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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary American society, competition is a way of life. It has, in fact, become so ubiquitous that we often fail to recognize its existence. Kohn (1992), a social and educational philosopher, states: “competition has become a cultural addiction,” and in today’s society “resistance to competition is viewed as suspiciously un-American” (p. 2). Economists advocate the belief that competition facilitates societal efficiency and well-being by eliminating those who fail in meeting the standards of efficiency and superior effectiveness (Rosenau, 2003). If the structural integrity of our economic system relies on competition, logic could suggest that social values are equally contingent on competitive tendencies. Upholding the principles of competition is perceived as a prerequisite of democracy; rivalry has been historically “a hallmark of patriotism and the American way of life” (Rosenau, 2003, back cover). The competition paradigm, however, has been questioned by numerous sociologists, philosophers, and educators based on views regarding competition as socially divisive, artistically stifling, physiologically damaging, and psychologically harmful. The magnitude of this topic necessitates inquiry beyond the limitations of this study. The objective here is to present both philosophical and empirical evidence supporting a need for such investigation. Defining certain terms often associated with competition, however, is required before the complexities of this issue can be explored.

Forms and Definitions of Competition

The terms contest and competition are often used interchangeably as a way of describing a rivalry or challenge between two or more participants. The first distinction
necessary to provide clarity on this topic is between structural and intentional
competition. Kohn (1992) defines *structural competition* as a situation or external
framework, whereas *intentional competition* refers to an attitude or internal structure (pp.
3-4). *Mutually Exclusive Goal Attainment*, where the success of one person requires
another’s failure, must be present for an activity to be categorized as structural
competition (Kohn, 1992). This form of competition is found in sporting events, political
campaigns, and music contests where one person or group/team must fail (lose) in order
for someone else or a different group/team to succeed (win). Within this framework,
there is a further distinction between subjective and objective measurements of
competitive success. In a basketball contest, for example, the team who has scored more
points once the allotted time has expired is declared the winner. This is a simple
illustration of objective measurement; there is a clear and incontrovertible means by
which one team triumphs. Conversely, in subjective competitions, the winner is decided
by an individual’s or a group’s personal judgment; figure skating events, the academy
awards, and music contests, all of which feature some form of artistic ability, are
examples of this type of success measurement. Under such conditions, it is unrealistic to
assume that the winners were incontrovertibly more successful than the losers (Kohn,

Intentional competition is somewhat easier to define than structural competition,
although the nuances and effects can be quite complicated. This form of competition is
simply defined as an internal desire to be the best; this type can exist within structural
competition. For example, as athletes compete in sporting events, it is common for them
to experience an intense desire to win (Kohn, 1992).
Finally, understanding the difference between *intragroup* and *intergroup* competitive experiences is needed to examine this topic. Authors often discuss intragroup competition experiences in education as being among students in a class, whereas athletic and music contests are forms of interpersonal competitive events, where a group of people collaborate together to defeat another group. The mutually exclusive nature of competition has important implications in the context of the teaching and learning environment.

**Competition in Education**

Professionals in the field of education generally agree that the fundamental purpose of educational institutions is to prepare students for societal achievement; Labuta and Smith (1997) discuss the need for education to sustain society. Based on this philosophy, teachers often assume the responsibility of exposing students to competition, thereby facilitating conceptual ideals and educative experiences that will yield success in the real world. Judgments are often made, based on various criteria, as to whether such justification is warranted.

The educational viewpoints of John Dewey have shaped the attitudes and practices of educators for decades. His progressive philosophy considers the experiences of students and whether those experiences facilitate or deter life-long learning (Dewey, 1997). “The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative” (p. 25). Curricular activities can be disconnected from reality and in turn prevent a transfer of learning to real-life situations (Dewey, 1997; Ormrod, 2004). According to Dewey (1997), a worthwhile educational encounter must have continuity and interaction. Determining the continuity
of an experience requires reflection on the direction of growth encouraged by the activity. “Failure to take the moving force of an experience into account so as to judge and direct it on the ground of what it is moving into means disloyalty to the principal of the experience itself” (Dewey, 1997, p. 38).

The effective implementation of worthwhile curricular experiences meeting the above mentioned criteria requires deep reflection and thoughtful preparation by the professional educator. Integration of competition into educational encounters is an example of such curricular judgment; based on Dewey’s philosophy, educators should take into account the moving force of competitive experiences to justify their inclusion. Many well-known individuals, such as Albert Einstein, have suggested that “the imposition of extrinsic constraints can undermine creativity” (Amabile, 1982, p. 573). Competition, an extrinsic motivator, could be seen from this perspective as a possible deterrent to intrinsic motivation, which elicits creativity. The determination of whether competitive experiences fall within the constructs of worthwhile educational experiences motivated the design of this research study. The development of public school music curricula is an important component of examining meaningful learning environments and competition from a music education perspective.

**Music Curriculum**

Music Educators have debated the components of an ideal music curriculum since the integration of music in American public schools in the early 19th century. The Pestalozzian educational reform movement influenced Woodbridge, Ives, and Mason, who were the central figures in integrating music into public school education. Initial support for school music was promoted “by means of children’s choir performances”
Teaching students to sing was the main focus of early music education advocacy and curriculum development; music literacy development using syllables of solmisation was the other fundamental pedagogical principle instituted by Mason. Music in the early American public schools was examined in terms of its intellectual, moral, and physical benefits to students (Mark & Gary, 1999). In the late 19th century, there was concern that music in schools had become more of an entertainment than an educational experience. Since the establishment of the Music Supervisors National Conference in 1907, which would later become the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) in 1934, several curricular models with unique philosophical and pedagogical principles have been suggested. For example, music curricula broadened to include electives such as performance-based ensemble classes, which eventually led to the development of instrumental music contests in the 1920’s (Mark & Gary, 1999).

Despite the debate that continues to permeate contemporary music education, one consensus currently exists—the ideal music curriculum is comprehensive in nature (Labuta & Smith, 1997; Lehman, 1995; Reimer, 1995).

**Comprehensive Musicianship**

Austin (1998) describes comprehensive musicianship as “performance with understanding” (p. 25). This philosophical ideal has endured numerous alterations and revisions since it first appeared over 50 years ago. In 1971, the *Symposium on the Evaluation of Comprehensive Musicianship* addressed musical competence categories: these included performing, creative, and descriptive competence. *A Blueprint for Band*, published in 1983, addressed similar musical proficiencies. In 1994, the national standards for music education were developed. As a result of the Goals 2000: Educate
America Act legislation, the federal government recognizes music as a core academic subject and has adopted the nine national standards in music education as the model for music curricula (Hommedieu, 2002). Although many individual state standards deviate from the national model, the Indiana music standards are aligned both in content and sequence (Bennett, 2009). Since the respondents of the current investigation are Indiana music educators, this distinction is important. Although the national and state standards for music education are aligned, curricular decisions in music program are often made by individual music educators or department heads as opposed to larger governmental authorities. To ensure a strong and vibrant future for music education, curricular decisions require careful thought and philosophical reflection; these decisions impact the quality and retention of student learning and musicianship.

*Music Education and Aesthetics*

Despite numerous ancient philosophies concerning aesthetics, the interest in aesthetic education in contemporary society is relatively recent. Such interest has produced books and articles pertaining to the importance of an *aesthetic experience*. The specific aim here is to uncover the relevance of aesthetic experiences as they relate to ideal music curricula.

One of the many dilemmas faced in the field of music education is recognizing the dual nature of music—it contains both utilitarian and aesthetic value. Music is effective in developing intellectual discernment, supporting general education goals (e.g., self discipline, self-esteem, reading skills, etc.), and providing students with cooperative learning experiences. Labuta (1997) believes music’s primary function is to heighten emotional awareness and perception. John Dewey’s previously mentioned philosophy of
experience in education was integral in conceptually separating aesthetic experiences from those that would not be classified as such (Fenner, 2003). Researchers and philosophers studying this phenomenon have argued over the subjective nature of beauty, appreciation, and “emotional consciousness” (Fenner, 2003, p. 42).

Art is meant to be a reflection of or response to the human condition due to the subjectivity of communicating emotion. “Paradoxically, art often becomes a casualty of the very social conditions it tries to reflect” (Miller, 1993, p. 140). The American culture’s obsession with competition serves as one such example. Art is an illustration or expression of human traits often stifled by competition; mutually exclusive achievement goals promote aggression, anger, fear, and even hatred (Kohn, 1992). The very nature of artistic expression could be seen from this viewpoint as being essentially destroyed by cultivating such tendencies. “Creativity and individualism are the opposite of competition because the very nature of creativity is to originate something new that defies standardization” (Miller, 1994, pg. 32). Although some claim an over-emphasis on winning in athletics as having psychological ramifications, mutually exclusive constructs are inevitably embedded within various sports. The structural integrity of football, basketball, tennis, and others is dependent upon mutually exclusive outcomes of success. Many activities considered to be athletic, however, are not equally reliant upon a competitive framework. Figure skating, for example, is an activity that exists outside the context of structural competition. Nevertheless, it has, along with similar activities, been subjected to the institutionalization of mutually exclusive goal structures.

As previously discussed, the philosophical basis around which this research study was designed focuses primarily on meaningful learning experiences. Encouraging
perceptive student insight and understanding through aesthetic education demands thoughtful reflection on the types of curricular opportunities provided in music classrooms. The purpose of a comprehensive music curriculum is to establish a learning environment in which these types of educational encounters can flourish; the National Standards for Music Education were designed to provide a contextual framework for such curricula. Technical and artistic training are critical components of developing musical intelligence. Making musical discriminations and meaningful connections while engaging in performance practices, however, is the intent of a standards-based curriculum. Through the implementation of learning experiences such as these, a broader perception of what it means to be musical can be achieved (Reimer, 2004).

**Competition in Music Education**

The debate regarding competition in the music curriculum has permeated the profession since the first music contest in 1923 (Rohrer, 2002). Although the contest format has evolved since and varies from state to state, supporting and opposing viewpoints have been consistent. Supporters of competition emphasize increased student motivation, self-esteem, performance achievement, music quality, group spirit, and music educator accountability resulting from competition. Critics of competition counter that many educators overemphasize the “winning at all cost” mentality, spend too much rehearsal time on contest music, neglect the comprehensive music curriculum, and rely on subjective assessment of student achievement (Rohrer, 2002). Many music educators feel that participating in competitive music events will encourage their students to strive for excellence and that competition can be done in a way that promotes healthy music making and education (Parkes, 1983; Schouten et al., 1983). Some have countered that
“excellence seems to have diminished as we have increased the number of competitive situations in our educational system” (Miller, 1994, p. 31). Others feel that in order to achieve an aesthetic appreciation for choral art, students need to participate in more cooperative learning activities. One music educator stated that we have “often emphasized the extrinsic values of our profession to gain public support for our cause” (Schouten et al., 1983, p. 29). Clarifying the relationship between competitive and comprehensive music learning is of utmost importance to providing philosophical insight and practical knowledge to the field of music education.

**Rationale and Purpose Statement**

The knowledge gained from deliberations on competition in general education and specifically in the teaching and learning of music has produced a complex and multifaceted issue. Researchers have conducted numerous studies examining this issue. Topics of these studies include: nature versus nurture, productivity, psychological and physiological concerns, enjoyment, aesthetics, motivation and attribution theory, classroom environment, self-concept in music, and academic achievement. There is, however, no current research addressing the effects of competition on comprehensive choral curricula. The competition paradigm in the field of music education is predominately rooted in the Midwest; according to several online sources, Indiana is considered by popular public opinion to be one of six states with a unique focus on show choir competition (Lorentz & Kelly, 2009; Wikipedia, 2009). It was the purpose of this investigation, therefore, to examine the relationship between competition and the curricular practices of Indiana secondary choral music educators. Specifically, the researcher investigated both show choir and concert choir competition to determine
possible correlations with comprehensive music curricula as outlined in the nine national standards for music education. The following research questions were developed to provide direction for this inquiry:

1. Is there a relationship between the involvement in curricular preparation for competitive choral events and the comprehensiveness of choral music curricula?
2. Is there a difference between the comprehensiveness of choral programs that participate in concert and show choir competition?
3. Is there a relationship between program size and comprehensive choral curricula?
4. Is there a difference between the comprehensiveness of middle school and high school choral curricula?
5. Do high school choral programs participate in curricular preparation for competitive events more or less than junior high programs?
6. Is there a difference between high school curricular show choir involvement and high school curricular marching band involvement?
7. Is there a relationship between the amount of time spent on choreography instruction and comprehensive choral curricula?
8. Is there a relationship between choral musical style selection and comprehensive choral music curricula?
9. Is there a relationship between choral musical style selection and the amount of curricular time spent on competition preparation?
10. Is there a relationship between choral musical style selection of Indiana choral music educators and the student enrollment of the school in which they teach?
Limitations

The use of survey data collection methodology, in general, has certain limitations including lack of control based on self-reporting. Previous findings indicate that music educators have been found to inaccurately report their curricular practices (Wang & Sogin, 1997). In some cases, the amount of time spent in each activity would suggest that some of the respondents did not accurately report their activities in the classroom (i.e., the time reportedly spent on each activity amounts to more class time than was possible).

The external validity of the study is limited due to the population and sample size. The significant results only apply to secondary choral music educators who taught in Indiana in the spring semester of 2009. To obtain results that will generalize to the broader field of choral music education, the survey would need to be extended to the national level. Despite attempts made by the researcher to clarify what was meant by competition involvement (competing against other ensembles), the interpretations of what it means to compete remained somewhat ambiguous in the results of this investigation. This leaves the internal validity of the self-reported data in doubt. Clarification is needed to standardize the meaning of music competition to avoid similar validity issues in future studies on competition.

Significance of the Study

The findings of the current study have the potential of significantly impacting the field of music education. Based on current findings, spending curricular time preparing for show choir competitions might be limiting the time spent addressing national standards. Choral music educators are encouraged to reflect on their practices and attempt
to make their choral curricula more comprehensive. Conclusions drawn from this investigation indicate that administrators and legislators should reflect on the possibility that competitive music experiences should be confined to and categorized as extracurricular activities. If public school athletic teams were integrated into the physical education curriculum during the regular school day, it could have an adverse affect on the level to which all physical education standards are met (Boone, 1983; Jewett, 1989); current findings suggest that the same might be true for choral music education. The results of this study should encourage a closer look at policies made regarding the choral music curriculum in Indiana secondary public schools. Furthermore, findings of this investigation imply that choreography and the amount of curricular time allotted for competition preparation is related to choral repertoire selections of Indiana choral music educators. Regardless of program size, grade level taught, or the participation in curricular choral competition preparation, however, music is not included on the standardized Indiana Statewide Testing for Education Progress (ISTEP) or core 40 end of year assessments; research-based data in this area is, therefore, of utmost importance to curricular decision-making in choral music education. The conclusions drawn from this investigation have provided a new line of formal inquiry to the field of choral music education.
CHAPTER TWO

RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW

The controversial topic of competition has a long history of philosophical contemplation and deliberation. Exploring this social and educational issue in order to make relevant deductions, draw meaningful conclusions, and provide practical implications for the music education field requires a thorough examination of related research literature. Literature pertaining to competition as it relates to society as a whole and the field of education provides a comprehensive view of underlying psychological constructs relevant to the current study. Research on music curriculum development and competition as it relates to music education will provide a conceptual framework for investigation into the relationship between competition and the curricular practices of choral music educators.

**Competition in Society**

Within the past century, numerous scientific investigations have studied competition in society as a whole as well as its implications to the education field. In order to fully understand the concepts associated with competitive tendencies and experiences, a look into the psychological and physiological ramifications is necessary. Previous research on societal competition has examined numerous psycho-social phenomena including nature versus nurture, productivity, self-esteem, anxiety and stress, aggression, and enjoyment.
Although debate exists as to the benefits of competition, the very essence of competition relies on *Mutually Exclusive Goal Attainment (MEGA)*, in which the success of one requires another’s failure (Kohn, 1992). Each culture reflects this phenomenon in a unique way. Even within America’s ultra-competitive society, various ideologies and pragmatic views exist relating to this paradigm. The integration of MEGA experiences into American public school curricula is a decision that is often made by administrators and educators. Devoid of purpose and scientific investigation, however, any philosophical grounding for such policy has little merit. According to John Dewey, the three variables involved in forming a purpose include: “(a) observation of surrounding conditions, (b) knowledge of what has happened in similar situations in the past…, and (c) judgment which puts together what is observed and what is recalled to see what they signify” (Dewey, 1997, p. 69).

Although purpose begins with an impulse or desire, a genuine purpose is an end-view (Dewey, 1997). The consequences resulting from an impulse requires an interaction with surrounding observable conditions. A child, for instance, may have an innate desire to touch a flame based on its brightness with no regard to the significance of the flame’s ability to burn. The consequence of action in this case would result from lack of previous experience. As humans mature, their ability to make informed judgments about their environment based on experience becomes more defined, thereby facilitating purposeful interaction with stimuli. In certain situations, however, the desire for immediate action of an impulse may be so intense or obscured by desensitization that it overrides intelligent and thoughtful reflection on long-term outcomes (Dewey, 1997). Formulating a purpose for educational experiences, based on the preceding criteria, gives meaningful direction
to the experiences and allows teachers to make informed curricular decisions, such as integrating competition into their curricula.

Kohn (1992) discusses various ways in which supporters of competition have brought purpose to competitive experiences and how this reasoning has caused the phenomenon to become so deeply ingrained in American culture. The logic surrounding a desirable position on competition includes: (a) the human nature argument, (b) increased productivity, (c) a capacity to build character, and (d) an increase in motivation and enjoyment. Understanding the effects of competition on learning requires a brief look at these fundamental principles.

*Human Nature Argument*

The first purpose in support of competition is its inevitability due to the naturally occurring competitive nature of human beings. Many belief systems counter that simply because certain animal instincts are innate human traits, as emotional and cognitive beings with the ability to make choices, we can and should resist some of those urges (Kohn, 1992). The question is then raised as to whether purposeful integration of competition in our culture falls into this category; this is one of many nature/nurture debates that have intrigued sociologists and philosophers for decades. The human nature argument states that “particular characteristics are an unavoidable part of human nature” (Kohn, 1992, p. 12). The word human nature is often used casually to justify certain human behaviors; the instinctive human condition can assumedly account for almost any behavior we encounter. It can be, in fact, comforting to avoid culpability due to perceptions that our human behaviors are inevitable. Providing incontrovertible scientific proof of such claims, however, requires assertions to be applied across all cultures and
throughout human history; such theories based on biological determinism have shown weaknesses in logic, empirical data, and, in some cases, outright fabrication (Kohn, 1997). John Harvey (1917), for example, observed that “in games, the pleasure comes from the competition itself…and not from the outcome” (p.12). From his observations and experiences, he concluded that competition, rather than the intended result (i.e., winning), is itself attractive and instinctive. Using this observation to ascertain an innate human need for competition would be similar to concluding that because some students prefer walking to their next class to listening to the lecture that will follow, all humans have an instinctive attraction to walking. Harry Ruben (1981) also believes that “we indeed have a competitive ‘code’ in our chromosomes” (p. 22). Ruben neither supports this claim with empirical evidence nor sufficiently explains his position, and therefore does not substantiate this purpose of competition. Despite many philosophical claims, it is impractical to scientifically prove or disprove competition to be innately human due to the interpretive nature of data collection in scientific research on the nature/nurture debate (Kohn, 1992).

On the other side of the debate, Deutsch (1973) stated that “it would be unreasonable to assume there is an innately determined tendency for everyone to want to be top dog” (p. 89). Tutko and Burns (1976) agree based on their experience with athletes that “competition is a learned behavior…people are not born with a motivation to win or to be competitive…and the will to win comes through training and the influences of one’s family and environment” (p.53). Riesman (1953) points out the paradoxical belief of Americans that competition is natural, “but only if it is constantly recreated by artificial systems of social roles that direct energies into it” (p. 252).
One of the first scientific investigations on this topic was attempted by May (1937). Findings of his research indicate significant societal implications. Although supported with empirical evidence, the vast quantity of data necessitated the findings be reported as generalizations in *The American Journal of Sociology* and are correspondingly stated:

1. Human beings by original nature strive for goals, but striving with others (co-operation) or against others (competition) are learned forms of behavior.

2. American children develop rudiments of competition and cooperation earlier than in other cultures.

3. In competitive and cooperative situations, the knowledge, options, judgments, and attitudes of others concerning the situation change the social form of the behavior.

4. Competition is more efficient in American public school children.

5. An individual’s estimate of possibly gaining prestige influences his decision to enter a situation as a competitor or co-operator.

6. Competitive and cooperative goals are based on culture context.

7. The educational system of a culture transmits the general societal norms of competitive and cooperative behavior.

8. The life history of an individual reveals how the biological equipment of the individual is modified by the culture into competitive or cooperative behaviors.
9. The life history of an individual reveals the continuous and cumulative nature of experience.

10. The life history of an individual reveals that the individual interprets and evaluates his own experiences. (pp. 888-889)

Not only has scientific evidence of competition as a human instinct been left unsubstantiated, but Kohn (1992) argues that competition is in fact a learned behavior; we as parents and teachers train children to be competitive from an early age through board and card games, athletics, and other childhood experiences. This point is not meant to discourage the promotion of childhood games, but simply to validate the claim that competitive behavior can be learned and is not necessarily instinctive. The lack of scientific proof coupled with the viewpoint that cooperative behaviors could also be considered an innate human characteristic raises the question as to whether competition and cooperation are mutually exclusive terms. Even if these claims are based primarily on conjecture, both types of behavior are seen in early childhood—often in the same child within the same environmental context. If there is an innate desire to compete and work with others, the decision must be made as to which drive is satisfied.

Productivity

Another purpose that strengthens a pro-competition viewpoint is heightened productivity and performance quality. Advocates for competition have argued that “minimal productivity, to say nothing of excellence, would disappear if we ceased competing” (Kohn, 1992, p. 45). It is assumed by some that competence requires competition. According to the research, however, superior performance is not reliant on competition; in many cases, achieving excellence actually tends to require its absence
Based on the data provided by these studies, Kohn points out that although the winner of competitive activities must provide a higher result either qualitatively or quantitatively, competition itself does not necessarily make for better performance.

Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, and Skon (1981) conducted a meta-analysis reviewing 122 studies from 1924 to 1980, all of which examined a possible relationship between competition and achievement. Sixty-five of the studies found that cooperation promotes higher achievement than competition, eight found the reverse, and 36 found no statistically significant difference. The superiority of cooperation held for all subject areas and age groups. Other studies have produced results indicating significantly higher productivity in intragroup cooperation than in intragroup competition, and also “significantly higher in intergroup cooperation compared to intergroup competition” (Workie, 1974, p. 228).

People who believe they will either lose or win regardless of their effort are often less motivated to improve; this motivational construct is absent in non-competitive activities. Furthermore, competitive individuals often focus so heavily on outperforming their peers that they become distracted from the actual activity (Kohn, 1992). Kohn states several examples of this psychological phenomenon: “In the case of piano competitions, artistic excellence is not promoted by making artists compete” (p. 56). The same is true in politics; a person who campaigns well to win an election may not necessarily have the skills required to run the country. Being a good leader and a good campaigner are two different things. Philosopher John McMurty was quoted in a sport’s magazine addressing similar issues in the world of athletic contests:
Actually, the pursuit of victory works to reduce the chance for excellence... It tends to distract our attention from excellence of performance by rendering it subservient to emerging victorious. I suspect that our conventional mistake of presuming the opposite—presuming that the contest-for-prize framework and excellence of performance are somehow related as a unique cause and effect—may be the deepest-lying prejudice of civilized thought. (Johnson, 1974, p. 446)

A fundamental principle of the psychology of competing is the mutual incompatibility of winning, and obtaining truth and understanding (Frankel, 1975). This viewpoint contradicts the claim that competition increases productivity, at least from an academic standpoint. Grossack (1953) conducted an experiment that explored differences between the effects of competitive and cooperative social situations on group behavior. Results supported the hypothesis that cooperation is a determinant of cohesiveness. More of subjects exposed to a cooperative treatment than those who were subjected to a competitive treatment attempted to positively influence others (Grossack, 1953).

Whittemore (1924) conducted an investigation that examined the influence of competition on the productivity and peace of mind of the traditional American worker in simple tasks involving mental and motor capacities. The group that was subjective to competition demonstrated higher productivity in terms of quantity. Conversely, the quality ratings of work were lower in the competitive group: “…the averages for all scores indicate a decrease in quality under competitive conditions” (Whittemore, 1924, p. 245). Although implications were limited, findings suggested a correlation between higher quantitative efficiency and mutually exclusive constructs of goal attainment—
more was produced. Conversely, a relationship between lower quality products and competitive goal structure was implied.

**Psychological and Physiological Implications**

Some have claimed that competition builds character (Kohn, 1992). This viewpoint influenced numerous investigations that examined the psychological ramifications of nurturing competitive tendencies. Results of such investigative reports provided empirical data showing direct and indirect effects of competition on both the physiological and psychological health of individuals that are largely negative (Rosenau, 2003). These inquiries examine the following topics: (a) self-esteem, (b) stress and anxiety, (c) product orientation, (c) dichotomous thinking, and (d) conformity (Kohn, 1992).

In reference to one psychological consideration of why humans compete, Kohn (1992) offers the proposition that “we compete to overcome fundamental doubts about our capabilities and…to compensate for low self-esteem” (p. 99). Research investigating this claim produced significant findings. Rubinstein (1977), for example, conducted an investigation based on her hypothesis that children in an expressive, noncompetitive social environment would demonstrate a higher level of self-esteem and a lower level of anxiety than children in a task-oriented, competitive social environment. Findings partially confirmed Rubinstein’s hypothesis: although no significant decrease in self-esteem occurred in the competitive group, there was an increase in self-esteem in the non-competitive camp. When divided into sub-groups of achievers and nonachievers, results were different; the change in self-esteem was greater for the achievers. Final
results revealed an increase in anxiety for the achievers in the competitive camp and the males in the noncompetitive camp (Rubinstein, 1977).

Research further suggests that competition can increase stress and anxiety. The type of social stress promoted by competitive activities has been shown to “upset the equilibrium of the neurological, endocrine, and immune systems” (Rosenau, 2003, p. 18). In sports, competition-related stress can affect the immune system and have other physiological ramifications (Rosenau, 2003). Fenici, Ruggieri, Brisinda, and Fenici (1999) indicated that competition can cause increased heart rates, which were associated with impaired performance and scores in action pistol shooting.

Kugler, Reintjes, Tewes, and Schedlowski (1996) examined the effects of competition on immune functions. They found higher subjective arousal states in competing coaches as compared to resting members of a control group during a match, and a decrease one hour after the end of the contest. Although previous findings suggested an impairment of immune functions resulting from chronic competition-related stress (Jemmott, 1983), the findings of this study indicated an opposite effect in situations involving acute psychological stress: the competition-related stress had an enhanced effect on the immune system (Kugler et al., 1996).

Previous research indicates that competition can also increase testosterone levels. In 1998, an investigation examining testosterone changes during vicarious experiences of winning and losing among fans at sporting events revealed a significant difference in testosterone levels before and after the match from the fans of both the winning and losing teams: “There was a significant team x team interaction, reflecting an increase in testosterone from the winning team’s fans and a decrease in those supporting the losing
team” (Bernhardt, Dabbs, Fielden, & Lutter, 1998, p. 60). Mazur, Booth, and Dabbs (1992) found similar increases of testosterone in non-athletic competitions (i.e., chess). In both a regional and city tournament, winning and losing had different effects on testosterone levels, but these occurred primarily when competition was more intense. Lastly, an investigation examining the effects of competitive reward structure on aggression in children revealed higher aggression levels in highly competitive groups; a high reward was shown to produce more physical and verbal aggression than a low reward (Ares & Babbitt, 1974).

In addition to the research on the effects of competition on aggression, Lanzetta and Englis (1989) conducted an investigation that examined the effects of competition versus cooperation on vicarious emotional responses. Results of this study indicated that vicarious emotional responses are related to expectations of social interaction. When presented with a competitive expectation, unsympathetic emotional responses were reported. Conversely, the noncompetitive expectation influenced the vicarious empathetic responses of the participants as measured both physiologically and verbally. Conclusions assert a possible empathetic human response when presented with a congruent affective experience, which is often perceived in cooperative situations. Conversely, mutually exclusive emotional experiences, often found in competitive experiences, tend to elicit counter-empathetic behaviors.

**Enjoyment**

Further support for competition derives from an assertion that competitive activities are more enjoyable and motivating than those within a cooperative or individualistic goal structure. Although certain forms of competition, such as fighting for
position, prestige, and profit in corporate America may not be considered enjoyable, the rush that is experienced when participating in or observing sporting events and other competitive games is considered by many to be motivating. A distinction must be made, however, between the enjoyment of winning and competition itself; a logical assumption that losing is not considered to be an enjoyable experience is justified in this case.

When comparing the competitive contexts of the workplace and the playing field, the pressure to win is an equal factor of success (Kohn, 1992). Sports, by definition, are competitive and, although winning can become “overblown, institutionalized, and a codified form of worship,” the salient competitive characteristic of athletics has become a prominent feature of American life (Leonard, 1975, p. 128). While a small minority of society relies on sports for their livelihood, the purpose of athletics is primarily recreational (Kohn, 1992). The debate as to whether play and competition are synonymous or at least compatible terms, however, is more ambiguous. Some value play as activities outside the conscious realm of ordinary or serious life (Huizinga, 1955). Play is chosen voluntarily due to its intrinsic rather than utilitarian value; it is meant to be pleasing and is in opposition to work. This view maintains an end to itself; humans do not play to master a skill or perform well, even if the activity results in skill development (Kohn, 1992). Huizinga (1955) argues that because of the systematization and regimentation of athletics, sports are a separate entity from play due to a decrease in leisure based on increased competitiveness. Athletic activities do not serve as a break from reality and are therefore not considered, by this view, experiences of play. Kohn (1992) claims that most definitions of play exclude competitive activities, due to the rigidity of rules, the extrinsic motivation factor of winning, and the goal-oriented nature
of rivalry. He continues by stating, “determined athletes memorize plays and practice to the point of exhaustion to beat an opposing team…if you are trying to win, you are not engaged in true play” (p. 83).

According to Rosenau (2003), it is the “competitive aspect of sports that generates stress…noncompetitive physical exercise has been found to counteract stress and facilitate positive psychological health” (p. 18). Wankel (1993) confirms this in his paper on the importance of enjoyment to the adherence and psychological benefits from physical activity. According to his research, enjoyment facilitates continued involvement in an activity and has “direct health implications through countering stress and facilitating positive psychological health” (p. 151).

Within the context of the enjoyment argument for competition are subcategories of the benefits. Supporters commend the unique ability of competition to promote physical fitness, teamwork, a zest for life, strategy development, a flow experience, and existential affirmation (Kohn, 1992). Few would deny the benefits of improving strength and fitness in conjunction with working with others toward a common goal. Acquiring the ability to think on your feet in unpredictable situations is also invaluable. Competition critics, however, counter that each of these benefits can be achieved outside the context of competitive activities; Kohn explains the popularity of aerobics and other noncompetitive approaches to exercise as support. The “we-versus-they” dynamic is also unnecessary for developing collaborative skills. Cooperative activities have been shown to be twice as effective in achieving this goal (Kohn, 1992). Kohn contradicts the desired effect of providing a zest for life by stating: “competition, like salt, provides zest…salt contributes to hypertension and also becomes a substitute for the natural flavor of the
food itself. Only when we come to depend on salt does food taste bland without it” (p. 89). Kohn (1992) believes that the dependence on competition to provide a sense of accomplishment is misplaced and that one should aim instead at an objective standard or attempt to exceed a previous personal achievement, which is ironically referred to as “competing with oneself” (p. 95).

Finally, the argument for competition states that it contains the unique capability of promoting what Csikszentmihalyi (1990) calls the flow experience, where time passes more quickly when completely engaged in an activity due to its autotelic function. “The experience itself is so enjoyable that people will do it even at great cost, for the sheer sake of doing it” (Csiksentmihalyi, 1990, p. 4). Although competitive activities may have the ability to promote such an experience, Csiksentmihalyi (1975a) suggested that competitive sports are less conducive to the flow experience than noncompetitive activities. The flow experience requires intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards, loss of ego, and a framework in which the individual is in control. It also has the potential of merging action and awareness. These requirements coupled with an equally matched competency and difficulty level determine the level to which a person will experience flow.

Csikszentmihaly (1975) investigated the relationship between play and intrinsic rewards. He conducted systematic interviews to examine the experiences reported by people involved in various play-forms (i.e., rock-climbing, playing chess, dancing, playing basketball, and composing music). Findings indicate that all these activities have certain qualities that have the potential of facilitating a flow experience. Some of these qualities include: (a) ability to concentrate on a limited stimulus field, (b) use of skills to
meet clear demands, (c) capacity to encourage a person to forget his or her problems, (d) escape from a separate identity, (e) feeling of control over the environment, (f) transcendence of ego-boundaries, and (g) a consequent psychic integration with metapersonal systems. Further analysis, however, revealed less potential of high school basketball in promoting a flow experience when compared with composing music. This is due, in part, to the fact that basketball’s “competitive structure fails to isolate the activity from everyday life, making concentration and the loss of ego relatively more difficult” (Csikszentmihaly, 1975a, p. 182).

**Competition in Education**

Research on competition in education is extensive and focuses primarily on the relationship between competition and student motivation, attribution, and classroom environment. The findings of previous investigations provide necessary insight into both the benefits and detriments of competition to student learning.

Motivation and Attribution Theory

Motivation is “an internal state that arouses us to action, pushes us in particular directions, and keeps us engaged in certain activities” (Ormrod, 2004, p. 425). Ormrod indicates that motivation orientations have a significant impact on student learning and performance. Maehr and Meyer (1997), for example, examined the influence of motivation on learning. According to their research, motivation increases an individual’s energy and activity level, directs an individual toward certain goals, promotes initiation of certain activities, and affects the learning strategies and cognitive processes an individual brings to the task. Understanding the specific importance of extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation on learning is a critical component of the competition debate.
*Intrinsic motivation*, where the source of motivation lies within the individual, facilitates the following: (a) cognitive engagement in the task, (b) taking on more challenging aspects of the task, (c) meaningful engagement in learning, (d) creativity, (e) persistence, (f) self-evaluation, and (g) desire for continued pursuit of learning (Ormrod, 2004). Extrinsic rewards, which can motivate in the short term, “may undermine the intrinsic reinforcement that an activity provides” (Ormrod, 2004, p. 458). Previous findings indicate that extrinsic rewards have little adverse effects when they are unexpected (Cameron, 2001; Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 2001).

Attribution theory focuses on how people explain their success and how that, in turn, affects learning processes. Weiner’s (2000) research indicates that people’s attributions appear to vary in terms of three key dimensions: (a) locus—internal versus external, (b) temporal stability—stable versus unstable, and (c) controllability—controllable versus uncontrollable. Various student attributions commonly studied include: (a) ability, which is internal, stable, and uncontrollable; (b) effort, which is internal, unstable, and controllable; (c) task difficulty, which is external, stable, and uncontrollable; and (d) luck, which is external, unstable, and uncontrollable (Ormrod, 2004).

According to Ormrod (2004), competition is a “pervasive element in our society…” and “…in competitive situations, success doesn’t depend on absolute mastery of a task; instead, it results from outperforming others” (p. 503). Motivation can derive from competition only if there is a reasonable chance of winning (Stipek, 1996). The negative side effects of competition on student motivation and attribution, however, include: (a) a focus on performance rather than mastery goals, (b) a low sense of
competence and diminishment of self worth in the losers, (c) a focus on ability rather than effort attributions, and (d) counterproductive behaviors such as cheating. Research indicates that competition ultimately leads to lower achievement for most students (Ormrod, 2004).

A meta-analysis was conducted by Eisenberger and Cameron (1996) on 96 studies examining the effects of rewards on intrinsic motivation. Results of this investigation indicated that “negative effects of reward are minimal and could easily be prevented in applied settings” (Cameron, 2001, p. 31). In response to this claim, Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (2001) conducted a second meta-analysis examining the same research question based on the following research concerns of the first meta-analysis: (a) high versus low interest not properly identified in analysis, (b) use of inappropriate control groups, (c) omitting studies with outliers, (d) omitting studies published during the period covered by meta-analysis, (e) omitting unpublished doctoral dissertations, and (f) misclassification of studies into reward contingencies as defined by cognitive evaluation theory. Their results support cognitive evolution theory, which states that tangible rewards significantly undermine intrinsic motivation. To counter this evidence, Cameron (2001) conducted another meta-analysis to examine previous studies in combination with additional findings adapting her analytical techniques to address these concerns. Results of the new meta-analysis indicated “no evidence for detrimental effects of reward on measures of intrinsic motivation” (p. 34). Verbal rewards such as praise were shown to actually increase free-choice intrinsic motivation. When rewards are delivered unexpectedly, there is no evidence of significant effects. When participants were offered a tangible reward,
however, for doing well at a task, they chose to do the activity less in a free-choice period.

Another investigation examined the effects of competition on children’s intrinsic motivation. Twenty-six children ages 10-12 were randomly assigned to conditions of competition or intrinsic mastery orientation through a balancing task often used as an assessment tool in elementary physical education classes. As predicted by the researchers, results indicated that the students in the competition group participated less during the allotted free time following the treatment than did the students in the intrinsic mastery group. Differences in intrinsic motivation could not have been caused by differences in perceived competence because subjects in the two groups showed no significant differences in the perceived competence measure—the post-test questionnaire (Vallerand, Gauvin, & Halliwell, 1986).

Reeve, Olson, and Cole (1985) examined the consequences of winning and losing on motivation and performance. They hypothesized that “…not all competitive experiences are alike and that the outcome of the competition—either a win or a loss—can have a profound effect on intrinsic motivation” (p. 293, ¶1). Reeve et al. (1985) continued by suggesting that “…winners receive competence feedback and that losers receive incompetence feedback…. [and therefore] …winners should exhibit more intrinsic motivation toward the task than losers” (p. 293, ¶3). The participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups: those who completed the puzzle first and those who lost the competition. From post-experiment questionnaires, the investigators concluded that higher intrinsic motivation occurs when a competitor wins. Further analysis revealed a change in performance based on competence versus incompetence
feedback. Once competence or incompetence feedback had been received, winners outperformed losers.

Ames (1981) studied the influence of cooperative and competitive reward structures on achievement attributions and effect. Eighty-four fifth- and sixth-grade children were asked to trace over the lines of a puzzle with a pencil without retracing any lines or lifting the pencil. The reward structure was manipulated by varying the contingency between the performance and type of reward received. The performance outcomes were reversed at the end of the experiment so that the previous losing child won and both cooperative pairs achieved their goal. The children were then given a questionnaire asking them to evaluate themselves and each other according to the four attribution constructs: ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck. Results suggested that the individual performance factor had an impact on the self-perception of ability, effort, task, and luck attributions. Children who performed at a high level judged their task easier and their luck better than those who lost in the competition. Results also indicated that the winning subjects attributed more ability to themselves than they did to their losing opponent in the competitive condition. Overall, findings suggest self-evaluative behaviors following a successful task performance being enhanced by a competitive win. The negative self-evaluations typically elicited by a poor performance were partly alleviated by a cooperative group condition that involved successful goal achievement. Self-evaluations were higher when the group was successful. Children in the successful cooperative groups felt more deserving of reward than those in the failing groups. Within the failing cooperative groups, however, children who received a prize felt less deserving than the children in the alternative condition who received no prize.
Deci (1981) conducted another study examining the effects of competition on intrinsic motivation. Eighty undergraduate students were asked to solve the same puzzle. Some were instructed to attempt to defeat their opponent, while others were asked to simply work to complete the puzzle as quickly as possible. Both male and female students showed less intrinsic motivation under the competitive conditions, but the males to a lesser degree than the females. Clifford (1972) conducted a study similar to the 1986 investigation discussed previously. This inquiry provided results showing both competitive and cooperative treatments enhancing student interest. The competitive group, however, did not significantly increase performance or retention of the material.

Aesthetics and Experience in Education

Amabile (1982) examined the effects of competition on children’s artistic creativity. Girls from the age of 7 to 11 made paper collages in this experiment, which were judged by a panel. The experimental group knew they would be competing for prizes, whereas those in the control group expected the prizes would be raffled off. The control group scored significantly higher than the experimental group on their creativity, novel use of materials, variation in shapes, and complexity. The control group, however, scored lower on the technical aspects of the collage including organization, planning, and representationalism. Results also suggested that creativity was reduced within the context of the external competitive constraints. The control group showed significantly higher variability in the number of colors used, the number of pieces used, and the percentages of pieces altered. Research on aesthetics in education has strong implications on meaningful learning experiences as they relate to music curricula.
Music Curriculum

Substantial knowledge has been gained from formal inquiry on teaching and learning as it relates to music instruction and curriculum development. Examining the relationship between competition and choral curriculum necessitates a thorough understanding of the fundamental concepts associated with music curriculum development. Noteworthy topics for discussion include: (a) aesthetics and music, (b) classroom environment, (c) comprehensive musicianship, (d) national standards for music education, and (e) music selection.

Aesthetics and Music

Reimer (2003) explains the difficulty in defining artistic vs. aesthetic experiences due to the various perceptions and historical developments of these concepts. Reimer argues that aesthetic education by definition cannot be characterized dogmatically, but as a philosophical guide by which to continually evaluate and modify the curricular structure of music classrooms. A curriculum based on such a philosophy must: (a) be philosophically and pragmatically convincing across all applications of music education, (b) be applicable to all students in schools, (c) be comprehensive in nature addressing all means of interacting with music, (d) have the ability to apply across all areas of a music program, (e) be focused primarily on experiences unique to music, (f) promote a transforming experience unique to music, and (g) include a multicultural view of music.

Aesthetic experience in music curriculum is a line of inquiry which has been recently studied due to the belief that “participation in bands and other performance organizations contributes to the development of aesthetic sensitivity, and it would appear that such an aesthetic experience is directly related to the quality of the musical
experience” (Anderson, 1975, p. 379). Anderson investigated possible effects of music literature on developing an aesthetic appreciation of music. The specific purpose of this study was to determine the effects of stage band vs. concert band music literature on the development of musicality and aesthetic sensitivity. The examiner administered pre-instruction and post-instruction tests (Gaston Test of Musicality and California Test of Aesthetic Judgment) to 600 high school band students. Subjects in the experimental group were exposed to exclusively stage band music; the two control groups were exposed exclusively to concert music and to both stage band and concert music, respectively. The same director worked with all three groups. Results revealed a higher growth in musicality and aesthetic sensitivity in the concert-only group. In addition, students exposed to both styles showed more aesthetic growth than the stage-band-only group. Statistics indicating the growth that occurred within the various groups showed all groups achieving highly significant growth on the musicality test, but the most dramatic gain was seen in the concert-only group compared with the stage-band-only group and for those subjected to both conditions. Regarding aesthetic sensitivity, the largest gain was again seen in the concert-only group compared with the stage-band-only group and students exposed to both concert and stage band music. When stage band members were compared to members of both bands on aesthetic creativity, there was a significant difference in favor of the students who were exposed to both stage and concert band literature. “Students exposed wholly or partially to concert band literature attained the primary goal of music education—the development of aesthetic creativity to music—and did so better than the stage band students” (Anderson, 1975, p. 83).
Classroom Environment in Music Classes

Hamann, Mills, Bell, Daugherty, and Koozer (1990) examined the perceptions of choral and instrumental students and teachers on classroom environment. The variables under investigation included, but were not limited to, contest rating and forms of intragroup competitive classroom structures. The Classroom Environment Scale Form R (CESR), a reliable and valid tool used to assess classroom environments in multiple disciplines including music, was used to discover possible relationships between numerous variables and classroom environment. Results indicated a significant difference between mean scores on the CESR based on festival ratings. A significant positive correlation was discovered between high contest ratings and a more positive perception of the classroom environment. More specific analysis revealed a significant correlation between intragroup competition within the classroom environment and lower student achievement. Final analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between contest ratings and student perception of involvement in classroom activities (Hamann et al, 1990).

Comprehensive Musicianship

In the 1960’s, the implementation of comprehensive musicianship through performance (CMP) became one of the most “ambitious overhauls of the substance and procedures of music education” (Thompson, 1990, p. 20). Thompson compared the current state of CMP training and implementation to physicians administering aspirin to patients with polio. His concern of empty methodology and lack of thoughtful reflection on curricular practices has been a concern shared by numerous music educators (Labuta, 1972; Lehman, 1995; Linton, 1967; Reimer, 1995). The claim has been made that pep
bands, glee clubs, and other entertainment-based musical experiences do not appropriately develop the type of musicianship indicated by the national standards for music education (Thompson, 1990). Although there is a perceived weight on literature connecting comprehensive musicianship to instrumental curricula, Linton (1967) discusses similar issues as related to choral curricula. His rationale for developing a planned program for teaching musicianship in the high school choral class includes the following: (a) extra-musical results of music curriculum (i.e., public relations and entertainment); (b) musical results limited to performance skills; (c) lower musical achievement in choral students when compared with band and orchestra students; (d) higher focus on inferior literature; and (d) overemphasis on rote instruction. Multiple studies have been conducted to address these concerns.

Watkins (1993) examined “the allocation of time for various nonperformance activities in middle and junior high school choral rehearsals” (p. 4). Twenty-nine junior high school choirs were videotaped in 15-minute rehearsal intervals; these segments were viewed by the researcher and data were analyzed using three categories: (a) nonperformance activities eliciting lower order thinking, (b) nonperformance activities eliciting higher-order thinking, and (c) nonspecific nonperformance activities and silence. Less than half of the rehearsal time of the choirs studied was dedicated to nonperformance activities. The mean percentage of nonperformance activities eliciting lower thinking was 33.86%, whereas the percentage of nonperformance activities eliciting higher order thinking was not significant. Final results revealed a small percentage of time spent on non-specific verbal activity and silence.
Whitener (1983) conducted an investigation comparing two different approaches to teaching beginning band. The investigator utilized six junior high beginning bands; three were assigned to a control group and three to an experimental group. Data included only those with no previous performing or music experience and was collected using a pretest/posttest design. The Music Achievement Test (MAT) was used to measure the students’ conceptual knowledge of music. Performance skills were evaluated using the Test of Performance Skills (TPS), but only as a posttest due to the subjects’ lack of experience. The pretest revealed no significant differences in musical skills or knowledge between the control and experimental groups. Analysis of posttest mean scores collected from Test One of the MAT—which provided measurements of aural music achievement in pitch, interval, and meter discrimination—revealed significantly higher scores in the experimental group that was exposed to a more comprehensive curriculum. No significant differences were found in TPS scores, indicating equal performance quality from all groups. Finally, regression analyses revealed an influence of scores based both on the teacher and the treatment.

A similar study was conducted by Garofalo and Whaley (1979), comparing the traditional approaches for teaching music through school band performance to the comprehensive unit study approach. Two different bands rehearsed the same piece under the two unique approaches and were given pretests and posttests to assess their conceptual musical knowledge; assessments included a multiple choice test, aural skills with a listening test, and technical ensemble proficiency with a playing test evaluated by three unbiased adjudicators. Results revealed a larger increase in conceptual musical
knowledge and a higher performance rating for the experimental group, which was under the comprehensive unit study treatment (Garofalo & Whaley, 1979).

**National Standards for Music Education**

Attempts have been made at standardizing the public school music curriculum since music was introduced into the Boston Public School system in 1837 (Lehman, 1995). Austin (1998) suggested that the National Standards for Music Education were adopted in 1994 to address this concern. “One purpose of the national standards… is to close the door on the era in which the music curriculum depended largely on the whims and idiosyncrasies of individual teachers, and open the door on an era in which there are generally accepted expectations concerning what all students know and are able to do” (Lehman, 1995, p. 5). In addressing the standardization of music curricula, however, many challenges including assessment, resources, professional development, and class time have become issues. In looking at these concerns, Lehman states the important point that “the arts are in the academic core for which other activities must be sacrificed” (Lehman, 1995, p. 10). The standards are meant to be utilized in ways that justify such inclusion. This ideal, however, is complicated by the fact that the standards are voluntary and that schools cannot be forced to implement them. Although certain schools and administrations encourage music educators to implement these standards into their lessons, it is ultimately up to the teachers to surmount the challenges they face in the integration of the standards into their music curricula (Lehman, 1995).

Strand (2006) surveyed 339 randomly selected Indiana music teachers regarding their use of composition (National Standard #4) in the classroom. The participants were asked to complete a questionnaire that included questions about demographics, practices,
and perspectives related to classroom composition. The description of the data collection procedure indicated that internet data collection techniques were utilized. The majority of the respondents indicated that they used composition in their classroom, although the frequency of composition use varied. Common reasons given for using composition for music learning activities include: (a) children learn more, (b) it enriches other learning, (c) teachers want to address all the standards, and (d) it is useful in assessing music learning. Common reasons given for not utilizing composition in music classes include: (a) too many other learning activities, (b) lack of technology access, (c) not enough instruments, and (d) not enough time. Data analysis revealed a significant relationship between the music generalists and the desire to address all national standards. Ensemble directors indicated that they used composition as a musical outlet, but not because they felt a desire to address all national standards (Strand, 2006).

Norris (2004) examined the sight-singing requirements at ratings-based choral festivals. For grades 9-12, it is expected that students sight read (National Standard #5), accurately and expressively, music with a difficulty of 3, on a scale of 1-6. The purpose of this investigation was to see how different states address this standard in choral festivals. The researcher administered a survey to the executive officers of each state’s MENC affiliate. Questions focused on sight-singing requirements in terms of difficulty, effect on rating, and specified music content. Results indicated that 86% of the states had large-group high school choral festivals; 58.1% of those reported inclusion of a sight-singing requirement. The majority of the states with a high school sight-reading requirement reported having prescribed levels of difficulty based on the content standards for music education. Only 17 states claimed to have sight-singing as a requirement for
middle school/junior high choral festivals. Data collected from Indiana revealed rating-based choral festivals for both junior high and high school programs. Only the high school festivals, however, included a sight reading portion. The high school festivals were also reported as having prescribed levels of difficulty.

Orman (2002) conducted an investigation comparing the national standards for music education and the use of class time by elementary music specialists. Thirty elementary music educators were videotaped in their classrooms. Observations of activities included: (a) getting ready, (b) talking, (c) singing, (d) performing on an instrument, (e) movement activities, (f) singing and playing an instrument, (g) listening to music, (h) listening to teacher or student, (i) verbal rhythm, (j) combination of activities, and (h) other. Results revealed the largest proportion of teacher time being spent on talking. Teacher modeling took up an average of 21.57% of the class time, and listening activities took up the least amount of class time. Students spent the majority of the class time listening to the teacher and students spent an average of 8.13% playing instruments. The least amount of student time was spent on verbal rhythm activities; less time was spent on this activity in 6th grade than in the lower 5 grades. The focus content area that comprised the most class time was reading and notating. The lowest focus area was evaluating. Improvisation was included in the lower three grades (1-3), but not in the upper grades (4-6). Finally, understanding relationships between music and other disciplines was part of the upper grade classes, but was almost nonexistent in the lower grades (Orman, 2002).

Byo (1999) conducted an investigation that examined 89 music specialists’ and 88 generalist classroom teachers’ perceived abilities to implement the National Standards for
Music Education. The survey instrument addressed issues relating the nine national standards to teacher training, interest, ability, resources, and perception of time constraints. Results revealed a significant difference between the overall ratings of music specialists and generalists. Music specialists’ responses were significantly more positive toward the standards than were the generalists’. A significant difference was also discovered between the specialists and generalists due to the content standard variable. A significant interaction occurred between the standard and teacher role variables. Music specialists felt more responsible, able, and interested in teaching the standards than the generalists (Byo, 1999, p. 119, Table 2).

Founder and Eckrich (1999) conducted a survey on the impact of the voluntary national standards on American college and university music teacher education curricula. They mailed a questionnaire to 556 college music professors including questions relating to the types of changes that occurred in the music theory, music history, large ensemble, and music education curricula. Some change was indicated in all curriculum sequences (Fonder & Eckrich, 1999, p. 31, Table 1). The highest percentage of change reported, however, was from the music education sequence. One school reportedly formed a national standards choir. Chi square analysis revealed two significant findings. More universities that had at least 500 music majors than those with 499 or fewer music majors reported making substantial curricular changes due to the adoption of the music national standards. Similarly, significantly more music schools with at least 200 music education majors than those with 199 or fewer, reported making substantial changes to the curriculum due to the music standards. Fonder and Eckrich (1999) concluded that the
music standards impacted the university curriculum more so when more students were studying to be public school music educators.

*Choral Music Selection*

The choral music selection of choral music educators has been explored in various formats. Leaders in the field of choral music education have identified prerequisites to what they believe are successful repertoire practices (Forbes, 2001). According to Forbes’ findings, choral directors do not use a consistent or systematic literature selection process. He also found that perceived director quality, teaching experience, program size, and socioeconomic make-up of a school might also influence the music selection practices of choral music educators.

Music educators and investigators have encouraged choral music educators to choose literature from a variety of styles and time periods (Heffernan, 1982; Lawrence, 1989). Others found that a well-developed philosophy of music education might influence repertoire selection (Decker & Kirk, 1988; Hoffer, 2001). Previous studies could suggest that some directors tend to choose literature from only one or two different time periods (Wyatt, 1995) and that Indiana high school choral music educators place more emphasis on light, entertainment-type literature at the expense of other styles (Turley, 1989).

**Competition in Music Education**

Researchers in the field of music education have studied the effects of competition on the teaching and learning of music for several decades. The findings of these studies have contributed in numerous ways to research knowledge on how students develop musically as well as the effects of various forms of competition on the
motivation, attributions, and perceptions of success in public school music students. Other studies have investigated the attitudes of music educators and administrators on music competition.

Motivation and Achievement in Music Students

Formal inquiries on competition as it relates to student motivation and attribution in music have been conducted using various designs and methodology. Weiner’s (2000) research on attribution theory influenced the designs of these investigations. According to this theory, the motivation for attempting any learning activity is due in part to how students perceive the causes of their potential success or failure in completing the task (Asmus, 1986). The previously described dimensions of locus, temporal stability, and controllability were examined within various music learning environments.

Stamer (2006) conducted a study examining the changes of high school choral and instrumental student perceptions of competitive experiences in music. Motivation for this study evolved from interest in the possible variance between sophomore and senior music students’ thoughts regarding music contests and whether competition in music promotes educative experiences. Results revealed positive student self-esteem following positive results (scoring high), the ultimate student goal of being recognized for high competitive achievement (winning), as well as an increase in motivation and group spirit when preparing for contests. Finally, the results revealed a student preference for contests in which there is one winner as opposed to a rating system. A change in student perception as they matured was also found. The mean score for sophomores on the question pertaining to student preference of contest format was lower than the mean score for seniors. Based on their responses, seniors did not have as high a motivation as
sophomores for contest preparation, and seniors had a stronger intrinsic motivation to perform at high levels. The mean score for sophomores on the question pertaining to motivation due to high contest ratings was higher than the mean score for seniors. Implications were made that preparing for competition contains motivational limits, thereby requiring emphasis on other stimulating factors as students mature and advance through the program.

Schmidt, Zdzinski, and Ballard (2006) conducted a study in which motivation orientations were examined. Cognitive motivational constructs included intrinsic vs. mastery, cooperative vs. individual vs. competitive, achieve success vs. avoid failure, and personal development competition vs. academic achievement. The intent was to study the effects of the above mentioned independent variables on the career goals of undergraduate music education majors. Correlations were discovered between the competitive and ego orientations, and between the approach success and avoid failure scales. The researcher concluded that undergraduate music education students define success by achievement of personal goals, mastery of challenging tasks, and collaboration with others. Findings suggested that, despite the competitive aspects of music education, undergraduate music education majors generally do not have strongly competitive orientations to achievement.

Schmidt (2005) conducted a similar study with secondary instrumental students. This study included 300 band students in grades 7-12. Academic achievement was measured by teacher feedback and motivation attributions were measured using a self-report questionnaire. Respondents reported a relatively high self-concept in music, felt successful in band when they improved and enjoyed working with other students in band
to achieve cooperative goals. “By contrast, relatively low means…were observed for competitive and ego orientations and commitment to band.” (Schmidt, 2005, p. 139). Additional correlations were analyzed leading to numerous conclusions including the tendency of instrumental students to define their own success most positively with mastery and cooperative orientations, a positive student perception of performance improvement when working with other students (within cooperative constructs rather than competitive), and consistency in motivation and experience variables across grade levels. Evidence suggesting a relationship between motivation and music learning was discovered as a result of data analysis. A relationship between competition and student attributions of ego, which aid in the development of motivation orientations, was also discovered. Moderate positive correlations were found between self-concept and mastery-oriented goal structure and mastery orientation and cooperative orientations. Results indicate that students tend to learn best under the “intrinsic or cooperative aspects of instrumental music, rather than its extrinsic or competitive aspects” (Schmidt, 2005, p. 144).

Austin and Vispoel (1998) investigated adolescent interpretations of success and failure in music classes. Many students claim to love music, but hate music class. This issue has been researched extensively and has led to numerous conclusions as to why this occurs (Austin & Vispoel, 1998). In this investigation, the researchers examined 153 7th-grade students who attended school in a midwestern United States community. The students completed questionnaires assessing demographics, music self-concept, attributional beliefs, and standardized music achievement. Teacher influence received the highest attributional score. Simple effect test results showed significant differences in
attributions of success and failure in the following categories: (a) effort, (b) teacher influence, and (c) peer influence. Finally, standardized test scores were more strongly correlated with both attributional beliefs and music self-concept scores than were course grades. Based on these findings, researchers concluded that teachers should “minimize the salience of ability differences by de-emphasizing public evaluation and competition among students who differ significantly in skill, confidence, or experience” (Austin & Vispoel, 1998, p. 42).

Sheldon (1994) examined the effects of competitive versus noncompetitive performance goals on music student ratings of band performances. The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a significant difference in student perceptions of performance quality based on their level of exposure to competition in their school music programs. The participants were divided into groups and rated the performances of various musical ensembles preparing for either music contests or noncompetitive performances. The participants gave a higher performance rating to the contest rehearsal group and a lower rating to the group that was not preparing for contest. The resulting purpose of the study proved to be a springboard for further research in the areas left unexplored, or unsupported by Sheldon’s (1994) findings.

Austin and Vispoel (1992) explored the effects of failure and strategy attributions on future motivation in performing ensembles. Results revealed an overall assumption of public school music students that a fictitious student described in the study would perform better, try harder, use more effective learning strategies, and receive more support when attributing success to effort, rather than ability, luck, or the task, all of which are uncontrollable. Further analysis confirmed the belief that attributions of effort
and strategy lead to significantly higher expectations of improved strategy, effort, and performance than ability attributions. Findings suggest a higher probability of future improvements in performance when attributions occur within a strategy or effort construct, which are considered internal and controllable, than attributions of ability, which is considered internal, but uncontrollable (Ormrod, 2004). Based on these findings, Austin and Vispoel (1992) recommended that “music educators should focus on promoting attributions of effort and strategy” (p. 21). Students must adopt the belief that musical knowledge and skills can be improved despite their natural ability in order for them to remain motivated to study music. Music educators must also help students develop their practice skills rather than simply forcing them to practice. If students remain unaware of effective practicing techniques, a reduction in their desire to practice will occur, causing their attribution of ability to become more pronounced; this can contribute to a decrease in motivation to study music. Concluding material acknowledges the need for further field-based research, which will help determine whether competition promotes or hinders music learning.

Austin (1988) also examined the effect of music contest format on self-concept, motivation, achievement, and attitudes of elementary band students. The results indicated a 76% student preference of the ratings performance assessment format to receiving comments only. The scores on the Self-Concept in Music Test (SCIM) revealed improvement in student musical self-concept following their acquisition of ratings and comments only. The group receiving ratings, however, showed a higher increase in their Musical Achievement Test (MAT) scores, signifying a positive correlation between receiving ratings and music achievement as operationally defined by the MAT scores.
Austin addresses a focus on music contest preparation as shaping the behavior and performance skills of the students. He further suggests, based on similar MAT scores in the pretest, improvement was not due to major differences in prior musical experiences and training. The researcher states reasoning for the interaction of self-concept and competition producing positive results; of the nine students receiving the lowest ratings, only three experienced a loss of self-esteem according to their post-SCIM scores. Several possible confounding variables were discussed including positive reaction due to the novelty of the new experience, adjudication climate, and the attitudes of teachers and parents.

Chandler, Chiarella, and Auria (1987) studied the performance expectancy, success, satisfaction, and attributions of 234 high school band students. Students filled out a questionnaire to collect demographic information including chair placement in band, personal reactions to their placement in band, and attributions (i.e., technical knowledge, effort, natural musical ability, difficulty of instrument, help from director, and luck). Results revealed that natural ability was perceived by the participants as the highest attribution of successful music performance. If students expected to play their instrument longer, it was likely they felt they should and would be placed in a higher chair. For students who challenged their peers for chair placement, perceived success was more positively related to internal attributes (i.e., technical knowledge, effort, and natural musical ability). Attribution theory suggests that students who perceive success tend to attribute that success internally and to controllable factors such as effort, whereas students who perceive failure tend to attribute it to external variables that are uncontrollable, such as luck and difficulty (Weiner, 1979). The mutually exclusive nature
of music competitions could suggest an external, uncontrollable attributions structure based on subjective measurement of success (Chandler et al., 1987).

Asmus (1986) also examined motivation orientations and attributions of success in music learning environments. The researcher obtained data from 589 music students in grades 4-12. Participants answered questions during their regularly scheduled music classes that pertained to their attributions of success in music. A significant difference was discovered between the observed and expected frequencies. “The relative proportions of responses in each of the attribution categories reported by the students were as follows: (a) internal-unstable, 38.65%; (b) internal-stable, 42.92%; (c) external-unstable, 9.85%; and (d) external-stable, 8.59%” (Asmus, 1986, p. 267). Subjects made more internal-stable and external-stable attributions when they expected to perform well, but more external-unstable attributions were made when they did not expect to perform well. A significant grade level main effect was indicated: students in higher grades reported fewer internal-unstable attributions, but more internal-stable attributions. Based on the findings, the researcher encouraged music educators to promote internal and unstable attributions, such as effort, in their classrooms and that competitive experiences should be limited in the music classroom due to the fact that students make “more ability attributions in competitive settings than in individually nurturant settings” (Asmus, 1986, p. 268).

*Perceptions of Music Educators on Competition*

Rogers (1985) examined the attitudes of high school band directors and principals toward marching band contests. The researcher sent a separate questionnaire to the band director and principal of 421 high schools; the respondents rated six aspects of marching
band contests relating to its values and benefits on a seven-point scale, where 1 = no value and 7 = great value. Benefits and value categories included: (a) general educational experience such as travel and meeting others students; (b) personal benefits such as discipline, responsibility, and self-esteem; (c) recruitment; (d) financial support for band program; (e) administrative support for the band program; and (f) public relations. Data pertaining to demographical information revealed significant differences in the number of contests per band per year based on geographical area. The West was highest in annual contest attendance and the Midwest was lowest. Sixty percent of the directors reported that their participation in competitive marching band was partially due to parent, student, and administrative pressure. Results also suggested that the principals valued competitive marching band more than the band directors in four of the six categories including: (a) educational experience, (b) personal benefits, (c) recruitment, and (d) public relations for the school. The highest rated category by principals was improving public relations for the school, whereas the highest band director rating was for personal benefits to students. Positive correlations between band directors and administrators and a low level of agreement between the paired groups were also reported. The highest correlation was in the recruitment category. A positive relationship between the number of awards earned and the size of the band budget was also discovered. School enrollment was a statistically significant predictor of principal ratings in multiple regression analyses; the principals of larger schools placed a higher value rating on marching band competition. Additional comments revealed a concern of band directors on an overemphasis on the contests as well as some uncertainty from the principals regarding the educational benefits of the
contests. Final analysis revealed a relatively low value rating from band directors regarding the musical benefits of the contests.

Summary

The effects of and purposes for competitive experiences in society have been studied in depth. Certain philosophical viewpoints related to the nature-versus-nurture debate claim competition as being humanly instinctive (Gilbert, 1988; Harvey, 1917; Ruben, 1981). Limited empirical data and theoretical constructs counter that both competition and cooperation are learned behaviors (Deutsch, 1973; Kohn, 1994; Tutko & Burns, 1976). May (1937) concluded that cooperation and competition are culturally motivated and that education influences cultural norms of cooperative and competitive behavior. The investigative reports related to competition’s influence on productivity indicated possible influences of competitive experiences on social behavior (Grossack, 1953), achievement (Johnson et. al., 1981), academic discernment (Frankel, 1975), and qualitative versus quantitative productivity (Lanzetta & Englis, 1989; Whittmore, 1924). The effects of competition on both psychological and physiological health have been found to be largely negative (Rosenau, 2003). Inquiries addressing the psychological and physiological impacts of competition revealed significant differences in increased self-esteem between noncompetitive and competitive environments (Rubinstein, 1977). Specific inquiries regarding stress and anxiety revealed a significant effect of competition on increased heart rates to dangerous levels (Fenici et al., 1999). Kugler et al. (1996) suggested that competition has a positive influence on the immune system. Contradictory evidence has also been discovered: academic stress has been shown to reduce the effectiveness of the immune system (Jemmott et al., 1983). Other studies discovered an
influence of competition on testosterone levels and aggression (Ares & Babbitt, 1974; Bernhardt et al., 1998; Mazur et al., 1992; Rocha & Rogers, 1976). Lanzetta & Englis (1989) concluded that competition can elicit counter-empathetic behaviors. Research on competition and enjoyment indicates that enjoyment is important to obtaining the psychological benefits from physical activity (Kohn, 1992; Wankel, 1993). Huizinga (1955) discovered that competitive athletic activities tend to suppress the leisureliness of physical activity. Research also revealed a possible interference of competition on flow experiences (Csikszentmihalyi, 1974; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Kohn, 1992).

Educational researchers have consistently concluded that competition directly affects student motivation (Clifford, 1972; Valierand et al., 1986) and attribution (Ames, 1981). Reeve et al. (1985) concluded that winning enhances intrinsic motivation relative to losing. Deci et al. (1981), however, suggested that competition negatively influences intrinsic motivation. Three different meta-analyses revealed that rewards can be used to produce both negative and positive effects on measures of intrinsic motivation (Cameron, 2001; Cameron & Pierce, 1994; Deci et al., 2001; Eisenberg et al., 1996). Amabile (1982) concluded that competition can stifle creativity in educational environments. Reports of aesthetic research as it relates to instrumental music education suggested that students exposed to concert band literature are more likely to experience an aesthetic awareness of music as compared to those exposed to stage band music (Anderson, 1975).

Research on music curricula was needed to facilitate the examination of its relationship to competition. Whitener et al. (1979) examined the effects of comprehensive music curricula on music learning; results revealed a significant increase in music achievement and performance in comprehensive band programs. Watkins
(1993) found a low percentage of choral rehearsal time spent on nonperformance activities that would elicit higher order thinking skills. Strand (2006) discovered a higher desire among general music educators than ensemble directors to address all the national standards. Orman (2002) concluded that elementary teachers spent the highest percentage of class time talking and that all nine standards are addressed inconsistently across all elementary grade levels, and Byo (1999) indicated a need for music specialists in elementary settings to deliver standards-based music curricula. Norris (2004) examined the implementation of national standards in music curricula and found inconsistent use of sight reading at rating-based choral festivals, and Strand (2006) found a high percentage of composition use in Indiana music classrooms, but at a low frequency. Finally, Fonder and Eckrich (1999) reported that the national standards in music have begun to impact college-level music curricula.

Research indicates that the implementation of standards-based music curricula is an important component of structuring meaningful music learning experiences and that the national standards are addressed inconsistently in public school music classrooms. Examining research literature on competition as it relates specifically to music learning offers the connective framework on which the current investigation was designed.

Numerous investigators have examined the effects of competition on creativity, student motivation, attribution, and performance achievement in instrumental music learning; in the case of piano competitions, artistic excellence was believed to be stifled by competition (Kohn, 1992). Hamman et. al. (1990) suggested that a more cooperative classroom environment, as opposed to one that promotes competition, leads to higher achievement in music. Research on motivation orientations in music students suggested
that competition has a negative effect on intrinsic motivation (Austin, 1988; Austin & Vispoel, 1992; Schmidt, 2005; Sheldon, 1994). Studies also indicate that some students cite external and uncontrollable attributions, which do not promote intrinsic motivation, when exposed to competitive music experiences (Asmus, 1986; Weiner, 1979). Schmidt et al. (2006) examined the motivation orientations, including competitive/ego, and concluded that undergraduate music education majors generally do not have strongly competitive orientations to achievement despite the competitive aspects of the profession. Stamer (2006) investigated the effects of competition on the perceptions of instrumental and choral music students and identified motivational limits in preparing for music competitions. Rogers (1985), in a study examining the attitudes of high school band directors and principals toward marching band contests, found the majority of the perceived benefits to be non-musical.

Numerous studies have examined competition in music education; the majority of these studies focused on instrumental music. No current research, however, has directly examined possible associations between competition and choral music curriculum. Research-based knowledge is needed to address the paradigm of competitive show choir and concert choir, which has gone relatively unquestioned in Indiana public school choral programs. It is the purpose of this study, therefore, to initiate a new research thread by examining the relationship between competition and the curricular practices of Indiana secondary choral music educators.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between competition and the curricular practices of Indiana secondary choral music educators. Previous studies on competition in music education (Austin, 1988; Austin & Vispoel, 1992; Schmidt, 2005; Schmidt et al., 2006; Sheldon, 1994; Stamer, 2006) focused on motivation orientation, attribution theory, and student achievement; most of these used instrumental students and educators as participants. Research on comprehensive music curricula (Byo, 1999; Fonder & Eckrich, 1999; Norris, 2004; Orman, 2002; Strand, 2006; Watkins, 1993; Whitener et al., 1979) linked comprehensive music curricula to higher student achievement in music, but found inconsistencies among music educators in addressing all the national standards. No current research has addressed possible influences of competition on comprehensive choral curricula and the classroom practices of choral directors.

Research Design

The present study focused specifically on comparing the two variables of competition and the integration of national standards in Indiana choral classrooms. This investigation was descriptive in nature and data was obtained via survey research methodology. The following research questions were created to provide direction for this inquiry:

1. Is there a relationship between the involvement in curricular preparation for competitive choral events and the comprehensiveness of choral music curricula?
2. Is there a difference between the comprehensiveness of choral programs that participate in concert and show choir competition?

3. Is there a relationship between program size and comprehensive choral curricula?

4. Is there a difference between the comprehensiveness of middle school and high school choral curricula?

5. Do high school choral programs participate in curricular preparation for competitive events more or less than junior high programs?

6. Is there a difference between high school curricular show choir involvement and high school curricular marching band involvement?

7. Is there a relationship between the amount of time spent on choreography instruction and comprehensive choral curricula?

8. Is there a relationship between choral musical style selection and comprehensive choral music curricula?

9. Is there a relationship between choral musical style selection and the amount of curricular time spent on competition preparation?

10. Is there a relationship between choral musical style selection of Indiana choral music educators and the student enrollment of the school in which they teach?

Prior to this investigation, a pilot study was conducted using the *Competition Choral Curriculum Questionnaire (CCCQ)* to help clarify sampling procedures, validity concerns, and overall methodology. The small number of participants (N = 19) was not effective in fully exploring the relationship between competition and curricular practices, but the pilot study did provide an opportunity to examine the variables and decipher optimal data collection and analysis methods as outlined below.
Respondents

The target population for this study was identified as the music educators who teach secondary choral music in Indiana public schools. Contact information was acquired via the Indiana Department of Education and the Indiana Directory of Music Teachers (Bucklin, 2008). Once the lists were obtained, the researcher sent an e-mail to the 440 educators who teach junior high or high school choral music exclusively; those who teach both junior high and high school were excluded from the study to facilitate the desired comparisons. The following assumptions were made regarding the respondents’ demographics: (a) all respondents had a college degree, most likely in music education; (b) all respondents had a working e-mail account through their school; (c) all respondents had access to the internet; and (d) all respondents were licensed to teach secondary choral music in the state of Indiana. The age of the respondents ranged from approximately 22 to 66; due to the data collection procedures that were utilized, the respondents’ sex, ethnicity, and race were unknown. The survey took place at the end of the 2008-2009 school year. Respondents were asked to reflect on their practices within the January-May 2009 time frame.

Instrumentation

Description and Development

The Competition Choral Curriculum Questionnaire (CCCQ) in Appendix A was developed using primary and secondary sources including Educational Research: An Introduction (Gall et al., 2007) and Mail and Internet Surveys: A Tailored Design (Dillman, 2007). As indicated previously in Chapter 2, research related to music curricula recognizes the national standards for music education as the nationally accepted structure
for comprehensive musicianship development. The questions pertaining to the curricular practices of the participants (i.e., Questions 2-5), therefore, were developed around the nine national standards. Specifically, Question 2 focused on the music selection of choral music educators, based on previous research on choosing choral literature (Decker & Kirk, 1988; Forbes, 2001; Hoffer, 2001; Wyatt, 1995). Question 6 was added to examine the amount of time spent on activities unrelated to the music standards (i.e., dancing). Questions 7 and 8 were developed to collect demographic data concerning the respondents’ school enrollment, program enrollment, and grade level taught. Question 9 was developed to obtain data relating to the time spent during the regular school day on preparation for show and concert choir competitions. Finally, Question 10 was developed to acquire information regarding curricular competitive marching band inclusion in the music programs of the respondents’ schools. Based on data from the pilot study, slight modifications were made to the survey instrument due to inconsistencies found in the results. These included: (a) modifying of the wording in Question 9, which allowed the data to be analyzed in the larger study as ordinal rather than nominal; (b) clarifying the difference between mutually exclusive competitive experiences and involvement in music events in which structure is based on individualistic goals (i.e., ratings and comments rather than rankings); and (c) comparing of curricular involvement in marching band to curricular show choir participation.

Validity

Face validity was evaluated via a rubric (Appendix B) that addressed clarity, understandability, and the level to which each question related to the intended variables, namely competition and choral music curriculum. Three choral music educators with
research training evaluated the questionnaire based on the rubric and rated each question on a scale of 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). Results revealed a grand mean of 1.07, indicating strong validity; Appendix C contains the individual responses of all three judges.

**Reliability**

Reliability of the CCCQ was analyzed using a test-retest procedure. E-mails were sent to 20 choral music educators outside the target population requesting them to complete the questionnaire. A link to the online survey was copied into the e-mail. One week later, another e-mail was sent requesting a second response to all 10 questions. Five respondents completed both the test and retest. The coefficient of stability ($r = .98$) indicated high test-retest reliability. In addition, a Cronbach Alpha of .862 indicated high internal consistency.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Once Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained (Appendix E), the researcher collected data via *Survey Monkey*, an internet-based survey program. The information provided by the participants was anonymous: the researcher was unaware of who participated in the survey and of their specific responses. Once the online questionnaires were completed, the responses were electronically secure: a username and password, known only to the primary investigator, was needed to access all data.

Due to the low return rate in the pilot study, the researcher considered sending paper questionnaires via mail rather than utilizing the online survey program. Research on survey methodology reveals mixed results in terms of response rates. A lower response rate, but higher response quality, was found in participants of online surveys.
when compared with telephone surveys (Fricker, 2005). Comparable response rates between mail and electronic mail surveys, however, were found in certain populations (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). When comparing e-mail and Internet surveys, internet surveys were found to be easier to navigate due to their interactive nature and are useful because they can be designed to appear nearly the same on all screens (Dillman & Tortora, 1998). An average response rate of 55.6% was suggested in an analysis of multiple academic studies (Baruch, 1999). Since research indicates that acceptable response rates can be obtained when utilizing both paper and e-mail questionnaires (Byo, 1999; Fonder & Eckrich, 1999; Strand, 2006), the current survey was conducted via the internet. Of the 440 survey’s sent out, 149 were returned, demonstrating a 33.9% response rate.

Data Analysis

The *Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)* was used for quantitative data analysis procedures. Categories were created in the database for each of the 10 questions on the CCCQ as well as additional categories for the summated responses to Questions 2-5 (Appendix A). Responses were coded appropriately, based on the type of question, and entered as either nominal, ordinal, or interval-ratio data as shown in Appendix G. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the demographic data. Frequency distributions were analyzed for all summed curricular scores and cross-tabulation statistics were utilized to facilitate more detailed descriptions of the participants.

To facilitate inferential statistical analysis, alpha levels were set at .05. Chi square tests were used to compare the probability of frequencies for demographic groups. Also, ANOVA tests were run in order to determine possible differences between the curricular
practices of the demographic groups including: (a) participation in show choir vs. concert choir vs. no competition, (b) large vs. small programs, (c) large vs. small schools, and (d) junior high vs. high school educators. Levene’s test for equality of variance was run to validate ANOVA findings. Bonferroni post-hoc tests were used for multiple group comparisons. Correlation tests were performed to determine if a relationship existed between the two primary variables. Debate exists as to the treatment of ordinal data in running correlations; some researchers have criticized the use of Pearson correlations with ordinal data (Allan, 1976; Kim, 1975; Vigderhous, 1971; Wilson, 1974;). Conversely, recommendations have also been made encouraging the use of parametric tests with ordinal data (Borgatta, 1968; Borgatta and Bohrnstedt, 1972; Labovotz, 1967; 1968; 1970; 1971; 1972; 1975). O’Brien (1979) found little distortion of r when rank order data were used; these results assume that the underlying variable is uniformly or normally distributed. Based on results and publication dates of previous research, the researcher used Kendall’s tau_b correlations, a nonparametric test, to analyze possible associations between the ordinal data.

Despite certain methodological limitations of survey research, statistical analysis of the data elicited numerous significant findings related to this inquiry. The findings will offer numerous implications for the field of music education and open a new research thread on the use of competition in public school choral music curricula.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this investigation was to examine the relationship between competition and the curricular practices of Indiana choral music educators. The researcher collected survey data to address each respective research question related to this inquiry. Respondents were asked to report the time they spent during the regular school day with their most advanced choral ensemble on both musical and non-musical activities from January to May, 2009, which was the competition season in Indiana for both show and concert choir. Analysis of the responses to the CCCQ produced the results outlined below, beginning with descriptive findings followed by the inferential results. Descriptive findings are organized according to the tests that were run pertaining to demographic information, the reported responses of curricular practices, and cross-tabulations of data. Inferential tests that were performed included chi-squares, ANOVAs, and Kendall’s tau correlations.

Descriptive Results

Demographics

To facilitate analysis between the primary variables, the researcher divided the respondents into demographic subgroups based on their responses to the CCCQ (Appendix A). Question 7 asked the respondents to report the grade level they taught (Figure 4.1). Question 8 included information regarding school (Figure 4.2) and program enrollment (Figure 4.3), while Question 9 focused on curricular preparation for competitive choral events (Figure 4.4).

As indicated in Figure 4.1, an equal representation of respondents who taught
junior high and high school was reported. As reported in Figure 4.2, 51% of participants taught in schools with a student enrollment below 1000 and 49% taught in larger schools. Figure 4.3 indicates that the highest percentage of respondents reported having between 100 and 149 students enrolled in choir; the reported program enrollments were equally distributed.

**Figure 4.1.** Percentages of respondents who taught junior high vs. high school.

**Figure 4.2.** Percentages of reported school enrollments.
The final demographic data that were analyzed include the type of competition preparation that reportedly occurred in the respondents’ classrooms during the regular school day. Results indicate that 40% of the respondents reported spending curricular time to prepare for competitive concert choir events as reported in Figure 4.4. Fifteen percent reported using curricular time to prepare for show choir competitions, while 11% used this class time to prepare for both concert choir and show choir competitions. Thirty-four percent of the participants reported using no curricular time to prepare for choir competitions.
Questions 2-5 of the CCCQ addressed the curricular practices of the choral music educators who taught in the state of Indiana during the 2009 spring semester; the questions were designed around the national standards for music education. Question 2 asked respondents to report the styles of music they worked on with their students and the amount of curricular time spent rehearsing each style. The stylistic choices for each of the seven sub-questions were the following: classical/concert music, Broadway selections, vocal jazz, popular styles, spirituals/gospels, patriotic pieces, and multicultural literature. All answer choices included a specified percentage range of curricular time spent on each style and were numerically coded as the following: 0 = none; 1 = 1-20%; 2 = 21-40%; 3 = 41-60%; 4 = 61-80%; 5 = 81-100% (Appendix G). As indicated in Table 4.1, the most frequent responses indicate that more time was spent rehearsing classical music than any other style (mode = 2; 21-40% of the curricular time was spent rehearsing classical
music). The least amount of curricular time was spent rehearsing vocal jazz music (mode = 0; no time was spent during the regular school day).

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style/Response</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Jazz</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 0 indicates that no curricular time was spent rehearsing that style; 1 indicates that 1-20% of the curricular time was spent rehearsing that style; 2 indicates that 21-40% of the curricular time was spent rehearsing that style; 3 indicates that 41-60% of the curricular time was spent rehearsing that style; 4 indicates that 61-80% of the curricular time was spent rehearsing that style; 5 indicates that 81-100% of the curricular time was spent rehearsing that style.

Question 3 of the CCCQ asked respondents to report the amount of curricular time they spent on non-singing musical activities. The sub-questions included the following activities: playing instruments, improvisation, composition, listening, self-evaluation, and evaluating others. As reported in Appendix G, the answer choices for the amount of curricular time spent on non-singing musical activities were numerically coded as the following: 0 = never; 1 = once or twice this semester; 2 = three to six times this semester; 3 = 7-11 times this semester; 4 = 12-17 times this semester; 5 = weekly; 6 = daily. The highest frequency of responses indicated that vocal anatomy was discussed 7-11 times in the semester (mode = 3). As indicated in Table 4.2, most of the respondents reported spending no curricular time playing instruments, improvising, and composing (mode = 0).
Table 4.2

Curricular Time Dedicated to Musical Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musical Activity</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating Others</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Instruments</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 0 = never; 1 = once or twice this semester; 2 = three to six times this semester; 3 = 7-11 times this semester; 4 = 12-17 times this semester; 5 = weekly; 6 = daily.

Question 4 of the CCCQ asked the choral music educators to report the curricular time they spent discussing cross-curricular connections to their literature. The options presented in each of the sub-questions included: math, vocal anatomy, acoustics, poetry, visual arts, dance styles, and foreign language (National Standard 8) and history/culture (National Standard 9). The answer choices for the amount of curricular time spent on cross-curricular discussions were numerically coded as the following: 0 = never; 1 = once or twice this semester; 2 = three to six times this semester; 3 = 7-11 times this semester; 4 = 12-17 times this semester; 5 = weekly; 6 = daily. As reported in Table 4.3, responses indicated that the participants discussed vocal anatomy the most (mode = 3; 7-11 times in the semester) and the least amount of curricular time was spent discussing visual art and the history of dance styles (mode = 0; no time was spent).
Table 4.3

*Curricular Time Dedicated to Cross-Curricular Discussions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Topic</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Anatomy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustics</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Styles</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 0 = never; 1 = once or twice this semester; 2 = three to six times this semester; 3 = 7-11 times this semester; 4 = 12-17 times this semester; 5 = weekly; 6 = daily.

The music literacy curriculum—National Standard 5—was examined by asking questions pertaining to the curricular time spent on both tonal and rhythmic literacy (Appendix A, Question 5). Respondents were asked to report the curricular time they spent on both reading and notating in simple meter, compound meter, major keys, and minor keys. The answer choices for the amount of curricular time spent developing music literacy skills were numerically coded as the following: 0 = never; 1 = once or twice this semester; 2 = three to six times this semester; 3 = 7-11 times this semester; 4 = 12-17 times this semester; 5 = weekly; 6 = daily. As indicated in Table 4.4, the highest number of respondents had their students read in simple meter and in major every day (mode = 6). The least amount of curricular time was spent reading in minor and notating (mode = 0).
Table 4.4

*Curricular Time Dedicated to Music Literacy Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy Category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Simple Meter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Major Keys</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Compound Meter</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Minor Keys</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Simple Meter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Major Keys</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Compound Meter</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Minor Keys</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 0 = never; 1 = once or twice this semester; 2 = three to six times this semester; 3 = 7-11 times this semester; 4 = 12-17 times this semester; 5 = weekly; 6 = daily.

Once individual responses were analyzed, curricular subgroup scores were calculated to examine the amount of curricular time spent addressing certain aspects of the respondents’ choral curricula from a broader perspective. To analyze the curricular time spent addressing National Standards 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7, which include non-singing musical activities, a score was calculated for each respondent by summating the responses to Question 3 of the CCCQ. The resulting musical activities score was based on 36 possible points. A score of zero would indicate that the respondent spent no curricular time having their students play instruments, improvise, compose, listen to music, or evaluate themselves and other choral ensembles. A score of 36 would indicate that the respondent had their students participate in the aforementioned national standards every day of the semester.

In analyzing the musical activities scores of the respondents, a fairly normal score distribution was revealed ($M = 15.5$, $SD = 5.32$). Scores were converted to ordinal data by dividing the total possible score by the six possible responses eliciting a score range of six for frequency analysis. As reported in Table 4.5, the highest frequency of scores were
between 13-18, indicating that respondents most frequently reported spending curricular
time on non-singing musical activities 7-11 times in the semester.

Table 4.5

Frequencies of Reported Curricular Time Spent on Musical Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Once or Twice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Three to Six Times</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>7-11 Times</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>12-17 Times</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-36</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The descriptions refer to the amount of time respondents spent on non-singing musical activities within the specified semester.

To analyze the curricular time spent discussing cross-curricular connections to the chorale literature, which is the focus of National Standards 8 and 9, a score out of a possible 48 was calculated for each respondent based on their answers to Question 4 of the CCCQ (Appendices A and G). A score of zero indicates that the respondent spent no curricular time discussing cross-curricular connections to their literature, while a score of 48 indicates that the respondent spent time in class every day discussing math, vocal anatomy, acoustics, poetry, history and culture, visual arts, dance styles, and foreign language.

Analysis revealed a fairly normal distribution of the cross-curricular scores \(M = 17.9; SD = 8.94\). The scores were converted to ordinal data by dividing the possible points by the 6 response categories; a score range of eight was used for frequency analysis. As indicated in Table 4.6, the highest frequency of respondents reported spending an average of 7-11 times in the semester having cross-curricular discussion related to their music. The fewest number of respondents reported having cross-curricular
discussions every day.

Table 4.6

Frequencies of Reported Curricular Time Spent on Cross-Curricular Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Once or Twice</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>Three to Six Times</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>7-11 Times</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-32</td>
<td>12-17 Times</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-40</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-48</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The descriptions refer to the amount of time respondents spent on non-singing musical activities within the specified semester.

The curricular time spent on music literacy development (National Standard 5) was analyzed by summating the responses to Question 5. A score out of a possible 48 was calculated for each respondent. A score of zero indicated that the respondent did not report spending any curricular time teaching their students to read or notate music whereas a score of 48 meant that they had their students read and notate daily in both simple and compound meter, and in major and minor keys.

Analysis revealed a normal distribution of the music literacy scores ($M = 19.9; SD = 8.4$). Scores were converted to ordinal data by dividing the possible points by the six response categories. As indicated in Table 4.7, the highest frequency of scores was between 17-24; more respondents reported spending an average of 7-11 times in the semester developing music literacy skills than any other range of time. The time spent on notation activities, however, was significantly lower ($M = 4.3; SD = 4.48$). As indicated in Table 4.7, more than half of the respondents reported that they did notation with their students once or twice in the semester.
Table 4.7

Frequencies of Reported Curricular Time Spent on Music Literacy Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>3-6 times</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>7-11 times</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-32</td>
<td>12-17 times</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-40</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-48</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The descriptions refer to the amount of time respondents spent on music literacy development within the specified semester.

Table 4.8

Frequencies of Reported Curricular Time Spent on Notation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Once or Twice</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>3-6 Times</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>7-11 Times</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>12-17 Times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-24</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The descriptions refer to the amount of curricular time respondents spent on developing notation skills within the specified semester.

Finally, the responses to Questions 3-5 of the CCCQ—questions pertaining to National Standards 2-9—were summated providing each respondent with a score out of 132. A higher overall curricular score would indicate that respondents spent more time addressing a wider range of musical topics and activities. A fairly normal distribution of scores was discovered ($M = 52.58, SD = 19.17$). As indicated in Table 4.9, the scores were converted to ordinal data by dividing the possible points by the six response categories creating a range of 22. The highest frequency was between 45 and 66.
Table 4.9

*Frequency Distribution for Overall Curricular Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-22</td>
<td>Less Comprehensive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-88</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-110</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-132</td>
<td>More Comprehensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cross-tabulation Results*

*Demographics.* Analysis using cross-tabulation statistics provided a more detailed demographic description of the participants. Analysis revealed that a higher percentage of the high school choral music educators reported spending curricular time preparing for competitive events (75%) as compared to the junior high educators (56%). As indicated in Table 4.10, the discrepancy was even greater when comparing the respondents who taught junior high and spent curricular time preparing for show choir competitions (11.6%) with the respondents who taught high school and spent curricular time preparing for show choir competitions (38.8%)

Table 4.10

*Cross-tabulation of Grade Level Taught and Curricular Preparation for Choir Competitions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>None n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CC n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SC n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Both n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* None = no curricular time was used for competition preparation; CC = Curricular time was used to prepare for concert choir competitions; SC = curricular time was used to prepare for both show choir and concert choir competitions; % = percentage of respondents in each group.
To facilitate discussion regarding school enrollment, demographic data were separated into the smaller (0-999 students) and larger (1000 or more students) schools. As indicated in Table 4.11, 55% of the respondents who reported teaching in a smaller school participated in curricular preparation for choral competition events compared with 76% who reported teaching in a larger school. The discrepancy between groups was similar when comparing competitive show choir involvement. Only 15% of the respondents who taught in a smaller school reported using time during the regular school day for competitive show choir preparation as compared with 38% who taught in a larger school.

Table 4.11

*Cross-tabulation of Curricular Choir Competition Preparation and School Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Competition</th>
<th>Smaller Schools</th>
<th>Larger Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Competition</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Choir</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Types</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents who reported teaching in schools with less than 1000 students are reported as a smaller school whereas those with 1000 or more students are reported as a larger school.

Demographic data regarding program size is separated into two similar groups; respondents who indicated that they had 149 students or fewer in choir were categorized as having smaller programs, and those who reported a program enrollment of 150 or more students were categorized as larger programs. As reported in Table 4.12, 57% of the participants with smaller programs reported spending curricular time preparing for choir competitions as compared with 77% for larger programs. The curricular time spent preparing for competitive show choir events differed slightly as well; 24% of the
respondents who had smaller programs reported spending curricular time preparing for show choir competitions, whereas 30% of the respondents who had larger programs competed in show choir events and spent time preparing during the regular school day.

Table 4.12
*Cross-tabulation of Curricular Choir Competition Preparation and Program Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Competition</th>
<th>Smaller Programs</th>
<th>Larger Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Competition</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Choir</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Types</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents who reported having less than 150 students in choir were considered educators with smaller programs whereas those with 150 or more students in choir were considered educators with larger programs.

Cross-tabulations were also performed to compare the program enrollments of the respondents who taught junior high with those who taught high school. As indicated in Table 4.13, 42% of the respondents who taught junior high reported having at least 150 students in choir, whereas 50% of the high school educators reported having at least 150 students enrolled in choir. The program-to-school enrollment ratio, however, was higher in the respondents who taught junior high. Ninety-one percent of the respondents who taught junior high had at least 10% of their school’s population in choir, compared with 71% of those who taught high school.
Table 4.13

Cross-tabulation of Grade Level Taught and Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Smaller Programs</th>
<th>Larger Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final cross-tabulation analysis was performed to determine if the respondents who reported spending curricular time preparing for show choir competitions also had a competitive marching band at their school that rehearsed during the regular school day. As indicated in Table 4.14, 56% of the respondents who spent curricular time preparing for show choir competitions also reported having a competitive marching band at their school that rehearsed during the regular school day. Conversely, only 28% of the participants who spent no curricular time preparing choir competitions reported having a competitive marching band that met during the regular school day.

Table 4.14

Cross-tabulation of Curricular Choir Competition Preparation and Inclusion of Curricular Competitive Marching Band

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Marching Band</th>
<th>None n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CC n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SC n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Both n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. None = no curricular time was used for choir competition preparation; CC = Curricular time was used to prepare for concert choir competitions; SC = curricular time was used to prepare for both show choir and concert choir competitions; % = percentage of respondents in each group.

Curricular Scores. When comparing the overall curricular scores based on both the grade level taught and all competition demographic subgroups, the highest score for
the junior high educators was discovered for those who spent time preparing for both concert and show choir competition events during the regular school day ($M = 62$). The lowest mean score was discovered for the junior high choral educators who used curricular time to prepare for show choir competitions, but not concert choir competitions ($M = 24.83$). Similarly, as indicated in Table 4.15, the highest mean for the high school educators was found in those who spent curricular time preparing for both types of competitive events ($M = 59.4$), and the lowest score was discovered for those who spent curricular time preparing for show choir competitions only ($M = 47.63$).

Table 4.15

Curricular Scores Based on Grade Level Taught and Curricular Competition Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Type of Competition</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show Choir</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>56.93</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show Choir</td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Both = respondents who spent curricular time preparing for concert choir and show choir competitions; concert choir = respondents who spent curricular time preparing for concert choir competitions; none = respondents who did not spend any curricular time preparing for choir competitions; show choir = respondents who spent rehearsal time preparing for show choir competitions.

When comparing the music literacy scores of the junior high ($M = 18.65$) and high school ($M = 20.98$) educators who spent curricular time spent on competition preparation, the participants who taught junior high and spent curricular time preparing for both concert and show choir competitions, as indicated in Table 4.16, spent the most
time developing music literacy skills ($M = 25.5$). The junior high respondents who reported spending curricular time preparing for show choir competitions but not concert choir competitions spent the least amount of time on music literacy development ($M = 7.17$).

When analyzing the curricular time spent on music literacy development in the high school programs, the respondents who spent time in class preparing for concert choir competitions also spent the most time on music literacy development ($M = 23.24$), as indicated in Table 4.16. The respondents who taught high school and spent curricular time preparing for show choir competitions spent the least amount of time developing music reading skills ($M = 15.94$).

Table 4.16

Music Literacy Scores Based on Grade Level Taught and Curricular Competition Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Type of Competition</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show Choir</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show Choir</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Both = respondents spent curricular time preparing for concert choir and show choir competitions; concert choir = respondents spent curricular time preparing for concert choir competitions; none = respondents did not spend any curricular time preparing for choir competitions; show choir = respondents spent rehearsal time preparing for show choir competitions.
Inferential Results

Chi-square and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests were used to identify potential differences among demographic groups and curricular scores, respectively. Kendall’s tau_b and Spearman’s rho tests were performed to determine relationships between the ordinal data sets; the lower value resulting from each test was reported (Gall, et. al., 2007). Responses to Questions 2-5 of the CCCQ were used to determine curricular subgroup scores indicating the amount of curricular time spent on rehearsing specific musical styles, non-singing musical activities, cross-curricular discussions related to the literature, and music literacy development, respectively. Responses to Questions 6-9 were used to determine the amount of curricular time respondents spent on choreography instruction, the grade level they taught, their school and program enrollment, and the amount of curricular time they spent preparing for choir competitions, respectively. Question 10 inquired about the curricular inclusion of competitive marching band at the respondents’ schools. All alpha levels were set at .05.

Chi-Square Results

Chi-square tests were performed to determine if there was a difference in the type of curricular preparation that reportedly occurred between the respondents who taught high school and those who taught junior high. Results indicated that a significant difference existed between the responses to CCCQ Question 9 based on the responses to Question 7b, χ²(3, 146) = 16.15, p = .001. Significantly, more respondents who taught high school reported spending curricular time preparing for show choir competitions than the respondents who taught junior high, χ²(1, 50) = 4.55, p = .03. More of the respondents who taught high school reported spending curricular time preparing for both
concert and show choir competitions when compared with those who taught junior high, 
\( \chi^2(1, 16) = 9.94, p = .002 \).

Chi-squares were also performed to compare the number of respondents who
reported having a competitive marching band that rehearsed during the regular school
day. Significant differences were discovered based on the type of curricular competition
preparation that occurred, \( \chi^2(3, 146) = 8.59, p = .035 \). More respondents who reported
spending no curricular time on choir competition also indicated that there was no
curricular inclusion of competitive marching band in their school, \( \chi^2(1, 148) = 9.69, 
\ p = .00 \). Furthermore, more respondents who reported involvement in curricular
preparation for concert choir but not show choir competitions, also specified that there
was no competitive marching band at their school that rehearsed during the regular
school day, \( \chi^2(1, 148) = 4.41, p = .04 \). No significant differences were revealed in terms
of the inclusion of curricular preparation for competitive marching band based on the
responses of those who reported spending curricular time preparing for show choir
competitions.

**ANOVA Results**

ANOVA tests were performed to determine potential main effects of and
interactions between the overall curricular scores and music literacy scores for each
demographic subgroup. Levene’s tests for homogeneity of variance were run, as well, to
ensure the validity of the ANOVA results. Finally, Bonferronni post-hoc tests were used
for multiple group comparisons.

A significant disparity in curricular scores between the competition demographic
subgroups was found, \( F (3, 145) = 3.876, p = .011 \). As indicated in Table 4.17,
Bonferonni post-hoc test results indicate that respondents who spent curricular time preparing for show choir competitions \((M = 41.41)\) scored lower than the respondents who spent time preparing for concert choir competitions \((M = 55.22, p = .02)\), and the respondents who spent curricular time preparing for both show and concert choir events \((M = 59.71, p = .017)\). Because the Levene test was also significant \((p = .004)\), results must be interpreted with caution.

Significant differences were also discovered in the summated music literacy scores between competition subgroups, \(F(3, 145) = 5.994, p = .001\). As reported in Table 4.17, Bonferonni post-hoc comparisons of the four groups indicated that the respondents who spent curricular time preparing for show choir competitions \((M = 13.55)\) spent less time on music literacy development than each of the other three groups including: respondents who reported spending no curricular time preparing for choir competitions \((M = 19.88, p = .01)\); respondents who spent curricular time preparing for concert choir competitions \((M = 21.69), p = .00\); and respondents who participated in both competitive show and concert choir preparation during the regular school day \((M = 21.94, p = .01)\). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was nonsignificant \((p = .205)\).
Table 4.17

*Post Hoc Bonferonni Results for Differences between Curricular and Music Literacy Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean 1(I)</th>
<th>Mean 2(J)</th>
<th>Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Score</td>
<td>None (51.96)</td>
<td>CC (55.22)</td>
<td>-3.26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC (41.41)</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both (59.71)</td>
<td>-7.75</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC (55.22)</td>
<td>SC (41.41)</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both (59.71)</td>
<td>-4.49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC (41.41)</td>
<td>Both (59.71)</td>
<td>-18.3</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML Score</td>
<td>None (19.88)</td>
<td>CC (21.69)</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC (13.55)</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both (21.94)</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC (21.69)</td>
<td>SC (13.55)</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both (21.94)</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC (13.55)</td>
<td>Both (21.94)</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* None indicates the respondents who did not use curricular time for competition preparation; CC indicates the respondents who used curricular time for concert choir competition preparation; SC indicates the respondents who used curricular time for show choir competition preparation; Both indicates the respondents who used curricular time for show and concert choir competition preparation.

No significant differences were discovered between the competition demographic subgroups in terms of the musical activities scores or the cross-curricular scores. Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 4.18 and Table 4.19. No significant differences in curricular scores were discovered between demographic subgroups including school enrollment, program enrollment, or grade level taught.
Table 4.18

*Musical Activities Scores based on Curricular Competition Preparation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Competition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Choir</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19

*Cross-Curricular Scores based on Curricular Competition Preparation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Competition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert Choir</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Choir</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Results

Bi-variate correlations were calculated to determine possible relationships between the curricular time spent on competition preparation and the curricular scores of the choral music educators who participated in this study. Results are reported below according to the relationships between the demographic variables (i.e., concert choir and show choir involvement, school enrollment, and program enrollment) and the curricular subgroup scores (i.e., overall curricular scores, music literacy scores, non-singing musical activities, cross-curricular scores, and musical style selection). Relationships between the curricular time spent on choreography instruction and all pertinent variables are also included. All correlations between demographic and curricular score data are reported in Table 4.20.
Curricular competitive concert choir preparation and curricular scores. In order to examine the relationship between the curricular time spent preparing for competitive concert choir events and the curricular scores, Kendall’s tau_b correlations were performed between the responses to CCCQ Question 9a and the summated responses to Questions 2-5. The relationship was found to be statistically significant ($\tau = .17, p = .01$). As the curricular time spent preparing for concert choir competitions increased, the overall curricular score increased. Further analysis revealed another significant low association between concert choir competition involvement and music literacy scores, which was created by summing the responses to Question 5 ($\tau = .16, p = .02$). As the curricular time spent preparing for concert choir competitions increased, the time spent developing music literacy skills increased to some extent. Finally, a significant relationship was discovered between the curricular time spent on concert choir competition preparation and the curricular time spent on cross-curricular discussions ($\tau = .16, p = .02$).

Curricular competitive show choir preparation and curricular scores. Results of Kendall’s tau_b correlations between the curricular scores of choral music educators and the amount of time spent preparing for competitive show choir events, which was determined by the responses to Question 9a, was statistically insignificant. A statistically significant relationship, however, was revealed in the analysis of the music literacy scores. As the curricular time spent preparing for show choir competitions increased, the time spent developing music literacy skills decreased slightly ($\tau = -.17, p = .02$).

Choreography and curricular scores. The researcher also performed Kendall’s tau_b correlations between the responses to Question 6 of the CCCQ, which inquired about the curricular time spent on choreography instruction, and each curricular subgroup
score. Numerous significant findings were discovered. As the time spent on choreography instruction increased, the overall curricular scores decreased somewhat ($\tau = -0.16, p = 0.05$). Furthermore, a significant negative correlation was found between the curricular time spent teaching choreography and the curricular time spent on music literacy development ($\tau = -0.25, p = 0.00$). Moderately low correlations were also discovered, when performing a Kendall’s tau test, between the curricular time spent preparing for competitive show choir events and the curricular time spent on choreography instruction ($\tau = 0.37, p = 0.00$).

**School/program enrollment and curricular scores.** When performing Kendall’s tau correlations between the summated curricular scores and responses to Questions 7 and 8, a significant association was found between program enrollment and the curricular time spent on musical activities ($\tau = 0.14, p = 0.04$). As the reported program enrollment increased, the curricular time spent on non-singing musical activities also increased.

Table 4.20
*Correlations between Demographics and Curricular Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Score</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>Choreography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Score</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Activities</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Curricular</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Literacy</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notation</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05.  **p<0.01.

*Note. CC = curricular time spent preparing for concert choir competitions; SC = curricular time spent preparing for show choir competitions; SE = school enrollment; PE = program enrollment.*

**Concert choir competition and music literacy scores.** To facilitate ordinal-to-ordinal associative analyses between the curricular time spent on competitive concert choir preparation and the responses to the individual sub-questions within the music
literacy curricular subgroup (e.g., reading in minor, notating in minor, etc.), Kendall’s tau_b correlations were performed. Although no significant relationship was discovered between curricular competitive concert choir and the time spent reading major melodic patterns, a positive correlation was discovered with minor reading activities (τ = .22, p = .001) as reported in Table 4.21. Significant results were also found with notation activities. As the involvement in curricular preparation for competitive concert choir events increased, there was an increase in the time spent on notating in both major (τ = .17, p = .01) and minor (τ = .15, p = .04).

*Show choir competition and music literacy scores.* Numerous significant findings resulted from correlation testing between the curricular time spent preparing for show choir competitions and the time spent on music literacy development. As the curricular time spent on preparing for show choir competitions increased, the curricular time spent on reading activities in simple meter (τ = -.21, p = .004), major (τ = -.17, p = .02) and minor keys (τ = -.19, p = .007), and rhythmic notation exercises in simple meter (τ = -.16, p = .02) decreased (Table 4.21).

*Choreography and music literacy scores.* Correlations were also run between the responses to the CCCQ Question 6, which inquired about the amount of curricular time spent on choreography instruction, and the time spent on music literacy development. As indicated in Table 4.21, significant relationships were discovered with reading in simple meter (τ = -.16; p = .02), and in both major (τ = -.19; p = .006) and minor (τ = -.24; p = .00). As the curricular time spent on choreography instruction increased, the time spent on reading activities in simple meter, and major and minor tonalities decreased.
Table 4.21

Correlations between Competition Preparation and Music Literacy Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy Activity</th>
<th>Concert Choir</th>
<th>Show Choir</th>
<th>Choreography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Simple Meter</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Compound Meter</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Major Keys</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Minor Keys</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Simple Meter</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Compound Meter</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Major Keys</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Minor Keys</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.

Choir competition and non-singing musical activities. An examination of the relationship between responses to Question 9 and Question 3, which included questions relating to the non-singing musical activities that took place in the participants’ classrooms, revealed significant findings. As the curricular involvement in preparation for competitive concert choir events increased, the time spent evaluating other choral ensembles increased slightly ($\tau = .15, p = .03$). Similarly, a positive correlation was discovered between show choir competition preparation and time spent evaluating other choral ensembles ($\tau = .18, p = .01$) as indicated in Table 4.22.

Choir competition and cross-curricular discussions. To determine associations between Question 9a and Question 4, which focused on cross-curricular discussions, Kendall’s tau correlations were performed. As indicated in Table 4.22, results revealed statistically significant and positive correlations between the time spent preparing for concert choir competitions and the following cross-curricular sub-questions: acoustics ($\tau = .16, p = .02$); poetry ($\tau = .24, p = .00$); history/culture ($\tau = .14, p = .03$); visual arts ($\tau = .17, p = .02$); and foreign language ($\tau = .22, p = .001$).
Significant relationships were also discovered between the curricular time spent preparing for competitive show choir events and the time spent discussing cross-curricular topics. As preparation for show choir competitions increased, the reported time spent on history and culture discussions related to the choral literature decreased ($\tau = -.14, p = .05$) as indicated in Table 4.22. A positive correlation, however, was found between show choir competition and discussion regarding the history of dance styles ($\tau = .20, p = .01$).

Table 4.22

*Correlations between Competition and Musical/Cross-Curricular Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Topic</th>
<th>Concert Choir</th>
<th>Show Choir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating Others</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustics</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Styles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p*< .05  **p*< .01

*Concert choir competition and music selection.* To determine the number of different choral music styles that were rehearsed in class during the semester in which the survey was conducted, a category was created in SPSS that contained data pertaining to the number of different styles rehearsed during the regular school day (Question 2 of the CCCQ). No significant relationship was found between the number of styles and the amount of curricular time spent preparing for competitive concert choir events. Correlation tests were also run between the responses to each individual musical style selection in Question 2 and Question 9a to determine if there was a relationship between
the respondents’ musical style selections and the curricular time spent preparing for competitive concert choir events. As indicated in Table 4.23, significant findings were discovered between curricular concert choir competition preparation and singing classical/concert music ($\tau = .25, p = .00$), popular literature ($\tau = -.25, p = .00$), and Broadway selections ($\tau = -.14, p = .049$). The choral music educators who spent more curricular time preparing for competitive concert choir events tended to spend more time rehearsing classical/concert music and less time on popular and Broadway literature.

Show choir competition and music selection. Further correlations were performed to determine if there was a relationship between the amount of curricular time spent on preparing for show choir competitions and the musical style selections of the participants. Specifically, the researcher performed Kendall’s tau_b tests between the responses to Question 2 and Question 9b of the CCCQ; numerous significant findings were revealed. A significant negative correlation between the number of styles and the amount of time spent preparing for competitive show choir events was discovered ($\tau = -.16; p = .03$), as reported in Table 4.23. As the amount of time spent preparing for competitive show choir events increased, the number of different styles that were rehearsed during the regular school day decreased. In addition to calculating correlations between the number of styles and curricular competitive show choir preparation, the investigator also analyzed possible associations between the curricular time spent on preparation for competitive show choir events (Question 9b) and each individual musical style (Question 2). A significant relationship was discovered with the following styles: classical/concert ($\tau = -.33, p = .00$), Broadway ($\tau = .16, p = .03$), and popular ($\tau = .16, p = .03$). The respondents who spent more curricular time preparing for competitive show choir events during the
regular school day tended to spend less time working on classical/concert literature, but more time on Broadway and popular music selections.

Choreography and music selection. To determine if an association existed between the music selection of the participants and the amount of curricular time spent on choreography instruction, Kendall’s tau_b tests were performed between responses to Questions 2 and 6 on the CCCQ. As indicated in Table 4.23, significant findings were discovered between the amount of curricular time spent on choreography instruction and the following musical styles: Broadway ($\tau = .41$, $p = .00$); popular ($\tau = .25$, $p = .00$), classical/concert ($\tau = -.32$, $p = .00$), and multicultural ($\tau = -.17$, $p = .02$). As the reported curricular time spent on choreography instruction increased, the respondents spent more time working on popular and Broadway literature and less time on multicultural music and classical/concert literature.

School/program enrollment and music selection. Although no relationship was discovered between school/program enrollment and curricular scores, significant relationships were found between student enrollment and music selection. Participants who taught in larger schools spent less curricular time rehearsing multicultural pieces ($\tau = -.14$, $p = .04$), spirituals and gospel music ($\tau = -.17$, $p = .02$), and popular music ($\tau = -.14$, $p = .04$). Respondents with larger choral programs spent more time rehearsing classical/concert literature ($\tau = .19$, $p = .003$), and less time working on popular music ($\tau = -.17; p = .01$). All correlations pertaining to demographics and music selection are reported in Table 4.23.
Table 4.23

Correlations between Demographics/Competition Preparation and Music Style Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musical Style</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>Choreography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Styles</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical/Concert</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Jazz</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituals</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01

*Note.* CC = curricular time spent preparing for concert choir competitions; SC = curricular time spent preparing for show choir competitions; SE = school enrollment; PE = program enrollment.

Music Selection and Curricular Activities. Non-parametric correlations were also performed between the reported music selection of the choral music educators and their curricular scores; numerous significant findings were discovered. As class time spent on rehearsing classical/concert music increased, there was an increase in both the overall curricular score ($\tau = .14, p = .05$) and the summated music literacy score ($\tau = .19, p = .01$) as indicated in Table 4.24. Further findings indicated that as curricular time spent rehearsing multicultural music increased, there was an increase in the amount of time spent on music literacy development ($\tau = .16, p = .02$). As the curricular time spent rehearsing vocal jazz selections increased, the overall curricular scores increased ($\tau = .15, p = .04$). There was also a positive correlation between the curricular time spent rehearsing vocal jazz music and the time spent on non-singing musical activities ($\tau = .25, p = .00$). As the curricular time spent rehearsing patriotic music increased, the curricular time spent on non-singing musical activities increased ($\tau = .19, p = .01$). As the number
of different styles rehearsed increased, there was also an increase in the time spent addressing musical activities ($\tau = .34, p = .00$). As the number of music styles rehearsed in the semester increased, there was an increase in the amount of curricular time spent discussing cross-curricular topics related to the literature ($\tau = .22, p = .00$).

As reported in Table 4.24, negative correlations were discovered between the time spent rehearsing popular music and the overall curricular scores ($\tau = -.22, p = .001$) as well as the music literacy scores ($\tau = -.30, p = .00$), and the cross curricular scores ($\tau = -.15, p = .02$). As the curricular time spent rehearsing popular music selections increased, the overall comprehensiveness level, curricular time spent on music literacy development, and time spent on cross-curricular discussions decreased. Furthermore, there was a negative correlation between the time spent on rehearsing popular music and the development of music notation skills ($\tau = -.22, p = .01$). Results of the Kendall’s tau_b correlations also showed a decrease in music literacy development as the time spent rehearsing Broadway music increased ($\tau = -.15, p = .03$).

Table 4.24

*Correlations between Music Style Selection and Curricular Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musical Style</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Music Literacy</th>
<th>Musical Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical/concert</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Jazz</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01

Kendall’s tau_b correlations were performed on the responses to the individual sub-questions on the CCCQ. As reported in Table 4.25, significance was revealed
between several variables. As the curricular time spent rehearsing vocal jazz selections increased, more improvisation was reported ($\tau = .27, p = .00$). Furthermore, as the curricular time spent rehearsing Broadway music increased, more discussion regarding dance styles reportedly occurred ($\tau = .21, p = .003$). More cross-curricular discussion regarding foreign language also took place as more rehearsal time was spent during the regular school day on multicultural choral music ($\tau = .25, p = .002$).

Final analyses using Kendall’s tau correlations revealed numerous negative correlations with popular music. As the curricular time spent rehearsing popular music increased, a decrease was shown in the amount of curricular time spent on the following activities: vocal anatomy discussion ($\tau = -.16, p = .02$), poetry ($\tau = -.22, p = .001$), history and culture ($\tau = -.21, p = .002$), reading in compound meter ($\tau = -.23, p = .001$), reading in the major mode ($\tau = -.23, p = .001$), reading in the minor mode ($\tau = -.27; p = .00$), notating in simple meter ($\tau = -.18, p = .01$), notating in compound meter ($\tau = -.16, p = .02$), notating major mode exercises ($\tau = -.20, p = .005$), and notating minor mode patterns ($\tau = -.22, p = .002$).
Table 4.25

*Correlations between Music Style Selection and Individual Activities/Discussions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Discussion</th>
<th>Vocal Jazz</th>
<th>Broadway</th>
<th>Multicultural</th>
<th>Popular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Styles</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Anatomy</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Compound Meter</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Major</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Minor</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Simple Meter</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Compound Meter</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Major</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Minor</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01

*Related Findings*

Analysis of the data using Pearson correlations revealed significant associations between the categories of reported choral curricular activities. Moderate to strong correlations were found between the following curricular subgroup scores: musical activities and cross-curricular activities (r = .723, p<.01), music activities and music literacy score (r = .493, p<.01), and cross-curricular activities and music literacy score (r = .508, p<.01). As the curricular time spent in each curricular activity increased, there was an increase of reported curricular time spent on the other activities related to the national standards for music education.

*Summary*

In Questions 2-5 of the CCCQ, respondents reported the time they spent addressing the national standards for music education in their choral classrooms. Responses were summated and categorized based on their overall curricular score, non-
singing music activities score, cross-curricular score, and music literacy score. Analysis of all scores revealed a normal score distribution across all curricular subgroups.

Questions 6-10 of the CCCQ inquired about the use of curricular time spent on choreography instruction, demographic information, curricular time spent on preparation for choir competitions, and the inclusion of curricular competitive marching band. Responses were categorized into demographic subgroups and analyzed. Results of the demographic response data indicated a fairly equal representation of all demographic subgroups in this investigation including school size, program size, grade level taught, and involvement in curricular preparation for choral competition events.

Respondents reported spending the greatest amount of time rehearsing classical and concert choral literature while the least amount of time was spent on vocal jazz music. In regards to non-singing musical instruction, respondents spent the most curricular time on listening and self-evaluation activities and the least amount of time playing instruments and composing. Examination of responses that addressed the time spent on cross-curricular discussions related to the literature revealed that the respondents discussed vocal anatomy between 7-11 times in the semester, which was the most time spent in that category. The least frequent cross-curricular discussion was history of dance styles, which typically occurred only once or twice in the specified semester. Response data from Question 5, which related to music literacy development, revealed that participants spent the most time reading in simple meter and in major; the least amount of time was spent notating in compound meter and in minor.

Cross-tabulation tests were performed to determine if Indiana high school choral music educators participated in curricular preparation for competitive choir events more
than junior high choral music educators. Results indicated that the high school choral music educators participated in some form of curricular preparation for competitive choral events to a higher degree than the participants who taught junior high at the time of the survey.

Chi square results revealed a significantly lower number of junior high educators than high school educators who used curricular time to prepare for choir competitions. Results also indicated that many of the Indiana music programs that did not include curricular preparation for show choir competitions also did not have a competitive marching band at their school that met during the regular school day.

ANOVA tests were run to determine if there were any significant differences between the comprehensiveness of competitive show and concert choir programs. The respondents who spent curricular time preparing for show choir competitions had significantly less comprehensive programs than those who spent curricular time preparing for concert choir competitions. Furthermore, time spent preparing for show choir competition during the regular school day resulted in significantly less time on music literacy development than those who spent curricular time preparing for concert choir competitions and those who did not spend any curricular time preparing for choir competitions.

Kendall’s tau_b correlations were performed to determine possible relationships between curricular concert choir competition preparation and comprehensive choral curriculum. As curricular time committed to preparation for concert choir competitions increased, there was a corresponding increase in the amount of time spent on music literacy development and on cross-curricular discussions, specifically visual arts,
acoustics, poetry, foreign language, and history/culture. As respondents allotted more
time to curricular concert choir competition preparation, more time was spent addressing
National Standards 5, 8, and 9.

Correlations were also performed between the curricular time spent on show choir
competition and time spent addressing the national standards. Exploration of the data
showed that as curricular time spent preparing for show choir competitions increased
there was a decrease in the amount of time spent on music literacy development and
discussions relating to history and culture. As respondents allotted more time to
curricular show choir competition preparation, less time was spent addressing National
Standards 5, 8, and 9.

Analytical tests were also performed to determine possible relationships between
related variables. A negative correlation was discovered between the time spent on
choreography instruction and the overall comprehensive curricular score. As the
curricular time spent on choreography instruction increased, less time was dedicated to
music literacy development, particularly in terms of notation. Correlation tests revealed a
significant positive association between choreography and curricular preparation for
competitive show choir events. A significant relationship was also discovered between
program enrollment and the musical activities score. As the program enrollment
increased, more time was spent on developing non-singing musical skills such as
improvisation, composition, listening, and evaluating.

Analysis of correlations between musical repertoire selection and the two primary
variables elicited several significant findings. As the time spent on curricular concert
choir competition preparation increased, respondents spent more time rehearsing
classical/concert literature, but less time rehearsing popular and Broadway selections. Conversely, as more curricular time was spent preparing for show choir competitions, more time was committed to rehearsing Broadway and popular styles and correspondingly, less time was used to rehearse classical/concert music.

Correlations were performed between the amount of curricular time spent on choreography rehearsal and the number of musical styles rehearsed in class. As respondents dedicated more curricular time to rehearsing Broadway and popular music selections, an increase of choreography instruction was also reported. A negative correlation, however, was discovered between the time used for choreography instruction and time spent rehearsing classical, multicultural, and patriotic music.

Respondents who had larger student enrollment in choir tended to spend more time on classical/concert literature and less time working on popular music selections. Findings also indicated a relationship between music selection and choral curricular activities. Rehearsing Broadway musical selections was positively correlated with discussion on the history of dance styles. Additionally, more discussion on foreign language took place as the rehearsal time spent on multicultural music increased and vocal jazz music was positively associated with time spent on improvisation. Finally, as more time was allotted to the rehearsal of popular styles, less time was used on music literacy instruction, as well as cross-curricular discussions relating to vocal anatomy, poetry, and history/culture. National Standards 5, 8, and 9 were addressed less often when a substantial amount of time was spent rehearsing popular music.

Conclusions based on current and previous findings will be used to address each of the 10 research questions related to this inquiry. Interpretations of the data will
facilitate discussion regarding specific implications of these results for the field of music education and will lead to the development of additional research questions for future investigations related to the use of competition in the choral curriculum.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

“Competition has long been a hallmark of patriotism and the American way of life” (Rosenau, 2006, back cover). American culture could be seen from this perspective as being built on the competitive nature of human beings as well as our capitalistic economic structure. The competition paradigm is shared by the American community and enormous energy is expended to protect it (Rosenau, 2003). Some believe, therefore, that educators have a responsibility to provide students with knowledge, skills, and conceptual ideals required to survive in a society filled with mutually exclusive goal structures. Music educators have the duty and privilege of providing students with musical experiences that will encourage a life-long appreciation for artistic beauty as well as understanding music’s role and importance in our American society. Previous research has shown that certain aspects of these social, educational, and musical principles might come into conflict with one another. Although many believe competition to be a naturally acquired human trait (Harvey, 1917; Ruben, 1981), evidence from previous research indicated that both competition and cooperation could be learned behaviors and are culturally contextual (Deutsch, 1973; May, 1937). Studies have also suggested that promoting and instilling competitive behaviors in certain individuals can have negative psychological and physiological effects (Ares & Babbitt, 1974; Jemmott, 1983; Kugler, 1996; Lanzetta & Englis, 1989; Rosenau, 2003). Competition can detract from productivity (Johnson, 1981; Workie, 1974), and reduce the enjoyment of certain activities (Csiksentmihalyi, 1975a). In regards to educational concerns, research has indicated that extrinsic motivators, such as awards gained from activities that are
structured around mutually exclusive goals, can negatively influence student motivation and attributions (Ames, 1981; Deci et al., 1999), as well as meaningful and creative learning experiences (Amabile, 1982; Dewey, 1997; Ormrod, 2004). Although these findings suggest that competitive activities, due to the impediments of standardized assessment, undermine creativity, the data collection methods required to obtain these results were themselves standardized by design. This creates a paradoxical dilemma in terms of drawing meaningful conclusions from research studies on competition and creativity using quantitative investigative techniques.

Researchers in the music education field have reported that student motivation in music can be negatively influenced by the integration of competitive activities in music classrooms (Austin, 1988; Austin & Vispoel, 1998; Chandler et al., 1987; Schmidt, 2005; Schmidt et al., 2006; Sheldon, 1994; Stamer, 2006; Weiner, 1979). Finally, previous findings suggest that numerous factors have influenced the level to which the national standards for music education are addressed in public school music programs (Byo, 1999; Norris, 2004; Orman, 2002; Strand, 2006).

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationship between competition and the curricular practices of Indiana choral music educators. Analysis of the survey response data brought certain discussion points relevant to the use of competition in Indiana public school choral curricula to the surface. The points are outlined below, beginning with conclusions based on the posed research questions followed by the implications of these findings to the music education field and recommendations for further research.
Conclusions

Conclusions drawn from the results of this investigation are organized according to each respective research question. Relationships between the curricular time spent addressing the national standards for music education and the curricular time spent preparing for choir competitions were determined by running correlations between the responses to CCCQ Question 9 and CCCQ Questions 2-5. Other correlations were performed between demographic data, such as school size, program size, grade level taught, and curricular time spent on choreography instruction. Potential differences between the comprehensiveness of curricular competitive show and concert choirs were analyzed using ANOVA statistics. Differences between the comprehensiveness of small and large programs as well as junior high were determined, as well. Chi-square statistics were performed to determine if more Indiana high school educators than junior high educators involved their students in curricular preparation for competitive choral events. Chi-square statistics were also used to analyze significant differences between the curricular integration of competitive marching band and show choir in Indiana public school music programs. Furthermore, correlations were run between CCCQ Question 6, which inquired about the amount of time spent on choreography instruction, and the questions pertaining to the national standards (i.e., Questions 2-5). Finally, correlation tests were used to determine if a relationship existed between musical style choices and the comprehensiveness of choral curricula in Indiana.

The results of previous research examining the use of competition in education are indirectly related to deductions made in this study. Preceding research investigations examining competition focused almost exclusively on motivation orientations, goal
structures, attributions, achievement, and productivity; the relationship of results to previous findings is limited mostly to implicit inference.

Research Question #1: Competition and Comprehensive Choral Curricula

The first research question states: is there a relationship between the involvement in curricular competition and the comprehensiveness of choral music curriculum? Significant positive and negative relationships were discovered between responses to CCCQ Question 9, which inquired about the time spent during the regular school day preparing for competitive choir events, and CCCQ Questions 2-6, which focused on the amount of curricular time spent addressing the national standards for music education. Findings indicate that curricular implementation of preparation for structural competition had an impact on the curricular decisions made by Indiana secondary choral music educators in the spring of 2009.

Curricular preparation for concert choir competitions. Results suggest that the respondents who reported spending curricular time preparing for concert choir competition also spent a significant amount of curricular time developing music literacy skills. Previous and current findings indicate that Indiana state concert choir contests do include sight reading, but only at the high school level (Briel, 2009; Norris, 2004). In terms of the non-singing musical activities, results of the current study suggest that Indiana music educators did not address notation activities, composition, and improvisation to the same level as the other standards. Similar findings were discovered in previous studies on music curriculum (Strand, 2006; Watkins, 1993). Specifically, the amount of time spent on composition activities was low, as was found in a previous investigation (Orman, 2002).
Findings also suggest that using curricular time to prepare for concert choir competitions encouraged Indiana choral music educators to spend more time on cross-curricular discussions such as acoustics, history and culture, visual arts, poetry, and foreign language. Results of the tests performed between the curricular time spent on competitive concert choir preparation and the time spent on non-singing musical activities indicate that participating in curricular preparation for concert choir events encouraged Indiana choral music educators to spend more time on evaluating other choral ensembles. Curricular preparation for show choir competition was also positively correlated with the amount of time spent addressing National Standard 7, which deals with evaluating music.

Curricular preparation for show choir competitions. Results of the Kendall’s tau_b correlation tests indicate that Indiana choral directors who prepared for competitive show choir events during the regular school day spent less time on developing the music reading skills of their students. Additional findings suggest that the respondents who reported spending significant curricular time on competitive show choir preparation spent less time discussing history and culture, but spent more time discussing the history of dance styles. Results also indicated a positive relationship between the curricular time spent preparing for competitive show choir events and the time spent on choreography instruction.

Research examining possible associations between competition and comprehensive musicianship in choral curricula has not been studied sufficiently; the results of this inquiry, therefore, cannot be adequately compared. Due to the unique
nature of this study, previous research findings neither support nor refute the conclusions drawn from this investigation.

Research Question #2: Differences Between Show Choir and Concert Choir Curricula

The second research question addressed possible differences between the curricular practices of Indiana choral music educators who spend curricular time preparing for show choir competitions and those who spent time preparing for concert choir competitions. The ANOVA test results confirm the conclusions based on the correlation findings. The data suggest that Indiana choral music educators who participated in curricular preparation for show choir competitions had less comprehensive curricula than those who reported spending curricular time preparing for concert choir competitions and those who used no time during the regular school day getting ready for choir competitions. This was especially true when comparing the time spent addressing National Standard 5, which focuses on music literacy development. It is important to note, however, that the show choir directors who also reported using curricular time to prepare for concert choir competitions had significantly more comprehensive curricula and spent more time developing music literacy skills than the respondents who only prepared for show choir competition during the regular school day.

Research Question #3: School and Program Enrollment

No statistically significant relationship was discovered between comprehensive choral curricula and school or program enrollment. This suggests that Indiana public school choral music educators who teach in larger schools and have larger programs generally spend the same amount of time addressing the national standards as those who teach in smaller schools and have smaller programs. Findings from the correlation
testing, however, indicated that educators who teach in larger schools spent less time addressing certain styles of music such as popular music, multicultural selections, and spirituals.

In terms of program size, the highest percentage of respondents reported having between 100 and 149 students enrolled in choir, a lower average than previous national surveys have indicated (Bagwell; 1984; Johnson & Memmott, 2006; Sandene, 1994; Tipps, 2003). Current findings suggest that educators who spent more curricular time rehearsing classical/concert literature and less time rehearsing popular music had more students enrolled in choir.

Descriptive results indicate that more respondents who spent curricular time preparing for concert choir competitions had larger programs than those who reported spending curricular time preparing for show choir competitions as well as those who reported spending curricular time preparing for both show choir and concert choir competitions.

Research Question #4: Grade Level Taught and Comprehensive Choral Curricula

ANOVA results comparing junior high and high school educators showed no significant differences in overall curricular scores or music literacy scores. Descriptive results, however, did show that the respondents who taught high school spent slightly more curricular time developing music literacy skills than the junior high program. Previous research claimed that Indiana rating-based contests did not include sight-reading at the junior high level (Norris, 2004).
Research Question #5: Junior High vs. High School Competition Involvement

Research Question 5 was developed to determine whether high school or junior high choral programs in Indiana are involved more heavily in curricular preparation for choral competition. Chi-square results suggest that more Indiana high school choral music educators spent curricular time preparing for competitions than junior high educators; this was especially prevalent when comparing curricular preparation for show choir events.

Although descriptive results indicate that the school-to-program enrollment ratio is higher in Indiana junior high than high school choral programs, further research is needed to confirm if a discrepancy exists and if curricular preparation for competition plays a role in such a discrepancy.

Research Question #6: Competitive Marching Band vs. Show Choir Involvement

Research Question 6 was developed to determine whether or not competitive marching band directors used the regular school day to rehearse to a lesser degree than competitive show choir directors. Chi-square results indicate that more respondents who did not use curricular time preparing for show choir competitions also reported that there was no curricular competitive marching band at their schools as compared to those who did participate in curricular show choir competition preparation. Rogers (1985) indicated that administrators often encourage competitive involvement in their instrumental music programs to build community support for the school. Current findings suggest that the lack of involvement in curricular marching band competition is somewhat related to the absence of curricular choir competition preparation in Indiana public schools.
Research Question #7: Choreography and Comprehensive Choral Curricula

In order to address Research Question 7, the investigator performed Kendall’s tau_b correlations between the responses to CCCQ Question 6, which inquired about the amount of curricular time that was dedicated to choreography instruction, and CCCQ Questions 3-5. Findings suggest that choreography instruction interfered with music literacy instruction in Indiana choral music programs. Results also indicate that Indiana choral music educators who spent more time in class rehearsing popular music and Broadway selections used more class time for choreography instruction. Finally, less time was reportedly spent rehearsing classical literature when more curricular time was dedicated to choreography instruction.

Research Question #8: Musical Style Choices and Comprehensive Choral Curricula

Analysis of the data indicates that respondents who spent more time rehearsing classical and concert literature also spent more time on music literacy development. Previous research suggests that higher quality directors who teach choral music in the southern part of the country tend to choose more literature selections that are from classical, folk, and non-western musical traditions and less popular music (Forbes, 2001). Reames (2001) found that choral directors tend to program 20th century music most frequently.

Results imply that the respondents who rehearsed vocal jazz music spent more curricular time improvising (National Standard 3), which, according to current findings, is often neglected. Also, rehearsing a wider variety of musical styles was associated with more curricular time spent on cross-curricular discussions (National Standard 8 and 9) as well as non-singing musical activities (National Standard 2-4). Findings further suggest
that as respondents spent more time preparing for show choir competitions, the number of musical styles rehearsed decreased.

Data analysis also revealed that respondents who rehearsed popular music during the regular school day spent less curricular time on music literacy development. Finally, the respondents who reported spending a significant portion of their rehearsals on popular music spent less curricular time discussing vocal anatomy, history and culture, and poetry. Previous research indicates that formal musical concepts can be effectively taught using popular music selections in instrumental ensembles (Grashel, 1979).

Research Question #9: Musical Style Choices and Curricular Competition Preparation

Analyses of the data pertaining to literature selection and curricular preparation for choir competitions revealed that using curricular time to prepare for choir competitions is related to the styles of repertoire to which Indiana choral music students were exposed. Respondents who reported spending a substantial portion of class time preparing for concert choir competitions spent more time rehearsing classical/concert literature and less time rehearsing popular and Broadway selections during the regular school day. Conversely, the respondents who reported spending more curricular time preparing for show choir competitions spent more time during the regular school day rehearsing popular and Broadway music and significantly less time on classical/concert literature, multicultural selections, and spirituals.

Previous findings have indicated that choral selection has a profound influence on the curricular practices of choral music educators as well as the discriminatory skills of students in regards to the qualitative elements of music, which can in turn lead to greater aesthetic awareness and sensitivity (Forbes, 2001). Other research cites the necessity of
choral music selection to include literature from all periods and styles (Heffernan, 1982; Lawrence, 1989).

**Research Question #10: Musical Style Choices and Program Size**

Previous research findings imply that educators use popular music to motivate choral music students and to increase their numbers (Turley, 1989; Wyatt, 1995). Findings from this investigation, however, suggest that rehearsing classical/concert literature, at least during the regular school day in Indiana public school choral classrooms, is associated with higher numbers and that the use of popular music might not actually be associated with higher numbers in choir. Similar findings were reported in research examining the repertoire selection of high school choral music educators who taught in Southern states (Forbes, 2001).

**Implications**

The results of the current investigation provide compelling implications for the field of music education. The conclusions drawn from data pertaining to each respective research question contributed unique perspectives on competition as it relates to comprehensive music curriculum. The associative links discovered between the two primary variables under investigation, in combination with additional comments made by the respondents, provided a conceptual framework for continued deliberation on the century-old music competition debate. Underlying constructs of choral music curricula related to this investigation include: (a) comprehensive musicianship training, (b) recruitment and retention of choral music students, (c) the developmental levels of junior high vs. high school students, (d) the use of choreography in choral curricula, and (e) choral music selection.
Competition and Comprehensive Choral Curricula

The success of American public educational institutions is often structured around standardized test performance; federal education initiatives such as No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, and The Education Recovery Act base the success of public schools on student scores on such tests; successful schools are often seen as those with the highest student passing rate. Although each school does not start out at a point of socioeconomic equality, as is the case in many structurally competitive educational activities, the perceived success of public schools is based on how competitive the student test scores are when compared with other schools (Rosenau, 2003). The content of the standardized tests, on which perceived educational success is typically based, is structured around the national standards for each respective subject area (Johnson & Memmott, 2006). Since music is not included in such standardized tests, some administrators and music educators may believe that the only way to demonstrate excellence in their field is by comparing performance results against other ensembles (Miller, 1994; Parkes, 1983; Rohrer, 2002; Schouten, et al., 1983). Results of the current study might indicate, paradoxically, that the very means by which success of choral music programs is sometimes measured could be interfering with the time spent addressing the national standards for music education.

Findings indicate that music literacy training occurred less often in competitive show choir programs, but preparing for concert choir competitions possibly enhanced the music literacy instruction that occurred in Indiana choral programs. This could imply that the reason competitive concert choir directors spent more time developing music literacy skills is solely to prepare for the requirements at contest, due to the fact that sight reading
is included in the Indiana State School Music Association (ISSMA) organizational contest format (Briel, 2009; Norris, 2004). Results also indicate, however, that the respondents who spent more time on concert choir competition also spent more time on reading in minor and notating in both major and minor, none of which was included on the sight reading portion of any 2009 ISSMA contest events (Wasson, 2009; Wasson & Dunn, 2009). No significant relationship was discovered between the time spent on preparation for concert choir competitions and reading rhythms in simple meter or melodic exercises in major, both of which were included in the sight reading portion of the 2009 High School ISSMA concert choir events (Wasson, 2009; Wasson & Dunn, 2009). This data could be interpreted as a counter-argument to the previously stated conclusion.

Results also indicate that preparing for concert choir competition during the regular school day was associated with more time spent on history and culture. This might be due to the fact that 86% of the pieces on the Group I High School ISSMA List for organizational contest are classical or concert music selections (i.e., concert music from any of the historical time periods including traditional European music, folk music, and art songs). Eight percent of the pieces on the required Group I High School list are spirituals, and six percent are multicultural pieces (ISSMA, 2009a). Seventy-one percent of the pieces on the Group I required ISSMA Junior High list are classical/concert pieces. Eight percent of the required junior high contest pieces are spirituals and 11% of the pieces are multicultural (ISSMA, 2009b). None of the pieces on the required High School or Junior High Required Lists would be considered popular music styles or were from Broadway shows (ISSMA, 2009a, 2009b).
Forty-five percent of the selections on the required High School music list for the ISSMA concert choir contests are in a foreign language and many options were composed prior to the 20th century (ISSMA, 2009a). Thirty-two percent of the pieces on the required junior high list are in a foreign language (ISSMA, 2009b). Several art songs are also included on both lists, which could explain the increase of time reportedly spent on discussions relating to poetry. Since the participants were asked to reflect on their curricular activities with their most advanced students, it is possible that a high percentage of the participating choral music educators were preparing music from those lists at the time of the survey.

The fact that more time was spent discussing foreign language and history in rehearsals that were designed, at least partially, for concert choir competition preparation could suggest that Indiana choral music educators are more motivated to teach comprehensively when they are preparing for concert choir competitions. It must be stated, however, that numerous competitive concert choir events take place in Indiana that are outside the regulatory jurisdiction of ISSMA rules and therefore do not necessarily abide by the prescribed music lists.

Although findings infer that curricular show choir competition preparation is associated with evaluating other ensembles, it is important to note that no association was discovered between either form of competition involvement and student self-evaluation, which indicates that curricular involvement in preparation for competitive events does not necessarily encourage students to evaluate their own performance skills.

Results suggest that show choir directors rehearse Broadway and popular music during the day significantly more than classical music. A possible cause, based on
conjecture and personal experience, is that the shows of winning groups generally focus on more popular and Broadway styles. Classical music is sometimes implemented into the show, but not often. E-mail and personal communications with some of the directors whose show choirs placed in the top five in the state within the last five years indicate that the majority of musical styles used in their show choir shows were either from a popular style of music or a Broadway show (Adriansen, e-mail communication, April 28, 2010; Conrad, personal communication, March 13, 2009; Gardner, e-mail communication, April 4, 2010; Kuske, personal communication, April 29, 2009; Wiehe, personal communication, April 13, 2009).

Some educators may agree that losing repeatedly might cause student motivation to decrease. Those who feel that competing at the state level would cause such a decrease in motivation might consider participating in smaller contests in which they could have more success. If, in fact, one purpose behind competing in music is to compare one group’s success against a mutually exclusive standard of excellence, defeating weaker groups—those who would not be able to compete with the top groups in the state—would be an illogical way of achieving this. If, however, one purpose of competing is to bring recognition and community support to the program and school by obtaining tangible awards which can be displayed, as is often the case in sports, the previously mentioned tactic could be an effective way of reaching this goal (Rogers, 1985; Rohrer, 2002).

Findings indicate that curricular competitive show choir preparation was associated with less music literacy instruction. Competitive show choir events in Indiana generally do not have sight reading requirements. If success at such events (i.e., winning) is not directly reliant on how well the students sight read, a possible explanation for the
findings is that show choir directors who spend time during the school day preparing for such events are not as motivated to develop music reading skills in class.

Based on the findings of this investigation, one could conclude that, in addition to using a substantial amount of class time on choreography instruction, Indiana show choir directors might also have a tendency to spend a substantial amount of class time discussing educational material related to the national standards for dance education (National Dance Standards, 1994). In the current study, history of dance styles is categorized under National Standard 8, which addresses cross-curricular connections to music.

Educators make curricular decisions on how to spend their class time when they step into their classrooms, and as choral music educators, those choices often involve balancing the need for academic rigor and performance skill development. Possibly due to this conflict in the field of music education, the findings from this investigation suggest possible time constraints in public high school choral classes to equally address the national standards for music education. Although it is unrealistic to suggest that all standards could or should be addressed equally in a choral classroom in terms of the curricular time spent on each, such limitations might be increased by an unrealistic quantity of literature attempted in the allotted rehearsal time throughout the year. Current findings suggest that curricular competition preparation might be a contributing factor to spending an excessive amount of curricular time on developing performance skills at the expense of comprehensive music education. Based on the results of this investigation, this author’s recommendation is that Indiana choral music educators, particularly those who participate in curricular preparation for show choir competitions, should make it a
priority to balance the time spent during the regular school day on literature preparation
with music literacy development, nonperformance musical activities, and cross-curricular
discussions. Admittedly, this is a challenge in the public school environment with the
public pressure to reflect positively on the school and community (Rohrer, 2002; Rogers,
1985; Schouten et. al., 1983). If, in fact, educators recognize that using more curricular
time to develop such skills could make it more difficult to achieve the extrinsic goals for
their programs, consideration should be made if preparation for show choir events should
take place outside of the regular school day.

*Program Enrollment and Competition Involvement*

Findings indicate that there was no significant difference between student
enrollment in choir based on participation in curricular preparation for choir
competitions. Previous research indicates that choral music educators believe that
motivation techniques such as competition and popular music increase the number of
students who sign up for choir (Turley, 1989). Current findings, however, indicate that
classical and concert literature might motivate students to be in choir more so than
popular music, and that curricular preparation for competition may not in fact be
associated with higher program enrollments. This indicates a potential contradiction to
the previously justified purpose of competition asserting that competition increases in
student motivation to be in choir. There may be higher student retention rates in choral
programs where competition is not encouraged as a result of lower anxiety, higher focus
on meaningful learning experiences, and equal or higher musical self-concept (Austin,
1988). One could conclude from current findings that spending curricular time preparing
for show choir or both show and concert choir competitions might not increase the
student enrollment in choir, possibly due to the stress involved in preparing for competitive events. The 2009 ISSMA state show choir finals took place on March 21st, 2009. ISSMA State Qualifications took place on May 2, 2009. State Concert Choir Finals took place on May 9th, 2009 (ISSMA.net, 2009), which means that students who participated in programs that spent curricular time preparing for both show choir and concert choir competitions spent the majority of the semester competing. Further research is needed to validate this conjectural evidence. Perceptive reasoning might suggest that higher program enrollments are based partially on student motivation and attraction to choir; analytical outcomes could be interpreted similarly to previous findings claiming certain limits of extrinsic incentives on student motivation orientations (Austin, 1988; Clifford, 1972; Schmidt, 2005; Sheldon, 1994; Vallerand, Gauvin, & Halliwell, 1986).

The fact that respondents who reported spending curricular time preparing for both show and concert choir competitions also reported spending the most curricular time addressing the standards could indicate that higher quality music educators are involved in both types of choir competition (Bagwell, 1984; Roher, 2002; Stamer, 2006). Choral music educators might be more likely to participate in competitions, if they have been teaching public school choir for an extended period of time, are confident with their musicianship, have highly developed teaching skills, and can effectively motivate students. Additional comments were reported on the questionnaire indicating that some respondents chose not to compete with their choirs due to the fact that they felt their students would not be successful in a music competition, rather than attributing their lack of competition involvement to philosophical concerns.
Grade Level Taught and Competition Preparation

Descriptive findings also suggest that the junior high educators who prepared for competitions during the regular school day used less class time on music literacy development. The fact that sight reading is not included in the junior high ISSMA organization contest format (Briel, 2010) could account for this. However, these findings cannot be generalized to the larger population; additional research would be needed to validate this conclusion.

Findings also suggest that high school choral music educators participated in curricular preparation for choir competitions to a higher degree than junior high educators. From these results, one could conclude that competition might not be a motivating factor in junior high students to the same degree as it is in high school students. Another theory is that educators may realize that due to the social, musical, and psychological development of junior high students, competition is not appropriate for this age group (Cheung & Rudowicz, 2003; Merten, 1994). Final conclusions based on current findings include the structure of middle school/junior high vs. senior high school structure in Indiana: the structure differs in terms of the length of classes, curricular focus during the regular school day, and the structure in which concepts are taught (Clark & Clark, 1993; Clasen & Bowman, 1974). The music curriculum and availability of choir in the schedule, therefore, might differ, causing problematic variables with the current findings.

Choreography and Comprehensive Choral Curricula

Results suggest that choreography instruction may be interfering with the level to which the national standards for music education are addressed in Indiana public school
choral programs. Findings also strongly indicate that educators who used a substantial amount of curricular time for show choir competition also used a significant amount of time for choreography instruction. Based on the findings of this investigation, choral music educators need to be cognizant of the fact that, with limited instruction time during the regular school day, curricular choices must be made. In order to provide students with a comprehensive choral music education, a balance must be maintained between performance training, music literacy development, and standards-based academic rigor. Although current findings imply that choreography instruction was related to discussions pertaining to the history of dance styles, a negative relationship was discovered between choreography instruction and the amount of curricular time allotted for music literacy instruction as well as the overall comprehensiveness of Indiana choral curricula. As stated previously, it is unrealistic to assume that adequate vocal and dance training combined with an adequate standards-based music curriculum can be delivered in the curricular time allotted for Indiana public school choral music education. Junior high and high school educators, therefore, must make a decision as to the importance of providing their students with the educational breadth offered with adequate curricular integration of the national standards and whether choreography instruction is enhancing or detracting from that goal.

Music Selection

Results of this investigation indicate that using curricular time to prepare for choir competitions was associated with the type of choral literature to which students were exposed. Specifically, curricular show choir competition preparation might be discouraging Indiana choral music educators from exposing their students to a wide range
of musical styles, which might in turn deter the amount of time spent on comprehensive musical activities and educational discussion during rehearsals that take place during the regular school day. Findings also indicate that the style of music rehearsed was related to the amount of time spent addressing the national standards. Respondents who reported spending a substantial amount of time rehearsing popular music, for example, spent significantly less time on music literacy development and cross-curricular discussions. Educators might feel that popular music is more well-known to students, and therefore, music reading skills are not required to learn such literature. Although some feel that popular music can be used to effectively teach both musical and non-musical concepts (Grashel, 1979), current findings could suggest that less academic information is being presented in Indiana public school choral classrooms when popular music is the focus of the literature rehearsal.

Findings also suggest that more time was spent on music literacy development when more time was dedicated to rehearsing classical/concert literature. This could be due to the fact that classical music tends to be more challenging and directors may feel a stronger need to develop music reading skills in order to perform classical and concert literature, which might be less familiar to the students and more difficult to teach by rote.

Many have claimed that American patriotism is enhanced by competition (Rossenau, 2005) and yet findings suggest that curricular preparation for choir competition might be discouraging the use of patriotic music in the choral classroom. Wyatt (1996) indicated that, due to the focus on European music in most university music history curricula, music educators are not exposed to American music composed by African Americans and therefore do not expose their students to such literature.
Current findings could suggest that the philosophical decision to use curricular time to prepare for competitive choir events is also related to both the literature selection and curricular practices of Indiana choral music educators. Research has also shown that Indiana high school choral directors place a great deal of emphasis on popular and light styles to the exclusion of other styles and time periods (Turley, 1989). Current findings could indicate that within the past 20 years, a change has occurred in terms of the musical styles to which Indiana choral music students are exposed; respondents in the current inquiry reported spending more time rehearsing classical/concert literature. A relationship was discovered between the use of class time for show choir competition preparation and rehearsing lighter styles of music. A choral music educator’s philosophical grounding for curriculum development has been suggested as a critical prerequisite to selecting literature for study and performance (Brunner, 1992, 1995; Richmond, 1990).

Based on conclusions from the current and previous research findings, the researcher discourages choral music educators from selecting music based on potential success in music competitions and focus more on choosing literature that is developmentally appropriate, has potential for teaching musical concepts, and offers a wider variety of musical styles to students. If curricular preparation for choir competitions is causing choral curricula to become mono-stylistic, directors should reflect on whether preparation for such events should remain outside the regular school day.

The curricular decisions made in public school music programs can be influenced by both curricular and extracurricular goal constructs. Academic goals are the focus of most core subjects such as math, English, and science. Some music educators strive to
develop time management skills, facilitate teamwork, foster a sense of ensemble and school pride, reward students for their hard work and accomplishments, and inspire musical excellence in their students (Richmond, 1995). Others feel a responsibility to instill academic values, more educational breadth, and a sense of cooperation in students through rigorous and comprehensive music curricula. Although these two sets of educational values are not mutually exclusive, Indiana choral music educators sometimes categorize them separately as was indicated in several additional comments made on the CCCQ. The co-curricular nature of music performance classes can sometimes obscure the boundaries between academic learning and values often associated with competitive sports; music competition could be seen from this perspective as a contributing factor to this phenomenon. A similar co-curricular goal attainment issue exists in the public school physical education curriculum. Some schools in Indiana allow students to receive their physical education credits via participation in physical extracurricular activities, such as athletics and marching band, to lower the student enrollments of physical education courses (Bennett, 2010). Those students are not necessarily receiving a comprehensive understanding of various physical activities or developing life-long physical habits to keep them physically fit, both of which are standards for physical education curriculum (Jewett, 1989).

If research revealed that curricular involvement in competition might decrease standardized test scores, public schools would have no option but to remove those programs from the curriculum in order to maintain their state funding. Based on current findings, choral music educators are encouraged to reflect on their curricular practices and whether the decision to integrate competition preparation in their choral curriculum
influences the time they spend on developing comprehensive musical knowledge and musicianship skills in their students. The implications of this study will aid in replication and extension. Adaptation of data collection procedures will provide further clarity to the philosophical issue of competition in the choral curriculum.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Despite attempts to clarify the meaning of competition, respondent comments revealed some inaccurate understandings of when students are actually involved in competition. The *Indiana State School Music Association (ISSMA)* holds numerous competitive and non-competitive choral events in the spring—the time in which the survey took place. The book for ISSMA rules and regulations shows that all junior high events are non-competitive in nature (ratings only) and yet several participants who teach junior high reported that they participate in competitive events with their junior high students via ISSMA (Briel, 2009; ISSMA.net). The reports from the high school educators are even more problematic. Since ISSMA holds both competitive and non-competitive concert choral events for high school students (District Concert Choir vs. State Qualifications), there is no way to know for sure whether or not the participants understood the difference despite attempts to make the directions on the questionnaire clear (Appendix A). The results of the participant reports who discussed involvement in show choir events are less ambiguous due to the fact that most, if not all, show choir events—including those by the Indiana State School Music Association—are competitive events (Briel, 2009). The perceptions of intentional and structural competition are somewhat unclear to some Indiana choral music educators as is the perception of what
preparing for competitions entails. One respondent made the argument that all musicianship training could be seen as preparation for choir competitions.

Despite limitations of this investigation—external validity concerns, issues related to self-report survey research methodology, and clear definitions of music competitions—conclusions drawn from the findings will serve as a springboard for future research on competition in music education. Based on the current knowledge gained from formal inquiry on competition in choral music education, the researcher recommends quantitative designs including: (a) a replication and extension study, (b) an examination of choral classroom environment as it relates to competition, (c) an investigation into the psychological implications of exposure to competition in choral music, (d) an examination of competition’s effect on student achievement in choral music, (e) a motivation and attribution study of choral music students related to competition, (f) an examination of competitive vs. cooperative goal structures as they relate to choral music curriculum development, and (g) the influence of competition on choral music assessment. Qualitative designs would further contribute to closing the current research gap. For example, a comparative case study relating competition to the social identity of choral music students, choral music programs, and public school institutions could help provide clarity into possible purposes behind the integration of competitive experiences into public school choral curricula.

*Replication and Extension*

Providing conclusive evidence in support of the initial research questions requires numerous adaptations to the overall research design and data collecting procedures for a replication and extension study. In terms of data collection procedures, minor
adjustments to the questionnaire combined with the implementation of additional research techniques would be beneficial. Although statistical analysis of the instrument revealed high reliability, slight modifications could increase both internal and external validity for an extension study. Such changes could include changing the types of questions from multiple choice to quantitative free-response in order to acquire ratio data rather than ordinal, and further clarifying the difference between mutually exclusive competitive experiences and involvement in music events in which structure is based on individualistic goals (i.e., ratings and comments rather than rankings). Sampling procedures could broaden the target population from Indiana choral music educators to include educators in the Midwest or the United States, creating the potential for improved generalization.

In regards to possible extensions to the study in future investigations, attitudinal data could be acquired to further understand the purposes of including curricular preparation for choir competitions. Research questions could be added to create more depth to the replication study. Examining the relationships between the attitudes toward competition and the curricular practices of choral music educators could enhance the internal validity and could help provide clarity to this complex issue.

Classroom Environment

Effective teaching strategies in the classroom influence meaningful student learning (Single, 1991). Inquiry is also needed, therefore, to determine if curricular preparation for choir competitions influences the classroom environment for student music learning, which has been previously investigated in instrumental classrooms (Hamann et al, 1990). Furthermore, previous research investigating the influence of
competition on student perceptions of music should be replicated and extended to choral music students; such research could provide a relevant context for this line of inquiry (Sheldon, 1994). Extension could also include an investigation examining the effects of competition on student achievement in music.

*Psychological Effects of Competition*

Additional exploration of the psychological impact of competition is likewise essential in providing a more comprehensive look at this research thread. Investigation of competitive situations and their relationship to empathy and other emotional responses serves as one such example. Based on the results of their study, Lanzetta and Eglis (1989) asserted various implications of competitive experiences in society. In social situations, human beings interact with psychological phenomena that change their perceptions and social conduct; individuals taking part in mutually exclusive emotional experiences are subjected to such perceptual alterations. Accepting this conclusion infers a potential motivation, resulting from competition, for aggressive or hostile behavior designed to produce negative outcomes for others, thereby producing egocentric counter-empathetic pleasure. Extreme cases are detected in highly competitive activities in which the success of an individual involves blocking a desired emotional response of another in order to achieve an equal but opposite self-interested outcome. Experimental studies in choral music education could investigate this psychological phenomenon as it relates to students involved in various choir contest formats.

*Motivation and Attribution in Choral Music Students*

Studies examining motivation orientations in relation to competitive goal structures encompass the majority of investigative research on this topic. The study
conducted by Vallerand, Gauvin, and Halliwell (1986) provided conclusions indicating reduced intrinsic motivation in losers of competitive experiences due to a perceived sense of diminished competence. “These findings serve as a cautionary note to teachers and other professionals who may wish to employ competition as a motivational device in children’s activities” (Vallerand, Gauvin, Halliwell, 1986, p. 655). Clifford (1972), in a similar study, found extrinsic motivation to be useful in the completion of less challenging tasks in conjunction with a need for intrinsic motivational constructs in achieving more complex tasks. Although researchers in music education have applied this conceptual framework to their research in instrumental ensembles (Schmitt, 2005; Sheldon, 1994; Austin, 1992, and 1988), gaps in research examining the effects of competition on motivation orientations and self-concept of secondary choral music students remain.

*Choral Curriculum Development*

Research examining the structure of choral curriculum in competitive and non-competitive choral programs is also needed. A systems or activities approach to music curriculum development is often used to develop musicianship skills as opposed to a conceptual or content approach (Labuta & Smith, 1997). Current learning theory suggests that a conceptual approach to music curriculum development is superior for meaningful student learning (Austin, 1998; Ormrod, 2004; Taetle & Cutietta, 2002). Research examining the curricular structure of both competitive and noncompetitive choral programs could be invaluable to the field.
Competition and Choral Music Assessment

Research is needed to determine if there is a relationship between curricular preparation for competition and the types and amount of assessments that occur in public school choral classrooms. In order to effectively assess student learning in music, authentic assessments, both cognitive and psychomotor, must take place as a part of the instructional process (Asmus, 1999; Boyle & Radocy, 1987; Oosterhof, 2001). Due to the structure of choral music classes coupled with the need for individual student assessments, this continues to be difficult for choral music educators (Fisher, 2008; Kenan-Takagi, 2000; McCoy, 1991; Niebur, 1994). Empirical data is needed to determine if using class time to prepare for choir competitions compounds this already challenging situation.

Qualitative Studies

In combination with changes in compilation procedures and additional quantitative research designs, validation of quantitative data will require supportive qualitative data to bridge the current research gap. Acquiring this form of information will necessitate detailed observations and carefully designed interviews with personnel involved in various forms and degrees of music competition (e.g., show choir vs. concert choir, mutually exclusive vs. individualistic goal structures, curricular vs. extracurricular, etc.). A study investigating the phenomenon of social identity in high school choral music students, educators, and the perceived identity of public high school as it relates to choir competition could further contribute to this line of inquiry. Qualitative techniques utilized in comparative case study research would facilitate such investigation.
Filling the choral competition research void will involve experimental, causal-comparative, and case study research designs, similar to those previously described; purpose statements and research questions will consist of viable queries associated with the effects of competition on the self-concept, musical achievement, attitudes, motivation, classroom environment, social identity, and the curricular and comprehensive musicianship development of choral music students. Such inquiry could aid in providing the required data to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of this complex and controversial issue.

**Conclusion**

Societal structure and pressures continue to influence the curricular decisions of educators and administrators in teaching institutions. Structuring meaningful and educative curricular experiences, as defined by John Dewey, involves a clear sense of purpose, direction, opportunity for growth, and continuity. Research findings offer some insight into competitive choral curricular experiences in terms of meeting the aforementioned criteria. The direction in which educational experiences guide student learning is a fundamental principle of skillful instruction; all significant educational decisions require philosophical justification based on research knowledge, educational experience, and meaningful self-reflection. Spending class time preparing for music competitions is a consequential curricular choice with potential effects on both the utilitarian and aesthetic nature of educative choral experiences. Despite many attempts to provide conclusive data regarding the psychological, physiological, and educational (both general and musical) effects of competition, further philosophical discussion must take place and additional empirical data should be collected. Continued contemplative and philosophical deliberation on this dilemma via formal inquiry will facilitate needed
advocacy for academic music curriculum development and meaningful student learning in public school choral programs.
REFERENCES


APPENDIX A

Questionnaire Cover Letter
Competition Choral Curriculum Questionnaire
(CCCQ)
Indiana Choral Music Educator,

A research study is being conducted through Ball State University involving the secondary choral music educators in the state of Indiana. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between competition and the curricular practices of choral music educators. The results of this study will offer research-based knowledge providing needed philosophical support for music in the public school curriculum.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please click on the following link: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=g5Yn59DVONLVolOVKulB1g_3d_3d

Please answer the 10 questions and submit by May 20, 2009. The survey will take approximately five minutes to complete. If you have any questions regarding this inquiry, please feel free to respond to this e-mail and I would be happy to answer them.

Your consideration of participation is greatly appreciated!

**Principal Investigator**
Greg Johnson  
MM Student  
Ball State University  
Choral Music Educator  
Fishers High School  
gjohnson@hse.k12.in.us

**Faculty Advisor**
Dr. Don Ester  
Professor & Coordinator of Music Education  
Ball State University  
Muncie, IN 47306  
765-285-5406  
dester@bsu.edu
### II. Curricular Practices

Please answer the following questions by clicking the box that corresponds to how often you involved the students in your MOST ADVANCED CHORAL ENSEMBLE in the given activities this semester (January-May, 2009).

2. The percentage of rehearsal time spent in my most advanced choral ensemble on the following styles of music this semester was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Style</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical/Concert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Jazz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual/Gospel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify Below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 

3. I involved the students in my most advanced choral ensemble in the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice this semester</th>
<th>3-6 times this semester</th>
<th>7-11 times this semester</th>
<th>12-17 times this semester</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing Instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating other performing ensembles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 

4. I engaged the students in my most advanced choral ensemble in cross-curricular discussions during rehearsal involving:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice this semester</th>
<th>3-6 times this semester</th>
<th>7-11 times this semester</th>
<th>12-17 times this semester</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Anatomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Dance Styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
5. I had the students in my most advanced choral ensemble read and/or notate in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Notate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Meter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. 2/4, 3/4, 4/4, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound Meter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. 6/8, 9/8, 12/8, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Keys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Keys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The average percentage of rehearsal time spent during the regular school day (NOT including time outside of class) on choreography in my most advanced choral ensemble this semester was:

- none
- 1-20%
- 21-40%
- 41-60%
- 61-80%
- 81-100%

Indicate additional activities that take place during your choral rehearsals.
III. School Demographics

Please answer the following questions regarding the demographics of your school and the structure of your music curriculum.

7. Indicate the grade levels YOU teach and YOUR school size (please answer for either Junior High OR High school, NOT both).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of my Junior High School is:</th>
<th>Less than 100 students</th>
<th>100-499 students</th>
<th>500-999 students</th>
<th>1000-1499 students</th>
<th>1500-2000 students</th>
<th>More than 2000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The size of my High School is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The size of my choral program is:

- [ ] Less than 50 students
- [ ] 50-99 students
- [ ] 100-149 students
- [ ] 150-199 students
- [ ] 200-250 students
- [ ] More than 250 students

9. The average percentage of rehearsal time spent during the regular school day (NOT including time outside of class) on preparation for choir events in which my most advanced group competed against other choral ensembles this semester was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive Concert Choir Events</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>1-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Show Choir Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

10. If there is a competitive marching band program, when do they rehearse?

- [ ] Our music curriculum does not include competitive marching band.
- [ ] The marching band rehearses during the regular school day.
- [ ] The marching band rehearses before/after school.
- [ ] The marching band rehearses both during the school day and before/after school.

Comments:
APPENDIX B

Item Validity Rubric
ITEM VALIDITY

For each item below, review the item and indicate its level of acceptability by circling the appropriate rating, 1 for acceptable to 3 for unacceptable.

For evaluation criteria, consider a) general clarity, and b) the extent to which each item pertains to the variable of interest (title of the tool).

For example, item “Smt” is asking how much time is spent in advanced choral classes on reading in simple meter. The item is acceptable if 1) it is clearly written and understandable, and 2) it is clearly related to the focus of the tool (as identified by the title).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Practice</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Concert</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Jazz</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual/Gospel</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>1f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td>1g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Practice</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing Instruments</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Listening</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>2e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating other choral ensembles</td>
<td>2f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Practice</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Anatomy</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustics</td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture</td>
<td>3e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>3f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Dance Styles</td>
<td>3g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>3h</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Practice</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Simple Meter</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Compound Meter</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Major</td>
<td>4c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Minor</td>
<td>4d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Simple Meter</td>
<td>4e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Compound Meter</td>
<td>4f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Major</td>
<td>4g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notating in Minor</td>
<td>4h</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Demographics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral Program Size</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>5c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choreography</td>
<td>5d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marching Band</td>
<td>5e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Individual Validity Ratings of the CCCQ
I. Instructions

Directions on how to fill out the questionnaire were clearly written and understandable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th>Judge 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Curricular Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th>Judge 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question #2 | Question is clear/ understandable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question is related to the curricular practices of choral music educators | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question #3 | Question is clear/ understandable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question is related to the curricular practices of choral music educators | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question #4 | Question is clear/ understandable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question is related to the curricular practices of choral music educators | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question #5 | Question is clear/ understandable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question is related to the curricular practices of choral music educators | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question #6 | Question is clear and understandable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question is related to the curricular practices of choral music educators | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.33 |

III. Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th>Judge 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question #7 | Question is clear and understandable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question is related to demographics of structure of choral programs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question #8 | Question is clear and understandable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question is related to demographics of structure of choral programs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question #9 | Question is clear and understandable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question is related to demographics of structure of choral programs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Question #10 | Question is clear and understandable | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.33 |
| Question is related to demographics of structure of choral programs | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1.67 |

Grand Mean 1.07
APPENDIX D

Protecting Human Subjects (NIH Tutorial)
Certificate of Completion
Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that Greg Johnson successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course “Protecting Human Research Participants”.

Date of completion: 06/11/2008

Certification Number: 47274
APPENDIX E

IRB Application Form
HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH APPLICATION

Protocol title: Examining the Relationship Between Competition and the Curricular Practices of Choral Music Educators

Proposed project dates: begin: 3/15/09 end: 12/15/09

Principal Investigator: Greg Johnson E-mail: gjohnson@hse.k12.in.us
Department: Music Education Telephone: (765) 716-4068
(check all that apply) ☐ Faculty/Staff ☑ Graduate student ☐ Undergraduate student ☐ Unaffiliated
(If the PI is a student researcher or not affiliated with Ball State University, a Faculty Sponsor must be listed below.)
Faculty Sponsor: Don Ester PhD E-mail: dester@bsu.edu

To comply with the federally-mandated educational requirement, you (and all Key Personnel for this project – including the faculty advisor/sponsor) must have completed the online tutorial on the protection of human subjects. A copy of the computer-generated certificate indicating your successful completion of this tutorial must either be uploaded with this application or be on record in the Office of Academic Research and Sponsored Programs.

Have you and all Key Personnel completed this online tutorial? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Principal Investigator Assurance Statement

I have read and understand Ball State University’s “Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research” as stated in the Faculty and Professional Personnel Handbook, and I agree:

a) to accept responsibility for the scientific and ethical conduct of this research study,
b) to obtain IRB approval prior to revising or altering the research protocol or the approved Informed Consent text, and
c) to report immediately to the IRB any serious adverse events and/or unanticipated problems which occur as a result of this study.

The Principal Investigator must electronically sign this study prior to submitting the protocol to the IRB for review. When you sign this study as the Principal Investigator, you are also agreeing to the terms in the Principal Investigator Assurance Statement above.
Faculty Sponsor Assurance Statement
As the Faculty Sponsor for this study, I certify that I have reviewed this protocol and affirm the merit of this research project and the competency of the investigator(s) to conduct the project. My involvement in this study is as follows (check one option):

☐ I will be involved in this project. My name is listed and my responsibilities (described in the Key Personnel section) include supervision and oversight of this project.

☐ I will be involved in this project. My name is listed and my responsibilities (described in the Key Personnel section) in this project are limited (e.g., data analysis only). I affirm that this investigator has the competency to conduct this research study without my supervision or that of any other faculty or staff member of Ball State University.

☐ I will not be involved in any aspect of this project (including data collection). However, I have reviewed this protocol and the investigator’s research experience and expertise. I affirm that this investigator has the competency to conduct this research study without my supervision or that of any other faculty or staff member of Ball State University.

A Faculty Sponsor must electronically sign this study for all student research projects and for all persons not affiliated with Ball State University before the protocol is submitted to the IRB for review. When you sign this study as the Faculty Sponsor, you are also agreeing to the terms in the Faculty Sponsor Assurance Statement above and accepting responsibility for ensuring that the terms of the Principal Investigator Assurance Statement are met.

Key Personnel
List all persons, other than the PI, who will have a role in the research project (refer to an attachment if necessary):

Name: Don Ester PhD
Department: Music Education
Responsibilities: Faculty Advisor/Sponsor

Name: 
Department: 
Responsibilities: 

Name: 
Department: 
Responsibilities: 

Name: 
Department: 
Responsibilities:
Subject Population

Check all categories that apply to the subjects:

☐ Cognitively impaired  ☐ Pregnant women
☐ Minors (individual under age 18 years)  ☐ Prisoners
☒ Normal healthy volunteers  ☐ Students
☐ Patients/clients  ☐ Student athletes
☐ Other, explain: ____________________________

Will information pertaining to the research be withheld from subjects (incomplete disclosure/deception)?  ○ Yes  ☐ No
If yes, for what purpose? ____________________________

List the location(s) where the research will be conducted:  Questionnaire (Online)
Observations: 5 Public High School

If advertisements will be used to recruit subjects, indicate the format(s) to be used:

☐ Flyer  ☐ Radio
☐ Newspaper  ☐ Television (e.g., public access channel)
☒ Electronic media, describe:  E-mail
☐ Other, describe: ____________________________

Collaborators and Permissions

If any part of the research is to be conducted at another institution with a collaborator, provide the following information for the research collaborator:

Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
E-mail: ____________________________ Telephone: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
APPENDIX F

Consent Form
Consent Form for Thesis Research Project

“Examining the Relationship between Competition and the Curricular Practices of Choral Music Educators”

Greg Johnson, Masters Student
Department of Music Education
Ball State University
Spring 2009

Purpose of the Study

Due to current research gaps, the purpose of this inquiry is to study the relationship between competition and the curricular practices of secondary public school choral music educators. Specifically, the researcher will look at both show choir and concert choir competition to determine correlations with comprehensive music curricula as established in the nine national standards for music education. Ideally, this investigation will result in findings that will elicit future research on this topic and contribute a new thread of research to the field of music education.

Procedure

You will be invited to complete an online questionnaire requesting demographic data and information regarding curricular practices in your choral classroom. The survey will take approximately five minutes.

Respect for Persons

Participation in this study is voluntary. You will not be included in the study without your informed consent. Consent may be withdrawn at any time without penalty or loss of benefits gained from the study.

Benefits and Risks

The personal risk associated with this study is minimal. You may choose not to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable. Once you complete the survey, no further involvement associated with this investigation will be required.

Confidentiality

In an effort to protect the privacy of you and your school, your name will not be reported in the project. Due to the online nature of the survey, the researcher will be unaware of your identity.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the following:
Research Compliance, Sponsored Programs Office,
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
(765) 285-5070
irb@bsu.edu
I agree to participate in the research project entitled “Examining the Relationship between Competition and the Curricular Practices of Choral Music Educators”. I have read the description of this project and give my consent to participate. I understand that I can print a copy of this informed consent form to keep for future reference.

**Principal Investigator**
Greg Johnson
Masters Student
Ball State University
gsjohnson@bsu.edu

Choral Music Educator
Fishers High School
(office) F118
Fishers, IN 46038
765.716.4068
gjohnson@hse.k12.in.us

**Faculty Advisor**
Dr. Don P. Ester
Professor & Coordinator of Music Education
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
765.285.5406
dester@bsu.edu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 3-5</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
<th>Summated Scores: Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-2/sem</td>
<td>3-6/sem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 2, 6, 9</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7n</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>100-499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>51-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8n</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cur. SC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7/8</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Vocal Jazz</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Playing</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Improv</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>Eval Others</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Accoustics</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>History/Culture</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>History of Dance</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5ar</td>
<td>Read Simple</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5br</td>
<td>Read Compound</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5cr</td>
<td>Read Major</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5dr</td>
<td>Read Minor</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5an</td>
<td>Notate Simple</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5bn</td>
<td>Notate Compound</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5cn</td>
<td>Notate Major</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5dn</td>
<td>Notate Minor</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>Choreo</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum Cur</td>
<td>Summated Curr.</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>SUM 2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum MA</td>
<td>Summated Musical Activites</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>SUM 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum CC</td>
<td>Summated Cross Curricular Score</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>SUM 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum ML</td>
<td>Summated Music Literacy Score</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>SUM 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1 through 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7n</td>
<td>JH/HS</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>Program Size</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>1 through 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7\8</td>
<td>Program/School Size</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>CC Comp</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>SC Comp</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>Comp?</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-</td>
<td>Marching Band</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, or 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>