

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTRUCTOR AND
INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND THE CONCERT REPORT
ASSIGNMENT IN MUSIC IN GENERAL STUDIES COURSES IN THE
UNITED STATES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

KIRSTEN FEDJE UNDERWOOD

Norman, Oklahoma

2012

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTRUCTOR AND
INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND THE CONCERT REPORT
ASSIGNMENT IN MUSIC IN GENERAL STUDIES COURSES IN THE
UNITED STATES

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
SCHOOL OF MUSIC

BY

Dr. Irvin Wagner, Co-Chair

Dr. Charlene Dell

Dr. Paula Conlon

Dr. David Tan

Dr. William Wakefield

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Charlene Dell and Dr. Irvin Wagner for their continued and unwavering support of this project.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables.....	viii
Abstract	x
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Describing Concert Attendance	1
Need for the Study.....	5
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	7
Value of the Study.....	8
Definitions.....	8
Chapter 2 Review of Related Literature.....	10
Music Vocabulary	10
What Language Reveals about Music	10
The Use of Language to Describe Music	13
Writing	20
Writing about Music.....	20
Writing in Non-music Settings.....	22
MGS Course Content	31
Concert Attendance and Reports.....	33
Summary of Related Literature and Implications for the Current Study	38
Chapter 3 Method.....	43

Participants	43
Instrumentation.....	44
Procedures	47
Participant Demographics	47
Institutional Characteristics.....	49
Instructor Characteristics.....	52
Data Analysis	54
Chapter 4 Results	59
Findings: Instructor Practices and Attitudes Regarding the Concert Report	60
Research Question 1	65
Findings: The Role of the Concert Report in MGS Courses.....	67
Research Question 2.....	71
Findings: The Writing Process and the Concert Report.....	72
Research Question 3	77
Findings: Research Question 4.....	81
Findings: Qualitative Results for Open-ended Question # 27.....	86
Summary of the Results	93
Chapter 5 Conclusions	96
Summary	96
Demographic Results	98
Research Question 1	100
MGS Instructor Practices	100
Research Question 2.....	102

The Role of the Concert Report	103
Research Question 3	104
The Writing Process	105
Research Question 4 and Student Learning	107
Qualitative Results	109
Implications	110
Limitations	111
Recommendations for Further Research	112
References	114
Appendix A Concert Report Survey	122
Appendix B Email Text Containing Survey Link	135
Appendix C IRB Approval Letter	137
Appendix D CMS Project Approval Letter	140
Appendix E Unedited Responses to Open-ended Question #27	141

List of Tables

Table 1 Regional Distribution of Respondents	49
Table 2 Institutional Categories	50
Table 3 Institutional Enrollments	50
Table 4 Single Section Music in General Studies Class Size	51
Table 5 Educational Preparation of Instructors	52
Table 6 College Teaching Experience	53
Table 7 Music in General Studies Teaching Experience	54
Table 8 Number of Concert Reports Required per Semester	60
Table 9 Number of Pages Required for Concert Report	61
Table 10 Time Spent Grading a Single Concert Report.....	62
Table 11 Overall Concert Report Content.....	63
Table 12 Areas Addressed by the Concert Report	64
Table 13 Number of Concert Reports Assigned based on Institution Type.....	66
Table 14 Concert Report Due Dates based on Institution Type.....	67
Table 15 Proportion of Final Grade	68
Table 16 The Role of the Concert Report	70
Table 17 Importance of the Concert Report Reflecting Concepts Covered in Class	71
Table 18 Verification of Attendance based on Instructor Status	72
Table 19 Use of Guidelines	73
Table 20 Additional Writing Activities.....	75
Table 21 Writing Mechanics	76
Table 22 Instructor Knowledge of Common Grading Rubric Usage.....	78

Table 23 Instructor Knowledge of English/Composition Pre-requisite	78
Table 24 Re-writes Based on Teaching Experience.....	79
Table 25 Re-writes and Institutional Enrollment	80
Table 26 Regional Use of Critiqued Drafts.....	80
Table 27 Rotated Factor Matrix ^a	83
Table 28 Qualitative Responses to Question #27.....	88
Table 29 Alternative Respondent Uses of Qualitative Response Question #27	89

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between institutional and instructor characteristics and the assignment of the concert report within American college music in general studies courses. Four research questions were addressed: (1) Do significant differences exist in instructor practices regarding the assignment of, and attitudes towards the concert report when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics? (2) Do significant differences exist in the role the concert report plays in MGS courses when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics? (3) Do significant differences exist in writing pedagogy, writing preparations, and the use of guides for writing the concert report when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics? (4) According to instructors, what dimensions of student learning are reflected in the concert report?

Data were collected using a researcher-designed questionnaire, consisting of three parts and 43 items, resulting in 182 sub-items. Participants responded online via SurveyMonkey.com. A population of 256 MGS instructors answered the survey questions. The largest number of respondents were full professors with a doctoral degree whose teaching load was made up of 25% or less MGS courses, from small public undergraduate and graduate institutions in the North Central and Southern regions of the country. The largest number of instructors had over 25 years of overall teaching experience, and 10-14 years experience teaching MGS.

Overall results indicate MGS instructors' expectations for and attitudes about the concert report were more similar than dissimilar. The most important areas addressed by the concert report were the improvement of listening skills, promoting

aesthetic awareness, and building future audiences. Instructors assigned an average of two concert reports per semester, most frequently requiring them to be two pages in length.

Very few significant differences were found based on region, and instructor and institutional characteristics. A significant difference was found between type of institution and number of pages expected for the concert report. Full- or part-time status created a significant difference in whether or not the concert report was meant only to verify concert attendance, and whether or not there was a common grading rubric. A significant difference in the use of re-writes was found based on years of teaching experience and institutional enrollment. A significant difference was found in the use of critiqued drafts when compared by region.

Factor analysis revealed three dimensions of student learning: applied analysis, affective development, and critical evaluation. Qualitative analysis of open-ended response data supported survey findings. Due to the small size of the sample, the results of the study were not generalizable. However, the results provide a baseline of information about the concert report previously unavailable to instructors interested in this assignment in college level MGS courses.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Describing Concert Attendance

Attendance at concerts provides benefits to the listener. When compared to listening alone, the visual experience of classical music may allow students to concentrate longer, and may help inexperienced listeners match sounds and sights more confidently (Geringer, Cassidy & Byo, 1997). The inexperienced listener responds positively to the concert experience (Sims & Kuhn, 1993), but is not conversant with sufficient vocabulary to describe what has been heard (Flowers, 1983b).

The art of describing music is challenging. Often, well known composers feel that words are not necessary for the achievement of a true understanding of their music. Music confirms or creates a mood that may or may not have been intended by the composer (Kivy, 1989). In a letter to Mendelssohn, Souchay assigned specific meanings to the *Songs without Words*. Mendelssohn's response included the statement, "words remain ambiguous, but we both understand the music properly" (Strunk, 1998, p. 1201). Similarly, Schumann made the following assertion about his own music criticism journal in 1836: "the best way to talk about music is to be quiet about it" (Treitler, 1997, p. 26). The reader is reminded that Schumann did not subsequently follow that advice, indicative of the difficulty faced when discussing music (Treitler, 1997).

These statements presuppose that in some way, music transcends words. Reimer (2003) feels that musical meanings are unavailable through language. The understanding of a musical work may not be entirely demonstrated in written

description or analysis. Elliott (1995) argues that verbal abstractions about music should serve mainly as supplementary material, and that involvement in some kind of music making is what allows for the full understanding of music. Yet, large numbers of students in music in general studies (MGS) courses are assigned to attend local concerts and write about their music listening experiences, so it would be important to study how they are led as critical writers (Hoger, 1993), and how they subsequently develop their use of vocabulary for describing music. The contemporary name for a writing assignment describing a concert experience is the concert report.

There are many additional issues involved in the description of music. Cultural background can form the perspective from which music is explained, described and understood. Musical taste is based upon a cultural framework. Within this framework, the range of musical vocabulary utilized for the discussion of music spans technical, emotional, autobiographical, biographical, metaphorical and historical areas. Writing about music may require a specific, culturally shared vocabulary (Kivy, 1989; Krumhansl, 1990; Morrison & Cheung, 1999; Natvig, 2002; Spitzer, 2004). The words available to the listener describing music depend upon upbringing, experience and environment.

Understanding the distinction between the novice and expert listener clarifies the differing roles words acquire when they are used to communicate about music. There is a difference between what musicians and non-musicians hear and process (Flowers, 1983a; Johnson, 1996; Misenhelter & Price, 2001; Wolpert, 2000). Listener perceptions also vary depending upon educational level, background and age. Older listeners for example, regardless of their experience with music, use more categories of

description and blend more related language (Flowers, 2003; Hair, 1981; Johnson, 1996; Sheldon & Gregory, 1997). Musical experience and frames of reference influence what is discerned.

Novice and expert music listeners also write differently about music. Newcomers can write more interesting musical descriptions than veterans by virtue of their naiveté. Due to training, formal structure is often at the heart of the expert listener's commentary, while the novice relies upon refreshingly unexpected relationships and depictions (Subotnik, 1996). Contemporary music philosopher Kivy remarks:

Description of music is in a way unique. When it is understandable to the non-musician, it is cried down as nonsense by the contemporary musician. And when the musician or musical scholar turn their hands to it these days, likely as not the non-musician finds it as mysterious as the Cabala, and about as interesting as a treatise on sewage disposal. (Kivy, 1980, p. 3)

Kivy expresses both sides of this dichotomy, exposing differences in value assigned to novice and expert approaches to writing about music.

Some scholars contend however that writing can advance musical understanding. One pedagogical reason to assign the concert report is that the actual process of writing, in spite of its difficulty, can allow writers to discover what they know and do not know. The writer translates mental images into language, and through that process, learns the subject at hand (Larsen & Merrion, 1987; Ziegler, 1981; Zinsser, 1988). As an author and amateur pianist, Zinsser (1988) discovered that learning how to write clearly about music, "an art form that the reader can never see or hear, one that

evaporates with the playing of every note” (p. 213), improved the author’s musicianship. Through a discussion of composers/critics Thomson and Sessions, Zinsser demonstrated the actual work, or effort, involved in both writing and composing was quite important, and could in fact yield similarly inspiring results (Zinsser, 1988). If musicians and composers can grow through writing, perhaps the novice can as well.

It can be a formidable task to write about even commonplace daily listening experiences, but this demanding process can be both worthwhile and effective (Pederson, 1995). To aid in this potentially difficult activity, writing across the curriculum (WAC) authors have identified thoroughly foreseeable forms of behavior that novice writers who are writing in an exotic field exhibit, and have formulated strategies for responding to these behaviors through WAC programs (Williams & Colomb, 1990; Young & Fulwiler, 1986).

Authors have provided varying levels of advice on how to write about music (Bellman, 2000; DiYanni, (1980); Wingell, 1997). Textbooks sometimes supply accompanying concert going guides. Research has not been conducted to discover how much these materials are used, or if they are helpful.

With this wide range of perspectives it is clear there is no reason to assume a unified theoretical framework from which to embark upon a study to determine the effectiveness of the concert report in the undergraduate music in generals studies curriculum. It would be helpful to first conduct a basic study of actual practices among instructors, in relation to regional and institutional characteristics.

Need for the Study

Teaching music to non-music majors can be like teaching the important aspects of a book to a class who cannot read (Kivy, 1993). The *NASM 2011-2012 Handbook* contains guidelines for music in general education and for the training of the professional musician. “Since almost all musicians serve as teachers, attention should be given to developing appropriate pedagogical techniques for discovering new ways of understanding and introducing music” (NASM, 2011, p. 191). Controversy exists about how to accomplish this goal. Bullard (1996), during the *Eastman Colloquium on Teaching Music as a Liberal Art*, suggested, “college teaching methods should evolve beyond the familiar verbal description of pieces, diagrammatic analysis, and disc jockeying” (Bullard, 1996, p. 4). At the same meeting, Levy expressed the idea that active listening was most important, while “the learning of facts and dates, historical sequences, and the like is completely unimportant” (Levy, 1996, p. 12). A general music specialist suggested the most skillful ‘music appreciation’ instructors have learned to develop students’ listening skills with the least amount of reference to notation or terminology (Schwartz, 1984). Within the guidelines prescribed by NASM, different views about instruction in music pertinent to the writing of the concert report exist, but no one has inquired about these differences.

During the 1980’s, NASM, in conjunction with the College Music Society (CMS), embarked upon a series of projects on the subject of music in general studies courses (MGS) in higher education. Surveys distributed to music units in 1982 and 1989 focused on academic music courses and the instructors who taught them, performance options for non-music majors, and general policies about MGS courses.

The 1989 survey report revealed that among respondents, 73% of music units required concert attendance in MGS courses (College Music Society, 1989, p. 39). The 1982 and 1989 NASM survey instruments investigated concert attendance as a course requirement, but did not survey whether or not respondents assigned papers or summaries of concert experiences. Respondents to these surveys mentioned writing assignments as a category in which a change had been made (College Music Society, 1989, p. 43), and journal writing as well as collaborative papers were listed as innovative projects (College Music Society, 1989, p. 61). However, no further details about those assignments were provided. No details about writing of any kind were addressed in these surveys, and since that time NASM/CMS has not investigated writing in MGS courses.

Flowers (1983a), Cassidy and Speer (1990), and Sims and Kuhn (1993) conducted studies specific to the concert report. Researchers found that when writing about a concert experience, college students tended to write general descriptions, more than technical ones. Instruction in musical terminology prior to concert attendance increased students' use of that vocabulary (Flowers, 1983a). Aspects of concert attendance behavior, and the effects of that attendance on college students' attitudes were also studied (Flowers, 1983b; Sims & Kuhn, 1993). How undergraduates verbalize what is heard in music has been investigated (Cassidy and Speer, 1990; Ellis, 1999; Flowers 1983b; Flowers, 2003; Hair, 1981; Zalanowski, 1990). What have not been investigated are common expectations among those instructors who assign the concert report.

In 1998, 41% of higher education music program resources were committed to teaching non-music majors, students whose main association with music was as “active listeners” (Seaton, 1998, p. 2). Yet, aside from the studies conducted in 1983, 1990 and 1993, and the NASM/CMS 1982 and 1989 surveys, no current research delineates common practice regarding the use of the concert report, a written demonstration of non-music major student learning, in higher education music units. Recent studies have not explored instructor expectations for the concert report. Whether or not instructor, institutional, and regional characteristics interact with those expectations has not been surveyed. A baseline study is needed to describe who is using the concert report, what the concert report is expected to contain, and how regional and institutional characteristics, as well as instructor demographics, may relate to those factors.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between institutional and instructor characteristics and the assignment of the concert report within college MGS courses. The demographic features of instructors and their current teaching institutions were surveyed. This researcher-designed survey also investigated instructor preferences and attitudes about the content of the concert report. Data were analyzed to determine any relationships, revealing current practices among respondents in relation to their regional and institutional characteristics.

Research Questions

1. Do significant differences exist in instructor practices regarding the assignment of, and attitudes towards the concert report when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics?

2. Do significant differences exist in the role the concert report plays in MGS courses when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics?
3. Do significant differences exist in writing pedagogy, writing preparations, and the use of guides for writing the concert report when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics?
4. According to instructors, what dimensions of student learning are reflected in the concert report?

Value of the Study

MGS instructors in higher education, graduate students contemplating future employment in the field of MGS, Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) instructors, textbook publishing company staff that compile accompanying ancillary materials, and secondary school music teachers may find the results of this study valuable. Upon completion of the analysis of data, current and potential MGS instructors will be able to learn what their peers at different institutions expect from the concert report. WAC instructors will find out how much their resources are being used by MGS instructors. Textbook publishing staff will be apprised of how much their ancillary materials are used. Secondary school music appreciation teachers will be able to compare their current practices with what their university associates do. Further research can be undertaken to expand upon the results.

Definitions

College Music Society (CMS): a consortium of college, conservatory, university and independent musicians and scholars interested in all disciplines of music (CMS, 2011).

Concert report: a written summary of a live concert experience.

Continuous Response Digital Interface (CRDI): a researcher devised instrument developed at Florida State University in 1989 and used to measure ongoing and changing responses while people are listening to music (Gregory, 1995).

Music in General Studies (MGS): a disciplinary area established by CMS that concentrates on introductory survey courses in music.

National Association of Schools of Music (NASM): recognized by the United States Department of Education as the agency responsible for the accreditation of all music curricula in higher education (National Association of Schools of Music, 2011).

Writing across the curriculum (WAC): “an educational reform movement that has been promoting writing as a mode of learning and as an activity central to critical thinking in institutions of higher education since the early 1980s” (Bridgewater State University, 2010, para. 1).

Writing center: A university center with a “Writing Staff...committed to the success of campus and community writers throughout various stages of their writing projects, with primary emphasis on the development of student writers” (Bowling Green State University, 2012, para. 1).

Writing to learn (WTL): a writing process that can feature the followings steps: focus, research, draft, revise and edit (Zinsser, 1988).

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

Although a small amount of research was conducted on the concert report decades ago, very little research has been done of late. Therefore this review of related literature has focused on the building blocks of the concert report. Studies investigating the use of music vocabulary reveal the ways students use words when speaking or writing about music. Examples of other kinds of writing, such as journals and short answer questions, have emerged in music appreciation studies, and reveal the kinds of writing music in general studies (MGS) instructors have used. Because no research has actually concentrated on writing in MGS courses, studies on writing in non-music settings have furnished insights into the writing process. Two MGS studies that include surveys have also been important to review for question types in the current project. The few inquiries that specifically addressed the concert report have been reviewed for their procedures, conclusions, and what they suggest for further study.

Music Vocabulary

What Language Reveals about Music

Describing music is often an illusive and difficult task, even for musicians. An analysis of music criticism pinpoints some fundamental issues. Hoyer (1993) identified and analyzed seventy-five metacritical statements written over two centuries addressing what musicians perceive to be music criticism. Metacriticism was defined as an appraisal of the genre and rhetorical condition of criticism (p. 18). Hoyer described the history of the genre, the audiences and communities of music criticism, and its inherent pedagogical ideas. Field-specific writing pedagogy was analyzed in this study. The

researcher pointed out “the uniqueness of musical knowledge, practices, and communities does not exist apart from the rhetoric employed by musicians” (Hoger, 1993, p. 206). Three pedagogical models for music criticism were debated: talent, practice and models. Hoger asked, “are there identifiable pedagogies for discipline-specific discourse other than *immersion?*” (Hoger, 1993, p. 236). The researcher asserted that it was important to examine how students in introductory and music appreciation classes were guided as critical writers, because large numbers of them write responses to what they hear at concerts they must attend, or music they must listen to through recordings. Upon reviewing texts on teaching music, writing about music, and syllabi, it was clear to Hoger that little had been done that recognized writing’s role in shaping the musical content of assignments. Hoger notes that awareness of the relationships between the rhetorical and disciplinary traditions of a field of study gives direction and power to both instructors and to students who are concerned about discipline-specific writing.

Pederson (1995) and Walsh (2000) considered musicians’ self-awareness of reactions to listening experiences. Pederson (1995) studied daily music listening from a psychological perspective. Openness to the world and to the investigation of experience in the form of exact description is a presupposition of phenomenological psychology, as is the suspension of the researcher’s preconceptions and presuppositions. To minimize the bias of presuppositions, Pederson explains those presuppositions in a procedure known as bracketing (p. 58). As a participant observer, Pederson kept a journal of significant listening episodes that occurred during data collection, along with contemplation about those episodes. This qualitative project dealt exclusively with

descriptions of the music listening phenomena experienced by adults within the context of their daily lives. The two research questions explored how music listening was initiated, and then what the listener subsequently experienced. Six participants were selected with purposefully varying levels of musical training and/or background. Data were collected over seven days through participants' audio-journaling. After Pederson transcribed and studied participants' audio-journal entries, detailed interviews were conducted and audio taped. Participants also completed a demographic survey. Descriptive data analysis was conducted using Giorgi's 4-step method. First, protocol was obtained by blending journal and interview content. This protocol was then studied. Second, meaning units were formed. Third, psychological language was applied to the meaning units. Fourth, a summary of themes was completed using the converted meaning units (Pederson, 1995, p. 75). This study indicated that listening to music influenced physical and psychological activities, created transcendent experiences, influenced social existence, and facilitated intrapersonal growth.

Walsh (2000) investigated peak experiences while listening to or performing music. The researcher defined peak experience as "a state of hyper-focused awareness often including physical sensations and a sense of euphoria" (p. 4). This qualitative study followed the stages of heuristic methodology, a descriptive research technique that requires the researcher be immersed in the process and personal experience of the study (p. 27). The procedure consisted of initial engagement, immersion, incubation, illumination, explication and creative synthesis. Walsh interviewed five musicians about their peak experiences with music, and discovered that the musicians felt a difference in peak experience when listening as compared to when performing.

Listening to a live performance enhanced listening more than listening to a recording. Musicians felt the peak experience more when performing with others, and more still when performing in front of an audience instead of alone (p. 63). Four out five of the musicians identified non-verbal communication and cognition that transcends words and/or ideas in a spiritual manner as being important aspects of peak experience (Pederson, 1995).

Language reveals the musical experience. Research studies by Hoger (1993), Pederson (1995) and Walsh (2000) were concerned with the representative use of language rather than the technical use of terminology, and revealed that aesthetic and emotional responses are difficult to write about symbolically. Students express their aesthetic reactions to music in the concert report, and these studies demonstrate the kinds of struggles that may occur when students put their aesthetic responses in writing.

The Use of Language to Describe Music

The next group of studies investigated the use of music vocabulary in the classroom. Music as a discipline has its own language and semantic system (Hoger, 1993). The following investigations have looked at the teaching, learning and use of music vocabulary by different groups of students, and reflect the reasons it will be important to inquire about the vocabulary current MGS instructors expect their students to use.

Hair (1981) investigated the verbal identification of music concepts among children and college students. A group-listening test was administered to 226 children and 73 adults, the total number of participants (*N*) totaling 299. The children were randomly chosen from nine intact music classes, grades two through four, at an

elementary school. The adults were college students: 56 elementary education majors in an introductory music course, and 17 music education majors taking an elementary music-methods class. The children and music education majors participated in one 12-minute listening test during a regularly scheduled class, and the elementary education majors were tested at both the start and end of their course. The listening test was constructed so that the difficulty level increased over ten renditions. The melody was presented in the key of C as follows: normal using piano, loud, soft, fast, slow, one octave higher, one octave lower, sung, harmonized, in parallel minor, and with rhythmic change. Analysis of the data included t-tests, ANOVA, and Duncan's multiple range tests. Hair (1981) found that all subjects used terminology consistently when describing music concepts correctly. However, incorrect choices were not similar between children and adults; only one to five words were common to each group, from a range of 23 to 72 different words per item (Hair, p. 19). Children had more trouble with the following changes: octave higher, octave lower, sung, harmonized, minor and rhythmic change. Adults responded to the harmonized, minor and rhythmic changes with a lower percentage of traditional terms. Education majors used descriptive words at the beginning of the course, and more traditional terminology at the end. Musical training affects description of music perception, and different language skills are available to people at different age and educational levels. This is important to know because of the variety of experience students bring to a classroom.

Flowers (1983a) examined how differentiated instruction affected non-musicians' ability to hear and count changes in a musical excerpt. Subjects in music fundamentals and elementary music methods classes ($N = 124$) took pre- and post-test

procedures after listening to an excerpt from Stravinsky's *Petroushka Suite*. Between testing, four weeks of differentiated instruction were given to subjects randomly assigned to four groups. One group served as a contact control, one received instruction in vocabulary, one in listening, and one in vocabulary and listening. Pre- and post-test procedures were the same. Subjects listened to a cassette tape in a private study carrel and spoke the number of changes they heard into a microphone. Their voices were recorded onto a tape of the excerpt. Subjects then listened to the excerpt/voice tape and described what they heard in writing, stopping the tape as often as necessary. Flowers then studied each subjects' written response, totaling how many changes each subject had counted, how many musical elements each subject had referenced, and how many technical vocabulary words each subject had used to describe what they heard. The researcher created seven music element categories to analyze the number of elements referenced by subjects, and one point was given to each word used that fit into one of the categories. The total number of vocabulary words used by each subject was counted for whether they were correct or incorrect for the passage described. Pre-test data analysis revealed no significant differences between the four groups for any of these measures. There were no pre- and post-test differences found among groups for number of changes counted. A Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA indicated a significant difference among groups in pre- and post-test descriptions. Vocabulary and listening instruction resulted in significantly higher description post-test scores when compared to vocabulary only or contact control instruction between pre- and post-tests. Vocabulary only and vocabulary with listening groups showed a significant increase in total vocabulary between pre- and post-tests. Flowers found that using words to describe

music was more fluent when listening was combined with class work on music vocabulary. Different approaches to vocabulary instruction affect the type and correctness of words used to describe music in a listening exercise.

Flowers (1985) compared the written descriptions of music excerpts by graduate music students to that of undergraduate music majors. Twenty-two graduate and 15 undergraduate students in a Psychology of Music class listened to excerpts from Smetana, Nielsen, Bartok and Beethoven. Excerpts were divided into nine sections for ease of response, and students were asked to write about each excerpt. Specific writing instructions were not given, and students could write freely. Flowers counted the number of technical, nontechnical and extra-musical words/phrases utilized, and applied chi-square analyses to compare groups' use of those terms. Graduate and undergraduate students were both found to use fewer nontechnical and extra-musical than technical words. No significant differences were found between the number of any of the three types of terms used by graduates and undergraduates. However, while graduate students did not differ in how many technical terms they used, they used those terms more often. Flowers hypothesized from the results that graduate students use technical terms more frequently because they may be rewarded during their coursework for having a good command of this terminology. This study provides a useful snapshot of the comfort level of undergraduates and graduates writing about music.

Zalanowski (1990) studied the influence of learning styles and human physiology on writing or drawing in response to music. Subjects were 72 college non-music majors in psychology or introductory music courses. Hemisphere orientation, often known as thinking style, was determined through subjects' pre-testing using the

Herrmann Participant Survey Form. Thirty-six each of right and left-hemisphere oriented subjects chosen by the researcher from a pool of 300 participated in the study. Subjects were randomly assigned to visual representation, verbal description or control conditions. All subjects listened to a selection by Schumann. The visual representation group received instructions to follow the music and draw a picture, the verbal description group to write a descriptive paragraph, and the control group to describe the music in their minds only. In addition, subjects completed a survey constructed to measure appreciation that asked subjective questions about the listening experience using a Likert scale, and also asked for a description of any images experienced while listening. Zalanowski computed the means for answers to the survey and organized them by condition and hemisphere orientation. Two judges, the researcher and another music instructor rated subjects' drawings and verbal descriptions on a 10-point scale. Zalanowski found that left-hemisphere oriented subjects developed higher appreciation levels when asked to write about a musical work, and right-hemisphere oriented subjects did better when asked to draw representative pictures. This study informs the music educator of the differing learning styles presented by students.

Lychner (1998) looked for relationships between terminology and response to music. Equal numbers of music and non-music majors ($N = 256$) were randomly divided into three experimental groups and one control group. Each of the four groups listened to excerpts by composers Puccini, Bach, Beethoven and Sousa. In this study, a Continuous Response Digital Interface (CRDI) device was used. A CRDI device measures ongoing and changing responses while people are listening to music. Subjects were instructed to turn the dial of the CRDI in response to the excerpts. One group

manipulated the dial to match aesthetic responses to the excerpts, the second group to match felt emotional responses, and the third group to match perceived tension responses. The control group was instructed to manipulate the dial freely. The musical selections were presented in four different orders in an attempt to control for a possible order effect. A multivariate repeated measures analysis of variance indicated no significant difference between non-music and music majors' responses, the largest Wilks's lambda F value being $F(9,409.018) = 1.253$, accompanied by a reference value of $\alpha = .05$, of $F = 1.903$. Musical selections, order, and terms showed a significant triple interactive effect at $F(27,511.733) = 1.808$, with a reference value at $\alpha = .05$ of $F = 1.508$. Analysis of group graphs indicated a strong similarity between aesthetic-response and felt-emotional-response. The free-response condition was similar to the aesthetic and felt-emotional response conditions. The perceived tension condition showed differences to the other three conditions, but Lychner (1998) noted these distinctions among conditions could not be considered statistically significant. What could be concluded was that perceived tension in music from distinctive style periods produced diverse responses among subjects when compared to the aesthetic and emotional responses.

Morrison and Cheung (1999) studied preference and use of written descriptors in response to listening. Subjects ($N = 379$) were music education and non-music majors in a music elective course in the United States, Hong Kong, and the People's Republic of China. Subjects listened to nine musical selections representing Western and Chinese classical music and jazz, and indicated how much they liked or disliked the selection using a nine point Likert scale. Subjects also were asked to provide a written

response to each selection describing the reasons for each Likert response. A repeated measures ANOVA compared Likert response mean scores categorized in relation to region and major. Written descriptions were analyzed through a researcher-developed categorization process. A significant difference was found among responses to three musical styles, with American subjects preferring Western classical, jazz and then Chinese classical; Chinese subjects preferring Chinese classical, then Western classical, then jazz; and Hong Kong subjects preferring Western classical, Chinese classical and then jazz. American subjects used more analytical comments, while Hong Kong's students and Chinese subjects made more metaphorical comments. Morrison and Cheung found that each group of music majors from the different countries used more analytical comments than non-majors. Descriptive comments written in response to contrasting musical styles differ based on the cultural and educational background of the listener.

Ellis (1999) studied undergraduates' spoken responses about excerpts both before, and after, a music appreciation course. The purpose of the course was to develop skills in describing musical elements, identifying style periods, and naming musical excerpts from an assigned list. During the semester, students practiced describing music verbally in quizzes and in examinations. A small amount of time was dedicated to the historical background of musical works. Subjects ($N = 30$) were chosen randomly from two sections of the course, and were asked to verbally describe what they were hearing in a set of taped excerpts, both before the start of the course, and after completion of the course. Taped excerpts consisted of 16 examples from the four main Western classical style periods, and from American and multicultural popular

music traditions. None of the examples were studied during the course. Subjects' responses were recorded on tape and then transcribed. Pre- and post-test responses were organized into five categories: Musical - describing musical events; Affective - feelingful responses; Associative responses associated with non-musical events; Judgmental - evaluations and preferences; and Miscellaneous - other responses related to the task. Responses in the Musical category, the description of music, increased from pre-test to post-test, and there was a decline in post-test totals of affective, associative, and judgmental responses. Ellis found that the use of musical terms, and references to instruments of the orchestra, increased greatly. A music appreciation course causes students to focus less on the effects of music, or making judgments about music, and more on describing music. Inspiring a less feelingful response in favor of a more clinical reaction is not necessarily a desirable result of a music appreciation course (Ellis, 1999).

Writing

Writing about Music

Writing about music has been studied in the form of journals and short answer questions. Doebler (1995) examined an interesting instructional approach to music appreciation. The experimental strategy emphasized conducting, listening and journal writing using examples from both Western and non-Western music. Subjects ($N = 165$) were music appreciation students from three groups: three undergraduate classes, three high school classes and one junior high summer music camp class. Throughout the semester or summer, students wrote journal responses to instructor presentations, and each student conducted musical examples in front of the class. Analysis was based on

pre- and post-assessments of attitudinal and personal values, a count of the number of musical and affective comments in each of the first and last three journal entries of each student, and a count of positive and negative comments or constructive criticisms in the final journal entry of each student. Results showed a statistically significant increase in high school and college students' attitude towards, and personal value for music; junior high school students' results were not significant. High school and college students also showed a statistically significant increase in affective and musical comments between beginning three and ending three journal entries; again, junior high school student results were not significant. Seventy-five percent of the final journal entries as analyzed were positive, and 21% negative. Doebler concluded that journal writing could identify personal reactions in terms of Reimer's three levels of listening (as cited in Reimer, 1989) – sensuous, perceptual and creative. Doebler found journal writing was an effective technique that aided students' communicating their expressive reactions to music (Doebler, 1995).

Holloway (2001) explored cooperative action learning compared to the traditional lecture technique in college music appreciation classes. Subjects in three classes ($N = 88$) taught by different instructors in different states participated in a traditional lecture based on cooperative learning class. Cooperative action learning strategies included cooperative group work, hands-on activities, composition, directed listening, role-playing and listening assessment. A pre-post-test control group design was used. The Hevner Test for Musical Concepts was administered to all subjects as a pre-test at the beginning of the semester and as a post-test at the end. Holloway developed two student surveys. One established students' musical background and was

distributed at the beginning of the semester to all subjects. Another was distributed to the cooperative action learning subjects at the end of the semester and inquired about the effectiveness of this teaching approach. Holloway constructed 45 cooperative active learning lessons. Individual listening assessments included extensive subjective and objective short answer questions that were comprehensively discussed in class. Activities were designed to sequentially build knowledge of and experience with listening, vocabulary, musical style, composition and affective response. A multivariate repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted. The pre-post-test scores acted as the repeated measure, the Hevner listening achievement scores were the dependent variables, and the teaching method was the independent variable. Subjects who were taught using cooperative action strategies achieved significantly higher listening skill scores as measured by the Hevner Test for Musical Concepts, specifically on listening achievement of melody ($p < .009$), meter ($p < .001$) and timbre ($p < .001$). Eighty-three percent of students who experienced cooperative action strategies preferred this approach over a traditional lecture based class. Students responded positively to short writing assignments, as a part of a hands-on approach that included composition, group work and discussion.

Writing in Non-music Settings

Research devoted to writing in non-music course settings has yielded results in writing across the curriculum (WAC) areas, WAC being defined as “an educational reform movement that has been promoting writing as a mode of learning and as an activity central to critical thinking in institutions of higher education since the early 1980s” (Bridgewater State University, 2010). Research results have also been applied

to writing to learn (WTL) areas, WTL being defined as a writing process featuring focusing, researching, drafting, revising and editing (Zinsser, 1988). Studies by Johnson (1991), Murdick (1992), Davis (1996), Goss (1998), and Loud (1999), while not in music, inform the current investigation regarding the strategies necessary for teaching writing skills in other areas, and provide an understanding of similar writing skills used in writing concert reports. The application of WAC and WTL constructs has not been studied in the area of music.

Johnson (1991) studied the effect of essay writing on achievement in mathematics. The researcher used the pretest-post-test control group design. Form A of the Educational Testing Service's Algebra 1 test was used as the pretest, and Form B as the post-test. The study was conducted over a six-month time span, and involved four ninth grade Algebra I classes, two of which served as experimental groups (total = 37) and two of which as control groups (total = 31). Subjects did not know they were part of a study. It was hypothesized that treatment groups would experience increased achievement in mathematics as a result of the teacher-developed writing assignments. As the treatment, short-answer essay questions were designed to measure mathematical recall, cognitive processes, and comprehension processes. Specifically, the essays covered terms, concepts, processes, applications, and relationships of mathematical ideas. Treatment groups were given the opportunity to practice answering the essay questions before the test, while control groups did not engage in either practicing or writing test essays. Two teachers each had one treatment and one control class. The researcher trained the teachers in the use and meaning of essay writing in a mathematics course. For data analysis, an analysis of covariance was performed using the pretest as

the covariate and the post-test as the dependent variable. The control groups and treatment groups were independent variables. First, descriptive statistics of pre- and post-test scores were noted. Mean scores improved for both groups during the experiment. A test of equal variances was conducted on the pre-test mean scores, yielding a probability level of 0.099. This indicated the variances were not significantly different at the 0.05 level of significance. A *t* test on the pre-test mean scores ($p = 0.12$) demonstrated the group scores were not significantly different. The Test for Equal Slopes – ANCOVA was run, with a resulting *p* value of 0.90, indicating that the assumption of equal slopes was not violated. Because the regression lines for the individual groups were parallel, no interaction between the covariate (pre-test scores) and the treatment occurred. Johnson found the use of ANCOVA was appropriate, and an ANCOVA was conducted to compensate for initial differences on the pre-test. The significant main effect for Group demonstrated that the treatment and control means were statistically different. The treatment group's post-test scores were significantly better than those of the control group. The writing strategy positively affected the treatment group's achievement: understanding of mathematics profited from essay writing. Since the pretest means of the group were not significantly different, the ANCOVA did not create weighted post-test means. Another analysis was performed. An ANOVA was run using group and trial as independent variables, and the post-test scores as the dependent variable. The ANOVA indicated significant main effects for Group and Trial, with a significant Group x Trial interaction at the 0.05 level of significance. Both the treatment and control groups profited from instruction, but the

treatment group profited differentially more from the essay writing. This was shown by appreciable improvement in the post-test mean scores (Johnson, 1991).

Murdick (1992) investigated the value of writing to learn activities in college art history and studio art classes. This study was made up of two parts. The first part was a survey distributed to art instructors at 416 universities, constructed to identify and clarify what was important to teachers who use writing regularly. The first research hypothesis Murdick intended to test was that art instructors generally assign formal essays for examination purposes only (p. 154). The second part was a control-experimental group comparison study conducted in classes for students who were not art majors. This portion of the study would test WTL for its effect on content learning and on conceptual and procedural knowledge.

The first part of the study achieved non-generalizable results. There were 29 respondents to the survey, but because of the lack of research on writing in art classes, Murdick felt the survey results provided a foundation for further inquiries. Survey respondents assigned a large amount of writing to students. Discipline-specific elements were important to 59% of the respondents, and in regard to the evaluation of writing, 76% said that general rhetorical features were important; 45% found grammar and style important to evaluate. Murdick also asked about the writing process, inquiring into the use of models, multiple drafts of papers, criticism by peers, and instructor/student conferences. Multiple drafts were an element of the course for 48%, peer criticism for 14%, use of a Writing Center for 10%, and the use of elaborate handouts for 7%. In-class writing-to-learn was used by 55%, with out-of-class journals used by 31%.

The survey made up the first part of Murdick's study. The second part of the study used an experimental-control group comparison design. Two sections each of undergraduate Art Appreciation ($n = 39$ experimental, $n = 37$ control), Art History ($n = 30$ experimental, $n = 15$ control) and Introduction to Drawing ($n = 21$ experimental, $n = 15$ control) students served as convenience samples for the study. One of each class served as an experimental section that engaged in writing to learn activities, and one of each served as a control section that did not. Art appreciation students took pre- and post-test final exams consisting of fill-in-the-blank, slide identification, and multiple choice questions on art. The seven WTL activities were to write in response to a painting chosen by the teacher from a campus art show. In the art appreciation class, the experimental group scored four points lower than the control group on the post-test. Murdick pointed out that the control group started out with higher pre-test scores. Upon interviewing the instructor for the course, the researcher learned that the art appreciation control group consisted of upperclassmen and older, non-traditional students, and was one of the most intelligent groups of students the instructor had ever taught. Murdick considered this to be a factor when interpreting the results. The art history students took a pre- and post-test, and the researcher also used a part of the final examination as part of the post-test procedure, to determine consistency of results (p. 167). The art history tests used the same kinds of questions as the art appreciation tests, but with different content. The five WTL activities were the same as in art appreciation. In the art history class, the experimental group increased their post-test score 17.3 percentage points more than the control group did, which was a 45.4 percentage point increase versus the 28.1 percentage point increase of the control group. The introductory drawing class'

pre- and post-tests consisted of drawing similar charcoal still lifes at the beginning and end of the semester. Their WTL treatment was journal writing. In the introductory drawing class, the experimental group's post-test scores demonstrated they had learned more than the control group. The researcher interviewed the drawing instructors. The experimental group art teacher indicated that the journals revealed struggles students had had in applying drawing concepts that the instructor had not previously been aware of. Murdick designed this two-part study to serve as a prototype for instructor research in WTL. The investigation is also an ethnographic analysis of how the art teachers involved came to embrace WTL as a strategy to improve learning.

Davis (1996) examined the influence of writing activities on learning demonstrated by introductory statistics students. Using two classes of students each, the static-group comparison design was used. Students in the experimental group ($n = 16$) completed seven writing-to-learn assignments over 15 weeks, while the control group ($n = 24$) received lecture-based instruction without the writing assignments. Treatment subjects' writing assignments consisted of homework projects, due at the next class meeting, and called for calculating statistics, interpreting results and applying results to a prescribed audience. Post-tests consisting of two midterm examinations and a final examination reflecting course content were administered to both groups. The true mean score of the group who received writing instruction was higher than that of the group who did not receive such instruction. The writing-supplemented teaching strategy was effective in enhancing learning outcomes, indicated by the confidence interval constructed for the difference between the true mean overall scores (Davis, 1996, p. 51).

Additionally, regression results indicated that writing was beneficial to subjects with both high and low GPA's (Grade Point Averages).

Goss (1998) studied the effect of WTL strategies in undergraduate calculus. A writing component was added to an introductory course to discover if there was a relationship between writing and learning calculus. Subjects were two intact classes taught by the same instructor, one receiving the treatment ($n = 20$), expressive writing assignments, and one a control group ($n = 24$) that did not write. The researcher used the Nonequivalent Control Group Design by Campbell and Stanley. The independent variable was the expressive writing assignments. The dependent variable was academic achievement measured by a total end of semester score. The results of chapter tests, a final examination, and laboratory grades made up this score. The control and experimental groups discussed the same topics during class. The treatment group wrote about these topics, and the control group did not. American College Testing (ACT) verbal and mathematics scores served as covariates to remove possible initial differences between groups. Analysis of covariance was used to examine the data. There was no significant difference in academic achievement between the experimental and control groups. Goss found that nevertheless, the classroom transformed into an environment in which students engaged in the "construction of mathematical concepts" (p. 51), corroborating work by other mathematical writing scholars. Subjects were able to discuss mathematics in a more organized manner, and through the reading of subjects' written assignments, the instructor became more aware of their struggles to understand calculus.

Loud (1999) studied the effect of journal writing on both achievement and attitude in college mathematics. A quantitative comparative study was conducted, using as subjects students in three sections of an undergraduate mathematics course. Two sections ($n = 31$) taught by Loud wrote journals, while the third section ($n = 13$), taught by another member of the mathematics department, did not write journals. Each journal assignment consisted of constructing a weekly summary, analyzing problems, and discussing mathematical concepts. The summaries and discussions followed course content. Loud consulted another mathematics education professor to achieve content validity for the concept analysis assignments. The researcher constructed rubrics for scoring journal entries. All subjects completed an attitudes and beliefs survey at the beginning and end of the semester. The survey, journal scores, and final examination supplied the data for analysis. Subjects in the sections who wrote journals scored significantly higher on the final examination than subjects who did not. In order to ensure that different levels of mathematical abilities in the two groups did not explain the significant difference in final exam scores, Loud compared subjects' mathematics and verbal Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores using a one-factor ANOVA. The researcher found that mean SAT scores were actually lower for the journal writing sections than for the non-journal writing section. The differences between SAT scores were not statistically significant, but since non-journal writing subjects came into the class with higher abilities, and scored lower on the final examination, Loud contended the treatment effect may have been more significant (p. 77). The difference in final exam scores could not be explained by differences in mathematical skills, suggesting journal writing may have had an even more significant effect than the difference in

scores indicated. An Independent Samples T-test compared answers to survey questions between journal and non-journal writing sections. There was a difference in attitude toward memorization between sections: journal-writing sections exited the course with more confidence in memorization skills than did the section that did not write journals. Step-wise regressions were used to analyze relationships between final examination scores and attitudes and mathematical abilities and skills between sections. Final stepwise regression explained 75% of the variability in the end of semester examination scores using three variables: problem total score, concept analysis score, and change in affect score. Loud acknowledged limitations to the study. The results may have differed if the same instructor had taught both types of sections, if more or different concepts been included, and if different problems had been used. However, no prior studies had investigated a relationship between journal writing, attitudes towards mathematics, and mathematical achievement in a college course.

WTL has had a positive effect on college courses in mathematics and art. Johnson (1991) found that essay writing improved achievement in mathematics. Murdick (1992) revealed that essay and journal writing had improved student learning in art appreciation, art history and drawing classes. Davis (1996) found that WTL had a positive effect on learning in statistics courses. Goss (1998) demonstrated that expressive writing assignments positively influenced learning calculus, and Loud (1999) determined journal writing was influential in student learning of mathematics. Understanding the impact of both WAC and/or WTL activities in relation to the concert report informs the current study. No previous research has specifically investigated the use of WAC or WTL within music in general studies (MGS) courses.

MGS Course Content

The status of jazz/rock and music appreciation courses was investigated and provided an outline of instructional practice. Grandy (1988) surveyed MGS jazz and rock instructors. The sample consisted of 127 American college instructors randomly chosen from approximately 200 CMS members listed under the category of “Jazz History and Literature.” A response rate of 70% was attained. The purpose of the study was to identify instructor demographics, types of courses offered, teaching strategies, course objectives, and course content, and to secondarily develop a jazz course curriculum. Grandy analyzed responses and used descriptive statistics to demonstrate the results. Forty-eight percent of instructors surveyed held doctorates and 48% held master’s degrees. Sixteen percent of respondents majored in music, and 16% in music education, and 12% in performance. The average teaching experience of respondents was 21 years, and experience teaching jazz and/or rock was 12 years. Jazz history was a teaching specialty to 12.9%, and jazz performance of 12.3%. The History of Jazz was the course title reported by 21% of respondents, and Jazz Appreciation by 6%. Respondents were asked to rate the importance, on a scale of 1-10, of live concert attendance, hearing live or recorded music during class, writing papers, reading scores, seeing films, give oral reports, following listening guides, and singing. Grandy reported that this portion of the survey was completed inconsistently, and was therefore inconclusive. The responses that were completed correctly indicated that listening to recordings during and outside of class was rated as important, and reading scores, giving oral reports and singing were rated as not important. Grandy’s study provided an

overview of MGS jazz and rock instructor and course characteristics, and asked relevant questions about teaching strategies.

Renfroe (2005) investigated the goals and objectives of music appreciation courses in American southeastern colleges accredited by NASM. Directors of NASM accredited schools or departments of music at 102 public and private colleges in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia and Florida were asked to complete a researcher-designed survey electronically via SurveyMonkey.com. Fifty-nine music school/department directors completed the survey. In addition to goals and objectives, Renfroe examined textbook use and instructional efficacy. Descriptive and chi-square statistics were applied to the data. Renfroe found that 51% of subjects emphasized music listening as a course objective, and 25% music history. One respondent stated an objective was “to provide...a knowledgeable concertgoer” (Renfroe, 2005, p. 58). Seventy-three percent ranked music elements as very important. Several goals for music appreciation courses were significant to respondents. Ninety percent indicated learning style traits was important, 64% that learning instrument names was vital, 91% that learning composers’ names was important, and 81% that understanding appropriate concert attendance etiquette was key. Sixty-four percent of respondents chose understanding the function of composer, interpreter and listener in the production of music as an objective.

Through crosstabulation, Renfroe (2005) found significant relationships between student achievement of a feelingful response to music and knowledge of music elements ($p = .029$), historically representative composers ($p = .031$), musical style ($p = .014$), and etiquette ($p = .001$). A significant relationship was also found between etiquette

and both empathy ($p = .010$) and instrument family ($p = .005$). According to the researcher, subjects believed attending live concerts and exhibiting suitable concert etiquette was important to music appreciation, and strengthened student listening experiences. Additionally, students' ability to describe style periods was related to a familiarity with music elements. Interestingly, Renfroe also concluded, "developing informed music consumers with specific ideals of what constitutes 'good' music is a valid concern for music appreciation instructors" (p. 194). This study informs the current investigation by demonstrating what respondents from NASM accredited music departments in the Southwestern United States thought it was important to learn in music appreciation, a type of MGS course. Connections were made between concert etiquette and learning about music elements, composers, musical style. Empathy and the attainment of a feelingful response to music were also shown to be associated with concert etiquette. Renfroe's study indicated music instructors were concerned with cultivating knowledgeable and responsive concert audiences.

Concert Attendance and Reports

Little research devoted specifically to the concert report has been conducted recently. Flowers investigated undergraduate non-music majors' concert attendance characteristics in three ways over three academic years (Flowers, 1983b). Part I studied music preference, Part II studied time of concert attendance preference, and Part III studied concert report vocabulary use. For Part I, music preference, as demonstrated through the types of concerts attended, was studied over three semesters. Subjects ($N = 122$ undergraduate non-music majors) were required to attend two live concerts as part of music fundamentals or music methods courses. Records of the concerts students

attended were kept, and the types of musical genres represented were tabulated.

Analysis of this data demonstrated that the top genres preferred by students, based on number of concerts in that genre attended, were solo recitals, choir concerts, symphony orchestra, pops, musical theatre and instructor or professional solo recitals, in that order, followed by symphonic band, rock, chamber music, pop vocal, contemporary Christian, dance, opera, country-western, jazz, ethnic, children's music, or folk.

For Part II, Flowers studied when, during a semester, music fundamentals or music methods students at two universities chose to attend concerts. Data were collected weekly, and consisted of the number of concerts attended. There were 94 total concerts attended at University I, and 95 total concerts attended at University II. University I students were required to write two concert reports by the end of the semester, and University II students were required to write concert reports that were due twice during the semester, one at the ninth and one at the sixteenth week. Students at University I attended 52% of the total concerts during the last two weeks. Students at University II demonstrated attendance distributed throughout the first nine weeks, and many students attended concerts during the fourteenth week. Due dates spread through the semester, rather than exclusively at the end, resulted in more students attending concerts throughout the semester, and may have helped students complete their reports in a timely manner.

For Part III, Flowers studied vocabulary use in 125 concert reports written by students in music fundamentals or music methods courses. The researcher did not specify from which university type the reports were collected. Specific instructions about length or content were not given. The frequency of term usage was analyzed.

Flowers categorized word types, separating general descriptors from single words such as beat, fast and loud. Students used fewer words to describe musical sound and more general words. The investigator suggested more class time be spent on terminology because few words were used steadily or precisely by the majority of students. Available vocabulary was cited as lacking, even though students did almost always write positive reports. The concert report assignment was a positive outlet for undergraduate non-musicians' expression of the affective aspect of music listening.

Cassidy and Speer (1990) studied the effects of differentiated instruction on the use of descriptive terminology in student concert reports. Subjects were students in undergraduate elementary music methods classes. Two sections ($n = 36$) were given listening experiences with vocabulary training, and practice using the vocabulary. Two sections ($n = 35$) were given similar vocabulary training only. All subjects were required to attend two concerts, one prior to mid-semester and one prior to the end of the semester. All subjects were tested on voice and instrument knowledge before the first concert report was due. Three weeks prior to final exams, all subjects defined a set of vocabulary terms. Testing was undertaken to control for vocabulary word knowledge, but no significant differences were found between groups on either test. Concert report instructions indicated each be one and a half to two pages long, describe each piece performed, include an argument for or against bringing children, and attach a copy of the program. A total word count, and the number of word/phrase types used were compiled for data analysis. Data were organized into five categories: technical terms, descriptors, comments, referential, and value judgments. Chi-square analysis revealed no difference across categories and between groups on the first concert report,

and a significant difference between groups on the second report. When changes in words/phrases used from the first to the second report were analyzed, there was a significant difference within the listening plus vocabulary treatment groups. For continued analysis, the number of terms used was converted to percentages within the following areas: instrumentation, tempo, melody, harmony/texture, form, or dynamics. Chi-square analysis revealed a significant difference in the kinds of technical words used in the second report. Listening plus vocabulary groups used words from all areas more often in the second report. This group also progressed from the first to second report in their use of more specific descriptive words, while the vocabulary only group used a similar percentage on both reports. Listening plus vocabulary training allowed students to use the terms they were learning in class to write concert reports, and the use of technical vocabulary improved.

Sims and Kuhn (1993) investigated students' attitudes towards concert attendance. Over two and one-half years, undergraduates ($N = 441$) enrolled in the non-music major music literature, music fundamentals, and music methods courses were surveyed about their reactions to required concert attendance. Two hundred fifty eight subjects were in classes with concert attendance requirements, and 183 were in classes without those requirements. Students required to attend concerts also wrote reaction papers. All students anonymously completed a survey at the end of the semester. The survey contained slight differences in verb tenses to account for the presence or absence of the concert requirement. Subjects were asked what their level of awareness of university concert offerings was, what their level of enjoyment was for attending concerts, how strong was the possibility of their attending a concert after that semester,

and how valuable a course requirement to attend concerts was or had been. The final question situated the context for their concert attendance habits during previous semesters. They could respond with any of the following: enjoy the music, had friends or relatives performing, was invited to attend with friend or relative, was required to attend for another college class, was curious, or other.

Survey item responses were transformed into numbers for analysis, and answers to the last question were assigned percentages because of their status as a “check all that apply” construction. Responses of the groups with no concert attendance requirement were then compared to those of groups with the requirement. Awareness and enjoyability means of both groups did not differ. A significant difference at the .05 level was found between groups with and without a concert attendance requirement regarding future concert attendance. Students were more likely to indicate that they would attend a concert in the future, and valued the concert attendance requirement more, when they were required to attend concerts as part of the course. The highest percentage of response from both groups indicating why students had attended concerts in the past was that they enjoyed the music, followed by a friend or relative performing. For the group with no concert attendance requirement, more indicated it was because they had been invited to attend or were curious. Sims and Kuhn concluded that required concert attendance was a positive or neutral, but not negative experience, for the non-music majors studied. Concert attendance in an MGS course was not detrimental to student attitudes about live music.

Summary of Related Literature and Implications for the Current Study

Flowers in 1983, Cassidy and Speer in 1990, and Sims and Kuhn in 1993 conducted the key studies important to the current investigation. Studies by Hoyer (1993), Pederson (1995) and Walsh (2000) have examined musicians' struggles with music vocabulary, and have provided insights into the problems non-musicians face when writing about music. In the context of music terminology, Hair (1981), Flowers (1983a), Flowers (1985), Zalanowski (1990), Lychner (1998), Morrison and Cheung (1999) and Ellis (1999) have studied the music classroom at various educational grade levels and for the music and non-music major, with implications for the music educator. Writing in music courses has received partial attention by Doebler (1995) and Holloway (2001), and Davis (1996), Goss (1998), Johnson (1991), Loud (1999), and Murdick (1992) have investigated the use of writing in other college level classes. Grandy (1998) and Renfro (2005) have surveyed MGS course content, providing a certain level of scholarship for that area. These studies raise pivotal questions, and in combination with research specific to concert attendance and reports, lead to a framework for the current survey.

Describing music is a challenging task, for musicians as well as non-musicians. Hoyer (1993), in an analysis of metacriticism, studied undergraduate music texts, writing about music, and music course syllabi from the perspective of music criticism, and found that not enough recognition had been granted to the role of writing. Pederson (1995) reported that the adult amateur musicians may observe some kind of transcendence during listening sessions that is difficult to explain, and Walsh (2000) found that during episodes of peak listening or performance, even musicians find that

their experience goes beyond words into the realm of nonverbal communication. These studies concentrated on what the use of words revealed, rather than analyzing the number and types of words used. They point to the challenges musicians face as they use language to explain deeply felt musical experiences. Self-observation of one's reaction to a musical event is also a factor for the listener who must construct a concert report, and in the MGS course, the writer has even less experience with music and words than the musician.

Researchers have studied the use of music terminology in the classroom setting. Hair (1981) found that an introductory college music course affects the kinds of descriptions students use to explain what they hear. Flowers (1983a) learned that listening to music while learning music vocabulary was a more efficient way to improve non-music majors' ability to describe music than listening alone or learning vocabulary alone. In a subsequent study, Flowers (1985) established that graduate and undergraduate students used technical, nontechnical and extra-musical terms to describe music in similar numbers, and graduate students used those terms more often. Zalanowski (1990) investigated the influence of human physiology on the use of terminology, and found aspects of hemisphere orientation may have guided students' ability to write about music; some students were found to respond more successfully through drawing a visual response rather than writing. In another study, both music and non-music majors had similar aesthetic and felt emotional responses to musical excerpts, indicating a common understanding of those terms (Lychner, 1998). Morrison and Cheung (1999) found that cultural background influenced how students responded in writing to music excerpts played, and that music majors used more analytical

comments. Ellis (1999) discovered that students could learn to verbally describe music using more musical terms and fewer affective, associative, and judgmental responses through a course in music appreciation. These studies exemplify several ways students thought about music and considered how to describe what they heard. Description of music in the concert report, and what instructors specifically expect that assignment to contain and demonstrate, has not been researched recently.

Journal writing has had a positive impact on music appreciation students' attitudes towards and increased use of affective response to music (Doebler, 1995). Holloway (2001) found that a cooperative action learning approach increased student achievement in learning about melody, meter and timbre. Cooperative action learning activities included answering short answer questions in writing and discussing answers in small student groups. Holloway observed that students participating in the study preferred the experimental approach to the lecture method. These studies observed a positive effect from journal and short answer writing activities. The presence and/or influence of these writing activities in courses that require the concert report have not been investigated.

The literature of writing across the curriculum and writing to learn in non-music courses has supplied insight into the writing of the concert report. Davis (1996), Goss (1998), Johnson (1991) and Loud (1999) demonstrated that the use of journal writing, essays, informal directed writing, and writing to learn activities resulted in increased learning of college mathematics, calculus and statistics. As can be seen by the research of Murdick (1992) writing activities supported learning in art classes. Because no one

has researched the use of either WAC or WTL in MGS classes, these investigations have been helpful in constructing questions about WAC and WTL in the current survey.

Research by Grandy (1998) described demographic and course characteristics of jazz/rock MGS instructors. Instructional practices were also surveyed, and while the analysis was at times inconclusive, the questions asked were valuable for the current study. A 2005 survey conducted by Renfroe revealed that, in the southeastern United States, the majority of schools teaching music appreciation emphasized music elements. Subjects believed attending live concerts and exhibiting suitable concert etiquette was important and strengthened student listening experiences. The teaching of style periods was positively related to the teaching of music elements. These investigations served as a springboard for constructing demographic and instructional questions about the concert report.

Multiple studies conducted by Flowers (1983b) specifically on the concert report showed that writing about a live concert could be a positive experience where expression of the affective aspect of music listening was concerned. Cassidy and Speer (1990) found that vocabulary use improved among non-music majors when they were instructed in listening plus vocabulary training, and students used the terms learned in class when writing concert reports. Students would attend concerts in the future when concert attendance was required as part of a course, and attendance during the course was a positive experience (Sims and Kuhn, 1993). These studies did not survey instructors to discover their expectations for the concert report assignment, and did not ask if other writing activities were used.

The most recent research on aspects of the concert report was conducted in 1993. The purpose of this study is to examine the assignment of the concert report in college MGS courses. The researcher-developed survey will investigate instructor and institutional characteristics, expectations regarding the content of the concert report, and the use of writing across the curriculum resources. Analysis sought to discover whether significant differences were found in concert report content based on regional, instructor, and institutional characteristics.

Chapter 3

Method

The current study sought to discover the relationship between instructor and institutional characteristics and the assignment of the concert report in music in general studies (MGS) courses in the United States. The researcher-designed survey instrument used the terminology and goals for MGS courses applied by the National Association of Schools of Music/College Music Society (NASM/CMS) in the 1982 and 1989 Music in General Studies Surveys (College Music Society, 1989). Specific use of the concert report was not investigated in these surveys.

Participants

To locate pilot study respondents, Oklahoma institutions for higher learning were identified by their presence on the *State Regents for Higher Education* website (<http://www.okhighered.org/state-system/colleges-universities/list.shtml>). Each institutional website was then searched for the names of Music Department faculty members who taught MGS courses such as Music Appreciation, American Popular Music or World Music. Upon compilation of this list, and with University of Oklahoma Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, this researcher distributed the preliminary survey, available through SurveyMonkey, via an email link. Forty-nine surveys were distributed to Oklahoma college instructors. Six instructors completed the pilot survey.

A subgroup of university music instructors was chosen to receive the survey instrument. Instructors listed by CMS as having a teaching interest in MGS were asked via email to be respondents for the final survey. The CMS has indicated the professional importance of the establishment of music in general studies as a specialty

(Aloisio, 2005). CMS maintains mailing lists for 43,311 instructors at 1,793 institutions in the United States and Canada. Four thousand three hundred and fifty one instructors in the United States and Canada indicate MGS as a teaching area. American MGS instructors ($N = 3,171$) were chosen for this study. This subgroup was selected based on research that predicts use of the concert report in MGS college classes (Flowers, 1983a; Sims & Kuhn, 1993).

A listing of music faculty specifying an interest in MGS is maintained in the CMS Directory of Music Faculties in Colleges and Universities, U.S. and Canada (2011). This researcher contacted the Information Services department of CMS to clarify the procedure for distributing a survey through the CMS electronic mailing list. The researcher-developed survey was reviewed by the CMS Survey Committee and approved for distribution. An embedded link to the survey, available through SurveyMonkey, was contained in an email, and the CMS Information Services director distributed the email on behalf of this researcher to the MGS instructors on their mailing list. MGS instructors ($N = 3,171$) in the United States comprised the final population for this study. Canadian instructors were not surveyed.

Instrumentation

The final researcher-designed survey was divided into three sections entitled “Demographic Information,” “The Concert Report in Your Courses,” and “The Concert Report Writing Process.” Questions in the “Demographic Information” section covered the region, types of degrees granted, and enrollment at the respondent’s institution. The next questions established the degrees earned, current faculty status, years taught at the

college level, years spent teaching MGS courses, and MGS courses as a percentage of the teaching load of respondents.

In “The Concert Report in Your Courses” section, a concert report was clearly defined as a written response to a live concert experience, and an MGS course as an undergraduate course designed for the non-music major. Questions in this section asked what musical knowledge instructors believed must be demonstrated in the concert report, what attitudes instructors had about the use of the concert report, the perceived role of the concert report in MGS courses, and the types of MGS courses that included the concert report as an assignment.

The survey included questions to establish class enrollment, availability of a teaching assistant, the number of concert reports assigned, the length of those reports, when the report(s) are due, and what proportion of the final grade the concert report represented. A 4-point scale offering responses ranging from “not important” to “very important” was used for items regarding student recognition of musical form, musical style, composers, and performance practice, as well as student ability to critically evaluate performances. Respondents were asked to rate how important it was that a connection was made between concepts being covered in class and the concert experience.

A 4-point rating scale determined levels of importance for the concert report acting to increase music literacy, expand known/familiar repertory, develop analytical skills, further understanding of theoretical aspects of a composition, demonstrate knowledge of historical chronology, improve listening skills, promote aesthetic awareness, and build future audiences. In a question meant to investigate additional

details about concert report contents, respondents checked all that apply from the following: general comments about all pieces on the concert, detailed descriptions of student chosen highlights, comments about audience demographics and behavior, and/or correctly identified materials from program notes, whether printed or oral. Respondents were asked to describe the function the concert report served in their course using an open-ended format. This item allowed participants to identify any issues not covered in the previous questions.

In “The Concert Report Writing Process” section, a Writing Center was defined as a university center with a “Writing Staff...committed to the success of campus and community writers throughout various stages of their writing projects, with primary emphasis on the development of student writers” (Bowling Green State University, 2012). This section of the survey was included in order to discover what respondents used to explain content requirements for the concert report, what writing activities prepared students for the concert report, and whether or not a Writing Center was utilized in that preparation. Likert-type responses of agreement/disagreement were used to determine the perceived efficacy of the concert report, amount of grading time, use of common assessments among similar sections, and whether students were allowed to take notes during the concert.

On a 4-point scale of “not important” to “very important,” the perceived value of the following components of the concert report were sought: appropriate grammar; who, what, where, why and when information; a clear thesis statement; and a clear structural framework based on a thesis statement. A 4-point Likert-type scale of “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” was meant to determine the effectiveness of the

concert report for the achievement of course learning outcomes. This scale was also used to explore the prevalence of students' focus on: musical aspects of a performance, emotional responses, or descriptions of the concert venue and audience

Procedures

The final survey was reviewed by the CMS Survey Committee, and was approved by that committee for distribution to higher education instructors in the United States who indicated music in general studies as a specialty. *A Survey of the Concert Report* was administered electronically using SurveyMonkey. The researcher purchased a professional membership, which included SSL encryption. Responses were secure and confidential, and no identifying information was retained. In December 2011 CMS distributed the email letter on behalf of the researcher to the 3,171 MGS instructors in their database. The email contained a description of the project and a link to the survey. The consent form was contained in the first page of the survey instrument. Upon reading the consent form, respondents chose yes to enter the survey, or no to exit. The email letter and consent form were both approved by the OU Internal Review Board. Participation was voluntary and could be ended at any time, and all responses were anonymous. Due to the holidays in December, 2011, and the busyness of the beginning of an academic semester in January, the email reminder was sent in again by CMS in February, 2012. The survey was closed at the end of February, 2012.

Participant Demographics

Of the 3,171 instructors who were contacted on multiple occasions, 274 responded. Seven of those participants answered question one only, and 11 only completed the demographic portion of the survey and then did not complete the

remainder. These 18 responses were removed based on their non-completion of the survey, resulting in a final sample of 256 participants, for a response rate of 8.64%.

The opening section of “A Survey of the Concert Report” obtained regional, institutional, and instructor demographic characteristics. Geographic regions were specified as follows:

- Eastern: CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
- North Central: IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI
- Northwestern: AK, ID, MT, OR, WA, WY
- Southern: AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV
- Southwestern: AR, CO, KS, MO, NM, OK, TX
- Western: AZ, CA, HI, NV, UT

Only 12 (4.4%) responses were received from the Northwestern region, therefore those responses were recoded as part of the Western region. One response was missing, but that respondent did complete the rest of the survey. Table 1 presents the regional distribution of responses.

Table 1

Regional Distribution of Respondents

Region	<i>N</i>	%
Eastern	55	21.5
North Central	61	23.8
Southern	60	23.4
Southwestern	39	15.2
Western	40	15.6

Institutional Characteristics

The survey divided possible institutional categories into public and private associates, baccalaureate and doctoral levels. Only one respondent indicated a private associates institution, 11 a private masters institution, and 21 a private doctoral institution. Responses were recoded as private undergraduate, private graduate, public undergraduate and public graduate. Table 2 presents the institutional types reported by respondents.

Table 2

Institutional Categories

Institution Types	<i>N</i>	%
Private undergraduate	61	23.8
Private graduate	29	11.3
Public undergraduate	86	33.6
Public graduate	79	30.9

Among enrollment categories originally included in the survey was an under 1,000 group. However, only eight respondents indicated teaching at a school of that size. This category was recoded with the 1,000-4,999 group to create a 4,999 and under category. The enrollment categories of respondents are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Institutional Enrollments

Enrollment	<i>N</i>	%
4,999 and under	100	39.1
5,000-9,999	55	21.5
10,000-19,999	46	18.0
20,000-29,999	34	13.3
above 30,000	19	7.4

The survey included a question about class size. Only eight respondents indicated they taught a class larger than 151 students, so this category was recoded into the 101-150 category, which was renamed 101 or more. Additionally, twelve respondents indicated 61-80, and 12 also indicated 81-100, therefore these categories were combined to form a 61-100 category. The results are provided in Table 4.

Table 4

Single Section Music in General Studies Class Size

Size	<i>N</i>	%
40 or less	171	66.8
41-60	37	14.5
61-100	27	10.5
101 or more	20	7.8

Few respondents indicated that music in general studies courses represented 75-100% of their teaching load. These responses were therefore re-coded to combine with 50-75%, resulting in a 50-100% category. MGS courses represented less than 25% of the teaching load for the largest number of respondents ($n = 104$, 38%). Seventy-seven (28.1%) instructors indicated MGS courses accounted for 25-50% of their teaching load, and 74 (27%) indicated 50-100% of teaching load. Nineteen respondents (6.9%) did not answer this question.

Respondents were asked if they had a teaching assistant for their MGS class. Only 31 (12.1%) responded that they had a teaching assistant, 222 (86.7%) did not have a teaching assistant, and three (1.2%) did not answer the question.

Instructor Characteristics

Categories were not recoded for types of degrees earned by instructors. The smallest number of respondents ($n = 30$, 11.7%) indicated degrees in music education. The largest number ($n = 95$, 37.1%) indicated earning the doctorate in music. Table 5 reveals the educational preparation of instructors.

Table 5

Educational Preparation of Instructors

Degrees	<i>N</i>	%
Bachelor's & Master's degrees in Music	49	19.1
Bachelor's & Master's degrees in Music Education	19	7.4
Bachelor's, Master's & Doctorate in Music	95	37.1
Bachelor's, Master's & Doctorate in Music Education	11	4.3
Combination of Bachelor's and Master's degrees	15	5.9
Combination of Bachelor's, Master's & Doctoral degrees	66	25.8

The highest numbers of respondents were full professors ($n = 81$, 31.6%). Only one respondent indicated they were a graduate teaching fellow, and two were visiting faculty. These categories along with the 42 adjunct responders were recoded into one new group entitled "Non-tenure track faculty" ($n = 43$, 16.8%). Similar numbers of Lecturer/Instructors ($n = 41$, 16%), Assistant Professors ($n = 41$, 16%) and Associate Professors ($n = 50$, 19.5%) responded to the survey. Forty-eight (18.8%) participants

indicated they were part-time, and 200 (78.1%) were full-time. Eight did not respond to this question.

Seventy-six (29.7%) respondents had over 25 years of college teaching experience. Forty-eight (18.8%) had 10-14 years experience, 43 (16.8%) had 15-19 years experience, 38 (14.8%) had 5-9 years experience, 34 (13.3%) had 20-24 years experience, 14 (5.5%) had four years experience or less, and three did not complete this question. Table 6 provides these results, juxtaposed with Table 7, which indicates years of experience teaching MGS.

Table 6

College Teaching Experience

Years	<i>N</i>	%
4 or less	14	5.5
5-9	38	14.8
10-14	48	18.8
15-19	43	16.8
20-24	34	13.3
over 25	76	29.7

Table 7

Music in General Studies Teaching Experience

Years	<i>N</i>	%
4 or less	22	8.6
5-9	49	19.1
10-14	61	23.8
15-19	40	15.6
20-24	34	13.3
over 25	50	19.5

When asked what types of MGS courses respondents taught, the participant could indicate all that applied. Results indicated the following: 202 taught Music Appreciation, 59 taught World Music, 58 taught Popular Music, 79 taught Combined Genres, and 38 indicated other as the category best describing their course.

Data Analysis

Data were hand entered from SurveyMonkey into SPSS 20 software on a Macintosh computer. SPSS was used to analyze nominal and scale data, and preliminary data analysis was conducted to identify errors in the data from coding. HyperRESEARCH was used to code the open-ended responses to Question #27, and an additional professional educator checked and commented on this qualitative coding. Of the 274 participants, 18 failed to continue past the demographic section and were removed from the study, leaving a final sample of 256 participants.

Research Question 1 asked if significant differences exist in instructor practices regarding the assignment of, and attitudes towards the concert report when grouped by regional, institutional, and instructor characteristics.

Research Question 2 asked if significant differences exist in the role the concert report plays in MGS courses when grouped by region, class and institution size, and instructor characteristics.

Research Question 3 asked if significant differences exist in writing pedagogy, writing preparations, and the use of guides for writing the concert report when grouped by regional, institutional, and instructor demographics.

Research Question 4 asked what dimensions of student learning were reflected in the concert report according to the instructors surveyed.

The analysis of nominal and scale data were reported using frequencies and percentages. Where rating and Likert-type scales were used, modes were indicated.

Survey Questions #15, 16, 17, 26 and 43 focused on assignment characteristics. Crosstabulations were conducted using the following questions for each: by Region, using Question #2; by Institutional Characteristics, using Questions #3, 4, 12 and 13; and by Instructor Characteristics, using Questions #5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Survey Questions #25, 40 and 42 addressed attitudes. Crosstabulations were conducted using the following questions for each: by Region, using Question #2; by Institutional Characteristics, using Questions #3, 4, 12 and 13; and by Instructor Characteristics, using Questions #5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Survey Questions #14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 concentrated on the role of the concert report in MGS courses. Crosstabulations were conducted using the

following questions for each: by Region, using Question #2; by Institutional Characteristics, using Questions #3, 4, 12 and 13; and by Instructor Characteristics, using Questions #5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Survey Questions #32, 33, 34, 37, 38, and 39 centered on the uses of writing pedagogy in regard to the concert report. Crosstabulations were conducted using the following questions for each: by Region, using Question #2; by Institutional Characteristics, using Questions #3, 4, 12 and 13; and by Instructor Characteristics, using Questions #5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Survey Questions #30, 31 and 36 were concerned with preparatory writing exercises in relation to the concert report. Crosstabulations were conducted using the following questions for each: by Region, using Question #2; by Institutional Characteristics, using Questions #3, 4, 12 and 13; and by Instructor Characteristics, using Questions #5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Survey Questions #28 and 29 focused on the use of writing guides as aids to students composing a concert report. Crosstabulations were conducted using the following questions for each: by Region, using Question #2; by Institutional Characteristics, using Questions #3, 4, 12 and 13; and by Instructor Characteristics, using Questions #5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

As an open-ended item, Survey Question #27 allowed respondents to use their own words to describe the function of the concert report in their courses. The answers to this question were coded using HyperRESEARCH, a program designed to assist in the analysis of qualitative data. Researchers have communicated an important perspective regarding qualitative inquiry.

Qualitative researchers tend to view reliability as a fit between what they record as data and what actually occurs in the setting under study, rather than the literal consistency across different observations. (Biklen & Bogdan, 1998, p. 36)

The answers to Question #27 provide a snapshot of how the concert report functions in respondents' courses, from the point of view of the instructor. For this research study, codes were initially developed that identified 100 ideas that were observed in the answers provided. These ideas were then reviewed and merged into 18 comprehensive codes representing the content of the responses. This researcher also asked a retired English professor with additional degrees in psychology and education, an extensive general education background, lifelong choral music experience, and who has held officer positions in the local opera guild, to review the raw data, the initial codes, and the final codes developed. Viewed from a quantitative research perspective, this action may or may not have provided a level of reliability. The codes and analysis developed are presented as part of the results in Chapter 4. The raw data can be found in Appendix E.

To further understand instructor responses to Survey Questions #20-23 and #25 in terms of student learning, and to discover any themes present in those data, an SPSS factor analysis procedure known as Dimension Reduction using a Rotated Factor Matrix, was applied. Factor analysis can reduce a sizable number of variables, while retaining many of the qualities present in those variables, for further analysis. Such analysis can facilitate the understanding of behavior (Green & Salkind, 2011, p. 313), clarifying the functions of the variables, which in this study would apply to student learning. Questions #20-23 and #25 asked respondents to indicate the importance of a

variety of items that might be included in the concert report, and it was felt that factor analysis could reveal information about how instructors used this assignment for student learning. After establishing that these questions would be included in the factor analysis, the procedure was begun with an initial rotation. Five factors were initially identified. SPSS analysis was subsequently refined by limiting the number of factors to four, and then three, based on statistical data in each of the factor analysis results. The three factors in this analysis were found to require different skills that were interpreted as dimensions of student learning, which could be understood through the referencing of Bloom's Taxonomy. The results of this analytical approach to Questions #20-23 and #25 are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between institutional and instructor characteristics and the assignment of the concert report within college MGS courses. Instructor characteristics, as well as the characteristics of their current teaching institutions were surveyed. This researcher-designed survey also investigated instructor preferences and attitudes about the content of the concert report. Data were analyzed to determine any relationships revealing current practices among respondents in relation to their regional and institutional characteristics. The sample consisted of American higher education instructors ($N = 256$) who were on the Music in General Studies (MGS) Electronic Mailing List of the College Music Society (CMS). Due to the small sample size, the results of this study are not generalizable. Specific research questions were:

1. Do significant differences exist in instructor practices regarding the assignment of, and attitudes towards the concert report when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics?
2. Do significant differences exist in the role the concert report plays in MGS courses when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics?
3. Do significant differences exist in writing pedagogy, writing preparations, and the use of guides for writing the concert report when grouped by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics?
4. According to instructors, what dimensions of student learning are reflected in the concert report?

Findings: Instructor Practices and Attitudes Regarding the Concert Report

The first research question addressed the basic practices and attitudes with regard to the concert report, and sought to discover any significant differences based on region, and instructor and institutional characteristics. Questions addressing the number of concert reports required per semester, the number of pages required for each report, when concert reports were due during the semester, how much time instructors spent grading the concert report, and general content expectations were asked to provide information on practices.

Data analysis was facilitated by re-coding categories for the number of concert reports required per semester: “three,” “four” and “five or more” concert reports were combined into “three or more.” The remaining categories were “zero,” “one,” and “two.” Table 8 illustrates that instructors most frequently assigned two ($n = 103$, 40.2%) concert reports per semester, followed by the assignment of three or more ($n = 87$, 34%).

Table 8

Number of Concert Reports Required per Semester

Number	<i>N</i>	%
Zero	12	4.7
One	49	19.1
Two	103	40.2
Three or more	87	34.0

Table 9 indicates the number of pages required for a concert report. Such a small number of respondents indicated the requirement of either “four,” or “five or more” pages that these categories were re-coded and combined with “three” pages, to create a category of “three or more” pages. The most frequent requirement for the concert report was two pages ($n = 107$, 41.8%).

Table 9

Number of Pages Required for Concert Report

Number	<i>N</i>	%
One	58	22.7
Two	107	41.8
Three or more	75	29.3

Respondents were asked when during the semester concert reports were due. Sixty-nine (27%) indicated the end of the semester as a due date, 108 (42.2%) indicated reports were due at even intervals throughout the semester, and 63 (24.6%) allowed concert reports to be submitted when it was convenient for the student based upon available performances.

Instructors were asked how much time was spent grading concert reports. The results are indicated in Table 10. The most typical amount of time spent grading a report was six to ten minutes, indicated by 35.5% ($n = 91$) of respondents, followed by 34.4% ($n = 88$) grading one paper in five minutes or less.

Table 10

Time Spent Grading a Single Concert Report

Minutes	<i>N</i>	%
5 or less	88	34.4
6-10	91	35.5
11-15	31	12.1
16-20	18	7.0
21 or more	6	2.3
A teaching assistant grades the concert reports	3	1.2

Instructors identified the types of content they expected in concert reports.

Respondents could check all that applied. The largest number of respondents ($n = 190$, 74.2%) indicated that content should be made up of detailed descriptions of student chosen concert highlights. Results are indicated in Table 11. The percentages listed are those of the entire sample who checked each item.

Table 11

Overall Concert Report Content

Content	<i>N</i>	% of Total <i>N</i>
General comments about all pieces on the concert	170	66.4
Detailed descriptions of student chosen concert highlights	190	74.2
Comments about audience demographics and behavior	121	47.3
Correctly identified program note materials, printed or oral	125	48.8

Respondents indicated the importance of functions of the concert report on a 4-point rating scale comprised of (1) not important, (2) fairly important, (3) important and (4) very important. The items to be ranked were chosen from the College Music Society 1982 and 1989 Music in General Studies Questionnaires (College Music Society, 1989, p. 58), a survey that identified MGS course goals. Most important to instructors in the current study were improving listening skills ($M = 3.57$, $SD = .629$) and promoting aesthetic awareness ($M = 3.31$, $SD = .629$). Understanding theoretical aspects was least important ($M = 1.77$, $SD = .887$). The high standard deviation indicates a great deal of variability among respondents. The complete responses, including mode (M_o) are indicated in Table 12.

Table 12

Areas Addressed by the Concert Report

Areas	M_o	M	SD
Increasing music literacy	3	2.95	.935
Expanding known repertoire	3	2.93	.897
Developing analytical skills	3	2.71	.919
Understanding theoretical aspects	1	1.77	.887
Knowledge of historical chronology	2	2.41	.942
Improving listening skills	4	3.57	.629
Promoting aesthetic awareness	4	3.31	.789
Building future audiences	4	3.21	.943

The next survey question asked whether or not the concert report was an effective or ineffective method for achieving the learning outcomes of the course. This question used a Likert-type scale of (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree or (4) strongly agree. Respondents indicated that the concert report was effective as follows: $M_o = 3$, $M = 3.26$, $SD = .656$. Respondents indicated that the concert report was ineffective as follows: $M_o = 2$, $M = 1.82$, $SD = .760$.

A similar attitudinal question asked if the concert report usually demonstrated either an acceptable or unacceptable level of musical literacy to reflect course content. The means for an acceptable level was 2.87 ($SD = .549$), and for an unacceptable level 2.14 ($SD = .682$), and the mode 2 and 3 respectively.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked if significant differences would be found in instructor practices regarding the assignment of, and attitudes towards the concert report when measured by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics. The null hypothesis, that there would be no significant differences, could be accepted for all but two relationships. Statistically significant differences were found between the number of concert reports required and institution type, and concert report due dates and institution type.

Crosstabulation between the number of concert reports required and the type of institution resulted in a significant difference; $\chi^2 (9, N = 250) = 30.17, p = .000$, although four cells had an expected count less than five. Categories could not be re-coded for this question due to the difference between requiring zero concert reports, and any other number. A post hoc Kruskal-Wallis Test was conducted, and confirmed significance, $\chi^2 (3, N = 250) = 20.75, p = .000$. Fifty-three percent of private undergraduate institutions required three or more concert reports. There was a similar effect, though less pronounced, in private graduate institutions, where 46% required three or more, as opposed to 26% and 24% in public undergraduate and graduate institutions respectively (see Table 13).

Table 13

Number of Concert Reports Assigned based on Institution Type

Number of Concert Reports	Institution Type			
	Private Undergraduate	Private Graduate	Public Undergraduate	Public Graduate
Zero	0	0	3	9
One	7	4	24	14
Two	21	11	35	36
Three or more	32	13	22	19

A significant difference was revealed between institution type, and concert report due dates; $\chi^2 (6, N = 239) = 14.52, p = .024$. Due to only three categories (end of semester, at even intervals, or when convenient for students), it was difficult to interpret the results of the post hoc Kruskal-Wallis Test. With a result of $\chi^2 (3, N = 239) = 7.465, p = .058$, statistical significance was almost reached. Re-coding was not possible. Forty-two percent of public undergraduate institutions required reports be due at the end of the semester. In contrast, 53% of private graduate institutions reported concert reports were expected at regular intervals, and 50% of private undergraduate institutions also indicated concert reports were due at regular intervals throughout the semester (see Table 14).

Table 14

Concert Report Due Dates based on Institution Type

Due Dates	Institution Type			
	Private Undergraduate	Private Graduate	Public Undergraduate	Public Graduate
At end of semester	11	6	36	16
At even intervals throughout semester	30	12	28	37
When convenient for student based on concert availability	18	9	20	16

No further statistically significant differences were found among concert report practices, and attitudes about the concert report, based on region, and instructor and institutional characteristics.

Findings: The Role of the Concert Report in MGS Courses

The second research question addressed the role of the concert report based on region, and institutional size and instructor characteristics.

Instructors assigned the concert report in a variety of MGS courses.

Respondents indicated the courses in which they assign the concert report in a “check all that apply” format. One hundred ninety-one (74.6%) assigned the concert report in Western Music Appreciation, 36 (14.1%) in World Music, 34 (13.3%) in Popular Music, 66 (25.8%) in Combined Genre courses, and 32 (12.5%) in courses designated as “Other.” When asked if the purpose of the concert report was only to verify concert

attendance, 237 (86.5%) respondents indicated it was not. Seven (2.6%) indicated the concert report was assigned only to verify attendance.

Respondents indicated that only a small proportion of the final grade was accounted for by the concert report. One hundred two (39.8%) respondents indicated the concert report accounted for 11-20% of the final grade, while 77 (30.1%) indicated the report amounted to 10% or less of the final grade. Most respondents (88.7%) indicated the concert report assignment accounted for 30% or less of the final grade (see Table 15).

Table 15

Proportion of Final Grade

Proportion	<i>N</i>	%
0-10%	77	30.1
11-20%	102	39.8
21-30%	48	18.8
31-40%	11	4.3
41-50%	6	2.3

The role of the concert report in music in general studies courses was explored with several detailed questions, again using a 4-point rating scale of: (1) not important, (2) fairly important, (3) important and (4) very important. A demonstration of aesthetic awareness received the highest mean ($M = 2.89$, $SD = .821$). An understanding of musical phrase structures received the lowest mean ($M = 1.73$, $SD = .794$). The greatest

degree of variability was found in “identify the correct composer” ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.074$). This item was more dispersed among respondents than any of the other items. Since the standard deviation was higher than one, and there were only four possible responses, the distribution was examined. A histogram chart was relatively flat: there were 57 respondents who answered “not important,” 54 who answered “fairly important,” 76 who answered “important,” and 49 who answered “very important. These statistics indicate that respondents did not agree on any one level of importance for this item. However, in consideration of the fact that respondents had only one choice in which to indicate this was not important, and three to indicate how important it was, 48.8% indicated this item was either important or very important. “Demonstrate understanding of musical form” was skewed negatively to the right. Only 4.3% of respondents felt this item was very important. “Demonstrate understanding of phrase structure” was also skewed negatively. Only 2.7% of respondents found this item to be very important. The findings are shown in Table 16.

Table 16

The Role of the Concert Report

Role	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Use musical terminology correctly	2.86	.859
Correctly identify instruments	2.77	.922
Demonstrate aesthetic awareness	2.89	.821
Describe an emotional response	2.77	.891
Describe programmatic elements	2.62	.884
Understand musical form	2.05	.863
Understand phrase structure	1.73	.794
Identify the correct style period(s)	2.66	.969
Identify the correct composer(s)	2.50	1.074
Critically evaluate the concert	2.65	.962
Understand good performance practice	2.28	.978
Understanding bad performance practice	2.17	.990

Respondents were asked how important it was that a connection was made between concepts covered in class and the concert experience. Forty point one percent ($n=110$) of respondents indicated this connection was very important, 28.8% ($n=79$) that it was important, 18.2% ($n=50$) that it was fairly important, and 1.1% ($n=3$) that making a connection was not important (see Table 17).

Table 17

Importance of the Concert Report Reflecting Concepts Covered in Class

Rating	<i>N</i>	%
Not important	3	1.1
Fairly important	50	18.2
Important	79	28.8
Very important	110	40.1

Research Question 2

The second research question asked what significant differences would be found in the role the concert report plays in MGS courses when measured by region, and institutional and instructor characteristics.

The null hypothesis could be accepted for all but one relationship. A statistically significant difference was found between the full- or part-time status of instructors and whether or not the purpose of the concert report was only to verify concert attendance; $\chi^2 (1, N = 236) = 6.03, p = .014$. A post hoc Kruskal-Wallis Test confirmed this significance, $\chi^2 (1, N = 236) = 6.005, p = .014$. Forty-four part-time respondents indicated the concert report was not meant to simply verify concert attendance, as did 185 full-time respondents. Four part-time and 3 full-time respondents indicated the concert report was only for concert attendance verification purposes. The difference was that a larger percentage (8%) of part-time instructors reported using the concert report only to verify concert attendance than full-time

respondents (1.5%). Nearly 86% of all respondents indicated that this was not the sole purpose of the concert report, as opposed to 2.6%, who said it was. Table 18 displays the results.

Table 18

Verification of Attendance based on Instructor Status

Purpose to Verify	Part-time	Full-time
No	44	185
Yes	4	3

No further statistically significant differences were found when the role of the concert report was measured by region, and institutional and instructor characteristics.

Findings: The Writing Process and the Concert Report

The third research question addressed what significant differences would be found in the implementation of writing pedagogy, the application of common rubrics and preparatory guides, and the use of campus Writing Centers when measured by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics. Respondents were asked if all instructors teaching similar sections of MGS courses followed a common grading rubric. With respect to a common rubric, 157 (57.3%) did not use one, 34 (12.4%) did use a common rubric, and 55 (20.1%) did not know if such a practice was observed in their academic unit.

Respondents were asked what types of guidelines, if any, were used to explain content requirements for the concert report to students. The majority of respondents

indicated they used instructor developed written guidelines ($n = 214$, 83.6%). Only 14 used departmentally generated written guidelines. Full results are indicated in Table 19. Due to the availability of a “check all that apply” option, the percentages listed are for the total N .

Table 19

Use of Guidelines

Type	N	% of total N
Departmentally generated written guidelines	14	5.5
Instructor developed written guidelines	214	83.6
Instructor verbal guidelines	124	48.4
Published guidelines or books about writing	31	12.1
Other	19	7.4

Instructors agreed ($n = 121$, 47.3%) that students should take notes during a concert in order to respond to the music in the most efficient manner. Most ($n = 51$, 19.9%) strongly agreed that students should take notes, 40 (15.6%) disagreed, and 28 (10.9%) strongly disagreed. When asked if English/Composition was a pre-requisite for their course, 206 (80.5%) indicated it was not, 30 (11.7%) indicated it was, and 13 (5.1%) did not know if such a course was a pre-requisite.

A large majority of respondents indicated their institution had a Writing Center ($n = 230$, 89.8%). Whereas 11 (4.3%) instructors did not know whether or not their school had such a center, 8 (3.1%) indicated their school did not have a Writing Center. Respondents were asked how often they sent students to the Writing Center for help

writing a concert report. Of respondents, 41 (16%) sent students often, 119 (46.5%) sent students to the center sometimes, and 67 (26.2%) never sent students to the Writing Center. Nine (3.5%) did not know if their institution had a Writing Center, and seven (2.7%) indicated that there was no Writing Center at their institution. A large number of respondents agreed ($N = 150$, 58.6%) that referral to the Writing Center resulted in improved writing of the concert report. Twenty-five (9.8%) respondents disagreed, and 25 (9.8%) strongly agreed that concert reports were enhanced by a Writing Center.

Instructors regularly required a concert program be submitted with the concert report ($n = 147$, 57.4%). Exactly one respondent (0.4%) required only notes be turned in, 36 (14.1%) required the concert program with notes be submitted, and 53 (20.7%) did not require anything submitted in addition to the concert report.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether specific types of writing activities were used in addition to the concert report. Respondents were asked to check all that applied. Table 20 displays the results. The most common additional writing activity used among respondents was the short answer test question ($n = 128$, 50%), followed by essay test questions ($n = 112$, 43.8%), and other writing activities ($n = 104$, 40.6%).

Table 20

Additional Writing Activities

Activity	<i>N</i>	% of Total <i>N</i>
Regular in-class writing	34	13.3
Occasional in-class writing	75	29.3
Listening journal	53	20.7
Written summaries of group activities	23	9.0
Essay test questions	112	43.8
Short answer test questions	128	50.0
Other writing activities	104	40.6
The concert report is the only writing activity for the course	32	12.5

The survey contained a question about drafts that was re-coded due to an extremely low response to some items. “Draft(s) critiqued by the instructor,” “draft(s) critiqued by peers” and “both of the above” were combined to become a single category, entitled “drafts critiqued by instructor and/or peers.” Thirty-eight respondents (14.8%) indicated they used this option, while 201 (78.5%) did not utilize drafts at all.

A set of questions using a 4-point rating scale ranging from “not important” to “very important” was used to establish the importance of writing mechanics among instructors. The highest mean ($M = 3.11$, $SD = .930$) was indicated for who, what, where, why and when information. A clear structural framework based on a thesis statement was rated with the lowest mean ($M = 2.37$, $SD = 1.066$). The high standard

deviation for this item demonstrated the responses were more evenly distributed, and this item also reflected several modes. Among respondents, 65 (25.4%) indicated this item was fairly important, and the same number indicated it was important. Sixty-three (24.6%) indicated this item was not important, and 43 (16.8%) found it very important. Respondents did not agree on the level of importance of this item. A clear thesis statement also exhibited a large standard deviation ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 1.029$). Table 21 indicates the median, mode, mean and standard deviation among responses.

Table 21

Writing Mechanics

Activity	Median	M_O	M	SD
Appropriate grammar	3	4	3.07	.914
Who, what, where, why, when information	3	4	3.11	.930
A clear thesis statement	3	3	2.58	1.029
Structural framework based on a thesis statement	2	2 ^a	2.37	1.066

^aMultiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown.

Instructors were asked about their perception of the general focus of student concert reports. Students' emotional responses to the concert program were an important focus for the concert report ($M = 3.14$, $SD = .577$). Respondents agreed ($M = 3.08$, $SD = .589$) most students paid attention to the musical aspects of pieces performed at a concert. A mean of 2.73 ($SD = .708$) was indicated for students writing about extraneous, non-musical descriptions of the concert venue and audience. The mode (M_O) for all three items was 3.

Research Question 3

The third research question asked what significant differences would be found in the implementation of writing pedagogy, the use of common rubrics and preparatory guides, and the utilization of campus Writing Centers when measured by region, instructor, and institutional characteristics.

The null hypothesis could be accepted for all but four relationships. As will be shown below, significant differences were found between the use of common grading rubrics and part- or full-time instructor status, re-writes and teaching experience, re-writes and institutional enrollment, and regional use of critiqued drafts.

Crosstabulation indicated that a significant difference; $\chi^2 (2, N = 238) = 8.47, p = .014$ was found between the use of a common grading rubric and whether instructors were full- or part-time. A post hoc Kruskal-Wallis Test confirmed this significance, $\chi^2 (1, N = 238) = 4.453, p = .035$. A higher percentage of part-time (38%) than full-time (19%) faculty indicated that they did not know if instructors who taught similar sections of a course followed a common rubric. Among full-time instructors, a high percentage (66%) indicated that a common rubric was not used. Overall, 63% of respondents indicated a common rubric was not used for grading concert reports.

Table 22

Instructor Knowledge of Common Grading Rubric Usage

	Part-time	Full-time
No	25	126
Yes	4	29
I don't know	18	36

Initially, significance was found upon crosstabulation between part- or full- time status and knowledge of whether English/Composition was a pre-requisite for music in general studies courses; $\chi^2 (2, N = 241) = 11.298, p = .004$. However, statistical significance was not confirmed by post hoc testing. More part-time instructors indicated that they did not know whether English/Composition was a MGS course pre-requisite.

Table 23

Instructor Knowledge of English/Composition Pre-requisite

	Part-time	Full-time
No	38	160
Yes	3	27
I don't know	7	6

A significant result $\chi^2 (5, N = 232) = 12.96, p = .024$ was found when crosstabulating the number of years an instructor had taught at the college level with

whether or not a student could re-write their concert report. Statistical significance was confirmed with Kruskal-Wallis post hoc testing, $\chi^2 (5, N = 232) = 12.904, p = .024$. More instructors with less than 15 years of experience answered “no” than a strictly normal distribution might have predicted. More instructors with 20-24 years of experience answered yes than no. In this group, 53% allowed re-writes and 47% did not.

Table 24

Re-writes Based on Teaching Experience

Ability to re-write	Years of College Teaching Experience					
	4 or less	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	over 25
Yes	3	6	10	12	16	20
No	11	29	37	30	14	44

A significant relationship $\chi^2 (4, N = 233) = 10.844, p = .028$ was also found between institutional enrollment, or the size of a college, and whether or not instructors allowed students to re-write their concert report. Post hoc Kruskal-Wallis testing confirmed statistical significance, $\chi^2 (4, N = 233) = 10.797, p = .029$. Among respondents who worked at a 20,000-29,999 sized institution, 53% allowed re-writes. This compared to 29% allowing re-writes at 29,000 and above sized institutions, 27% at 4,999 or less sized institutions, 24% at 5,000-9,999 institutions, and 8% at institutions sized 10,000-19,999.

Table 25

Re-writes and Institutional Enrollment

Ability to re-write	Institutional Enrollment				
	4,999 or less	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	over 29,999
Yes	26	13	8	15	5
No	67	40	34	13	12

Statistical significance at $\chi^2 (4, N = 238) = 10.48, p = .033$ was found between region and the use of critiqued concert report drafts as a writing activity, confirmed by Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 (4, N = 238) = 10.436, p = .034$. In the Southern and Eastern regions, 24% and 22.5% respectively used critiqued drafts while 76% and 77.5% did not. The percentage of respondents using drafts in the North Central region was 17%. However, in the Western and Southwestern regions, 8% and 3% respectively used drafts, while 92% and 97% did not. Table 26 indicates the number of respondents replying yes or no by region.

Table 26

Regional Use of Critiqued Drafts

Use of Critiqued Drafts	Region				
	East	N. Central	South	Southwest	West
Yes	11	10	13	1	3
No	38	50	42	35	35

Findings: Research Question 4

The fourth research question sought to discover what dimensions of student learning are reflected in the concert report. Survey Questions #20-21 and #25 drew from earlier CMS surveys (College Music Society, 1989, p. 58). Questions #22 and #23 were original. Respondents to this survey ranked the importance on a 4-point scale of 19 areas that might be addressed in a concert report. These rankings contained information on instructor attitudes toward student learning in the concert report assignment. Factor analysis was used to discover any further dimensions of that learning.

To further understand instructor responses to Survey Questions #20-23 and #25 in terms of student learning, and to discover any themes present in those data, an SPSS factor analysis procedure known as Dimension Reduction using a Rotated Factor Matrix, was applied. The criteria used to determine the number of factors to rotate were the theoretical hypothesis that the measure was unidimensional, the scree test, and the interpretability of the factor solution. The scree plot suggested a preliminary hypothesis of unidimensionality was false. Based on the plot, three factors were rotated using a Varimax rotation procedure. The rotated solution, shown in Table 27, yielded three interpretable factors, applied analysis, affective development, and critical evaluation. The applied analysis dimension accounted for 19.6 % of the variance, the affective development for 13.9 % of the variance, and the critical evaluation dimension for 11.2% of the variance. The remainder of the factors had Eigen values close to 1, or less, indicating that they explained the same amount of variance, or less, as an ordinary variable in the list of items. This was indicated by the scree plots, which tended to level

out to a common slope after three factors. No items failed to load. The full results are shown in Table 27.

Table 27

Rotated Factor Matrix^a

	Factor		
	Applied Analysis	Affective Development	Critical Evaluation
Correct usage of musical terminology	.605	.051	.019
Correct identification of instruments	.494	.083	.200
A demonstration of aesthetic awareness	.263	.683	.150
The ability to describe an emotional response	.047	.482	.227
The ability to describe programmatic elements	.395	.377	.273
An understanding of musical form	.590	.108	.132
An understanding of phrase structure	.621	.198	.153
The ability to identify the correct style period(s)	.815	.127	.041
The ability to identify the correct composer	.738	.062	.141
An accurate critical evaluation of the concert	.187	.293	.404
An understanding of good performance practice	.226	.209	.903
An understand of bad performance practice	.175	.196	.905
Increase music literacy	.325	.248	.194
Expand known/familiar repertoire	.346	.439	.183
Develop analytical skills	.290	.440	.098
Understand theoretical aspects of a composition	.490	.215	.245
Demonstrate knowledge of historical chronology	.686	.258	.040
Improve listening skills	.131	.588	-.053
Promote aesthetic awareness	.049	.792	.159
<u>Build future audiences</u>	.032	.420	.141

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
 Boldface type indicates loading.

^a Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

The 19 items that loaded for each of the three dimensions or factors are listed by dimension below, and the groupings are then explained.

- Applied Analysis. Students use tools from course content to analyze the performance and works performed.

Correct usage of terminology

Correct identification of instruments

The ability to describe programmatic elements

An understanding of musical form

An understanding of musical phrase structure

The ability to identify the correct style period(s)

The ability to identify the correct composer(s)

Increase music literacy

An understanding of the theoretical aspects of a composition

Demonstrate knowledge of historical chronology

- Affective Development. Students demonstrate or advance a change in the way they perceive or feel about musical performance.

A demonstration of aesthetic awareness

The ability to describe an emotional response

Expand known/familiar repertory

Develop analytical skills

Improve listening skills

Promote aesthetic awareness

Build future audiences

- Critical Evaluation. Students critically appraise aspects of the performance

Accurate critical evaluation of the concert

An understanding of good performance practice

An understanding of bad performance practice

The applied analysis dimension items use tools from course content to analyze works performed. These items correlate with the rising levels of Bloom's categories of learning, starting with knowledge, and expanding to include comprehension, application, analysis and synthesis (Bloom, 1956). Students learning in applying terminology, identifying instruments, discerning a historical style period or composer, and thinking about musical phrase structure and/or form were making their way through Bloom's domains. From this perspective, the grouping afforded by factor analysis is logical. As they interact, these activities serve to increase music literacy.

The affective development dimension was defined as demonstrating or advancing a change in the way a student perceives or feels about a musical performance. Krathwohl's Taxonomy of Affective Domain (Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1964) was applied to the kinds of learning grouped into this category. From simple to complex, these domains include receiving information willingly, listening and responding, appreciating, understanding values others associate with a phenomenon, integrating ideas and feelings, and changing behavior in light of new evidence. Among the learning outcomes grouped by factor analysis that fit these domains are describing an emotional response, improving listening skills, and expanding known/familiar repertory. In functioning to build future audiences, the concert report assignment deals

with motivation and attitudes. Both the demonstration and promotion of aesthetic awareness items loaded with this group. The recognition of the aesthetic is grounded in values, and rejects stereotypical attitudes in pursuit of the truth. The highest level of the affective domain deals with the internalization of values. The development of analytical skills is crucial for the recognition of the aesthetic. Because these areas interact so thoroughly, the groupings seemed logical.

The third category into which student learning elements were grouped by factor analysis dealt with critical evaluation, defined as the critical appraisal of aspects of a performance. The accurate critical evaluation of a concert, and the understanding of whether the performance exemplified good or bad performance practice, would utilize skills at the top of both the Cognitive and Affective Domains. Students would need to critique, evaluate, discriminate and defend these appraisals. These three aspects of learning were properly grouped, in terms of their relationship to the domains of learning.

Findings: Qualitative Results for Open-ended Question # 27

Question #27 was open-ended and allowed respondents to expand upon their answers or to address issues not covered in the survey. The question read: “Please describe the function the concert report serves in your course.” One hundred ninety seven, or 76% of respondents chose to leave comments. HyperRESEARCH was used to code responses. The raw data is reproduced in Appendix E.

The responses provide a snapshot of how the concert report functions in respondents’ courses, from the point of view of the instructor. For this research study, codes were initially developed identifying eight very broad groups of 100 preliminary

ideas observed in the data. These ideas were then reviewed and merged into 18 specific codes representing the content of the responses. For example, respondent comments addressed the importance of live concert music in various ways. Some respondents mentioned students' first attendance at a live classical concert, and others reported the greater impact of live vs. recorded music.

For code checking purposes, this researcher asked a retired English professor with additional degrees in psychology and education, an extensive general education background, lifelong choral music experience, and who has held officer positions in the local opera guild, to review the raw data, the initial codes, and the final codes. This reviewer found the non-parallel structure of the responses to be a bit of a problem, but understood this was part of the nature of the open-ended response option. The reviewer validated the assessment of the responses as being represented by all but one of the researcher-chosen codes. Based on that recommendation, this code was removed. The responses related to the deleted code were reviewed and re-coded under existing codes. This procedure eliminated a duplicate code. Twelve final codes reflected student learning, and five additional codes represented respondents' alternative uses of the open-ended question. The latter featured alternative assignments, additional functions, agreement with the questionnaire items, and negative comments about the concert report. The results are indicated in Tables 28 and 29.

Table 28

Qualitative Responses to Question #27

The concert report assignment	N	%
Improves student appreciation of the value of live concert music	127	23.5
Facilitates the application of concepts learned in class	107	19.8
Improves writing skills	59	10.9
Enhances listening skills	47	8.7
Reinforces terminology	41	7.5
Facilitates an affective response	37	6.8
Builds future audiences	33	6.1
Synthesizes course content	22	4.0
Develops aesthetic responses	21	3.8
Encourages an analytical approach to listening	13	2.4
Is a vehicle for assessment feedback	13	2.4
Addresses general education learning outcomes	12	2.2
Deepens cultural awareness	8	1.4
TOTAL	540	100.0

Table 29

Alternative Respondent Uses of Qualitative Response Question #27

	N	%
Broadened the scope of survey descriptors, suggesting alternatives	70	70
Addressed additional functions of the concert report	14	14
Clarified agreement with survey descriptors	6	6
Provided negative statements about the concert report	5	6
Revealed respondent did not utilize the concert report assignment	5	5
TOTAL	100	100

Twenty-three percent ($n = 127$) of the qualitative responses addressed the importance of student interaction with live musical events. Respondents commented as follows:

The main point is to experience live music and to enhance listening skills. So many students have had little to no exposure to classical music and hearing it live makes all the difference.

The concert report serves as a way to get students to listen to live music and give them an opportunity to listen[ed] in a focused way within the context of a social situation.

The concert report serves to expand the classroom by giving students a chance to hear classical music live. Most are unaware that it is readily available on our campus.

Nineteen percent ($n = 107$) of the comments reflected instructors' intentions that the concert report demonstrate concepts learned in class. Some representative examples include:

To apply concepts from class to live performances outside of class.

...to give them opportunities to use the recently acquired musical language and terminology they have learned...

The function is to expand on the listening and conceptual skills we are learning in class.

To apply what we learned in class to actual concert performances. To connect theory with reality.

Fifty-nine respondents (10.9%) referred to the improvement of writing skills through the concert report assignment.

State of California requires verbal communication components in designing courses. Instead of doing essay questions on tests, the reviews from concerts fill those requirements very well.

The concert report motivates students to attend concerts, it encourages them to actually listen to the concert, it gives a framework for listening, understanding and appreciation of music, it forces them to examine and articulate their experiences and it helps develop writing skills.

The enhancement of listening skills ($n = 47$, 8.7%) was discussed by respondents.

It allows students to demonstrate their critical listening skills in two important ways: hearing aural attributes like form, melody, harmony, lyrics, etc. and understanding the cultural and social aspects of a concert experience.

Sharpens students' skills of listening, observation, aural analysis and critical engagement with music

Respondents commented on reinforcing terminology (7.5%):

I expect the student to be able to discuss the performance using correct terminology in a way that would be intelligent as well as correct.

The concert report requires students to experience and gain an appreciation for live performance and to develop the skill of listening and describing the basic elements of music using appropriate terminology.

Facilitating affective responses (6.8%) was mentioned:

The ability to cognitively realize what is happening, not at the expense of the affective, imaginal right brain experience, is a central objective, evidenced through the paper.

The students generally have little experience in serious listening to art music. These reports are for self-study, to document growth in skills and discover the joy of discovery. The grade is for taking the assignment seriously, but NOT for developing expertise. I want each student to feel comfortable saying negative things or to admit a lack of interest, knowing these are valid responses along the way, and that they will NOT be punished in any way for being who they are. Only when they trust the teacher and the experience to be non-threatening can they hope to find enjoyment in the act of artistic engagement.

Building future audiences (6.1%) was also important to respondents:

My students regularly attend concerts of their favorite music, but most would not attend classical concerts without the pressure of a graded report. Once

they've gone, they often find that they enjoy them. In the reports, students apply what they learn in class to describe the music, audience behavior, performance details. They are encouraged to ask questions about things they don't understand. The reports show me what details I may have assumed "everybody knows" about classical music and concerts, or what concepts the students have not fully grasped. In addition, my students increase the size of the audience for music students who are performing. I hope that the reports will help build future audiences for classical music.

For many of my students (rural, public community college), this is the first time they have actually attended concerts, and becomes an "eye-opener" for them. My hope is to get them through the door, hoping they will attend future events on their own initiative.

Among alternative ideas, interesting types of assignments were mentioned that did not appear as questionnaire items. Instructors mentioned students writing about orchestra rehearsals or private lessons instead of a concert, interviewing a musician with pre-set questions, and writing comparative arts reaction papers, in which visual art, or theatre, for example, could be compared to a musical event. Additional functions of the concert report not included in the questionnaire items were extra credit, teaching a specifically ethnographic approach, and the expression of feelings. Respondents also voiced agreement with the contents of the questionnaire items, or were able to vent negative experiences with the concert report and MGS courses. The following is an example of one of the rare negative comments:

Students increase their ability to listen to, understand, speak, and write about musical art. Also, it helps to identify and "weed out" functionally illiterate and otherwise academically dysfunctional freshman and classroom/concert hall secondary- school grade-inflated idiots. This state spends way too much money on remediating the lack of college preparation caused by the teacher's union desire to prioritize employee compensation, tenure, etc., rather than student learning discipline. Sorry if this pisses you off...whatever...

Respondents also included positive comments:

I'm glad you are doing this survey!

Thoughtful questions!

Summary of the Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between institutional and instructor characteristics and the assignment of the concert report within college MGS courses. The results of this study are not generalizable due to the small sample size.

The first research question addressed the basic practices and attitudes of the population with regard to the concert report, and sought to discover any significant differences based on region, instructor and institutional characteristics. Statistically significant differences were found between the number of concert reports required and institution type. Statistical significance was initially encountered for concert report due dates and institution type, but post hoc testing did not support those results. Fifty-three percent of private undergraduate institutions required three or more concert reports. Public undergraduate institutions tended to require reports due at the end of the

semester, while the other institution types tended to require reports to be turned in at even intervals throughout the semester. No additional statistically significant differences were found for Research Question 1.

The second research question asked what significant differences would be found in the role the concert report plays in MGS courses when measured by region, and institutional and instructor characteristics. A larger percentage (8%) of part-time instructors reported using the concert report only to verify concert attendance than full-time respondents (1.5%). Nearly 86% of all respondents indicated that this was not the sole purpose of the concert report, as opposed to 2.6%, who said it was. No additional statistically significant differences were found for Research Question 2.

The third research question explored what significant differences would be found in the implementation of writing pedagogy, the use of rubrics and guides, and the utilization of campus Writing Centers when measured by region, and instructor and institutional characteristics. Significant differences were found between the use of common grading rubrics and instructor status. A larger number of part-time than full-time faculty indicated that they did not know if instructors who taught similar sections of a MGS course followed a common rubric. A high percentage (66%) of full-time instructors indicated that a common rubric was not used.

Significant differences were found between teaching experience, size of institution, and re-writes. Instructors with less than 15 years of experience tended not to allow re-writes, while those with 20-24 years of experience tended to allow re-writes, as did instructors who worked at institutions with an enrollments of 20,000-29,999 students.

Significant differences were found between region and the use of critiqued drafts. Higher numbers of instructors used critiqued drafts in the Southern and Eastern regions than in the North Central region, with the least use of this writing technique occurring in the Western and Southwestern regions. No additional statistically significant differences were found for Research Question 3.

The fourth research question sought the dimensionality of student learning in the context of the concert report. The rotated solution yielded three interpretable factors: applied analysis, affective development, and critical evaluation.

The qualitative responses to the open-ended question: “Please describe the function the concert report serves in your course,” reinforced responses to the survey questions. Comments suggested variants on the concert report assignment such as reports on orchestra rehearsals, private lessons, musician interviews, and comparative arts projects. Alternative functions of the concert report included use as extra credit points, as a vehicle for teaching an ethnographic approach, and as a way to express student feelings. There were a very small number of negative comments that reflected frustration with student preparation for college level coursework, and positive comments that reflected support for the manner in which survey questions had been constructed and presented.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between region, instructor and institutional characteristics and the assignment of the concert report within college MGS courses. The demographic features of instructors and their current teaching institutions were surveyed. This researcher-designed survey investigated the assignment of, instructor attitudes towards, role of, and writing pedagogy, writing preparations for, and use of guides for writing the concert report. Data were analyzed, revealing some, but very few, statistically significant relationships at a level of less than .05 ($p < .05$).

The researcher-designed instrument, “A Survey of the Concert Report,” was piloted with a group of Oklahoma MGS higher education instructors, and revisions were made. The pilot version consisted of two sections, while the final version consisted of three sections: “Demographic Information,” “The Concert Report in Your Courses,” and “The Concert Report Writing Process.” Possible responses to several questions were divided into shorter units in the final version, and the list of additional writing activities was shortened.

CMS maintains a database of higher education instructors in the United States and Canada. CMS accepts proposals from scholars who wish to use the CMS electronic mailing list to send out questionnaires. Upon review by the CMS Survey Committee, “A Survey of the Concert Report” was approved for distribution.

The final population consisted of 3,171 instructors who had indicated a teaching interest in MGS. From this population, 274 responded, and 18 were removed based on non-completion of the survey. Due to the overall return rate, the results of this study are not generalizable. The final response rate was 8.64%.

The response rate to the current survey may have been improved had the instrument been distributed to a smaller population of College Music Society members who had a teaching interest in MGS. The instrument may also have been too long in length. However, it is interesting to note that the response rates to the CMS 1982 and 1989 Music in General Studies Questionnaires were 32% and 17% (CMS, 1989, p. 27) respectively. According to CMS, those responses could not be regarded as statistically valid representative samples of music schools or practices in the U.S. due to the low response rates (p. 26).

The data for Research Questions 1, 2 and 3 were analyzed with frequencies, percentages, modes, means, crosstabulations and /or chi-square procedures. When significant chi-square values were found, post hoc analysis was conducted using the Kruskal-Wallis Test. Research Question 4 involved factor analysis of survey Questions #20-23 and #25, which inquired about student learning. Qualitative responses to survey Question #24, an open-ended item allowing respondents to describe the function of the concert report in their own words, were coded using HyperRESEARCH software. A second researcher checked the coding, suggested some changes, and the results were then summarized.

Demographic Results

The final sample consisted of 256 participants. The course taught most by respondents was Music Appreciation, followed by Combined Courses, World Music, and Popular Music, with the category “Other” receiving the fewest responses. Sixty-one participants responded from the North Central region of the country, 60 from the South, 55 from the East, 40 from the West, and 39 from the Southwest. The largest number of respondents ($n = 100$, 39.1%) taught at small institutions (4,999 and under), and the smallest number ($n = 19$, 7.4%) at schools with an enrollment above 30,000. MGS instructors taught in small classes of 40 students or less, with only 20 instructors teaching classes larger than 100 students. MGS courses made up less than 25% of teaching load for 38% of respondents, and 25-50% for 28.1%. Only 12.1% of instructors had a teaching assistant, a percentage that makes sense based on the small class size reported by most instructors.

The review of literature provided survey item examples, and results of earlier surveys matched the current findings. More instructors from public institutions ($n = 165$, 64.5%) than private ($n = 90$, 35.1%) responded to the current survey. Similarly, the NASM/CMS 1982 and 1989 MGS Surveys (College Music Society, 1989) organized their inquiries based in part on institutional public or private status, and received more responses from instructors at public institutions. The largest numbers of respondents to the current study were full professors ($n = 81$, 31.6%). Interestingly, in both the fall of 1981 and 1988, the largest number of faculty teaching MGS courses that responded to the NASM/CMS surveys were full professors (p. 34-35).

A concern regarding the current study had to do with the number of full professors who responded, whose teaching load may have consisted of less than or equal to 25% of their total load. MGS courses represented less than 25% of the teaching load for the largest number of respondents ($n = 104$, 38%). Seventy-seven (28.1%) instructors indicated MGS courses accounted for 25-50% of their teaching load, and 74 (27%) indicated 50-100% of teaching load. However, the proportion of full professors having a teaching load of either less than 25%, or 25-50% was relatively equal. And while the largest number of respondents' teaching load consisted of less than 25% MGS, similar, fairly close numbers of respondents' teaching load was made up of 25-50% or 50-100% MGS courses. If those numbers were combined, one could say that over half of the respondents (55.1%) to the current survey experienced an MGS teaching load involving more than a quarter of their assignment. This is important to know because one would hope that respondents would have a good amount of current experience teaching MGS.

The largest number of instructors in the current study had 25 years or more of teaching experience, and most frequently reported having 10-14 years experience teaching MGS courses. A comparison of the current results with those from Grandy's (1988) study of MGS instructors who taught Jazz and Rock music provided some interesting points with regard to level of education and teaching experience. A higher number of respondents to the current survey held doctoral degrees (67.2%) than did those to Grandy's (48%) 1988 survey. The average teaching experience of instructors in the Grandy study was 21 years. The average years teaching jazz and/or rock in Grandy's study was 12 years.

Research Question 1

The subject of the first research question was whether or not significant differences existed in instructor practices regarding the assignment of, and attitudes towards the concert report when grouped by region, instructor and institutional characteristics. The current study found a statistically significant difference between institution type and the due dates of concert reports. When compared by institution type, public institutions contrasted with private. Among public undergraduate institutions, 42% expected reports turned in the end of the semester, while private undergraduate and graduate schools expected reports at even intervals. Flowers (1983b) studied concert report requirements at two universities, where the concert report due dates differed: one university required two reports by the end of the semester, and the other required the reports at even intervals. While Flowers described the universities in the 1983b study, no mention was made as to whether they were public or private, so a comparison of this aspect of the data cannot be made. No further statistically significant differences were found in answers to Research Question 1.

MGS Instructor Practices

While not statistically significant, instructor practices revealed by the current study were both different and similar to previous surveys. The current survey reported a high mode and mean for the importance of improving listening skills ($M_O = 4$, $M = 3.57$, $SD = .629$). Renfroe (2005) found that 51% of respondents emphasized music listening. The current survey demonstrated respondents found identifying instruments and composers to be important ($M_O = 3$). This was also the case with Renfroe's study. Six of the open-ended responses to Question #27 in the current survey indicated that

concert etiquette training continues to be important to some instructors. Eighty-one percent of Renfroe's respondents felt that teaching appropriate concert etiquette was important.

The current survey incorporated goals for MGS courses applied by the NASM/CMS 1982 and 1989 MGS Surveys (College Music Society, 1989, p. 58). The NASM/CMS survey asked for ratings of importance for the following MGS goals: emphasizing increasing music literacy, expanding known repertoire, developing analytical skills, and building future audiences. Using means, the most important goals indicated by respondents to the current survey were improving listening skills and promoting aesthetic awareness. Building future audiences was third in importance. Building future audiences received the highest response in the 1989 survey. The mode for all three skills in the current study was four, indicating very important. It is interesting to note that the NASM/CMS questionnaire did not include improving listening skills and promoting aesthetic awareness as goals in the 1989 survey. Respondents added them at that time to an open-ended item entitled "Alternative Goals." Based on the responses of participants in the current study, the development of listening skills and of aesthetic awareness appear to have grown in importance to MGS instructors since 1989.

The level of importance attributed to building future audiences indicated by respondents to the current survey supports Sims and Kuhn (1993), who found that student concert attendance resulted in plans to attend future concerts. The qualitative response section allowed respondents to indicate additional reasons for the concert report. One of these was the importance of attending live performances. Walsh (2000)

observed that listening to a live performance rather than a recording resulted in enhanced listening.

The assignment of the concert report exemplified different expectations among instructors surveyed. When asked to identify the type of content expected in concert reports, keeping in mind that this choice indicated “check all that apply,” respondents indicated “detailed descriptions of student chosen concert highlights” most frequently ($n = 190$), and “general comments about all pieces on the concert” 8% less often ($n = 170$). The contrasting language skills available to people at different age and educational levels, as well as dissimilar musical backgrounds, affects the description of music perception (Hair, 1981). Flowers (1983b) studied frequency of term use, and found that students employed fewer words to describe musical sound and more general words. Based on the results, respondents to the current survey did not have a clear preference for how detailed or how general the concert report should be.

According to the current study, the scheduling of concert reports and length expectations have not changed over time. Results from the current study indicated instructors most frequently assigned two concert reports per semester, requiring the reports to be two pages in length. Flowers (1983b) found that students were required to attend two live concerts as part of non-music major courses. Flowers ascertained the concert report was usually one and one-half to two pages long. The current findings are consistent with past findings.

Research Question 2

The subject of the second research question was whether or not significant differences existed in the role the concert report played in MGS courses when grouped

by region, class and institution size, and instructor characteristics. One statistically significant difference was found in regard to the role of the concert report in MGS courses. A larger percentage of part-time (8%) than full-time (1.5%) instructors indicated the concert report was only used to verify concert attendance. Importantly, 92% and 99% of respondents did not use the concert report solely to verify concert attendance. No further statistically significant differences were found regarding Research Question 2.

The Role of the Concert Report

The NASM/CMS 1982 and 1989 MGS Surveys (College Music Society, 1989) were reviewed in order to articulate the role of the concert report in the current study. Elements from the organization of course content (College Music Society, 1989, p. 29), as well as from the Renfroe (2005) survey of music appreciation courses, were utilized to construct survey items for the current study. Forty-one percent ($n = 107$) of respondents indicated the demonstration of aesthetic awareness was very important on a rating scale of “not important” = 1, to “very important” = 4 ($M_0 = 4$). When Lychner (1998) experimented with students’ manipulation of a CRDI device in response to music, a strong relationship was found between aesthetic and emotional responses. Ellis (1999) was concerned about a music appreciation course causing students to focus less on the effects of music, and on their adopting a more clinical reaction. The Lychner and Ellis studies corroborate the importance of aesthetic awareness, and the current results support their findings.

Large numbers of respondents to the current study found it important (30.9%) or very important (45.5%) that the concert report connected concepts covered in class with

the concert experience. The qualitative responses contained 107 references to the concert report demonstrating concepts learned in class, and 41 comments about the report reinforcing terminology. Cassidy and Speer's (1990) study indicated, with specific vocabulary training, a progression in the use of specific descriptive words was found from the first to second report. The current study indicated 108 (42%) of the total number of respondents required concert reports be submitted at even intervals through the semester.

Respondents to the current survey allotted a small proportion of the final grade to the concert report assignment. This result was consistent with other information gleaned from the current survey: the short length of the concert report; the relatively small number of concert reports required each semester, and the short amounts of grading time instructors devoted to a single concert report. Previous research did not explore grade proportions or grading time allotted to the concert report.

Research Question 3

The subject of the third research question was whether or not significant differences existed in writing pedagogy, writing preparations, and the use of guides for writing the concert report when grouped by region, instructor and institutional characteristics. A statistically significant difference was revealed in the current study regarding the writing process and the contrast between the knowledge of part- and full-time instructors. A larger than expected percentage of part-time (38%) than full-time (19%) instructors did not know whether or not their colleagues used a common rubric to grade concert reports. Sixty-three percent of all instructors who responded did not use a common rubric. A larger than expected percentage of part-time instructors (14%) did

not know whether or not English or Composition was a pre-requisite for the MGS course they taught, compared to full-time instructors (3%). This pre-requisite was not required for MGS courses according to 82% of all respondents. Part-time respondents may be less familiar in general with departmental practices or requirements than full-time respondents might be. Most respondents did not use common rubrics, and English/Composition was not a pre-requisite for the MGS courses they taught.

Instructor support for concert report re-writes was statistically significant when measured by years of college teaching experience, as well as institutional enrollment. Respondents with less than 15 or over 25 years of teaching experience tended not to allow re-writes. However, the instructors with 20-24 years of experience did allow re-writes. A greater number of instructors from institutions with less than 19,999 and more than 29,999 students did not allow re-writes, while those from institutions of 20,000-29,999 did. Regional use of critiqued drafts was also different at a statistically significant level. The Southern (24%) and Eastern (22.5%) regions used such drafts as a writing activity more than other areas. In the West, only 8% of respondents used critiqued drafts, and in the Southwest, only 3% used this writing activity. Information of this nature has not been previously collected.

The Writing Process

The majority of respondents used instructor developed written guidelines to explain concert report expectations to their students. Forty-eight percent used instructor verbal guidelines, and 12.1% took advantage of published guidelines or books about writing. Bellman (2000), DiYanni (1980) and Wingell (1997) wrote books to facilitate writing about music. A limitation of this study was the absence of an open-ended item

where respondents could list the books used. Interestingly, only 5.5% of respondents used departmentally generated written guidelines, perhaps indicating instructors were able to develop and maintain individual expectations for the concert report in their MGS courses.

An interesting result of the current survey concerned note-taking during concerts. Over half of the respondents agreed that students should take notes during a concert in order to respond efficiently to the music for the purposes of writing a concert report. Ellis (1999) might be concerned that this activity may engender a less aesthetic, and more dispassionate student response to live music. Further research may yield insights regarding how helpful, or distracting, this activity is for students, although student note-taking may not be a controllable activity in the context of the live concert setting.

A large majority of respondents indicated English/Composition was not a prerequisite for MGS courses. This question was asked because having completed a college level English/Composition course would be helpful to students new to writing about music (Young & Fulwiler, 1986). As a standard general education offering for freshmen and sophomores, however, it is unlikely that many MGS courses have this requirement. The results of the current study support this conclusion.

A Writing Center was present at a large majority of institutions. Respondents sometimes sent their students to a center, and more than half of instructors agreed that a referral improved student writing of the concert report. Murdick (1992) found the use of multiple drafts, peer criticism, and use of a Writing Center facilitated learning in Art History and Studio Art. The current survey results were interesting because 78.5% of

respondents indicated they did not utilize drafts in the concert report assignment, and 65% did not allow re-writes, leading one to question what referral respondents were referencing when indicating student writing improved after a Writing Center visit. A limitation of this study could be that the Writing Center survey questions needed to be more specific, and should have included a query about optional use of the center. Nevertheless, Murdick's results regarding Writing Center usage were confirmed.

MGS instructors who completed the survey utilized specific additional writing activities. Fifty percent of respondents to the current survey indicated short answer test questions were used in their class. Twenty percent of respondents to the current survey used listening journals. Holloway (2001) and Johnson (1991) found short answer questions facilitated learning in non-music courses. According to previous studies, journal writing improved scores in mathematics (Loud, 1999) and Art History (Murdick, 1992).

Respondents found writing mechanics to be fundamental. "Who, what, where, why and when information in the introduction," and appropriate grammar were important, and respondents agreed that students focused on musical aspects of the concert. The teaching of writing mechanics was important to respondents. The importance of writing mechanics issues in the context of the concert report had not previously been studied.

Research Question 4 and Student Learning

The subject of the fourth research question was what dimensions of student learning were reflected in the concert report, according to instructors. The rotated solution supplied by factor analysis yielded three dimensions: applied analysis,

affective development, and critical evaluation. The analytical dimension accounted for 19.6 % of the variance, the affective development dimension for 13.9 % of the variance, and the critical evaluation dimension for 11.2% of the variance. All 19 items loaded for one of the three factors. None failed to load.

Aspects of student learning that factor analysis grouped in the analytical dimension, in which tools from course content are used to analyze a performance, correlated with the lower levels of Bloom's categories of learning, including knowledge and comprehension (Bloom, 1956). Students recall and apply information learned in class, such as terminology, when summarizing what they hear during a concert. In identifying a style period or composer, students compare, contrast and categorize in their effort to analyze the music they are listening to. In keeping with the general education purposes of MGS courses, survey respondents rated as less important the higher levels of learning such as understanding the theoretical aspects of a composition, phrase structure or musical form.

Student learning that factor analysis grouped as pertaining to affective development was defined for the purposes of this study as demonstrating or advancing a change in the way a student perceives or feels about a musical performance, and specifically with changes in perception. Krathwohl's Taxonomy of Affective Domain (Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1964) could be applied to the kinds of learning grouped into this category. To receive information willingly, to listen and respond, and to understand values others associate with a phenomenon are all important aspects of the Affective Domains of learning. Factor analysis grouped the learning activities that were rated with the highest mode ($M_o = 4$) by respondents to this study. These activities

included students' demonstration of aesthetic awareness and the improvement of students' listening skills. Also, according to respondents, the most important purposes of the concert report assignment ($M_O = 4$) were the promotion of aesthetic awareness and the building of future audiences. The ability to describe an emotional response, to expand known/familiar repertory, and to develop analytical skills were all rated with a mode of three, and were also grouped in this category. In the context of this study, developing analytical skills could be interpreted as being able to change the way one listens to music, assigning changing values to what is heard.

The third category into which student learning elements were grouped by factor analysis dealt with critical evaluation, or the critical appraisal of aspects of a performance. At the top of Bloom's Cognitive Domain, the accurate critical evaluation of a concert, and the understanding of whether the performance exemplified good or bad performance practice, would be difficult for students with little musical experience, in a general education setting, to necessarily be able to achieve. Some students may clearly understand good vs. bad performance practice, but respondents to this study did not rate these goals as being as important ($M_O = 2$) for students to achieve as the affective learning outcomes.

Qualitative Results

Twenty-three percent of the qualitative responses addressed the importance of student interaction with live musical events. Nineteen percent reflected instructors' intentions that the concert report demonstrates concepts learned in class, confirming that a connection should be made between class concepts and the concert experience. This result is in agreement with that of Cassidy and Speer (1990).

Respondents emphasized the improvement of writing skills, consistent with Flowers (1983b), the enhancement of listening skills, and the reinforcing of terminology (Cassidy and Speer (1990). In line with the Affective Domain of learning, respondents thought facilitating affective responses was a valuable activity. Building future audiences was mentioned consistently, in line with the NASM/CMS 1982 and 1989 Questionnaires (College Music Society, 1989).

The qualitative responses to the current study also revealed the importance of emotional and aesthetic reactions to a live musical performance. These two characteristics were discussed in over 10% of the qualitative remarks contributed by survey participants. Similarly, Lychner (1998) and Ellis (1999) studied students' emotional and aesthetic responses to music.

Alternative suggestions for concert report events were suggested, such as writing about orchestra rehearsals, observing private lessons, and conducting musician interviews.

Aside from the few negative remarks, the qualitative responses reinforced the contents of the survey. Participants were able to describe the function of the concert report in their own words, and most found a meaningful way to express their enthusiasm for MGS teaching and the concert report.

Implications

The three dimensions of student learning discovered in the factor analysis on the one hand reduce some of the complexity of dealing with 19 response items, but they raise or refine also a number of questions. How are these dimensions related to each other? Are they mutually exclusive and independent, or is one a necessary condition, a

pre-requisite, for another? The work of Ellis (1999) suggests that applied analytical assignments might in fact reduce affective development responses, such as emotional response or advancing aesthetic awareness. It may be that the dimensions are in outright conflict with each other. These questions reinforce a concern that merged in working through this analysis: it is certainly possible that on some occasions we could be expecting too much in the concert report, expecting students to use elements taught in class to analyze the performance, to properly apply and use various concepts and terminology, to develop and express an emotional response, to demonstrate an expansion of aesthetic awareness, and critically appraise a performance, in two pages, with no drafts or rewrites. The comments certainly show that instructors are very carefully constructing their assignments and of course limiting themselves to specific and manageable tasks within a larger list. However, research might help us to develop an approach that is reasonable and progressive in advancing towards the seemingly important goals in the affective development dimension. Having had these concerns with the list of 19 items and their interrelationships, the finding of the three dimensions of student learning certainly clarified some relationships, but raised these questions again in a new light. This finding and several other findings may be useful in developing a theoretical framework for a number of future studies.

Limitations

The low response rate of the current survey made the results ungeneralizable. There were very few significant differences found between region, instructor and institutional characteristics, and instructor practices, the role of the MGS concert report,

and the writing process. The few significant findings may have been influenced by the very small sample size.

Among the demographic questions, it would have been interesting to include a set of items inquiring about the professional focus of the respondent. Were they singers, instrumentalists, musicologists, etc.? Such information would have enriched the analysis greatly. The current study focused on characteristics generally uncontrollable by participants.

An open-ended response box should have accompanied items that indicated “other.” A good number of respondents indicated that choice, and what those options actually were would have enriched the results of the study. What did instructors teach if they indicated “Combined Genre Course,” or “Other?”

A greater number of questions should have been devoted to instructional practices that prepare students to use music vocabulary correctly. Student learning was addressed in an indirect, rather than direct manner.

Recommendations for Further Research

The concert report, according to the results of the current study, is a very short writing assignment at many institutions. It would be interesting to ascertain whether or not longer concert reports generate any significant differences in student learning. A large qualitative study that analyzes concert reports from representative institutions might provide deeper insights into student writing. Flowers’ 1983 study broke ground in this area, but scholars have not followed through with any further large-scale qualitative analyses of concert reports.

A qualitative study could also be conducted to examine MGS course syllabi and concert report guidelines that describe report expectations. While an extremely lengthy project, such analysis could provide many insights. A simple online search results in thousands of references to MGS course syllabi, and these syllabi would probably yield information about the concert report. Because respondents most often cited using their own written guidelines to explain concert report expectations, it would be very interesting to construct a method for studying exactly what the contents of current guidelines are.

The concert report grading process would be interesting to study. While 69.9% ($n = 179$) of respondents spent 10 minutes or less grading a single concert report, 19.1% ($n = 49$) spent 11-20 minutes on the same task. Most respondents did not use a common grading rubric ($n = 151$), therefore it would be beneficial to discover what grading guidelines, if any, instructors use. Such a study could tie in with an investigation of MGS syllabi.

As further research is conducted on aspects of the concert report, a deeper understanding of the importance of live music to current college students, our future audiences, will continue to be achieved. It is hoped that this study contributes some knowledge to this area of MGS scholarship.

References

- Aloisio, G. (2005). Teaching music in general studies: the time has come for specialists. *The College Music Society Newsletter*, May, 2006. Retrieved May 15, 2007 from http://www.music.org/cgi-bin/newletter_show.pl?h=56&f=28&id=240
- Alphabetical listing of Oklahoma colleges and universities. (2010). Retrieved April 8, 2010, from <http://www.okhighered.org/state-system/colleges-universities/list.shtml>
- Bauer, W. I. (1995). *The relationships among elements of learning style, mode of instruction, and achievement of college music appreciation students*. (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55 (10), 3129A.
- Bellman, J. (2000). *A short guide to writing about music*. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
- Bilken, S. K. & Bogdan, R. C. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction for theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bowling Green State University (2012). Learning Commons: Writing. Retrieved Dec. 7, 2012 from <http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/learningcommons/page97689.html>
- Bridgewater State University (2010). *What is WAC? Definition of writing across the curriculum (WAC)*. Retrieved Dec. 7, 2012 from <http://www.bridgew.edu/WAC/WACatBSC/WhatIsWAC.cfm>
- Bullard, T. C. (1996). Listening with the eyes: an approach to music teaching. In R. Freeman and S. Mahoney (Eds.), *The Eastman Colloquium on Teaching Music as a Liberal Art* (pp. 1-10). Missoula, MT: The College Music Society.
- Cassidy, J. W. & Speer, D. R. (1990). Music terminology: a transfer from knowledge to practical use. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 106, 11-21.

- College Music Society (1989). *Music in the undergraduate curriculum: a reassessment (CMS Report No. 7)*. Boulder, CO: The College Music Society.
- College Music Society (2005). *Beyond Wingspread (CMS Report No. 4)*. Retrieved May 15, 2007 from <http://www.music.org/cgi-bin/showpage.pl?tmpl=/profactiv/pubs/rpts4/beyond&h-27&f=>
- College Music Society (2011). *Directory of music faculties in colleges and universities, U.S. and Canada, 2011-2012*. Missoula, MT.
- Davis, J. J. (1996). *An investigation of the relationship between writing-to-learn activities and learning outcomes for introductory statistics students*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of San Francisco, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57 (06), 2399A.
- DiYanni, R. (1980). Sound and sense: writing about music. *Journal of Basic Writing* 2(4), 62-71.
- Doebler, J.S. (1995). *Development, trial and evaluation of a conducting, listening and writing based general music course*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56 (01), 130A.
- Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: a new philosophy of music education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, M. C. (1999). Spoken responses about music excerpts before and after a course in music appreciation. *Contributions to Music Education*, 26(1), 7-32.
- Fisher, R. R. (1949). *The construction and validation of an instrument to measure musical appreciation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.
- Flowers, P. J. (1983a). The effect of instruction in vocabulary and listening on nonmusicians' descriptions of changes in music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 31(3), 179-189.

- Flowers, P. J. (1983b). Aspects of concert attendance behavior of undergraduate nonmusic majors. *Contributions to Music Education*, 10, 19-26.
- Flowers, P. J. (1985). Descriptions of music excerpts by graduate and undergraduate music majors. *Contributions to Music Education*, 12, 9-13.
- Flowers, P. J. (2003). What was that?—talking about what we hear in music. *Applications of Research in Music Education (Online)*, 21(2). Retrieved February 2, 2006 from <http://newfirstsearch.oclc.org/images/WSPL/wsppdf1/HTML/07558/EYGXU/H SN.HTM>
- Geringer, J. M., Cassidy, J. W. & Byo, J. L. (1997). Nonmusic majors' cognitive and affective responses to performance and programmatic music videos. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 221-233.
- Goss, M. A. (1998). *Writing to learn: an experiment in calculus*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi, 1998). Dissertation Abstracts International, 59 (12), 4385.
- Grandy, L. H. (1988). Collegiate non-music major courses in jazz and rock: A curriculum development. (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49 (05), 1087A.
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2011). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: analyzing and understanding data*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gregory, D. (1995). The continuous response digital interface: an analysis of reliability measures. *Psychomusicology*, 14, 197-208.
- Hair, H. I. (1981). Verbal identification of music concepts. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 29(1), 11-21.
- Hoger, E. A. (1993). *Writing in the discipline of music: rhetorical parameters in writings about music criticism*. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54 (01), 159A.

- Holloway, M. S. (2001). *The use of cooperative action learning to increase music appreciation students' listening skills*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Utah, 2001). Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (12), 4714.
- Huitt, W. (2011). Bloom et al.'s taxonomy of the cognitive domain. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved November 15, 2012, from <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/cognition/bloom.html>
- Johnson, C. M. (1996). Musicians' and nonmusicians' assessment of perceived rubato in musical performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 44, 84-96.
- Johnson, L. A. (1991). *Effects of essay writing on achievement in algebra*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52 (03), 833A.
- Kivy, P. (1980). *The corded shell: Reflections on musical expression*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kivy, P. (1989). *Sound sentiment: an essay on the musical emotions, including the complete text of The Corded shell*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kivy, P. (1993). *The fine art of repetition: essays in the philosophy of music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., and Masia, B.B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook II: Affective domain. New York: David McKay Co. *Krathwohl's Taxonomy of Affective Domain*. Retrieved November 16, 2012 from <http://classweb.gmu.edu/ndabbagh/Resources/Resources2/krathstax.htm>
- Krumhansl, C. L. (1990). *Cognitive foundations of musical pitch*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Larsen, C. M. & Merrion, M. (1987). Documenting the music experience: the music journal. In T. Fulwiler (Ed.), *The journal book* (pp. 254-268). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Levy, K. (1996). Active listening: a perspective. In R. Freeman and S. Mahoney (Eds.), *The Eastman Colloquium on Teaching Music as a Liberal Art* (pp. 11-17). Missoula, MT: The College Music Society.
- Loud, B. J. (1999). *Effects of journal writing on attitudes, beliefs, and achievement of students in a college mathematics course*. (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International, 60(03), 680.
- Lychner, J. A. (1998). An empirical study concerning terminology relating to aesthetic response to music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46(2), 202-219.
- Misenhelter, D. & Price, H.E. (2001). An examination of music and nonmusic majors' response to selected excerpts from Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du printemps*. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49(4), 323-329.
- Morrison, S. J. & Cheung, S. Y. (1999). Preference responses and use of written descriptors among music and nonmusic majors in the United States, Hong Kong, and the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 47(1), 5-17.
- Murdick, W. (1992). *Writing-to-learn in college art classes*. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52 (11), 3847A.
- Murray, D. M. (2002). *Write to learn*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.
- National Association of Schools of Music. *2011-2012 Handbook*. Retrieved June 27, 2012 from http://nasm.artsaccredit.org/site/docs/Handbook/NASM_HANDBOOK_2011-12.pdf
- Natvig, M. (Ed.) (2002). *Teaching music history*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

- Pederson, T. L. (1995). *A phenomenological investigation of music listening in daily life*. (Doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55 (10), 4611B.
- Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: advancing the vision*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Reimer, B. (1989). *A philosophy of music education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Renfroe, D. C. (2005). *An investigation of the current status of music appreciation courses at colleges and universities in the southeastern region of the United States and accredited by the national association of schools of music*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 2005). Dissertation Abstracts International, 66 (06), 2149.
- Routch, W. V. (1958). *The construction and validation of an achievement test in music appreciation for general college students in state teachers colleges of Pennsylvania*. (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1957). Dissertation Abstracts International, 18 (01), 124.
- Schwartz, E. (1984). The training and retraining of college music faculty. *Papers from the Dearborn Conference*. Retrieved May 15, 2007 from <http://www.music.org/cgi-bin/showpage.pl?tmpl=/profactiv/pubs/rpts/dearborn/schwartz&>
- Seaton, D. (1998, October). Music and American higher education. In R. D. Gunstream and S. Hope (Directors). *Music and American Higher Education*. Summit conducted at the meeting of the Music Educators National Conference, Washington, D.C.
- Sheldon, D. A. & Gregory, D. (1997). Perception of tempo modulation by listeners of different levels of educational experience. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45(3), 367-379.

- Sims, W. L. & Kuhn, T. L. (1993). Effects of required concert attendance on attitudes of college students enrolled in music courses for nonmusic majors. *Research Perspectives in Music Education*, 4, 28-31.
- Spitzer, M. (2004). *Metaphor and musical thought*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Strunk, O. & Treitler, L. (Eds.). (1998). *Source readings in music history*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Subotnik, R. R. (1996). *Deconstructive variations – music and reason in Western society*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Townsend, M.A. (1994). Writing across the curriculum. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of English studies and language arts: a project of the National Council of Teachers of English* (pp. 1299-1302). Jefferson City, MO: Scholastic, Inc.
- Treitler, L. (1997). Language and the interpretation of music. In J. Robinson (Ed.), *Music and meaning* (pp. 23-56). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Walsh, K. F. (2000). *Shed some light: open the door. A descriptive study of the feeling of peak experience while listening to or performing music*. (Doctoral dissertation, The Union Institute, 2000). Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (09), 5011B.
- Williams, J. M. & Colomb, G. G. (1990). The university of Chicago. In T. Fulwiler, & A. Young, (Eds.). *Programs that work: models and methods for writing across the curriculum* (pp. 83-111). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Wingell, R. J. (1997). *Writing about music: an introductory guide*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Wolpert, R. S. (2000). Attention to key in a nondirected music listening task: musicians vs. nonmusicians. *Music Perception*, 8(2), 225-231.

Young, A. & Fulwiler, T. (Eds.) (1986). *Writing across the disciplines: research into practice*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Zalanowski, A. H. (1990). Music appreciation and hemisphere orientation: visual versus verbal involvement. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 38(3), 197-205.

Ziegler, A. (1981). *The writing workshop*. New York: Teachers & Writers Collaborative.

Zinsser, W. (1988). *Writing to learn*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Appendix A Concert Report Survey

A Survey of the Concert Report

Information Sheet for Consent to Participate in a Research Study

My name is Kirsten Underwood and I am a graduate student in the Music Department at the University of the Oklahoma. I am requesting that you volunteer to participate in a research study entitled "An Investigation of Music in General Studies Instructor Practices Regarding the Concert Report." You were selected as a possible participant because of your interest in teaching Music in General Studies courses at the college level. A Music in General Studies course is defined as an undergraduate course for the non-music major. A concert report is defined as a written response to a live concert experience.

Please read this information sheet and contact me to ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the characteristics of the assignment of the concert report in college Music in General Studies classes as they relate to instructor and institutional characteristics.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete an on-line survey questionnaire, which should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Completion of each question is voluntary and not required. You may choose to end your participation at any time.

Participation in this study involves less than minimal risk. The benefits to participation are none. You will not be compensated for your time and participation in this study.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not result in penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

The records of this study will be kept private and your supervisor will not have access to your responses. In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you as a research participant. Research records will be stored securely. The IP or Email addresses of respondents will not be saved, and therefore all responses will be completely anonymous. Only approved researchers will have access to the records.

If you have concerns or complaints about the research, the researcher(s) conducting this study can be contacted as follows: Kirsten Underwood, Graduate Student/Principal Investigator, at 580-284-4358 or kirstenu@cameron.edu or Dr. Charlene Dell, Faculty Advisor, at 405-325-2081 or cdell@ou.edu. In the event of a research-related injury, contact the researcher(s). You are encouraged to contact the researcher(s) if you have any questions. If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than the individuals on the research team, or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

You may print out a copy of this information to keep for your records. If you are not able to print out a copy of this information, please request one from the Principal Investigator, Kirsten Underwood.

The University of Oklahoma is an Equal Opportunity Institution.

NOTE: Because this will be an anonymous on-line survey, the participants name, IP or Email address, and the date upon which the questionnaire was completed will not be requested or provided in the results.

I acknowledge that I have read the above information. I have been able to ask questions and receive satisfactory answers. By clicking "YES" below I consent to participate in the study. By clicking "NO" I decline to participate in the study, and understand that I will therefore exit the survey.

***1. Do you agree to the consent information listed on this form?**

- ☐ Yes, I agree to the above consent form.
- ☐ No, I do not agree to the above consent form.

A Survey of the Concert Report

Demographic information

To put your answers in context, we would like to gather some personal information. Your answers will remain completely confidential.

2. In what region of the country do you teach?

- ☐ Eastern (CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT)
- ☐ North Central (IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI)
- ☐ Northwestern (AK, ID, MT, OR, WA, WY)
- ☐ Southern (AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV)
- ☐ Southwestern (AR, CO, KS, MO, NM, OK, TX)
- ☐ Western (AZ, CA, HI, NV, UT)

3. At which kind of degree-granting institution do you currently teach?

- ☐ Private Associates
- ☐ Private Baccalaureate
- ☐ Private Master's
- ☐ Private Doctoral
- ☐ Public Associates
- ☐ Public Baccalaureate
- ☐ Public Master's
- ☐ Public Doctoral

4. The total enrollment for the institution at which I teach is in the following range:

- ☐ under 1,000
- ☐ 1,000-4,999
- ☐ 5,000-9,999
- ☐ 10,000-19,999
- ☐ 20,000-29,000
- ☐ above 30,000

A Survey of the Concert Report

5. Which degrees have you earned?

- ☐ Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Music
- ☐ Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Music Education
- ☐ Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees in Music
- ☐ Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees in Music Education
- ☐ Combination of Bachelor's and Master's degrees
- ☐ Combination of Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees

6. Please indicate your current faculty status:

- ☐ Graduate Teaching Fellow
- ☐ Adjunct
- ☐ Lecturer/Instructor
- ☐ Assistant Professor
- ☐ Associate Professor
- ☐ Full Professor
- ☐ Visiting Faculty

7. Please indicate whether you are part-time or full-time.

- ☐ part-time
- ☐ full-time

8. How many years have you taught at the college level?

- ☐ 4 years or less
- ☐ 5-9 years
- ☐ 10-14 years
- ☐ 15-19 years
- ☐ 20-24 years
- ☐ over 25 years

A Survey of the Concert Report

9. How many years of experience do you have teaching Music in General Studies courses?

- ☐ 4 years or less
- ☐ 5-9 years
- ☐ 10-14 years
- ☐ 15-19 years
- ☐ 20-24 years
- ☐ over 25 years

10. The Music in General Studies course(s) I teach represent(s) the following percent of my teaching load:

- ☐ 25% or less
- ☐ 25-50%
- ☐ 50-75%
- ☐ 75-100%

A Survey of the Concert Report

The Concert Report in Your Courses

In this section, you will answer short questions about the use of the concert report in the Music in General Studies courses that you teach. For the purposes of this study, a concert report is defined as a written response to a live concert experience. A Music in General Studies course is defined as an undergraduate course designed for the non-music major.

11. What type(s) of Music in General Studies course(s) do you teach (check all that apply)?

- ☐ Western Classical Music Appreciation
- ☐ World Music
- ☐ Popular Music
- ☐ Combined Genres
- ☐ Other

12. What is the average enrollment for a single section of the Music in General Studies course(s) you teach?

- ☐ 40 or less
- ☐ 41-60
- ☐ 61-80
- ☐ 81-100
- ☐ 101-150
- ☐ 151 or more

13. Do you have a teaching assistant for your Music in General Studies class(es)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

14. In which of the survey courses below do you assign the concert report (check all that apply)?

- ☐ Western Classical Music Appreciation
- ☐ World Music
- ☐ Popular Music
- ☐ Combined Genre Course
- ☐ Other

A Survey of the Concert Report

15. How many concert reports must students complete?

- ☐ zero
☐ one
☐ two
☐ three
☐ four
☐ five or more

16. How many pages must each concert report consist of?

- ☐ one
☐ two
☐ three
☐ four
☐ five or more

17. When in the semester is/are the concert report(s) due?

- ☐ at the end of the semester
☐ at even intervals throughout the semester
☐ when it is convenient for the student based upon available performances

18. Is the purpose of the concert report ONLY to verify concert attendance?

- ☐ no
☐ yes

19. What proportion of the final grade does the concert report component receive?

- ☐ 0-10%
☐ 11-20%
☐ 21-30%
☐ 31-40%
☐ 41-50%

20. In the concert report, how important is it that students demonstrate:

- | | not important | fairly important | important | very important |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| correct usage of musical terminology | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| correct identification of instruments | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

A Survey of the Concert Report

21. In the concert report, how important is it that students articulate:

	not important	fairly important	important	very important
a demonstration of aesthetic awareness	☐	☐	☐	☐
the ability to describe an emotional response	☐	☐	☐	☐
the ability to describe programmatic elements	☐	☐	☐	☐

22. For each musical work described in the concert report, how important is it that students demonstrate:

	not important	fairly important	important	very important
an understanding of musical form	☐	☐	☐	☐
an understanding of musical phrase structure	☐	☐	☐	☐
the ability to identify the correct style period(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐
the ability to identify the correct composer(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐

23. In the concert report, how important is it that students express:

	not important	fairly important	important	very important
an accurate critical evaluation of the concert	☐	☐	☐	☐
an understanding of good performance practice	☐	☐	☐	☐
an understanding of bad performance practice	☐	☐	☐	☐

24. In the concert report, how important is it that a connection is made between concepts being covered in class and the concert experience?

☐ not important
☐ fairly important
☐ important
☐ very important

A Survey of the Concert Report

25. How important to you as an instructor is it that the concert report address the following:

	not important	fairly important	important	very important
increase music literacy	☐	☐	☐	☐
expand known/familiar repertory	☐	☐	☐	☐
develop analytical skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
further an understanding of the theoretical aspects of a composition	☐	☐	☐	☐
demonstrate knowledge of historical chronology	☐	☐	☐	☐
improve listening skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
promote aesthetic awareness	☐	☐	☐	☐
build future audiences	☐	☐	☐	☐

26. The concert report is expected to contain (check all that apply):

- ☐ general comments about all pieces on the concert.
- ☐ detailed descriptions of student chosen concert highlights.
- ☐ comments about audience demographics and behavior.
- ☐ correctly identified materials from program notes, whether printed or oral.

27. Please describe the function the concert report serves in your course.

A Survey of the Concert Report

The Concert Report Writing Process

In this section, you will answer brief questions about the writing aspects of the concert report assignment. For the purposes of this study, a Writing Center is defined as a university facility designed to offer writing resources and tutoring for students.

28. Do all faculty who teach similar sections of a course follow a common rubric for grading concert reports?

- ☐ no
☐ yes
☐ I don't know

29. Which of the following, if any, do you use to explain content requirements for the concert report to the students in your class:

- ☐ departmentally generated written guidelines
☐ instructor developed written guidelines
☐ instructor verbal instructions
☐ published guidelines, such as ancillary textbook materials, or books about writing
☐ other

30. What is your response to the following statement: Students should take notes during the concert in order to respond to the music in the most efficient manner.

- ☐ strongly disagree
☐ disagree
☐ agree
☐ strongly agree

31. Is an English/Composition course a prerequisite for the Music in General Studies course(s) you teach?

- ☐ no
☐ yes
☐ I don't know

A Survey of the Concert Report

32. Does your institution have a Writing Center available to assist students with writing mechanics?

- ☐ no
- ☐ yes
- ☐ I don't know

33. How often do you send your students to the Writing Center for help with their concert report writing?

- ☐ never
- ☐ sometimes
- ☐ often
- ☐ I don't know if there is a Writing Center at my institution
- ☐ there is no Writing Center at my institution

**34. Indicate below your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement:
Student referral to the Writing Center results in improved writing of the concert report.**

- ☐ strongly disagree
- ☐ disagree
- ☐ agree
- ☐ strongly agree
- ☐ I don't know if there is a Writing Center at my institution
- ☐ there is no Writing Center at my institution

35. Which of the following do you require students to turn in with their concert report?

- ☐ concert program
- ☐ notes
- ☐ concert program and notes
- ☐ nothing in addition to the concert report

A Survey of the Concert Report

36. Indicate which of the following writing activities you use in addition to the concert report. Check all that apply.

- ☐ regular in-class writing
- ☐ occasional in-class writing
- ☐ listening journal
- ☐ written summaries of group activities
- ☐ essay test questions
- ☐ short answer test questions
- ☐ other writing activities
- ☐ the concert report is the only writing activity for the course

37. Which of the following writing activities are a component of your concert report assignment?

- ☐ draft(s) critiqued by the instructor
- ☐ draft(s) critiqued by peers
- ☐ both of the above
- ☐ neither of the above

38. Are students allowed to re-write their concert report for a better grade?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no

39. How important is it that a concert report demonstrate the following?

	not important	fairly important	important	very important
appropriate grammar	☐	☐	☐	☐
who, what, where, why and when information in the introduction	☐	☐	☐	☐
a clear thesis statement about the experience as a whole	☐	☐	☐	☐
a clear structural framework based on a thesis statement	☐	☐	☐	☐

A Survey of the Concert Report

40. Please indicate your response to the following statements as they complete this sentence. The concert report:

	strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree
is not an effective method for achieving the learning outcomes of the course.	☐	☐	☐	☐
is an effective method for achieving the learning outcomes of the course.	☐	☐	☐	☐

41. In general, student concert reports tend to focus on the

	strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree
musical aspects of the pieces performed at the concert.	☐	☐	☐	☐
emotional responses to the concert program.	☐	☐	☐	☐
extraneous, non-musical descriptions of the concert venue and audience.	☐	☐	☐	☐

42. The student concert report usually demonstrates

	strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree
an acceptable level of musical literacy that reflects course content.	☐	☐	☐	☐
an unacceptable level of musical literacy that does not reflect course content.	☐	☐	☐	☐

43. In grading a concert report, on average, I am usually able to spend the following amount of time on each paper:

☐ 5 minutes or less

☐ 6-10 minutes

☐ 11-15 minutes

☐ 16-20 minutes

☐ 21 minutes or more

☐ a teaching assistant grades the concert reports

A Survey of the Concert Report

Thank You

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your assistance is very much appreciated!

Appendix B Email Text Containing Survey Link

Subject Title: Concert Report Survey

Dear Colleague,

You have been selected to be a possible participant in a research study because you teach a music-in-general-studies course at the college level. The purpose of this study is to investigate the characteristics of the assignment of the concert report in college music in general studies classes as they relate to faculty perspectives. If you agree, you will be asked to complete an on-line survey, which should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The knowledge reasonably expected to result from this research will, it is hoped, be valuable for faculty who have questions about their attitudes towards and circumstances surrounding their teaching non-music majors how to write in the discipline of music, exemplified specifically by the concert report, within music in general studies courses.

You will not be reimbursed for your time and participation in this study. Participation is voluntary. If you withdraw or decline participation, you will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the study. If you decide to participate, you may decline to answer any question and may choose to withdraw at any time. No IP or Email addresses will be saved, therefore all responses will be and remain completely anonymous.

Feel free to ask or send via email any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this survey. If you have concerns or complaints about the

research, please contact Kirsten Underwood, Graduate Student/Principal investigator at 580-284-4358 or kirstenu@cameron.edu.

Please take the survey here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/3DHY8J7>

Thank you for your participation!

Sincerely,

Kirsten Underwood

Graduate Student/Principal Investigator

Dept. of Music

University of Oklahoma

580-284-4358

The University of Oklahoma is an equal opportunity employer.

Appendix C IRB Approval Letter



The University of Oklahoma®

OFFICE OF HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANT PROTECTION - IRB

IRB Number: 13576

Category: 2

Approval Date: December 07, 2011

December 07, 2011

Kirsten Underwood
Fine Arts/Music
5549 NW Eisenhower Drive
Lawton, OK 73505

Dear Ms. Underwood:

RE: An Investigation Of Music In General Studies Instructor Practices Regarding The Concert Report

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed the above-referenced research project and determined that it meets the criteria in 45 CFR 46, as amended, for exemption from IRB review. You may proceed with the research as proposed. Please note that any changes in the protocol will need to be submitted to the IRB for review as changes could affect this determination of exempt status. Also note that you should notify the IRB office when this project is completed, so we can remove it from our files.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to call the IRB office at (405) 325-8110 or send an email to irb@ou.edu.

Cordially,


Aimee Franklin, Ph. D
Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board

Ltr_Prot_Fappv_X

1816 West Lindsey, Suite 150 Norman, Oklahoma 73069 PHONE: (405) 325-8110



Exit this survey

My name is Kirsten Underwood and I am a graduate student in the Music Department at the University of the Oklahoma. I am requesting that you volunteer to participate in a research study entitled "An Investigation of Music in General Studies Instructor Practices Regarding the Concert Report." You were selected as a possible participant because of your interest in teaching Music in General Studies courses at the college level. A Music in General Studies course is defined as an undergraduate course for the non-music major. A concert report is defined as a written response to a live concert experience. Please read this information sheet and contact me to ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to take part in this study.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete an on-line survey questionnaire, which should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Participation in this study involves less than minimal risk. The benefits to participation are that the knowledge reasonably expected to result from this research will, it is hoped, be valuable for instructors who have questions about teaching non-music majors how to write in the discipline of music.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not result in penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

The records of this study will be kept private and your supervisor will not have access to your responses. In published reports, there will be no information included that will make it possible to identify you as a research participant. Research records will be stored securely. The IP or

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THI... Page 1 of 2

OU NC IRB

Email addresses of respondents will not be saved, and therefore all responses will be completely anonymous. Only approved researchers will have access to the records. If you have concerns or complaints about the research, the researcher(s) conducting this study can be contacted as follows: Kirsten Underwood, Graduate Student/Principal Investigator, at 580-284-4358 or kirstenu@cameron.edu; Dr. Charlene Dell, Faculty Advisor, at 405-325-2081 or cdell@ou.edu; Dr. Irvin Wagner, Faculty Advisor, at 405-325-5344 or iwagner@ou.edu. In the event of a research-related injury, contact the researcher(s). You are encouraged to contact the researcher(s) if you have any questions. If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than the individuals on the research team, or if you cannot reach the research team, you may contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at (405) 325-8110 or irb@ou.edu. You may print out a copy of this information to keep for your records. If you are not able to print out a copy of this information, please request one from the Principal Investigator, Kirsten Underwood.

The University of Oklahoma is an Equal Opportunity Institution.

NOTE: Because this will be an anonymous on-line survey, the participants name, IP or Email address, and the date upon which the questionnaire was completed will not be requested or provided in the results.

I acknowledge that I have read the above information. I have been able to ask questions and receive satisfactory answers. By clicking "YES" below I consent to participate in the study. By clicking "NO" I decline to participate in the study.

*** 1. Do you agree to the consent information listed on this form?**

Yes, I agree to the above consent form.

No, I do not agree to the above consent form.

Next

APPROVED

DEC 07 2011

OU NC IRB

Appendix D CMS Project Approval Letter

Kirsten Underwood

From: Jack Taylor [taylorja35@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2011 2:35 PM
To: Kirsten Underwood
Cc: Julie Johnson; Jack Taylor
Subject: Re: Request to submit Survey via CMS

Kirsten:

We've completed our comments about your survey. It's very nice, and below are suggestions for changes.

I'll tell Julie at CMS that your survey is approved - am sending this email to her.
Best wishes to you for in your work on the dissertation!

Jack Taylor

Appendix E Unedited Responses to Open-ended Question #27

1. I think that has been covered in your survey! Attending concerts and applying concepts learned in the class is key to the course. The main point is to experience live music and to enhance listening skills. So many students have had little to no exposure to classical music and hearing it live makes all the difference. I'm glad you are doing this survey!
2. The concert report serves as a way to get students to listen to live music and give them an opportunity to listened in a focused way within the context of a social situation. As such, sometimes instead of the term "concert report" we use the term "field project," as the student (or student team) would be required to also investigate demographics, sound acoustics, space, and more general observations about the scene, almost an ethnography of sorts.
3. I have students attend an orchestra rehearsal, not a performance, and write up their observations of the conductor-orchestra interaction.
4. My students regularly attend concerts of their favorite music, but most would not attend classical concerts without the pressure of a graded report. Once they've gone, they often find that they enjoy them. In the reports, students apply what they learn in class to describe the music, audience behavior, performance details. They are encouraged to ask questions about things they don't understand. The reports show me what details I may have assumed "everybody knows" about classical music and concerts, or what concepts the students have not fully grasped. In addition, my students

increase the size of the audience for music students who are performing. I hope that the reports will help build future audiences for classical music.

5. Opportunity to focus attention on live performance experience, reflect on what they heard/saw, connect to course content.

6. I envision these concert reports as furthering the education of students in several ways: Writing across the curriculum; Diversity awareness of audiences/performers; Exposure to musical works students may have rejected unless required to attend; and A setting outside of class to build professional behaviors.

7. The concert report serves to expand the classroom by giving students a chance to hear classical music live. Most are unaware that it is readily available on our campus.

8. Formal paper that is to demonstrate understanding and application of basic music elements learned through terminology and listening skills acquired during the course.

9. The elements of music, including but not limited to, dynamic range, pitch range, meter, musical timbre, musical texture, musical form, and defining program or absolute music, are all to be embedded in the review of the concert. Musical style is not a factor and even a bad polka band is acceptable if the elements of music presented in the concert are critically defined.

10. All of the above.

11. I want students to have practice in writing prose. I want students to apply the concepts that they learn in class and in the textbook to real world musical experiences. I want students to broaden their musical experiences beyond stuff in class and in the textbook.

12. From course outcomes: • acquire vocabulary used to define, describe, categorize, and compare musical works in a variety of genres from the major historical periods of the Western art music tradition. • apply musical concepts to identify and describe musical works as they relate to individual artistic expression and the process of cultural change. • identify stylistic characteristics of major genres, style periods, selected representative composers, and selected masterworks of the Western art music tradition. • apply musical concepts and vocabulary to construct and explain individual aesthetic judgments with regard to specific musical works and performances.
13. The purpose of concert reports is for students to apply the listening skills they learn in my class.
14. Concert Reports are used to see if students can articulate an informed personal reaction to works in the arts and humanities. They must choose the composition or movement they liked best and explain why. Then they must choose the composition or movement they liked least and explain why.
15. Ensures exposure to new styles of music.
16. To practice listening skills covered in class; to broaden the students' musical perspective; to expose students to live acoustical music.
17. Hopefully students will relate the concepts discussed in the classroom to what they are listening to in the concert.
18. To apply what we learned in class to actual concert performances. To connect theory with reality.

19. In addition to the above mentioned information, the student must also research two of the pieces and their composers and provide interesting information that increased or decreased their appreciation for the piece.
20. Concert reports assess if students can identify the listening elements of a piece of music and respond to them aesthetically; and write knowledgeably and critically about music while demonstrating college/level writing skills.
21. Put to use the terminology learned in the semester. Give the students an opportunity to attend a really quality live orchestral concert. Encourage students to attend live concerts in the future.
22. The above plus just getting them to go to a live concert that is not rock or rap. I require one classical, one world music and one of the student's choice.
23. The concert report motivates students to attend concerts, it encourages them to actually listen to the concert, it gives a framework for listening, understanding and appreciation of music, it forces them to examine and articulate their experiences and it helps develop writing skills.
24. Exposure to live Classical events; support of campus events; to focus listening skills and write about that; as an exercise in following assignment instructions (assignment is not explained in class--but on Blackboard).
25. From a guide: "As we will do in class discussions, the commentaries on each piece (each movement) may be a combination of objective observations and subjective comments. If possible, you should make observations about connections with pieces or styles we have studied in class or the text. Refer also to "Terms and Concepts" posting. In addition to describing the pieces, try to talk about your experience and impressions.

You may discuss what you liked (or disliked) and why, what composer would you like to hear more of? -- and why? Did you have a favorite piece or movement, or one you particularly did not like? What pieces were particularly well played? -- or poorly/unconvincingly played? Did some of your observations prompt questions?

26. The function is to apply the terms and concepts we've been studying and to expose the students to a type of performance many have never experienced. The reports routinely contain shocked comments about how they didn't realize how hard to was, what a conductor did, or that they didn't expect to like it.

27. To help the student listen to music in a more analytical manner.

28. As with most of the questions asked above, it depends--on the concert(s) or other performances in question, the point in the semester, the character & quality of the particular class.

29. The papers I assign that are connected to live concert going allow the student to discuss not only the musical aspects of the pieces performed, but also the importance of live performance and the active role listeners play in the music-making experience.

30. Students increase their ability to listen to, understand, speak, and write about musical art. Also, it helps to identify and "weed out" functionally illiterate and otherwise academically dysfunctional freshman and classroom/concert hall secondary-school grade-inflated idiots. This state spends way too much money on remediating the lack of college preparation caused by the teacher's union desire to prioritize employee compensation, tenure, etc., rather than student learning discipline. Sorry if this pisses you off...whatever...

31. It reviews the concerts attended over the semester, and then it compares the pros and cons of listening to music live vs. listening to recordings.
32. The concert reports reinforce activities from the classroom -- I turn the students into "junior ethnomusicologists" and let them "study" the event as an outsider.
33. I do not assign concert reports.
34. The primary function is cultural awareness, since the student is asked to attend concerts out of his/her primary cultural experience.
35. Term paper = includes concert observations, critical/analytical commentary and research components.
36. I have ceased teaching the music in general studies course (Music Apprec.) and have removed it from our curriculum. I assign concert reports in other music classes and their purpose varies, everything from evidence of attendance to a thorough evaluation of the event. It is a jump off point for discussion in the class, a bonding exercise and a way to find out what the students' levels of awareness are in their listening abilities.
37. Exposure to live classical music--a very new experience for most! A way to increase our audience at departmental performances. An opportunity to use new vocabulary and apply new concepts studied in class.
38. Students attend six to seven concerts during the course of the semester and write reaction papers on all but one of the concerts. As this is a first-year, writing intensive course, the reaction papers also cover that element of the first-year class expectation.
39. In my general music course, concert reports serve to train students to listen thoughtfully and analytically - and ideally to connect the concert experience with concepts discussed in class. In my world music course, the concert report is intended as

an introduction to musical observation and ethnography, eg. noticing what people are doing and why they are doing it.

40. Makes students demonstrate the art of listening, which is the total emersion into the subject at hand.

41. It serves mostly to show synthesis of knowledge, vocabulary and elements along with aesthetics and the ability to report aesthetic experience. I think it is important to share the second writing experience in my course. They must interview a musician, someone involved in music with set questions. My students enjoy this experience and it is often a family member. I find it really opens their eyes to the importance of music to these individuals and the passion for musical performance.

42. The primary aim is to analyze the concert as a performance event, exploring what music enables the performers, listeners and organizers to experience and express.

Students must demonstrate an awareness of characteristics of individual musical selections, the options each offers, and how performers and listeners engage with them.

43. The concert report requires students to experience and gain an appreciation for live performance and to develop the skill of listening and describing the basic elements of music using appropriate terminology.

44. To experience live music, and to describe the experience in a coherent and musically literate manner.

45. Through my corrections and comments on the returned reports, I aim to improve not only the students' listening skills and ability to articulate their musical experiences, but to improve their general writing skills as well.

46. Part of their final grade.

47. Promotes students' exposure to a variety of music genres; indicates their understanding of basic music concepts; requires that they discern the difference between the quality of the music and its performance.

48. It allows me to know if the students can HEAR what we have discussed in class as well as give them the aesthetic experience not possible in the classroom.

49. For many of my students (rural, public community college), this is the first time they have actually attended concerts, and becomes an "eye-opener" for them. My hope is to get them through the door, hoping they will attend future events on their own initiative.

50. Expand students' experience of live music.

51. I teach a large class of non-music majors at an state institution where the average ACT is 21. More than half of my students are minorities with poorly developed language skills. Some have no idea what a clarinet is. Function: To experience the classical music venue, practice concert etiquette, exercise writing/communication skills using musical terms. Concert Review Guidelines: Requirements and Suggestions
REQUIREMENTS Please follow the format and details below. • The paper must be typewritten. • In the upper left hand corner: Your Name Course, Section Date Example: John Smith Music 190, Section Three, December 15, 2008 • Next, a few spaces below and centered: A TITLE • Composition length: at least five paragraphs (Two pages or 500 words) • Terms: at least ten musical terms must be included in your review.

Examples: allegro, adagio, dynamics, timbre, bassoon, concertmaster, maestro, etc.

Please use bold typeface with the terms. • Numbered pages (page one doesn't need to be numbered). • Stapled pages. • Signed program stapled to your paper. • Completed Peer

Response Form and draft stapled to your paper. The grade of a paper without a completed Peer Response Form will be lowered ten points. • Place your CONCERT REVIEW and all your programs in a manila envelope or a folder with your name/section PRINTED CLEARLY on the outside and hand this in to me on the due date listed in the syllabus. • Concert Reviews handed in after the due date will be lowered 5 points for each day late. GRADING Grading Scale: 36-40 = A, 32 = B, 28 = C, 24 = D, Below 20 = F 40 points possible 40-point papers usually have: • Format and Details followed exactly • Well-developed paragraphs • No spelling, grammar or punctuation errors • Clear thought and detail • Two or more of the following: unique insight, humor, creativity, keen observation, a great title. • A completed Peer Response Form 36-point papers usually have: • Format and Details followed nearly exactly • Well-developed paragraphs • A few spelling, grammar or punctuation errors • Clear thought and detail • One or more of the following: unique insights, humor, creativity, keen observation, a great title. • A completed Peer Response Form 32-point papers usually have: • Most of the Format and Details followed • Some paragraphs undeveloped • Several spelling, grammar or punctuation errors • Some unclear thought and detail • Perhaps one of the following: unique insights, humor, creativity, keen observation, a great title. • A completed Peer Response Form 24-point papers usually have: • Some of the Format and Details followed • Some paragraphs undeveloped • Several spelling, grammar or punctuation errors • Some unclear thought and detail • None of the following: unique insights, humor, creativity, keen observation, or a great title. • A completed Peer Response Form 23-point-and-below papers usually have: • Most of the Format and Details not followed • Several paragraphs undeveloped • Many

spelling, grammar or punctuation errors • Some unclear thought and detail • None of the following: unique insights, humor, creativity, keen observation, or a great title. • No

Peer Response Form

SUGGESTIONS ONE APPROACH TO WRITING A CONCERT REVIEW... Have a purpose. Example: tell me the order of your preference of three pieces you heard on a concert and explain how you arrived at your preference. a. Collect and sort your information b. Take a stand (decide which piece you liked best) c. Write a draft TITLE (a good title tells everything --- create this last) INTRODUCTION (First paragraph) • Opening line (create this later) • Event - basic info (when/who/what/where) • Explain what you are going to tell your audience (which piece you liked best and why - reasons can be visual, auditory, interpretive, choice of music, etc.) • Link to next paragraph: take ONE WORD from the last sentence of the paragraph and insert it into the first sentence of the next paragraph. Example: "Before I discuss my favorite pieces, I'd like to mention a few things about the atmosphere of the concert setting. (Next paragraph) The atmosphere of the concert setting..."

PARAGRAPH TWO (atmosphere) • Link from previous paragraph • General description • Specifics: details, examples, comparisons, and "stories" • Link to next paragraph

PARAGRAPH THREE (second best piece) • Link from previous paragraph • General description • Specifics: details, examples, comparisons, and "stories" • Link to next paragraph

PARAGRAPH FOUR (third best piece or least liked piece) • Link from previous paragraph • General description • Specifics: details, examples, comparisons, and "stories" • Link to next paragraph

PARAGRAPH FIVE (favorite piece) • Link from previous paragraph • General description • Specifics: details, examples, comparisons, "stories" • Link to next paragraph

CONCLUSION (paragraph six) • "In conclusion..." a dull but effective link --- easy to understand • Tell them what you've told them (repeat your intro, slightly reworded) • Mention the other performers/pieces and include a few comments about them; other information about the concert • Final line --- wrap it up, make it funny, if possible; quotes are effective. Link it to the title with a common word. d. Create your title e. Create your opening line f. Refine your links g. Proofread (first time). Have someone read it and tell you "what they like about your paper" and "what they want to hear more of." h. Re-write i. Proofread (hardcore --- spelling/grammar, etc.)

FACT-GATHERING TIPS • Composer biography will generate useful facts • Period/era will generate musical characteristics • Title of the piece should generate information • Musical terms: think of the terms you already know: tempo, dynamics, timbre, crescendo, accelerando, names of musical instruments, etc.

ANOTHER APPROACH TO WRITING A CONCERT REVIEW • Use the same basic format as previously stated. • Focus on these three areas: a) atmosphere (surroundings -- - audience, hall, ambience, etc.) b) performers (stage presence, roles played in different pieces, prominence, sound quality, errors in performance, etc.) c) music (eras, composers, elements of the music which reflect the era/composer, use of MUSICAL

TERMS to describe the music) Write with a purpose. Your purpose: to answer the question "HOW DO I FEEL ABOUT THE CONCERT?" Focus on three areas:

ATMOSPHERE (where and under what conditions it was performed); PERFORMERS (how it was performed); and MUSIC (the compositions). Observations about the ATMOSPHERE: details about the concert hall, the audience, your physical surroundings, etc. Observations about the PERFORMERS playing the music: details about how they looked, what they wore, how they sounded, what they did, how they changed things, what the conductor did, how the performers communicated with each other and the audience, etc. Observations about the MUSIC (this should be the bulk of the body of the review): what era is it from, what genre is it, how were the elements of music at work in the music, what did you notice about melody, rhythm, harmony, form, tone color; what kind of patterns did you notice --- contrast and repetition, etc.?

Observations in summary: what did you expect to see and hear at this concert? How did you feel about going to this kind of concert before you went? How have those feelings changed (or not)? In other words, HOW do you feel about what you saw, and WHY do you feel that way?

WRITING PROCEDURE Step One: Collect information in each of the three areas. Step Two: From the information you have collected, determine which stand or opinion you want to take. It doesn't have to be the truth! A negative opinion is usually easier to write; a positive stand will (sometimes) get you a better grade. Throw out the facts that won't help you --- the same way OJ's lawyers and the prosecutors did...

Step Three: Write a rough draft. A standard essay includes four parts: Title, Introduction, Body, and Conclusion. Title: Compose the title last. Intro: THE IMPORTANCE OF A GOOD OPENING LINE. "The worst concert I ever attended

...(who/what/where/when)." Follow with YOUR OPINION and the three areas you are going to deal with to support that opinion. Body: Three paragraphs. Order them in importance two, three, one. Support with DETAILS and EXAMPLES. LINK.

Conclusion: "In conclusion..." repeat your INTRO (not necessarily verbatim, but verbatim is OK --- easy to understand; add a few other details and qualifiers (some of the facts you initially threw out because they didn't help you--- these may help protect you if the reader disagrees with you); SNAPPY FINAL LINE (A quote: a music quotation or ANY QUOTE --- make up one! "As my Grandpa Willie always said..." a question, a joke.) Title: Now create a title (it should tell EVERYTHING). Step Four: Proofreading (first time). Have someone read it and tell you WHAT THEY LIKE and WHAT THEY WANT TO HEAR MORE OF. Step Five: Re-write. Step Six: Proofreading (hardcore --- spelling/grammar, etc.)

SAMPLES OF CONCERT REVIEWS Copies of concert reviews from previous semesters are on reserve under HUFF -MUSIC 190 in the Music Library (Sallee 108). I WILL READ A DRAFT OF YOUR CONCERT REVIEW If you wish, I will read a draft of your concert review and I will discuss ways you can improve it. Please bring a copy to me during my office hours or call or email me to schedule an appointment. I will read and discuss your draft with you in-person only, and only if someone has already completed a Peer Response Form for you.

52. Many of the students have never been to a Classical Music concert. Over the years, many have been amazed that the concert attendance experience is both enjoyable and emotionally uplifting. The paper focuses on the various composer's musical achievements and the importance of the composer to the music world at large.

53. The focus of my class is to give non-music students an interactive musical experience. Part of this includes attendance at concerts given by our music department. The students may not write reviews of popular music concerts outside of the music department. My hope is that attending these concerts, and having to assess them in a critical manner, will give the students an appreciation of music other than what they normally listen to, and will also give them an appreciation of the time and effort required to perform on one of these concerts. This has worked very well--it is an eye-opening experience for them, and they enjoy this component of the course.

54. It allows students to demonstrate their critical listening skills in two important ways: hearing aural attributes like form, melody, harmony, lyrics, etc. and understanding the cultural and social aspects of a concert experience.

55. The concert report compels the student to attend a music concert performed through the Music Department and to evaluate the performance using the following criteria: a) the technical aspects of the performance/performers (could the student understand the text if the works were vocal; were there obvious wrong notes, rhythms, or other mechanical problems in evidence; et. al.); b) the presentational factors (appearance of performers, staging, facial expressions, performance mannerisms, et al.); and c) the most satisfying/enjoyable selection (what did the student consider the most successful piece or set of pieces and why). If there was at least one piece of classical music, the student is asked to compare and contrast it to a popular song.

56. Reinforces terminology and listening skills

57. The students generally have little experience in serious listening to art music. These reports are for self-study, to document growth in skills and discover the joy of

discovery. The grade is for taking the assignment seriously, but NOT for developing expertise. I want each student to feel comfortable saying negative things or to admit a lack of interest, knowing these are valid responses along the way, and that they will NOT be punished in any way for being who they are. Only when they trust the teacher and the experience to be non-threatening can they hope to find enjoyment in the act of artistic engagement.

58. To get non-musical people to be exposed to music and venues that they would otherwise not be exposed to.

59. The concert report in my course is designed to create in the students a basis for future musical encounters, while maintaining the level of critical listening we develop during class time. They will hopefully come to appreciate a wider range of musical genres and styles, while demonstrating awareness of course concepts.

60. The papers reveal application and grasp of knowledge learned, applied in real time in an art form that necessarily evaporates as it unfolds [unlike visual art which can be studied at the viewer's leisure - not "time sensitive"]. The ability to cognitively realize what is happening, not at the expense of the affective, imaginal right brain experience, is a central objective, evidenced through the paper.

61. It counted the same as the other essay-style exams.

62. To introduce students to live classical music To help students make connections between course material/class activities and real-world performances of classical music To help me find out what students are taking away from academic experiences.

63. Students reflect, many for their first time ever, on what they have heard, seen, and experienced at the concert, and how it relates to course material. This assignment is

given in Music Theory for nonmajors (Three attendances, three written reports) and Survey of Western Music (Three attendances, one more lengthy written report. I tend to expect greater insight, management of grammar and spelling, and one or two drafts, in that one).

64. The concert reports are not required. The students may turn in up to three, and these extra credit points can raise their final grade.

65. Forces students to hear live music.

66. Challenge them to listen more insightfully and critically. Work on writing skills. Prove they actually attended the event.

67. To provide an opportunity for students to experience a live performance (other than a popular concert), be exposed to new musical styles, timbres, etc. and to (hopefully) use their listening skills taught in class.

68. To put into practice what the student is learning so that they are aware that there is more than book knowledge. Also, to begin developing critical listening skills.

69. Students in the courses I teach are too diverse in level and interest for the report to serve any one function. For some it is essentially just a writing exercise; for others it is meant to be a way of tying together everything they've learned in the course and demonstrating their ability to apply musical terminology and concepts to music of their choice.

70. They are to use what they learn in class to help clarify what they are hearing.

71. Gets the students to live music! Some of them have NEVER attended a live music performance of any kind.

72. Critical analysis with personal style, rather than play by play of concert. meant to allow students to express their personal response to the 'new to them' music, to address students ability to assess musical performances, writing skills (should be in the format of a concert review to be published in music review section of newspaper, or music magazine, etc. - examples from NY Times, LA Times are given)

73. The concert report is a way to get students from this rural area to experience live classical and jazz music opportunities in the area. The importance of hearing music performed "live" can not be underestimated. It is at this moment in time during the semester that students "get it." Videos, DVDs and CD recordings cannot replace that live experience. I hope the students will gain an increased understanding of music that they generally do not habitually listen to and that they discover music that they really can appreciate. I hope that this carries on throughout their lives, so in addition to hopefully building audiences, I am hoping that their personal lives will continue to be enriched by what they have learned.

74. I want students to have the experience of a classical concert. Increasingly, they come to the university with no such experience.

75. The concert report provides an opportunity for the students to use the vocabulary they are learning in the class to describe musical terms and concepts which are being discussed in class. Concert reports help me understand what course material the students are understanding, or failing to understand.

76. I teach topics courses, not surveys, for non-majors and sometimes for majors and non-majors in the honors college. Sometimes attendances are required but as a basis for discussion and to incorporate into written work. But there is no report of the kind you

are asking about. My Gen Ed classes are small seminar type classes (fourteen-sixteen students).

77. The report gives the students opportunity to write about music—to express a particular point about a musical experience and to cover the parameters of "sound, setting, and significance," as articulated in the textbook. This course emphasizes the idea that music's importance comes from the fact that it has meaning in people's lives.

78. One report is to expose students to western classical music being performed on the highest professional level, The second is to encourage students to support their local community-based arts organizations.

79. To connect ideas we have discussed in class; to give them an experience they have not had (ie: attending an instrumental recital or orchestra concert); to compare their concert experiences (as I have them do more than); to understand their level of listening and music appreciation and be able to direct class discussion as appropriate - if I feel they need a better understanding of what to listen for, I can lead them in that direction; to be able to enjoy such an experience.

80. A student must show he/she has grown in the understanding of terminology and styles throughout the semester. I have one report early so that this growth is evident.

81. To experience a live musical performance and engage with music on an aesthetic and analytic level generally unknown to most students (in my experience).

82. Assess observational, listening/analytic, research, and writing skills.

83. I found it useless years ago and stopped this assignment.

84. I teach a "History of Rock and Roll" class and the (blues or rock and roll) concert reports are done for extra credit at the student's option.

85. Demonstrate ability to articulate personal thoughts and ideas correctly using a discipline related vocabulary - as opposed to the memorization of "facts" as would be demonstrated on objective quizzes.
86. Approx. one-third of the grade, the other portions being mid-term, final and attendance.
87. All above in number 26 - that they have to go to a live, western classical music concert. For most of them, they have never been.
88. Extra credit.
89. To allow students to experience music in a live concert, to give them opportunities to use the recently acquired musical language and terminology they have learned, to help them understand the role of this important music and to de-mystify it for them.
90. I allow the student to choose the type of music...i.e. vocal, orchestral etc. I hope they realize that there is an abundance of free or at least inexpensive quality music available to them.
91. The Concert Evaluation is used to measure the degree of growth in the descriptive utilization of the key elements of music, performer and audience etiquette, identification of musical styles with secondary emphasis on specific composers, and identification of correlation between the musical arts with the other arts and in historical contexts.
92. Apply learned materials. Also must interview a performer--learn about musicians. Experience music live rather than virtual.
93. It is there to primarily to expand their experiences with live music. They are to attend classical, jazz, ethnic, or theater music, not pop, rock, hip hop, country, etc. A secondary function is learning how to be a part of the concert world as a listener when it

is not an informal, very loud, venue. Third is to comment on the music itself connecting to the musical elements learned in class.

94. Experience live music making. Practice listening skills. Connect to class work.

Break down barriers to acceptance of art music.

95. In my Comparative Arts class, the writings are part of a series of reaction papers.

For non-music examples, students write 500 words describing the example and their reaction to it. The concert report functions in the same way.

96. Reinforce what the student is learning in class. Can they identify examples and terms we use in class? Expand their music listening skills. Can they converse with music intelligence?

97. Promote music vocabulary and ability to articulate in writing cogent thoughts in response to one of four concert essay questions chosen (cultural context, music elements, subjective perception, critique). Each is fifteen percent of total grade as pass/fail, but must be passed at high level (B/A- min.), with multiple rewrites available.

98. validation! this is real stuff people actually listen to.

99. The Concert Report is assigned with the expectation that students will: a) Become aware of concerts in the Western "Classical" tradition that are occurring in the University and local communities surrounding the school. b) Encourage aesthetic awareness of "classical" music in live performance versus recorded music. c) Promote writing skills in general and specifically as related to the use of musical vocabulary in the context of a review of a live "classical" concert.

100. Required for transferability to upper division. Demonstrates critical thinking and application of concepts and vocabulary from class content.

101. Aside from reinforcing and expanding concepts and specific material covered in my course, the main purpose is to get students to live performances where they nearly always have such a positive experience, they go again without my requiring them to.

102. I call them Concert Reviews. These are designed to help students practice writing about music, incorporating the terms and perspectives of which we speak in class. Also it provides possibility for attendance at live performance of styles that are covered in the classroom through recordings.

103. Demonstrates knowledge and assimilation of musical terminology and concepts in an applied setting.

104. It is the final assignment in a series of "listening" assignments in which students describe and respond to musical pieces, the first four of which are recorded, the last of which is live.

105. I use it as a tool to gauge their progress in understanding and expressing musical concepts with emphasis on writing.

106. I ask the students to describe the music, and then separately to give their reaction to the music. They may also write about any aspect of the experience that interests them. My goals are to promote critical listening and listening with open ears, and to expose the students to concert settings. Concert reports are always required in our Western appreciation course (Music Through History). For World Music, it depends on the availability of performances on campus.

107. Students critique the concert or performance and analyze one of the pieces from it for elements and effectiveness.

108. Primarily, it is an exercise in writing about music meaningfully and correctly.

109. An opportunity to use the course concepts in active listening at a live performance
110. Besides the information above, I think it is most important that students have an opportunity to develop their written communication skills.
111. Evaluate ability for critical listening and application of new concepts learned in the classroom.
112. The students in the sections of "Topics in Music" which teach are expected to do five papers each semester: one paper which is an account of an interview with a music professional, one paper that is an observation of a rehearsal of one of the college ensembles or private lessons (by arrangement with the instructor) involving a student and profession, plus the three concert observation papers. I am interested in the students (of varied backgrounds) becoming more discerning and articulate listeners.
113. Extra Credit
114. To ensure an audience at concerts and recitals sponsored by the Music Department.
115. Summarize performance event and repertory.
116. Combination of attendance verification AND application of concepts from class.
117. To provide an individual insight into a musical experience that may or may not be the first concert experience for the student.
118. Assimilates course content in a practical concert-going experience.
119. Provides students opportunities to use terminology developed in the course, but also to engage with an experience that they have often never undertaken.

120. Practice in formal paper writing application of musical terms learning in class check to see percentage of understanding to see if my teaching is getting through to non-musicians.

121. The concert reports in my course give students the opportunity to interact with their community by attending a live concert, increase listening and writing skills, and develop a familiarity with concert etiquette.

122. To expose the student to the traditions of the classical concert; to see and hear elements of the course in practice; to build future audiences.

123. Mainly to give them a concert experience that most would not have if it wasn't required. I grade the papers pass/fail and am looking for proof that they were paying attention at the concert and can comment in their own words about each piece on the program. I'm not looking for a "technically accurate" paper because most of these students have no idea how to write such a paper. Even though I cover form, style, etc., in class, there is not enough time in class for them to be proficient enough to put it into writing.

124. I teach a mixed genre course. Students must attend an approved concert, art exhibition, and theatre event (no doubling up). If it's a musical and they use it for theatre, they still describe the role of the music. The idea of the course is that students increase their perceptive abilities of the arts, and their overall perception of the role of the arts in the world around them.

125. Makes them experience music in a live performance and, hopefully, gets them to a concert of a genre outside their normal listening.

126. The concert report gives evidence that students see and hear music that has developed over the past 600 years and understand who and what are propellants to that development so that their taste in the future could include additional types and styles of music.
127. To enhance the student's concert experience and verify attendance.
128. It connects the student to the actual music practices of the region in which we live.
129. Have students listen to live music, one concert led by a conductor, the other an "other" concert. They also attend a rehearsal led by a conductor.
130. Students should make a connection between the classroom and the concert hall; a connection between listening to a CD or to something "live."
131. To give context to the material from the course.
132. Practical application of materials discussed/read about in class.
133. It is a way to put into practice the ideas that we discuss in class. Also a way to introduce the students to the concert experience.
134. To build more perceptive listeners.
135. The concert report is the culmination of all the concepts presented in the course. The student will be demonstrating his understanding of the basic elements of music and will also be addressing his emotional response to the performance.
136. Introduction to LIVE Music events. Remembering that the acoustics in a concert hall are much different from those of headphones or speakers; Audience participation can make the experience and the music more meaningful.
137. Exposure to live performance of classical music. Build Listening skills.

138. To be able to express in writing musical terms and the aesthetic experience using good grammar. For Question number 35. Students are given a tab on which they write their name and the recital they are attending. At the end of the performance, they turn in the tab. That's how we record attendance. The recitals are on our campus, so there's no need to turn anything in with their report. I already have all that information. I want the student to keep the program so he will be able to write his report. The report is a quiz that the students complete online. They know the short-answer questions ahead of time, so it's easy for them to complete the assignment.

139. To accustom students to attend available performances which they tend to avoid because they are not familiar with classical concerts, their parents did not take them, etc. To provide support for campus endeavors. To improve their listening skills, to draw vocabulary and listening together.

140. Students know so little about music that concert report's function is only to paper the in-house concerts. I don't participate in this. Kids are totally bored and rightfully so.

141. To broaden their listening horizons.

142. Required - gets students to listen and think critically to good music.

143. I expect the student to be able to discuss the performance using correct terminology in a way that would be intelligent as well as correct.

144. The concert report addresses the performances of 20th Century American music for this course. 20th Century compositional techniques are discussed in the report.

145. The concert report demonstrates the student's ability to use critical listening skills at a concert and the student's level of understanding of the music. Attending a live performance makes a greater impact on the student than just listening in class.

146. The point of a concert report is to expose students to music in a live setting, synthesize the classroom material, and to be able to write coherently about the experience. Students often have difficulty writing about music without slipping into clichés (sp) or MTV'esque canned review phrases. The process forces them to reevaluate their writing and how they experience music.

147. I feel that the concert reports will persuade students to go to concerts that they might never attend and perhaps open them up to new musical experiences.

148. Generally used as extra credit.

149. Concert attendance is for extra credit. Students also draw the stage and performers if they choose. Students often comment that they have never been to a concert or recital "like that."

150. as a writing component

151. AS AN INTEGRAL LAB EXPERIENCE

152. all of the above; and it is important that the students are listening critically so that (for example) they have reasons for liking (or not); that they have reasons for recommending (or not) a particular musical event; they need to be informed 'consumers' and 'appreciators' of music.

153. I want them listening to LIVE concert!

154. My expectations and guided questions change for each assignment. The first couple are short answer, then long answer, and the last two are papers. My expectation is that the students move from a basic working knowledge to analysis and connecting their new knowledge to the experience.

155. To apply the information from class work (elements, whatever style periods we may have covered to date) to "real" music - and I stipulate "classical" music, not jazz/world/rock/etc.

156. Note: Students are required to attend three concerts of music of the type we are studying, but they are required to write on only one of the concerts because I simply do not have the time to grade several hundred essays. Another note: Students may earn as much extra credit as they wish by attending a concert of ANY type of music. The fact that students have to write a concert means that they have to attend a concert. They are **STRONGLY** encouraged to attend the concert of the West Virginia Symphony Orchestra when it visits our campus each semester. The report serves more than a single function. Preparation for writing the report (attending the concert) means that students get to hear live symphonic music, something most of my students have never heard. In-class preparation for the concert provides the opportunity to learn about concert etiquette (for both listeners and performers) and conventions and to learn who the "players" are, so to speak (the conductor, the concertmaster, other principal players, etc.) Students learn the comparative sizes of orchestras for music of different periods. They learn how to read a concert program and how the orchestra is typically arranged on the stage, They learn the difference between absolute music and programmatic music, and they learn how a symphony is put together. They learn about teamwork and cooperation and being prepared and agreeing to follow the direction of a single leader in watching and hearing the orchestra. The programmed music is almost never in their course CDs, so they become familiar with more music through in-class preparation. At the same time, they are learning what to expect musically, to look forward to favorite

passages. I could go on, I suppose, but I think you see that live performance is central to what we do in this class. They have been learning how to make sense of what they hear and see on the page, and in this exercise, they get to make sense of what they see, as well. Furthermore, they get to use music vocabulary that they've been working on to describe the experience.

157. Sharpens students' skills of listening, observation, aural analysis and critical engagement with music. Links a specific performance to particular course themes (developed throughout the semester) and provides an opportunity for students to become familiar at first hand with the experience of a live, professional performance of classical music.

158. Thoughtful questions!

159. The student must truly understand the musical/aesthetic elements of the work of music in order to do the analysis that the paper requires. He/she must recognize what elements are performed and use appropriate terminology to describe what was heard. That's basically the point of the whole course: to be able to hear a piece of music of any style and speak intelligently to a musician about it. This assignment takes the Music in General Studies several levels beyond just filling out a multiple-choice test about composers or other musical facts--it has the students directly interacting with the actual music itself--the sounds and the concert experience. One other thing--when determining the mood/character of a piece of music, for my class it is essential that the student decide what emotion/character the composer is trying to communicate--what does it sound like--instead of "how it makes me feel." That is a HUGE change for a lot of

general education students, and the concert report helps them to take away their own personal emotions and really HEAR what's there.

160. So they can hear live music and appreciate what they are hearing.

161. Identify concepts learned in class. Articulate musical facts and opinions using vocabulary we have learned in class. Exposure to a Western Classical music concert (many attend one for the first time).

162. As indicated by above answers.

163. Apply material learned in class; actively experience a performance not passively (recordings).

164. It will show that students understand musical terms and use them in real life applications.

165. Live performance is so very different from recorded performance. Where recorded performance can be absolutely note perfect, it lacks ambience...it lacks preparation...it lacks "specialness" and anticipation...it lacks active participation (both visual and auditory) in the acceptance of the experience. Live performance is perfect even with its imperfections. Recorded performance is flawed, in part, because of its manufactured perfection. The concert experience expands ones life-palette. Live performance shows ordinary people doing extraordinary things. The thought, "Wow! I could do that." might actually cross their minds (or, at least, "I'd like to try that"...or, "I wonder what it's like to do that."). In a world that virtually enforces a kind of passive voyeurism, live performance invites active response. Just as in foods, where more sugar or more salt creates the illusion that it is "better", so the slickness of the music business and recorded sound, though we are told it is "better" it is really a necessary perversion on their part.

An opera recorded from one camera taking in the full stage, is boring. Our ability to be drawn from one side of the stage to the other is destroyed by the bland generality of the view and by the bad sound coming from an approximate area. At a live performance, our eyes are drawn to specific places, our minds create close-ups while still allowing our peripheral vision to catch the subtleties of responses from the wider arena.

Recording is incapable of delivering the total package, so it enhances the product, creating larger than life gestures and calling it better. It is an improvement over what recorded performance can do, but it falls so very far short of the total experience that only live performance can produce. The concert report is there, of course, to make sure they went...but more than that, I ask them to explain the unexplainable...to embrace the unembraceable. Tell me what your heart saw. Accept responsibility for your experience. Be open to a new experience. Recognize and embrace the viability of your response. See the world through your own eyes. Your experience will be far greater than the experience you are being told you had.

166. Two are required each semester, intended to serve the purposes listed above.

167. To expose students to different styles of music, to develop a critical ear and observation when listening to music or attending a concert, to apply the knowledge gained from the course regarding music theory.

168. Live performance is necessary to demonstrate that the student may have a different aesthetic experience from the one where the acoustics are instruments instead of coming from speakers as the source. Usually, it is more pleasing and exciting for them according to the papers.

169. To get the students off the couch and out of the dorm rooms to do something they may not do otherwise. In the process learn something about music in general and compliment classroom learning. Also to give the student and opportunity to judge the performance from bad to excellent. This all comes from study in the general music class.

170. The concert report allows students to use basic terminology learned in class (meter, key, texture, timbre, etc) in a real life situation. It also exposes them to a live concert experience, which some students may never have had.

171. An enriching experience.

172. The function is to expand on the listening and conceptual skills we are learning in class and to have the opportunity to hear and observe live music in a concert setting, thereby reducing fear of attending such events now and in the future.

173. Record attendance; help them to understand basic concert demeanor; help them put to use the terminology and period association presented in class; develop future concert attenders.

174. To expose them to a variety of different types of music, to give them the live performance experience (as opposed to listening in the classroom) and hopefully leads them to a more detailed listening experience in a more formal paper. Ultimately my hope is that they will look at live performances as a positive experience and become comfortable with new types of music in their lives and later with their children.

175. Expose students to a new musical experience to broaden horizons and open minds.

176. Concert attendance and reports are the semester project in this course.

177. First and foremost, I want my students to attend more concerts on campus, but also have the experience of attending a highly professional performance. In their reports, I want them to articulate what that experience was for them, did they enjoy it? Was it more exciting to hear live performance than recorded? While I do require reports on campus performances, the real highlight, capstone event of the course is attendance at a professional orchestral concert. Prior to the concert, students analyze and present sections of the work to the rest of the class. This pre-experience gives more opportunity to hear and understand the rep. from the concert. Their report describes both their experience of the event but also lets me know how effective the pre-concert activities have been.

178. Students are to try out their newly learned musical concepts and apply it to the listening experience to better understand the art and construction of music. Students MUST go to concerts of music they are unfamiliar with, since a central issue in my class is that aesthetic appreciation is learned.

179. Ability to apply concepts and terminology to a real experience and to develop some sense of quality assessment.

180. Functions as vehicle for application of knowledge gained in class, to break barriers for students with no previous exposure to Western Classical Music, aesthetic experience.

181. State of California requires verbal communication components in designing courses. Instead of doing essay questions on tests, the reviews from concerts fill those requirements very well.

182. To discern concepts discussed in class in a live setting.

183. To illustrate understanding of musical terms and concepts.
184. To connect the material covered in class with the live performance.
185. Asks them to engage in the listening experience and report on what they are hearing and place it within the historical context we've been exploring in class.
186. Causes the students to listen and analyze music better and they receive credit for doing that.
187. The main purpose of concert reports is to give an objective business-style report about the concert attended. I do not care what the student thinks or feels about the music. I imagine the report to be a work related assignment written by an entry level young professional that will be written for a supervisor who will then sign the document as the author. I want to see a professional, unbiased report about what took place at the concert. I use the following outline for the students to follow: Report Format for Music 100 Summary (One well-developed, brief paragraph of five to seven sentences) Detail (Four to six paragraphs of report) Comment (A brief paragraph of between three and six sentences) Total word count no more than 1300 words.
188. To hear live classical music, which is a different experience from listening to CDs.
189. Students are urged to attend concerts featuring music to which they have not being widely exposed. The report aids in bridging musical terminology used in class with an exposure/understanding of world musics and their practices.
190. Exposure to new types of live music.
191. To apply concepts from class to live performances outside of class. To promote critical listening and writing skills.

192. It is part of the path to musical understanding and enjoyment. It is one of the many tool used in the class.

193. The concert report is designed for students to show their ability to apply their knowledge of the elements of music to a situation outside of the classroom. In addition, it helps to encourage students to develop the habit of seeking out live music.

194. a) To expose the students to a musical experience ("classical" music) that they would not have if it were not required. b) To have to think and write critically about music using a basic music vocabulary.

195. Ten percent of grade for attending and writing up a concert review. Many students have never attended a live performance. This exposes them to that opportunity.

196. The concert attendance and critique allows students to practice what they learn in class. It enables students to attend performances they might not otherwise choose to attend. In many cases it opens their eyes to new music and the joy of live performances.

197. Develop listening skills.