reveal their years of experience, educational
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background, ensembles taught, and size of ensembles. Many of these demographic questions were styled after the instrument in Brame’s dissertation (2011). After demographic questions, methods of teaching were surveyed. Quantitative questions included Likert-type responses and item-selection questions. The qualitative portion of the survey asked for teachers to describe teaching processes, perspectives of teaching musicality in relation to the factors researched, and if they thought items were omitted from the survey.

Participants

The participants of this survey consisted of the membership of the North Carolina Bandmaster’s Association (NCBA). The participants were not chosen at random, but were a population of convenience (Johnson & Christensen, 2014); the researcher shares in membership of the North Carolina Bandmaster’s Association (NCBA). The number of members in the NCBA was not able to be officially determined; however, 505 director e-mails were compiled (n=505). In addition to this initial number, NCBA district chairs were asked to e-mail the survey out to all members of their districts. While 505 e-mails were sent, only 475 were received in valid e-mail address inboxes. For the purposes of this study, the sample population invited to participate will be approximately 500 (n=500). This number is chosen to accommodate the possible additional directors reached by way of district chairs and any duplicate e-mail accounts.

Survey Procedures

Initially, the individual districts of the NCBA were contacted for permission to use director e-mail. Appendix A contains the correspondence between the principal investigator and those directors. After receiving the responses from most of the directors, the principal investigator determined that searching for individual e-mail addresses would provide an ample sample. School e-mail addresses are public information accessible through school websites and
therefore, as many as possible were collected. However, the principal investigator also took the
suggestion of the NCBA district chairs and sent them separate invitations to be sent out across
district e-mail-lists unavailable to the principal investigator. This method also likely helped avoid
some requests from being considered spam.

The principal investigator also requested permission for this study through the University
of Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB determined that this study entailed
minimal risk and was approved as exempt (see Appendix B). Upon approval from the IRB, a
survey (Appendix C) was uploaded into Qualtrics, a questionnaire software accessible to
University of Florida students and faculty. The e-mails of the band directors in the NCBA were
entered into the sample population of Qualtrics, and a separate request was made specifically for
NCBA district chairs. The survey was sent to the sample population with an invitation letter
(Appendix D) through the Qualtrics program. A reminder e-mail was sent eight days later. After
offering two weeks of time to reply to the survey, the researcher compiled, analyzed and
discussed the results.

In order to ensure that all terms of the approval from the IRB were addressed certain
settings within Qualtrics were used. The primary setting applied was the anonymity setting. This
setting kept participant identity and IP addresses from being revealed to the investigator or any
other party. Another setting that was used allowed for the invitation to the survey to be shared
through e-mail. This setting permitted district chairs to forward the email to their district
members.

Survey Instrument

The current questionnaire (Appendix C) consists of 14 questions. An initial pilot survey
was administered in April 2015 with a population of 25 band directors (10 responding
participants). This initial pilot survey is Appendix E. Feedback from the pilot was used to revise the instrument to be used in the current study (Appendix C). The initial questions were intended to be demographic. They were written to discover what ensembles the band directors teach, the amount of teaching experience the directors possessed, the educational background of the band directors, and information about the size of their largest ensembles. A final demographic question was in regard to the participants’ perspectives of what constituted a “small band.” Many of these factors were inspired by the survey created by Brame (2011). Additional sources also provided insight for the survey questions.

The requested information about types of ensembles taught and years of experience were inspired by the studies reported by Goolsby (1996, 1997, & 1999) and an article about jazz ensembles (Perlmutter, 2013). The inquiries about ensemble size were based on information gathered from Criswell (2009) and Rogers (1991).

After the demographic questions, the survey contains questions about the concept of teaching musicality. These quantitative questions were multiple-choice. Directors were surveyed on techniques used to teach musicality and factors they believed to affect the instruction of teaching musical expression. A Likert-type scale question followed; this question asked the directors to indicate the level of value they place on elements of musical expression.

The final open-ended questions examined why or why not ensemble style may affect teaching musicality, whether or not size and instrumentation affect teaching musicality, and preferred methods of teaching musicality in relation to the director’s background. One final open-ended question allowed directors to express any concerns they felt were omitted from the survey. These questions related to research discussing methods used to teach musicality
(Burrack, 2005; Haston, 2007; Gumm, 2012; Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015). The survey was designed to be answered in between 5 and 15 minutes.

**Data Analysis**

The current study was a mixed-methods descriptive study; since both quantitative and qualitative elements were used, a variety of analysis methods were also employed. Quantitative data were compiled and analyzed using percentages and select measures of central tendency. In addition, cross tabulations were used to determine possible connections between statistical data. The qualitative data were analyzed using segmenting, inductive coding, a priori coding, and enumeration. When participants are quoted, the assigned number is proportionate to the time of recorded entry in Qualtrics. For example, the first person to complete the survey would be identified as “participant 1.”

**Validity and Reliability**

The results of this study provide insight into the musicality teaching strategies of a variety of band directors and what factors may have affected the choice of those techniques. This research is focused within a finite sample of band directors within one state (North Carolina). However, the sample of participants did provide an assortment of levels of experiences and backgrounds. For example, more than ten different types of ensembles were taught by the sample population. In addition, all ranges for years of experience and highest education earned were represented within this sample. While caution should be employed when making broad generalizations, the data provided does encompass a random and varied representation of band directors in North Carolina; therefore, it is externally valid to some extent.

The quantitative portion of this survey was consistently answered by 74 participants. Since one participant in the survey never answered any questions beyond agreeing to participate,
the same seventy-four participants answered all of these questions which helps make the survey is internally valid. Beyond the participation statistics, validity and reliability of this survey can be determined by the homogeneous nature of the responses. The homogeneous characteristics of the responses must be related to the percentage of the responses in relation to the categories analyzed. Raw responses vary when compared to demographic characteristics such as highest education or range of experience because of the varied number of responses in relation to each classification.

Implementing instrument methods resembling existing research also exhibits validity and reliability to the current study. The online survey method and certain demographic questions in the current study were styled after a study by Brame (2011). Brame instituted an on-line survey of band directors that asked both demographic and content specific questions. This descriptive survey used a sample from two state bandmaster associations. Beyond quantitative data, the qualitative questions about teaching methods and certain classifications of data were similar to the studies performed by Goolsby (1996, 1997, & 1999). Goolsby surveyed band directors on teaching methods and references verbal and nonverbal teaching methods in his results. The means of contacting, surveying and collecting the research in the current study were designed based on the procedures of Brame (2011) and Goolsby (1996, 1997, & 1999) providing validity to the methods employed.

Comparing methods of analysis used by Brame (2011) with methods used to analyze data in this study provides further validity and reliability to the findings of this study. Many of the demographic questions in the current study were designed in similarity to that of the on-line survey designed by Brame (2011). Methods for analyzing his results included percentages of
demographic data and cross-tabulations to determine possible correlations (Brame, 2011). Since
similar methods were used, validity and reliability of the strategies employed are established.

The qualitative data of this survey contains trustworthiness through multiple data sources,
and comparisons of results to quantitative data within this study. Fifty-five participants
responded to the first and third qualitative questions and 54 answered the second question. Fifty-
four or more participants compose more than 70% of the total population that participated in the
survey. In addition, this number provided at least 54 different answers to the questions which
provide multiple data sources from which to derive results.

The mixed-methods nature of this study also provided trustworthiness to the qualitative
results. Questions in the quantitative portions such as whether ensemble size affected the
instruction of musicality or educational background provided comparative data to qualitative
questions. By comparing the results from these mixed responses, the consistency of responses
helps provide trustworthiness to the qualitative results.

Results

Quantitative Results

At the completion of the two-week period, seventy-five participants had either completed
or partially completed the survey. Of the presumed 500 participants, the 75 responses resulted in
a response rate of 15%. One participant responded with an agreement to participate in the survey,
but did not answer any of the survey questions. Therefore, 74 participants answered the survey
questions. Percentages and the “mode” measure of central tendency were used to determine the
results from the question regarding which instrumental ensembles the participants taught
(Johnson & Christensen, 2014).
Seventy-four participants responded to this question. Of the 74 responders, all of them (100%) claimed to be instructors of concert band. The second most often taught ensemble was marching band with forty-one responses (55.41%). The third most commonly taught ensemble from the sample was jazz band with thirty-two directors (43.24%). Twenty directors (27.03%) chose “other.” Within this choice was an option for the participants to indicate what “other” ensemble they taught. Five directors (6.75%) mentioned instructing percussion ensemble. Two participants (2.7%) mentioned teaching chorus or choir. Two other participants declared teaching orchestra. Another two participants listed “pep band.” In addition, two participants mentioned teaching indoor percussion. Beyond these small percentages, one participant per item (1.35%) declared teaching chamber ensembles, brass ensemble, piano/guitar, music appreciation, general music K-5, “other instrumental ensembles,” or “winterguard and percussion ensemble.”

Based on the compiled results, the most commonly taught ensembles within the participating North Carolina band directors included concert band, marching band, and jazz band in descending order (See figure 1). Beyond these three primary ensembles, drastically smaller percentages of chamber or instrument specific ensembles are listed.

![Figure 1](image1.png)

**Figure 1:** Number of participants in relation to reported ensembles taught.
The second question of the survey asked the directors to identify their range of teaching experience in years; this information was collected and analyzed with percentages and the “mode” measure of central tendency (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). As with the first question of the survey, 74 participants answered this question. The initial range of experience listed was zero to five years. Twenty-three (31.08%) of the participants have taught between zero and five years. The range of zero-five years was the highest ranked answer. The second most often chosen response was the range of 11 to 15 years. Sixteen participants (21.62%) have taught between 11 and 15 years. The third most chosen teaching range was 16 to 20 years with 13 responses (17.57%). Eleven participants (14.86%) listed having taught for six to ten years; this was the fourth most common answer. The fifth most answered response was 21 to 25 years of experience with five participants (6.76%). The remaining six participants to answer this question chose either 26 to 30 years or more than 31 years. There were three participants per category (4.05% each). While the largest single grouping of participants was teachers with zero-five years of experience, fifty-one teachers with over five years of experience did participate in this survey (See table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ Years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third demographic question of the survey requested the highest music education degree earned by the participants and seventy-four participants responded to this question as well. The data from this question was analyzed using mode and percentages (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). The largest majority of participants hold a bachelor’s degree in music education as their highest related degree. This majority consists of forty-seven participants (63.51%). The second largest majority of participants held a master’s in music education as their highest degree with twenty-six participants (35.14%). Only one participant (1.35%) held a doctorate in music education.

The fourth survey question sought the directors’ personal reflections of their primary ensemble’s size. Seventy-four participants answered this question and their responses were analyzed using mode and percentages (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). The results of this were also used in relation to later questions of the survey. Twenty-six (35.14%) of the participants answered question four in the affirmative. This “Yes” meant that 26 participants perceived their bands as “small.” The remaining 48 participants (64.86%) answered “no.” Therefore, the majority of participants felt that they taught large ensembles (See Table 2).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.14%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.86%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N=74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth question of the survey was a follow-up question to the fourth. This question asked participants to place a number range for a “small band.” All participants (n=74) answered this question. This question was analyzed with mode, percentages, and mean (Johnson & Christensen, 2014); it was also used to connect other questions of the survey. The smallest
number of band members listed was “less than 8 members,” and the largest number listed was “more than 200 members.” In response to the perceived number of band members that comprise a “small band” no category over “41-60 members” was chosen. In addition, no participant chose less than eight members as a “small band.” The majority of the participants chose the range of twenty-one to forty members as a defining range of a “small band.” Forty-four participants (59.46%) chose this definition. The second most often range chosen by participants was between 8 and 20 members; this range was chosen by 27 directors (36.49%). Three directors (4.05%) chose a range of 41 to 60 members as a range of “small bands.” The results create a range of between 8 and 60 members composing a “small band” (See figure 2).

Figure 2: Percentages of participant responses in relation to what number range constitutes a “small band.”

By averaging all of the minimum range numbers (8, 21, and 41) with the number of responses, an average minimum range is approximately 17 members. When averaging all the maximum range numbers (20, 40, and 60) with the number of responses, and an average
maximum range number is approximately 33. Therefore, based on an analysis of the results, an average range for a “small band” could be between 17 and 33 members.

The sixth question of the survey asked the participants to indicate the size of their largest performing ensemble; this question was analyzed using mode and percentages (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Seventy-four participants responded to this question, and none of them had less than eight members in their largest ensemble. Only four directors (5.41%) listed having between 8 and 20 band members in their largest ensemble. Sixteen participants (21.62%) identified their largest ensembles as having between 21 and 40 members. The largest population of participants reported having between 41 and 60 members in their ensembles. This population consisted of 21 (28.38%) participants. The second most common ensemble size was between 61 and 80 members. Nineteen participants (25.68%) reported this range. Five directors (6.76%) mentioned having between 81 and 100 members. More than 9% of the participants (7 directors) mentioned having between 101 and 200 members. Only 2 participants (2.7%) reported having more than 200 band members in their largest ensemble. The average “small band” size derived by averaging the opinions of the queried participants (17-33 members) shows some discrepancy with the self-reported band sizes in relation to whether directors perceive their ensembles as “small.” Forty-eight participants reported large ensembles on the fourth question. However, based on the derived average and beginning with the next largest range in the questionnaire (41-60), 54 directors actually teach a large ensemble. This means that only 20 of the participants could be considered directors of “small” bands.

The seventh question regarding teaching strategies used for instructing music expression in the band classroom. The responses of the 74 participants that answered question seven were analyzed with mode and percentages (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). The two most commonly
used teaching strategies were metaphors and modeling. Seventy-one directors (95.95%) reported using each of these methods. The second most commonly used teaching strategies were physical gestures and verbal explanation. Seventy participants (94.59%) reported using these two strategies. Sixty-eight (91.89%) reported using singing, the next most common. Thirty-four directors (45.95%) indicated that they used score study to help teach musicality, and four participants (5.41%) mentioned “other” techniques. One of the “other” techniques mentioned was “visual diagrams.” While these may be separate, research in score study (Burrack, 2005) does indicate that using diagrams in addition to score study is part of the same teaching method. Nonetheless, one participant did list using visual diagrams in addition to score study. An additional technique mentioned under “other” was “imagery.” Woody (2006) implied that metaphors and imagery were terms that could be used interchangeably. The word “imagery” was added by a person that also reported using metaphors. Clearly, this participant views the methods as separate teaching strategies. The two other additional strategies mentioned in response to this question involved applying “‘instructional lyrics’ to the musical phrase” and applying a set of musicality rules developed by the director. The majority of the participants listed using metaphors, physical gestures, verbal explanation, singing, and modeling as their primary strategies for teaching musical expression.

By combining the techniques used and the reported ranges of experience levels, a more accurate picture of which methods are preferred by which age groups (See Table 3). The percentages in this table regard the proportion of technique uses in relation to the number of directors within an age group that participated in the survey.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction Techniques in Relation to Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A cross-tabulation of the techniques used and the reported highest levels of music education provides a more accurate picture of which methods are preferred by which degree recipients (See Table 4). The percentages in this table manifest the proportion of methods used in relation to the number of directors within an educational background that participated in the survey.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Metaphors</th>
<th>Physical Gestures</th>
<th>Verbal Explanation</th>
<th>Singing</th>
<th>Score Study</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>95.65%</td>
<td>95.65%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95.65%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95.95%</td>
<td>94.59%</td>
<td>94.59%</td>
<td>90.54%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95.95%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 contains evidence that ensemble size may not have much impact on the instruction techniques used by band directors. The percentages in this table indicate that a large majority of all ensemble sizes use most of the teaching techniques. While the category of “more than 200 members” does indicate that only 50% of the participants use some of the methods, it is important to note that only two directors identified their ensembles to be that size. The limited number in that category may have created an inflated result.

Table 5

Instruction Techniques in Relation to Ensemble Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Techniques Used</th>
<th>Ensemble Size (# of Members)</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphors</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Gestures</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Explanation</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Study</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling Other Total</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 contains evidence that ensemble size may not have much impact on the instruction techniques used by band directors. The percentages in this table indicate that a large majority of all ensemble sizes use most of the teaching techniques. While the category of “more than 200 members” does indicate that only 50% of the participants use some of the methods, it is important to note that only two directors identified their ensembles to be that size. The limited number in that category may have created an inflated result.

Table 5

Instruction Techniques in Relation to Ensemble Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Techniques Used</th>
<th>Ensemble Size (# of Members)</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphors</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Gestures</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Explanation</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Study</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling Other Total</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>61-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seventy-four participants replied to the eighth question of the survey, which was analyzed with mode and percentages (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Approximately 65% (64.86%) reported that the methods of teaching musicality depended on the style of ensemble being taught. The remaining 35% (26 participants) indicated that no difference of strategies should be employed in relation to the different ensemble types taught.

When the results of the types of instrumental ensembles taught were compared to the techniques used, the consideration of ensemble type being a factor that affects musicality instruction became clearer. Table 6 provides evidence that contradicts the majority perspective reported in the survey question analyzed above. While many directors choose to employ some methods more than others in various ensembles, the uses of most methods are fairly stable within one instrumental ensemble type. For example, there may only be 31 reported uses of metaphors from participants that teach jazz band, but only 32 participants reported teaching jazz band. Therefore, the majority (96.88%) used this method just like they did in other ensembles.
Table 6

Ensembles Taught in Relation to Techniques Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques Used</th>
<th>Marching Band</th>
<th>Concert Band</th>
<th>Jazz Band</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use Metaphors</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.15%</td>
<td>95.95%</td>
<td>96.88%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>95.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Physical</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestures</td>
<td>92.68%</td>
<td>94.59%</td>
<td>96.88%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>94.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Verbal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>90.24%</td>
<td>94.59%</td>
<td>96.88%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>94.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Singing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.56%</td>
<td>91.89%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>91.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Score Study</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.10%</td>
<td>45.95%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>45.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Modeling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.12%</td>
<td>95.95%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-four participants responded to the Likert-styled question that preceded the short-answer portion of the survey. The results of this Likert-styled question were analyzed using mode, percentages, and average value of the sub-groups of the expression elements listed (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). The musicality elements listed were listed as seven separate elements, but could be categorized into four sub-groups. These sub-groups include tempo, articulations, dynamics, and “timbre, tone, balance and blend.” Table 7 contains the percentages of the values given for each of the separate seven elements.

Table 7

Response Values and Percentages of the Valued Expression Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>More Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tempo Markings</td>
<td>45.95%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo Alterations</td>
<td>48.65%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.14%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the sub-groups, the value of musicality elements became more evident. For example, when the number of directors that indicated “tempo markings” and “tempo alterations” are combined, a total of seventy responses is established. When divided by the combined total number of responses (148), only 47.30% of the participants found tempo to be “very important.” Using the same method, articulations were “very important” to 66.22% of the participants, and dynamics were “very important” to 68.91%. However, the category of timbre, tone, balance, and blend was believed to be “very important” to 91.89% of the participants (See Figure 5).
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**Figure 5:** Sub-group percentage values in relation to participant importance ratings.

**Qualitative Results**

The tenth question of the survey was a descriptive answer question that asked participants to explain why they did or did not believe ensemble type affected musicality instruction. Fifty-five of the participants contributed responses to this question, and the data were analyzed using
inductive coding methods, enumeration, and percentages (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). After the coding was completed, three categories of responses were created. The first category contained responses or parts of responses that indicated that ensemble did in fact affect the instruction of musicality. Overall, 23 (41.82%) of the 55 participants responding to the question indicated that ensemble type did affect the instruction of musicality. The coded reasons that ensembles affected musicality instruction included: marching band instruction, music/ensemble context and style, jazz in relation to other ensembles, desired resulting sound, and performance setting (See Table 8).

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded Response</th>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marching Band</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Ensemble Context &amp; Style</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz vs. Other Ensemble Type</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Resulting Sound</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Setting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table includes the total number of responses for each reason (some responses contained more than one reason).

Within a hierarchy of coding, marching band instruction was broken down into factors such as memorization, visual concepts, colorguard, percussion, props, and outdoors/space/distance between performers. Six participants specifically mentioned marching band in their reasoning for musicality instruction differing by ensemble. Three of those participants specifically mentioned the factor of distance or outdoor space as a concern. For
example, one participant wrote, “Yes, with Marching Band, there is too great a distance between the corners of the field show to adequately listen across and blend” (Participant 39). This response indicates that a musicality concept (blend) needs to be taught differently in relation to the space or distance created by the outdoor characteristics of marching band.

Another marching band factor was visual concepts; like the references to distance or outdoor space, this factor was mentioned by more than one participant. Two participants mentioned visual concepts as a reason musicality might be taught differently to marching band. One participant wrote, “Any group that marches has to focus on cleaning visuals as well as music. It doesn't outright prohibit teaching musicality, but it definitely detracts from it” (Participant 2). The other participant mentioned visual concepts in addition to many other factors.

While marching band was a common ensemble type to cause teaching musicality to change, the most common reason was music ensemble or style context. This coded category was mentioned by 11 different participants. One participant wrote, “Different ensembles have different styles of playing. More importantly the timbre of the ensembles is different so teaching the students to blend and balance varies based on the ensemble” (Participant 56). With the mentioning of balance and blend specifically, this respondent gave viable reasoning as to why ensemble difference may affect how teachers approach teaching musical expression to differing ensembles.

A third coded reasoning for teachers changing their methods of teaching musicality in relation to ensemble regarded a difference between jazz and other ensembles. Three participants mentioned jazz in their replies. Two of those participants specifically compared jazz and concert
band. The other participant compared jazz to all other ensembles. One participant that mentioned jazz band compared to concert band wrote,

…The biggest difference for me comes between teaching musicality in Concert Bands and Jazz Bands. While I do very little in terms of changing timbre, tone quality, and dynamic definitions between these ensembles, I do teach students to change how they balance their sound, blend their sound, and articulate (Participant 10).

The participant that compared jazz to all other ensembles wrote, “I mainly see a difference in jazz and everything else. Jazz is rhythmically driven and many of the musicality of jazz comes from the individual player through improv” (Participant 3).

Another coded reasoning in favor of musicality instruction changing with ensembles was performance setting. This reasoning was similar to that of the outdoor space and distance sub-category discussed in marching band, but the responses either never specifically mentioned marching band or included other ensembles. For example, one of the three participants who mentioned performance setting as a factor wrote,

Different genres may need a different approach. A marching band that is performing outdoors may need to have a greater understanding of the range of dynamics needed while performing a phrase of music, which a concert band, in a concert hall setting, might be able to accomplish the same desired effect on a much more subtle level that might not be achieved outside. The same might hold true in a jazz ensemble for a soloist while playing with a mic or without being run through a sound system. In each of these cases the need to play musically is still there, but each ensemble may approach the balance of dynamics different (Participant 17).
While marching band is mentioned in this response (and is included in the sub-category response total as well), it also mentions concert band and jazz band considerations in relation to performance settings. This opens up the response to a more general “performance setting” category.

The final coded reasoning for musicality instruction to differ with ensemble type was the desired resulting sound of the ensemble. This reasoning was provided by two participants. The descriptions provided by the participants indicated that different ensembles are designed to produce an assortment of overall sounds. Therefore, different gestures or strategies should be used to create those sounds.

The second category created by the process of coding was how the variety of ensembles taught did not affect the musicality teaching strategies. Thirty-three participants (60%) responded in dissent with the belief that ensemble type affected the instruction of musicality. This category was broken into two separate classifications. The first classification focused entirely on reasons why ensemble type did not affect musicality instruction. The other classification included answers that provided other reasons why musicality instruction was affected since ensemble type was not a factor. This final classification became the third overall category developed from coding the responses provided.

The participants that responded with a clear belief that ensemble type did not affect musicality instruction totaled 25. These participants provided two reasons as to why teaching music expression did not change with ensemble type: that the concept of musicality was universal and therefore did not need to be taught differently, and that the teaching techniques were interchangeable between ensembles as the director deemed necessary.
The most common reason for music expression instruction not to change with ensemble type was the belief that musicality concepts were universal regardless of the ensemble. Twenty-one participants wrote a response that indicated this belief. For example one participant wrote, “I believe that musicality is universal regardless of the musical setting and that musicality should be the top priority when instructing any ensemble. If musicality is made priority, the instruction should be effective regardless of ensemble type” (Participant 5). Another participant responded, “Although, you may use different terms for basic technique (for example for percussion ensemble or jazz) you are always looking to make sure that your ensemble is producing the correct style, balance and other musical elements” (Participant 58). These responses, in addition to many others, indicate that while the ensemble may require a few adjustments, the concepts are the same and therefore do not require specific changes of instruction methods between ensemble types.

The second argument against music ensemble types affecting musicality instruction discussed the interchangeable characteristics of teaching methods. One response was clearly stated as follows: “Musicality whether voice or instrument has the same basis, so the methods are the same” (Participant 45). In other words, the participants indicated that teachers may use a variety of teaching methods to teach musicality, but the choices are not affected by ensemble type. Instead, they are likely affected by other factors.

These other possible factors resulted in the third category of responses to this question. The reasons for changing musicality instruction included instrument size, expected performance results, student age or ability level, music literature, and performance techniques. The most commonly mentioned factor was performer age or ability level. Five participants mentioned this as a possible factor. Three participants mentioned ensemble size as a factor. Two participants
listed performance results and one participant mentioned music literature and technique. These reasons were mentioned as possible factors in lieu of ensemble type.

The next descriptive question asked participants to explain why they did or did not believe ensemble size affected the instruction of musicality. Fifty-four participants responded to this question. The responses to this question were coded inductively, segmented into appropriate groups, enumerated, and also analyzed with percentages (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). When coded, responses were classified into two categories. These classifications were either “yes” or “no or other factors.”

Sixteen participants (29.67%) responded “yes” in some capacity or another to the question regarding ensemble size affecting musicality instruction. Within this coding, seven subcategories were found. The most common related to ensemble accuracy as a cohesive ensemble. Six participants mentioned ensemble accuracy as a concern. For example, one participant wrote, “I think the larger the ensemble, the more difficult it is to perform more musically. There are more people that have to do it 100% right, versus less people which makes it a bit easier” (Participant 15).

Ensemble accuracy is dependent on performer responsibility, and performer responsibility was specifically mentioned as another factor that could cause instructing large or small ensembles to be different. Four participants wrote that performer responsibility was a relevant concern when regarding ensemble size. For example, “Yes, larger ensembles have an advantage when it comes to hiding weaker performers and having a big impact when it is needed. (Horsepower)” (Participant 56). In this reply, the participant mentions ensemble accuracy with the references to weaker players hiding behind others. The participant also mentions dynamics when referring to “big impact.”
Four participants also mentioned that dynamic accuracy was a concern when ensemble size was considered. One of those participants was quoted above with the reference to “big impact.” However, other participants provided more blatant references to dynamics. For instance one participant wrote, “The size of an ensemble is relevant because a smaller ensemble doesn’t have the ability to have a wider range of dynamics than larger groups. The smaller ensemble however can have an easier time cleaning up articulations” (Participant 31). This participant also mentions articulations as a concern. Articulations were another factor considered, but only by two participants. The other participant mentioning articulations wrote, “Smaller ensembles require individuals to carry more weight; however it is easier to clean articulations. Students feel more comfortable with a large sound around them” (Participant 34).

Balance and blend were other factors mentioned in relation to ensemble size affecting the instruction of musicality. Three participants mentioned these factors. All three participants mention that balance and blend are a struggle for smaller ensembles. Beyond balance and blend, one participant mentioned that ensemble size affected ensemble depth. Specifically, the participant stated, “Yes and no, depending on what you are playing. I do believe it is easier to teach and be more musical with a larger group. You just have more depth with a larger group” (Participant 19). The implication of “depth” resembles an understanding of balance and blend.

A single participant mentioned that size directly affected the musicality instruction of marching bands. Therefore, this participant combined ensemble size and type as a combined factor to consider when instructing musicality.

The majority of participants in this study did not support a belief that ensemble size affected the instruction of musicality. Of the 54 respondents to this question, 38 (70.37%) of them responded in some way with “no.” While many mentioned other factors that were more
relevant to learning and performing musicality, 28 indicated that the reason musicality instruction did not differ with ensemble size was because the overall instruction was the same regardless. In fact, some specifically referenced chamber ensembles as support for their views. For example, one participant wrote,

Small ensembles should be able to perform musically. While the amount of sound being produced will differ from a larger ensemble, there is no reason a small ensemble can’t shape a phrase. Chamber ensembles perform musically. Why not a small band?

(Participant 54).

This reply and others like it provide strong support for ensemble size not being a primary factor affecting the instruction of musicality.

While many participants felt that instructing musicality was universally the same no matter the ensemble size, some did mention other factors. Nine participants mentioned instrumentation as a concern that could be affected by ensemble size. Six participants mentioned that larger factors to consider were performer skill or director interpretation. Five participants argued that musical expression could be taught to any sized ensemble as long as the repertoire was carefully selected. Two participants mentioned that musicality could be taught and performed by any sized ensemble if enough preparation was performed beforehand. Finally, one participant mentioned that size had no effect on musicality, but it did affect rhythmic precision. Overall, it appears that the majority of the participants believe ensemble size is not a relevant concern when teaching musical expression.

The third descriptive question asked participants to discuss whether or not they supposed ensemble instrumentation to affect the methods of teaching music expression to students. Fifty-five participants responded to this question and the data collected was analyzed using inductive
coding, enumeration, and percentages. The two overarching categories coded were “yes” and “no.” Within these general codes, a hierarchy of more specific reasons used to defend the directors’ perspectives was found.

Twenty-seven participants (49.09%) indicated that ensemble instrumentation did directly affect the methods of teaching musicality to bands. The most common reason for musicality and its instruction being affected was balance and blend. Sixteen participants mentioned or implied balance, blend, or both in their responses. For example, “Yes. A band needs a good balanced sound to perform musically well. Uneven instrumentation makes this much more difficult” (Participant 32). Fifteen other directors responded in a similar fashion.

The second most commonly coded reason for instrumentation affecting the instruction of musicality was adhering to the musical intent of the composer. Six participants indicated that without proper instrumentation, the composer’s original intent of the music is sacrificed and therefore, the instruction of musicality is affected. One participant wrote it this way, “Yes! All parts need to be covered. If the composer didn't want a French horn part, he wouldn't have written it” (Participant 15). Ensuring that horn part is covered is possible in less than desirable instrumentation is possible with rearranging or adapting to other instruments.

Some directors that participated in this study felt that adapting or rearranging parts to accommodate instrumentation was an example of teaching musicality being affected. Four participants specifically mentioned rearranging or covering parts in this capacity. Rearranging or covering parts was the third most commonly mentioned argument.

Some directors mentioned specific musicality elements that would be affected by instrumentation concerns and therefore require adjusting teaching methods. Three participants mentioned timbre as a concern. One of these participants wrote, “Yes. I used to have a band of
30, and I had to rewrite parts all the time; even then, timbre [sic] differences were lost” (Participant 51). Three other participants mentioned color and texture as music elements that raised concerns. For instance, “Absolutely, 2 years ago I had perfect instrumentation. Oboe, bassoon, 4 horns, 3 bones, 3 baritones. I just don't have that now. You lose [sic] so much texture when you lose [sic] what I call color instruments” (Participant 19). The musicality elements mentioned from these participants are characteristics that evidently affect teaching practices.

The majority of the respondents mentioned the reasons above for instrumentation affecting the instruction of musical expression; however, three other participants provided different answers. One participant did not list any reasoning by simply writing, “YES!” (Participant 16). Another participant mentioned dynamics and articulations being a concern. A third participant mentioned that instrumentation directly affected the instruction of musicality to concert bands.

While many directors mentioned instrumentation being a factor when teaching musicality, a slightly larger percentage disagreed. Twenty-eight participants (50.9%) stated that instrumentation did not affect the instruction of musical expression. Three participants simply stated disagreement with no further description. However, five other sub-categories were determined from those participants that indicated a negative response to this question. One sub-category was identified by seven participants who listed that musicality is a universal concept that supersedes ensemble instrumentation. For example, one participant wrote,

No, even though it does affect the level of music you can play. When your missing an oboe it's hard to play higher level music at contest because they do not prefer a flute sound as an alternate, or what ever instrument. But it's about making music and experiencing the journey through playing. Anybody can put a group of mixed matched
instruments together and perform some pretty amazing concerts because it all goes back to control and technique. (Participant 57).

Seven different participants mentioned a similar reason to rearranging or covering parts, a response that opposed their views. These participants indicated that the director and ensemble adapting to a piece of music (including rearranging or covering parts) was not a teaching strategy and therefore did not affect the actual instruction of musicality.

Some participants felt music expression was an individual skill not affected by the ensemble; therefore, ensemble instrumentation would not affect teaching musicality. Five participants stated that musicality was a skill developed by the individual performer and was a method of relating to other members of the ensemble. Since musicality was taught focused on the individual, the instrumentation of the ensemble was not relevant.

A different five participants wrote that instrumentation did not affect musicality instruction if repertoire selection was performed correctly. Many of these participants did concede that musicality could be a concern to ensembles with less than desirable instrumentation. They then discussed that if the director researched the music literature and chose well, then instrumentation concerns would be less of a concern. Four other participants agreed that the director should take responsibility and demonstrate the ability to overcome instrumentation concerns before the ensemble learns the music. The preparation or repertoire selection and director responsibilities would allow for the teaching of musical expression to remain the same regardless of instrumentation concerns.

The thirteenth question of the survey requested the participants to state their preferred methods of teaching musicality and where they first heard or learned of them; responses to this question varied. An assortment of methods was used to analyze the data of this question. Both a
priori coding and inductive coding were used to segment the data (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). A priori coding was used in relation to the methods to be listed by the participants. The pre-determined codes were: modeling, metaphors/imagery, verbal instruction, physical gestures, conducting instruction, score study, singing, and other. The responses to “other” and the replies to where the methods may have been learned were coded with inductive coding methods.

Enumeration and percentages were also used to determine frequency of coded responses. Fifty-three participants contributed responses to this question. One of the 53 participants answered the question with a statement of not understanding the question. For the purposes of enumeration and percentages, that response was omitted. Many participants mentioned more than one preferred method or place learned. A total of 72 preferred methods were listed by the 52 valid answers. Fifty-nine different places or experiences that influenced instruction methods were listed.

The most frequently mentioned teaching strategy in this question was modeling. Eighteen responses (25%) mentioned that modeling was a preferred strategy. Examples of the modeling discussed included playing or singing certain passages for students to imitate, and listening to recordings. Modeling was a strategy used by all experience ranges (See Table 9).
A similarly popular strategy to teach musicality was metaphors/imagery. Many of the participants specifically stated “metaphors.” However, other participants used terminology such as imagery, analogy, or storytelling. One participant even referenced movie scenes. Regardless of the diction, metaphors or imagery were implied. Fifteen responses (20.83%) included references to metaphors/imagery. Interestingly, metaphors were not mentioned by directors having taught more than 20 years (9 total participants, see table 7).

The third most preferred strategy of teaching musicality reported was singing. This method was reported by 11 participants (15.28%). Specific strategies mentioned in these replies included having students sing their parts, modeling, exaggerated expressive singing, and ear training. These strategies are all designed to use singing to help students become more aware of the expressive qualities of the music they are learning.

Verbal instruction and physical gestures were discussed by a similar number of participants. Verbal instruction was mentioned by seven participants (9.72%). Physical gestures, on the other hand, were stated by six participants (8.33%). The seven participants that preferred verbal instruction listed techniques like explaining musical expression to students, questioning, and comparing recordings. The six participants who indicated physical gestures as their primary method of instructing musicality mostly referred to conducting.

Conducting instruction and score study were the two least mentioned teaching strategies for instructing musicality in band. Two participants (2.78%) mentioned conducting instruction,
and one participant (1.38%) mentioned score study. One of the two participants that discussed conducting instruction mentioned using a conducting pattern to help subdivide rhythms while paying attention to expressive elements. The other discussed an exercise where students focused on the initial beat in a conducting pattern and expressive elements of a scale pattern between downbeats. The participant that mentioned score study actually discussed visual aids to help with expressive elements, which resembled suggestions by Burrack (2005).

Twelve participants (16.67%) mentioned preferred methods that did not fit into the “other” category. Six of these participants indicated that they either had no preference or used all methods interchangeably. Two mentioned teaching with established “rules” or guidelines. One participant mentioned teaching musicality through shaping and coloring. Another mentioned teaching with melodic contour and assigning number values that represented dynamic levels to specific notes. One participant even mentioned helping the students to develop “self-realization” of expressive elements through experience. These strategies were either too vague or unique to be classified in the other a priori categories.

Most of the methods were analyzed using a priori coding; however, the places that participants learned the teaching methods from were analyzed with inductive coding (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Through inductive coding, 12 classifications were created. Table 10 contains the classifications and how many responses indicated each. Some participants listed more than one place from which they learned certain techniques.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where Teaching Methods Were Learned in Relation to Which Methods Was Mentioned</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Methods Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learned From</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Singing, Modeling, Metaphor/Imagery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metaphor/Imagery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final question of the survey asked if there was anything missing from the content of the survey. Thirty-three participants responded to this question, and the feedback was analyzed using inductive coding and enumeration (Johnson and Christensen, 2014). Sixteen of the participants responded with either positive or neutral comments about the overall nature of the survey. One of those sixteen participants also provided a suggestion to include more information about emotional involvement and impact. The category of emotional involvement and impact was mentioned by a total of three participants. The other two responses were a part of the seventeen participants that made suggestions of content missing. Some of these examples are specific examples of the methods included in this study. For example, two participants mentioned listening to exemplary music examples as a technique for teaching music expression. Shaw (2015) mentioned that listening to recordings was a form of modeling. Another participant mentioned that defining musicality was necessary for this study to be complete. A third suggestion that already could be included within this study is the use of visual diagrams or visual aids. Burrack (2005) discusses how these aids can help with score study instruction. While a few
of the strategies are already a part of this study, some were not. Table 11 compiles all of the
suggestions and their frequency.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded Suggestions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phrase Shaping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agogic Weight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Conducting Themselves</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Involvement &amp; Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composers Intent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background of Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Aids/Diagrams</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Movement for Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation/Tone Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Exemplary Examples</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody vs. Other Parts Importance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicality differs from Music Expression</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation between Singing and Instrumental Playing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Fundamental Playing Techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age or Socially Diverse Groups as a Factor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Musicality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing alone vs. with others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to establish a definition for musicality and conclude
research-based methods for teaching musicality. In addition, it was designed to determine if band
director years of experience, educational background, ensemble type, ensemble size, or ensemble
instrumentation affected the methods used to teach musicality. With the research mentioned
(Randel, 2003; Lehmann, Sloboda, & Woody, 2007; Bergerson & Lopes, 2009; Gumm, 2012;
Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015) and results of this study, a definition and valued
characteristics of musicality were determined. In addition, a valid and viable list of teaching
methods was determined. Finally, whether factors affected chosen teaching strategies was obtained.

Definition of Musicality

The review of literature provided background for a comprehensive definition of musicality. From the literature (Randel, 2003; Lehmann, Sloboda, & Woody, 2007; Bergerson & Lopes, 2009; Gumm, 2012; Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015), musical expression can be defined as: the changes of tempo, dynamics, articulations, tone color, tone quality, timbre, vibrato, and visual presentation within a musical work. The current study provides support for many elements of this definition from active band directors within the state of North Carolina. Interestingly, some characteristics of musicality are more preferred than others, but no participant indicated that a characteristic of musical expression was “not important,” which means all participants agreed that each characteristic was a part of musicality overall.

The elements of timbre, tone, balance and blend were specifically identified as the most important characteristics of musicality according to the Likert-styled question included in this study. The second most valued element of musicality was dynamics. The third was articulations, and the least valued was tempo. While visual presentation was not included in the Likert-styled question, visual elements were commonly mentioned as concerns with ensemble types performing musicality in the qualitative portion of the study. Therefore, the majority of the facets of musicality were corroborated with the results of this study and the determined definition can remain.

Teaching Strategies for Musicality

Research provided six different teaching strategies for instructing musicality to an instrumental ensemble (Goolsby, 1996; Robinson, 1996; Kelly, 1997; Goolsby, 1999; Wolbers,
2002; Burrack, 2005; Bergeron & Lopes, 2009; Gumm, 2012; Brenner & Strand, 2013; Shaw, 2015). These six research strategies included metaphors/imagery, verbal instruction, physical gestures, score study, conducting instruction, and singing. The results of the current study provide evidence that many of these strategies are used by North Carolina band directors with a variety of backgrounds and experiences.

The 74 participants that replied to the question regarding strategies used provided evidence that the researched techniques are used. Over 90% of the participants listed using metaphors/imagery, physical gestures, verbal explanation, singing, and modeling as strategies to teach musicality in the band classroom. While score study was used by less than 50% of the sample, it does not detract from the fact that the method is used by directors within North Carolina.

Another reason the responses supports the methods found in research is the fact that only four “other” strategies were suggested in response to this question. Of these four techniques, one was “imagery.” According to Woody (2006), both imagery and metaphor have similar meanings. Another suggestion was visual diagrams which was discussed as a part of teaching score study (Burrack, 2005). The remaining two suggestions were both techniques that would have included verbal explanation or singing. Therefore, the results of this study provide additional support for metaphors/imagery, physical gestures, verbal explanation, singing, modeling, and score study as effective musicality teaching strategies.

Factors Affecting Teaching Musicality

The mixed-methods nature of this study helped provide an assortment of data that indicated whether certain constituents determined use of certain musicality teaching strategies. Some of the results can be connected to extant research. Through the results of the study, it was
determined that director experience was an influence on chosen methods of teaching musicality. However, other factors were either not supported enough to determine influence or did not appear to affect teaching methods according to the results of this study.

Quantitative data about director years of experience can be confirming to existing research. For example, the experience range of directors was determined in relation to extant research (Goolsby, 1996, 1997, & 1999; Brame (2011). Goolsby identified novice teachers as having taught less than three years and experienced teachers as having taught more than eight. The results of his studies found that more experienced teachers used non-verbal methods than novice teachers (Goolsby 1996, 1997, & 1999). In addition, support for the age ranges chosen to accommodate Goolsby (1996, 1997, & 1999) are found in Brame (2011). Brame identified novice teachers as zero-nine years and veteran teachers as having taught 10 or more years.

The results of the current survey support Goolsby’s findings regardless of the range of “novice” and “veteran” teachers. Non-verbal methods discussed by Goolsby (1996 & 1999) included modeling. If the range of teachers from between 11 and 31 or more years (beyond Goolsby’s 8 years or more experience and Brame’s 0-9 years) is compared to the teacher range of zero-ten years (which accommodates Goolsby’s 0-2 years and Brame’s 10 or more years), more uses of modeling and physical gestures are found used by more experienced teachers. The fact that the findings of the current study correlate to findings of other research help provide external validity to the results. Therefore, the current study supports that director years of experience does affect chosen teaching methods.

One possible factor in this survey that could not be determined by the results was whether or not instrumentation affected the instruction of musicality. The primary reasons participants felt instrumentation could be a factor included: balance and blend, composer intent, and
rearranging/covering parts. The main reasons participants did not feel instrumentation influenced music expression instruction included: musicality was a universal concept, director and ensemble adapting to a piece, musicality was an individual skill, and repertoire selection. Since the percentages of participants are almost evenly split and some arguments provided by both sides resembled each other, no definitive support for instrumentation being a factor can be determined.

Another possible factor in this survey that was unsupported by the results was whether ensemble type affected teaching method choice. The eighth question of the survey asked participants to identify whether or not they believed ensemble type to be a factor that affected methods of teaching musicality. Over sixty percent of the participants responded “yes,” while thirty-five percent did not. The group that responded to the qualitative question regarding the same topic was smaller and the coded responses revealed conflicting results. A smaller percentage of the participants that answered the qualitative question responded in an affirmative nature. When the quantitative data of techniques used and ensembles taught were compared, results similar to the qualitative data were derived. Proportionately, the number of directors that identified teaching certain ensembles closely resembled the number that used many methods. Since this information was analyzed in three different ways, and two of them collaborated, a stronger validity indicates that ensemble type does not affect the instruction techniques of musicality.

Beyond participant years of experience and ensemble type, other results provided interesting findings within this study. For example, the results of educational background compared to techniques used provided a foundation of data to compare to the qualitative question about preferred method and from where that method was learned. The results of highest music
education degree earned provided insight as to where some strategies may have been learned. For example, less than half of the participants with a bachelor’s degree mentioned using score study as a teaching method; however, over half of the participants with a master’s degree did. In addition, all of the participants with a master’s degree or PhD indicated using metaphors, while only 93% of those with a bachelor’s degree used metaphors. The use of physical gestures produced similar results. Regardless of these few exceptions, the fact that all methods were used by directors holding a bachelor’s degree indicates that educational background does not affect the strategy choice for teaching musicality.

The results of highest education compared to techniques used are further validated by the qualitative responses to the question about preferred method. The qualitative question about preferred method asked participants to identify the method(s) they used most often and where they learned about those methods. While the results are incomplete since 26 (50%) of the participants did not mention any location, the responses provided to help to validate the results of the quantitative research. Only one participant of the qualitative question indicated that graduate school provided teaching methods used to instruct musicality, and these methods were “other” methods specifically described by the participant. The most common answers of where teaching methods were learned were college (the minimum required education for a band director) and experience as a student. Therefore, both qualitative and quantitative data provide evidence that educational background does not affect the choice of method for teaching musicality.

A final element of this survey that can be discussed using both quantitative and qualitative data is the relationship of ensemble size and teaching methods used. Multiple questions relate to this association. For example, the determined range for a “small band” was an ensemble that included less than thirty-three members. When largest ensemble numbers were
reported, it was found that more directors taught “large” ensembles than believed they taught “large” ensembles. These results may have affected the qualitative beliefs of those directors since some of the participants taught an ensemble size they did not personally perceive as their current experience. Regardless, when the reported ensemble size was quantitatively compared to techniques used, a large majority of all ensemble sizes used most of the teaching techniques. In fact, more than eighty percent of all ensemble sizes except “more than 200” used all methods except score study and “other.” Score study was the least used method by all ensemble sizes, and the “more than 200” category only contained two participants, so percentages are likely inflated in relation to the sample. With the qualitative and quantitative data provided, it can be determined that ensemble size does not affect the chosen methods for teaching musicality.

The results of this study provided possible factors that could affect the instruction of musicality and also provided evidence as to whether those influences had any effect. For example, the results related to highest degree earned did not indicate that educational background affected the choice of teaching methods used when teaching musicality. In addition, results did not denote that ensemble type, size, or instrumentation affected the chosen methods to teach music expression. These results support many claims of the participants in this study about musicality being a universal topic that can be taught regardless of many influences.

Director experience level did determine that more non-verbal methods such as modeling and physical gestures were used by more experienced directors. This evidence correlated with prior research (Goolsby, 1996, 1997, & 1999) and provides additional support that director experience is a possible factor influencing the instruction of musicality.

**Future Research**
The results of this study also provided potential areas for future research. One example of suggested further research is to find more definitive evidence about whether or not instrumentation of an ensemble affects the musical expression instruction techniques. In addition, participants of the survey provided suggestions in the final question of the survey. One factor that was not considered in this study, but should be considered for future studies, is the age group of the students. More than one participant indicated that the age or ability level of students may affect teaching methods. Another factor that could contribute to further research related this study is the socio-economic status of the students or community. One participant mentioned that such a factor may affect musicality teaching methods. Other considerations that may benefit future research include the accommodating composer intent, the incorporation of physical movement in instruction, and relationship of teaching fundamentals on the instruction of musicality. These suggestions would provide an even more comprehensive understanding of teaching musicality in the band classroom.

Another consideration that should be considered for future research is one that relates to where directors may have learned about teaching strategies. The primary focus of this study was on first-hand experience and educational background. However, in the study some participants mentioned observing other directors and attendance of clinics or conferences. In further research these two influences should be included to assist in creating a more comprehensive understanding of where directors learn teaching strategies for their classrooms.

In addition to where directors may have learned teaching strategies, another suggestion for future research regards the effectiveness of chosen methods. The current study was restricted to which methods were used in relation to possible influences such as educational background or
ensemble type. However, future research should explore if the amount or quality of specific
technique uses changes in relation to other factors of this study.

One final suggestion for future research includes expanding beyond the band classroom. Some directors mentioned teaching chorus and orchestra. The research in this study did find inconsistency in results related to type of band ensemble affecting the methods used for teaching musicality. Perhaps some methods are indeed preferred over others in relation to completely different types of ensembles (i.e. string instruments, wind instruments, choral ensembles). While the results of this study do provide some deeper understanding of the instruction of musicality, there are still many areas within musicality and its instruction that could be explored further.
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Appendix A

E-mailed Correspondence

Requesting Permission to Contact District Band Directors

Request

Mr. Homiller,

My name is Jameson Stout, and I am the band director in Graham County, North Carolina (part of the Western District). I am nearing the conclusion of my Master's degree at the University of Florida. To complete my degree, I will need to do a capstone project. This project is beginning to take shape and will likely involve a survey that I need to send to a sample of participants. I contacted Alice Aldridge earlier to see if there was a state-wide database of emails for the band directors. He informed me that there was not, and I would need to contact each district individually. Therefore, I was wondering if there is a database of all the emails for all of the band directors in your district of NC bandmasters. If so, could I please have access to this list? Also, if there is such a list (and I am permitted access to it), could you also write a brief letter explaining that I have permission to email the band directors? This letter will help with the Internal Review Board (IRB) who will be determining if I can use the survey for my research.

If you are curious, my research will be focused on techniques for teaching musicality to instrument ensembles, if those techniques differ with ensemble size, and if those techniques differ based on the level of education achieved by the director.

On an unrelated side note, I doubt you remember me, but in 2005 and 2006, I was one of the Southwestern Randolph students/graduates that helped as a stage hand for the summer community theatre shows. I hope things are going well in Asheboro!

Sincerely,

Jameson Stout
Director of Bands
Graham County Schools

Response

Homiller, Philip W <phomiller@asheboro.k12.nc.us>
Wed 3/23/2016 11:06 AM

Jameson,

Of course I remember you! I hope you are well. We do have email contacts for all the directors in CDBA, but I don’t think I can give you that list due to our policies. Let me explore options with my webmaster to see if there is a way to get your request out without sharing the email list. I will get back to you.
Request

Mr. Workman,

My name is Jameson Stout, and I am the band director in Graham County, North Carolina (part of the Western District). I am nearing the conclusion of my Master's degree at the University of Florida. To complete my degree, I will need to do a capstone project. This project is beginning to take shape and will likely involve a survey that I need to send to a sample of participants. I contacted Alice Aldridge earlier to see if there was a state-wide database of emails for the band directors. He informed me that there was not, and I would need to contact each district individually. Therefore, I was wondering if there is a database of all the emails for all of the band directors in your district of NC bandmasters. If so, could I please have access to this list? Also, if there is such a list (and I am permitted access to it), could you also write a brief letter explaining that I have permission to email the band directors? This letter will help with the Internal Review Board (IRB) who will be determining if I can use the survey for my research.

If you are curious, my research will be focused on techniques for teaching musicality to instrument ensembles, if those techniques differ with ensemble size, and if those techniques differ based on the level of education achieved by the director.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jameson Stout
Director of Bands Graham County Schools

Response

Rodney Workman <rworkman@davidson.k12.nc.us>
Fri 3/18/2016 11:05 AM
We do have an email listserv in the NW district. I can forward things. I might have individual emails- I need to look.

Request

Ms. Clowes,

My name is Jameson Stout, and I am the band director in Graham County, North Carolina (part of the Western District). I am nearing the conclusion of my Master's degree at the University of
Florida. To complete my degree, I will need to do a capstone project. This project is beginning to take shape and will likely involve a survey that I need to send to a sample of participants. I contacted Alice Aldridge earlier to see if there was a state-wide database of emails for the band directors. He informed me that there was not, and I would need to contact each district individually. Therefore, I was wondering if there is a database of all the emails for all of the band directors in your district of NC bandmasters. If so, could I please have access to this list? Also, if there is such a list (and I am permitted access to it), could you also write a brief letter explaining that I have permission to email the band directors? This letter will help with the Internal Review Board (IRB) who will be determining if I can use the survey for my research.

If you are curious, my research will be focused on techniques for teaching musicality to instrument ensembles, if those techniques differ with ensemble size, and if those techniques differ based on the level of education achieved by the director.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jameson Stout
Director of Bands Graham County Schools

Response

Clowes, Lesli R. <lesli.clowes@cms.k12.nc.us>
Thu 3/17/2016 2:00 PM
The best scenario would be for you to send me whatever you want sent out when you are ready. I will then send out a mass e-mail to the membership in our district. I do not have access to all the individual e-mails; they are handled by our webmaster. So, I think it would be easier to just send it to me and I will pass it along. Let me know if that works for you.

Lesli Clowes
NBCT, MM-Wind Conducting,
Crestdale Middle School Director of Bands,
Crestdale Fine Arts Department Chair,
SCDBA Chair
980-343-5755

Request

Ms. Davis,

My name is Jameson Stout, and I am the band director in Graham County, North Carolina (part of the Western District). I am nearing the conclusion of my Master's degree at the University of
Florida. To complete my degree, I will need to do a capstone project. This project is beginning to take shape and will likely involve a survey that I need to send to a sample of participants. I contacted Alice Aldridge earlier to see if there was a state-wide database of emails for the band directors. He informed me that there was not, and I would need to contact each district individually. Therefore, I was wondering if there is a database of all the emails for all of the band directors in your district of NC bandmasters. If so, could I please have access to this list? Also, if there is such a list (and I am permitted access to it), could you also write a brief letter explaining that I have permission to email the band directors? This letter will help with the Internal Review Board (IRB) who will be determining if I can use the survey for my research.

If you are curious, my research will be focused on techniques for teaching musicality to instrument ensembles, if those techniques differ with ensemble size, and if those techniques differ based on the level of education achieved by the director.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jameson Stout
Director of Bands Graham
County Schools

Response

D Davis <ddavis120@suddenlink.net>
Thu 3/17/2016 1:54 PM
Jameson,
We do not give out our contact lists. However, I would be glad to send out an email to our membership on your behalf of you sent the message you want forwarded.

Request

Allen,

If you remember, I sent out a sample survey to you about a year ago. I am nearing the conclusion of my Master's degree at the University of Florida. To complete my degree, I will need to do a capstone project. This project is beginning to take shape and will likely involve a revision of the survey you helped me with a year ago. This project will require a larger number of participants. I contacted Alice Aldridge earlier to see if there was a state-wide database of emails for the band directors. He informed me that there was not, and I would need to contact each district individually. Obviously, since I am a member of Western District, I have access to our email directory. However, I was wondering if you could write a brief letter explaining that I have permission to email the band directors of our district? This letter will help with the Internal Review Board (IRB) who will be determining if I can use the survey for my research.
If you are curious, the revised survey of my research will be focused on techniques for teaching musicality to instrument ensembles, if those techniques differ with ensemble size, and if those techniques differ based on the level of education achieved by the director.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jameson Stout
Director of Bands Graham County Schools

Response

To Whom It May Concern:

Jameson Stout, Band Director at Robbinsville HS, is a member of the Western District of the NC Bandmasters Association. As the president of the Western District Bandmasters, I authorize him to email and will facilitate his emailing of the members of the district. We are happy to participate and support his research.

Jameson is a valued member of our organization. His research will no doubt be valuable to the members of our district and to music education as a whole. I have all confidence that he will be an excellent representative of your program upon its completion. Please feel free to email or call if you have questions.

Allen Klaes
Western District Bandmasters President
Band Director
West Henderson HS
3600 Haywood Road
Hendersonville NC 28791
jaklaes@hcpsnc.org
828-891-6571
You have received IRB approval to conduct the above-listed research project. Approval of this project was granted on 5/27/2016 by IRB-02. This study is approved as exempt because it poses minimal risk and is approved under the following exempt category/categories:

1. This research will be conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
2. This research involves the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior. Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. Disclosure of the human subjects responses outside the research does not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Principal Investigator Responsibilities:

The PI is responsible for the conduct of the study.

- Using currently approved consent form to enroll subjects (if applicable)
- Renewing your study before expiration
- Obtaining approval for revisions before implementation
- Reporting Adverse Events
- Retention of Research Records
- Obtaining approval to conduct research at the VA
- Notifying other parties about this project’s approval status

Should the nature of the study change or you need to revise the protocol in any manner please contact this office prior to implementation.

**Study Team:**

Stephanie Standerfer Co-Investigator
Appendix C

Teaching Musicality in Bands Survey

Demographics:

1. What Instrumental Ensembles do you teach? Please check All that Apply:
   - Marching Band
   - Concert Band
   - Jazz Band
   - Other (please specify): ________________________

2. Which range of teaching experience best describes you?
   - 0-5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - 11-15 years
   - 16-20 years
   - 21-25 years
   - 26-30 years
   - 31+ years

3. What is your highest music education degree earned?
   - Bachelor’s Degree
   - Master’s Degree
   - PhD

4. Do you consider your primary band ensemble “small?”
   - Yes
   - No

5. When you hear the words “Small Band,” what number range comes to mind?
6. What is the current number of members in your largest performing ensemble?

- Less than 8 members
- 8-20 members
- 21-40 members
- 41-60 members
- 61-80 members
- 81-100 members
- 101-200 members
- 21-40 members
- More than 200 members

**Topic Questions—Methods**

(Please consider how you instruct your concert band for these questions if you teach them differently from others)

7. When teaching musical expression, what techniques do you use? Please check all that apply.

- Use Metaphors
- Use Physical Gestures
- Use Verbal Explanation
- Use Singing
- Use Score Study
- Use Modeling
- Other (please specify): ___________________

8. Do you consider musical expression to require different instruction based on the ensemble being taught (i.e. concert band, jazz band, marching band, etc.)?

- Yes
- No
9. Please rate the following based on your view of the importance they be taught to an ensemble (1=not important, 4=very important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>More Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tempo Markings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo Alterations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation symbols</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Markings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Alteration text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timbre, Tone, Balance, &amp; Blend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Answers**

10. Please briefly explain your response to **Question # 8**.

11. Do you feel that the size of a band is relevant to its ability to perform musically? Why or why not?
12. Do you feel that the instrumentation of a band is relevant to its ability to perform musically? Why or why not?

13. What are your most preferred methods of teaching music expression, and where did you first find out about those methods?

14. Is there some part of teaching musical expression that has been left out of this survey? If so, please address that concern briefly in the space below.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY!
Appendix D

Dear Directors,

I would like to invite you to participate in a survey for a study I am doing to complete my Master of Music in Music Education degree for the University of Florida. It should take no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete. This survey centers on the methods of teaching musicality to band ensembles and what factors may contribute to those strategies being chosen by directors. Participation is completely voluntary, but I hope you will consider participating. If you are a NCBA district chair, please forward this survey to all of your members so that a larger sample population may be reached. Thank you very much for your time, consideration, and participation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Jameson Stout
Appendix E

Teaching Musicality in Bands Pilot Survey

Please complete this survey, and return it to Jameson Stout once you have completed it.

Demographics:

1. What Instrumental Ensembles do you teach? Please check All that Apply:

◊ Marching Band
◊ Concert Band
◊ Jazz Band
◊ Orchestra
◊ Other (please specify): ____________________

2. Which range of teaching experience best describes you?

◊ 0-5 years
◊ 6-10 years
◊ 11-15 years
◊ 16-20 years
◊ 21-25 years
◊ 26-30 years
◊ 31+ years

3. Do you consider your primary band ensemble “small?”

◊ Yes
◊ No

4. When you hear the words “Small Band,” what number range comes to mind?

◊ Less than 8 members ◊ 61-80 members
◊ 8-20 members ◊ 81-100 members
◊ 21-40 members ◊ 101-200 members
5. What is the current number of members in your largest performing ensemble?

- Less than 8 members
- 8-20 members
- 21-40 members
- 41-60 members
- More than 200 members

6. When choosing music for your ensemble, what factors do you consider important? Please check all that apply.

- Instrumentation
- Concepts needing to be taught
- Rhythm patterns
- Instrument range concerns
- Music Difficulty
- Music length
- Music Style
- Other (please specify): ______________

7. Please choose the number (1-5) that would describe the order you would perform these steps for teaching music (1 is to be done first, 2 second, etc.)

- Teach general concept (i.e. dotted notes)
- Assign Music
- Choose Music
- Teach Rhythms and Notes
- Teach Musical Expression
8. When teaching musical expression, what techniques do you use? Please check all that apply.

   ◊ Use Metaphors
   ◊ Use Physical Gestures
   ◊ Use Verbal Explanation
   ◊ Other (please specify): ____________________

9. Do you consider musical expression to require different instruction based on the ensemble being taught?

   ◊ Yes
   ◊ No

10. Please rate the following based on your view of the importance they be taught to an ensemble (1=not important, 4=very important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>More Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Music Terminology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo Markings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo Alterations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive symbols</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Markings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Alteration text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Answers

11. Please briefly describe the process you would go through to teach one of the concepts in Question # 10.

12. Do you feel that the size of a band is relevant to its ability to perform musically? Why or why not?

13. Do you feel that the instrumentation of a band is relevant to its ability to perform musically? Why or why not?

14. Is there some part of teaching musical expression that has been left out of this survey? If so, please address that concern briefly in the space below.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY!