

CHORAL ALL-STATE POLICIES AND PRACTICES: A SURVEY-BASED  
ANALYSIS AND CRITIQUE

by

G. DAWN HARMON McCORD

(Under the Direction of Mary A. Leglar)

ABSTRACT

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the massed choral ensemble became a popular phenomenon in American cultural life. Assuming various formats, it also found a permanent place in choral music education in the schools. Today, it exists as the all-state chorus, and is supported as a part of choral music education programs in every state in the nation. In spite of its prevalence, few studies have addressed its policies and practices or its effectiveness as an educational endeavor.

The purpose of this study was (a) to provide an overview of policies and practices utilized in all-state choral events; and, (b) to gather opinions of active all-state choral clinicians regarding the effectiveness of these policies and practices. Two researcher-authored questionnaires were designed to collect data. Subjects for the *Survey of Current All-State Policies and Practices* were those involved in the organization of all-state events in each state and the District of Columbia. Subjects for the *Survey of All-State*

*Clinicians' Opinions Regarding Current All-State Policies and Practices* were derived from published and unpublished lists of clinicians who had conducted all-state choirs in at least three states during the past five years.

Analysis of data led to the following conclusions: (a) more attention should be given to the formal statement and assessment of objectives; (b) the inservice education of teachers should be a component of the all-state experience; (c) student preparation and audition requirements should be stringent and comprehensive; (d) the role of the conductor as motivator is vitally important to the musical product; (e) communication between all participants should be improved; and (f) the rehearsal schedule should be arranged with the vocal health of the student in mind.

Suggestions for further study included: vocal stress associated with all-state events and development of assessment tools for the all-state event.

INDEX WORDS: All-State choirs, Choral music education, All-State conductors, Choral conducting, Choral conductors, Massed choirs, Music education, Choral singing — instruction and study, Choral singing — competitions, Music choral rehearsals, Auditions, Music — competitions, Musical ability — choral testing, Music festivals, School music — instruction and study, School music — United States, Noncompetitive music events.

CHORAL ALL-STATE POLICIES AND PRACTICES: A SURVEY-BASED  
ANALYSIS AND CRITIQUE

by

G. DAWN HARMON McCORD

B.M.Ed., Florida State University, 1971

M.M., Louisiana State University, 1988

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF MUSICAL ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2003

© 2003

G. Dawn Harmon McCord

All Rights Reserved

CHORAL ALL-STATE POLICIES AND PRACTICES: A SURVEY-BASED  
ANALYSIS AND CRITIQUE

by

G. DAWN HARMON McCORD

Major Professor: Mary A. Leglar

Committee: Allen Crowell  
William D. Davis  
Donald R. Lowe  
David Schiller

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
May 2003

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this work was made possible through the assiduous support of my dissertation committee Professors Allen Crowell, William D. Davis, Mary A. Leglar, Donald R. Lowe, and David Schiller. I am especially thankful to Dr. Leglar, chair of the committee, who generously contributed guidance, professional knowledge, and editorial assistance. A special word of gratitude is extended to Dr. Rebecca Reames, State University of New York at Potsdam, who provided data that greatly facilitated the identification of potential subjects. I am indebted to the University of Georgia Graduate School for granting me the Dissertation Completion Award, which enabled me to carry out the study. The University of Georgia School of Music provided a strong curriculum and an encouraging academic community..

My sincere gratitude is also extended to family, friends, and church for unbounded love and support to see that this goal was achieved without any barriers. Finally, a thank you is due to my parents who always tacitly assumed that all things are possible and modeled a strong work ethic.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	4
3 PROCEDURES .....	21
4 FINDINGS .....	25
5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	67
REFERENCES .....	76
APPENDICES .....	87
A SURVEY OF CURRENT ALL-STATE POLICIES AND PRACTICES.....	88
B SURVEY OF CURRENT ALL-STATE POLICIES AND PRACTICES AS PERCEIVED BY ALL-STATE CLINICIANS .....	96
C COVER LETTER TO ALL-STATE ORGANIZERS.....	104
D COVER LETTER TO ALL-STATE CONDUCTORS .....	106
VITA .....	108

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4.1: Maximum number of hours students are in rehearsal for any given day.....	29
Table 4.2: Rehearsal hours consumed in one all-state event.....	30
Table 4.3: Types of choral ensembles/voicing that occur in states.....	34
Table 4.4: Audition procedures .....	36
Table 4.5: Adjudication personnel used by responding states.....	37
Table 4.6: Number of judges used in the audition process.....	38
Table 4.7: Audition requirements .....	41
Table 4.8: Types of Choirs Represented in Surveys.....	47
Table 4.9: Policies and practices found to exist in current all-state events.....	48
Table 4.10: Musical Policies and Practices .....	51
Table 4.11: Information availability .....	55
Table 4.12: Contributions of the all-state experience .....	58
Table 4.13: All-state goals and objectives.....	59
Table 4.14: Suggested changes to the current all-state policies and procedures .....	62

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were: (a) to provide an overview of national practices and procedures pertaining to all-state choral events; and (b) to assess the effectiveness of those practices and procedures based on the opinions of active all-state choral clinicians.

Research questions were as follows:

1. What logistical practices are employed in all-state choral events: time of year, location, rehearsal venues, performance venues, and administrative organization?
2. What musical practices are employed in choral all-state events: types of ensembles, music repertoire, audition procedures, selection of clinicians?
3. What logistical and musical practices do all-state clinicians observe?
4. What all-state policies and procedures are considered to be effective as observed by all-state clinicians in specific events.

#### Limitations Of The Study

Data for the current procedures and practices were gathered from those identified as responsible for the organization and implementation of all-state events. The names of those sources were gathered from staff members of the Music Educators National Conference: The National Association for Music Education (MENC), state music association websites, and links from the MENC website. Where no website existed, the state music educators association (MEA) office was asked to supply the name of the

person who oversaw the implementation of all-state procedures. If the organization responsible for all-state was not the state MEA, the sponsoring organization was contacted. For data referring to all-state conductors' perceptions of current practices and procedures, all-state conductors were selected from those identified on the *Survey of Current All-State Policies and Procedures*. Known choral all-state conductors were also asked to suggest names of other active conductors.

### Need For The Study

In the twentieth century, the massed choral event grew popular throughout the United States. Historical studies have surveyed the early music contests and festivals and described their procedures and goals. Some studies have been specific to individual states and have discussed some of the current practices in that state, but only two studies have looked at the national status of choral all-state events. Wine (1996) asked state MEA presidents for information concerning selection, meeting times, and general impressions of the all-state chorus. Wine also sent state chorus chairs a questionnaire asking for more specific information concerning regional choirs, audition procedures, adjudication, and general impressions of the all-state experience. Reames (1997,1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2000, 2002a, 2002b) collected the repertoire lists and conductors' names for 50 all-state choirs. These studies provide significant information about the status of all-state choirs in the past decade. Additional data on current practices and procedures concerning all-state choral events would be of great benefit to choral music education.

### Definition Of Terms

The terms in this study will be defined as follows:

All-state chorus – A massed chorus made up of school-aged students selected from the population of school-aged children throughout a given state. The method of selection and specific age for a chorus varies from state to state.

Clinician – A chosen conductor for a massed performance ensemble.

Directors – Teachers who are responsible for the choral education of students participating in the all-state experience.

Massed choir – Choir made up of students from other choral ensembles.

Multiple audition procedure – A procedure whereby students participate in a preliminary audition followed by one or more higher-level auditions.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature in this dissertation is divided into three main categories: (a) history of massed choral events, (b) all-state practices, including audition/adjudication practices and all-state conductors, and (c) efficacious music education practices in the massed choral event.

#### History of Massed Choral Events

An examination of the history of massed choral events such as all-state chorus informs an investigation of current policies and practices in two important ways: (a) it identifies controversial issues that have influenced the development of present practices; and (b) it documents perceived educational benefits and weaknesses that may continue to exist.

An important distinction can be made on the basis of competition versus cooperation. Choral events can be classified into three categories: contests, in which individuals or ensembles compete for rankings or ratings; festivals, in which groups or representatives of groups meet in a noncompetitive, cooperative format to present a performance; and contest-festivals, in which groups or representatives of groups compete against a standard for a rating and, once chosen, participate in a cooperative massed choral performance.

Keller (1931) outlined the history and development of the music contest and competition festival "from the early Welsh Eisteddfod" (p. 2). Early massed choirs were

often selected through some form of competition between different choirs, with the winners or those with the highest ratings getting the opportunity to participate with other choirs under the direction of a master conductor. The noncompetitive festival also has a long history, which can be traced to pre-Revolutionary singing schools. Boston was the site of "the first publicized school music festival," which featured "singers from various schools in the city" (Cory, 1951b, p. 34).

During the 20th century the massed ensemble evolved to occupy a place of central importance in American choral music education (Keller, 1931). The most popular format in the early twentieth century was the national contest, in which the competition became fierce. Soon after the inception of national contests in 1923, music educators began to question the competitive approach. In 1932, no national contest took place; although the main reason was the economic depression, reservations about the competitive format also contributed to the decision (Burdett, 1985, p. 112).

The early state contests were sponsored by a variety of organizations and encompassed many different formats. Keller's 1931 study of state contests found that all but Maryland, Nevada and Virginia conducted some type of state music contest. There were five distinct types, namely, the open state contest, the state contest with preliminary district events, the state contest with independent sectionals organized without reference to other parts of the state, the regional contest, and the national contest (Keller, 1931, p. 113). Eleven states (Alabama, Delaware, Idaho, Louisiana, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, and Wyoming) had an open state contest. Sixteen states (Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota,

Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Texas) had preliminary district contests (Keller, 1931, p. 113). Mixed chorus events took place in twenty-six contests, and massed events were conducted in twelve contests (p. 142). Keller identifies several changes occurring in the state events, including the festival idea; combined choruses, bands, orchestras; and smaller ensemble groups as a climax of the contest event (p. 143).

The success of the state events paved the way for a variety of massed performances, including noncompetitive events. Keller states:

The idea of having combined groups and festival events in connection with the contest is gaining ground. The competition may be used as a stimulus but in the festival plan there is equal emphasis upon cooperative music making. . . . The combination of the two may be the solution of the problem. There may be schools interested in either contest or festival, or both, and the choice in form of participation in some instances may wisely be left to the individual school. (1931, p. 181)

Because of the variety of events held at the state level and the sponsorship provided by various organizations, it is difficult to date the first all-state choral event. According to Oldham (1966), Florida initiated an all-state chorus in 1927, New Jersey in 1928, Wisconsin in 1933, Vermont in 1936, and Nebraska in 1937 (pp. 52-54). Oldham's use of "all-state" is probably different from our understanding of the term. According to Clarke (1997) the first all-state chorus was initiated in 1940 in Texas (p. 6). Greenlee (1982, p. 7) declares that Indiana held its first state chorus event in 1938 at the Indiana State Teachers Association Convention. McRaney (1993) places Georgia's first all-state

event in 1931, when a massed chorus of 250 singers performed for a Georgia Educators Association convention (pp. 219-220).

Despite the uncertainty regarding the date of the first all-state event in the country, it is clear that the 1930s and 1940s witnessed the genesis of the all-state massed choral event. By 1950, several more states were sponsoring honor choirs of some type. A survey by Cory found that 16 states reported "the use, at least occasionally, of concerts by all-district or all-state groups composed of selected personnel" (1951a, p. 40). Since 1950, the all-state choral event can be found in each state and Washington D. C. in some format.

#### All-State Policies and Procedures and All-State Conductors

Few studies have examined the current status of choral all-state events in the United States, even though all-state participation continues to be an integral part of choral music education.

Early studies on massed performance policies and procedures focused on the contest and festival events that preceded all-state performances. They did, however, address some of the same issues as those found in all-state events. Best (1927) surveyed adjudication procedures and supplied a description of state contests. Specific data included information on who was eligible, basis of grading, and the scoring criteria (pp. 9, 11). Best provided an historical account of the contest and the use of ratings in the competitive experience.

Keller (1931) focused on the history of the music contest and competition festival, as well as the role of music contests in many states. Eligibility criteria reported by Keller

include some of those that are in use today (p. 138). Judging situations in the states surveyed included single judge, one or more judges on each event, three judges on each event, independent decision based on the judges personal choice of criteria, multiple judges conferring during contest, and judges conferring after the audition event. Keller's questionnaire categories included organization, types of contests, sponsorship and financing, size of groups, eligibility, enrollment, student age, director professional membership, events, time utilization, test and audition selections, performance rules, scoring, judging, and goals.

Only one study was found relating to choral all-state procedures in general. Wine (1996) surveyed each state's MENC and ACDA presidents and all-state choral chairs asking for information concerning selection, meeting times, and general impressions of the all-state chorus. The questionnaire sent to the state choral chairs asked for more specific information concerning regional choirs, audition procedures, adjudication, and general impressions of the all-state experience (p. 21). In addition to the survey, an attitudinal questionnaire was used to gather opinions as to whether practices allowed diversity and if the procedures garnered the most qualified participants.

Wine (1996) also asked respondents whether they considered the all-state massed performance a good event. On the basis of his findings, Wine strongly suggested that 3 to 5 high school judges be responsible for hearing all auditionees—a practice actually used by only one state (p. 26). The number of audition requirements ranged from 1 to 7, including, in various combinations, sight-reading, all-state music solo, tonal memory, required solo, director's ranking, theory (performance), theory (written), chosen solo, required quartet, and all-state quartet. In states with four or more audition requirements,

sight-reading and tonal memory were those most often included. The requirements were found to have a direct effect on curriculum, as teachers focused on preparing their students for success at the audition. According to Wine, "[t]his curriculum-related issue prompted the greatest response to questions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of audition procedures" (1996, p. 27).

McClung (2001) surveyed all-state choristers in six southeastern states to determine which sight-singing systems were used in their high school choral classrooms. The findings revealed that the sight-singing system most commonly used by the all-state choristers was movable tonic with melody pitch numbers, and that the second most common system was movable tonic with movable *do*. McClung recommended the development of a common approach to sight-singing to strengthen the effectiveness of music reading instruction (p. 7).

Nierman (2002) surveyed Nebraska Music Educators Association (NMEA) members to see if a change in performance ensembles was warranted. The survey queried the members to see if they preferred the current use of one large mixed ensemble; one smaller all-state mixed chorus, one women's ensemble, and one men's ensemble; or one smaller all-state mixed chorus and one women's ensemble. The results indicated that the number of respondents interested in maintaining the current status was approximately equal to the number of those interested in a two-choir format.

The engagement of competent and effective conductors is an important goal of the all-state event coordinator. Parker (1955) described the effective clinician conductor as being not only a good musician but also a "top-notch music educator, with a broad philosophy of education"; the effective conductor has "patience and understanding" and

an awareness of the background and experience of the group with which he or she is working, and “should be able to make students and directors feel that his efforts contributed toward making the activity a worthwhile success, that he gave them some concrete help, and that they might look forward with anticipation to working under his direction a following year” (pp. 49-51). Barresi (1979) listed similar criteria:

The guest conductor should have appropriate knowledge and demonstrated ability in working with students of the participating age level; a unique expertise in meeting the learning needs identified for the festival; a willingness to act as both teacher and conductor; and a knowledge of repertoire that is representative of various styles and periods. (p. 52)

A well-known all-state conductor, Donald Neuen, reflects on the conductor’s influence on the success of the event and on the responsibility that influence entails:

Since singers are always a true reflection of their conductor or teacher, it is the conductor's responsibility to be the prime source of motivation for all aspects of this energy. The conductor must become the generator that brings the score and teaching concepts to life for each singer. (1988, p. 43)

The role of the guest conductor has expanded to include workshops, seminars, and sharing of scholarship in areas of expertise (Greenlee, 1982, p. 7). Pooler (1984) offered to guest conductors a checklist designed to avoid misunderstandings at the all-state event. The article recommends clarifications on the contract; requests for past festival information and repertoire; fee and expenses; transportation and accommodations;

accompanist arrangements; instrumentalist planning and their required wearing apparel; resume/photos submissions; and piano quality and tuning.

Several studies have focused on the choice of clinicians and repertoire for the all-state choral event. Mason (1985) reported on the essential qualities necessary for being an effective choral conductor. Reames (1997,1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2000, 2002a, 2002b) has collected the repertoire and names of conductors of all-state choirs since 1996. This provides a valuable source for all involved with all-state planning as well as choral directors interested in new choral literature in a variety of styles and forms. Clarke (1997) studied the philosophy and rehearsal techniques of Eph Ehly, who has conducted 70 all-state choirs in 43 states with great success (p. 2).

#### Efficacious Music Education Practices in the Massed Choral Event

Several early studies dealt with effective music education practices employed in massed choral events. Reflecting continued research interest in comparing contests and festivals, Stehn (1947) provided a list of advantages and disadvantages of both formats, but Parker (1955) identified a trend away from the competition and toward noncompetitive events.

Cory (1951b) gathered information on competitive festivals from 44 states and noncompetitive data from 20 states. Cory found great variety in the types of entries in the noncompetitive festivals but reported that "[v]ocal and instrumental large groups are included in almost all of them. Vocal solos and small ensembles are included in 65 per cent of the sampling" (p. 34). Of the 17 states that provided information on the use of

“critics” (i.e., judges), one (Michigan) reported that none were used in that state; the remaining 16 used various types of judges. All of the latter states used college/university faculty members; 81% used outstanding high school directors; and 31% used professional musicians who were not music educators (pp. 34, 36). The responses showed a preference for out-of-state judges.

Ritchey (1954) examined massed events, both competitions and nonselective mass performances, in relation to their impact on music education. Morlan (1966) sought to identify activities and projects of state music associations that are most effective. No other activity garnered as many responses as did the all-state event. According to Morlan,

Evidence cited frequently for considering all-state group performances as a most effective activity include: (1) upgrading of both literature and standards of performance; (2) opportunity for both students and teachers to work with an inspiring guest conductor; (3) influencing talented music students to consider music as a career; (4) favorable reception by the public, especially when performances are a part of a state education association meeting; and (5) continuous growth of interest as reflected by significant increases each year in the number of applicants for participation. (1966, p. 31)

However, Morlan cited several concerns, on the part of both music educators and school administrators, about the competitive nature of many such events.

More recently, a survey-based study by Rittenhouse (1989) found disagreement between choral directors and administrators about the most effective format for choral ensemble contests and festivals: administrators generally favored competition events, while 63.3% of choral directors responding to the survey participated in noncompetitive

festivals for ratings and comments (pp. 110-111). Administrators seemed to be more interested in the end result, whereas the choral directors were interested in the efficacy on educational goals and learning (p. 116). In a 1972 study of competition festivals in Georgia, however, Sandlin found no significant difference in the opinions of high school principals and music teachers (choral and instrumental) concerning competitive events.

Barresi (1979) complained that with the performance at hand, the goals and objectives were frequently forgotten. Barresi suggested five specific goals for the achievement of musical outcomes:

- 1) meet the specified music need of the students;
- 2) expose participants to an instructive, stimulating, and inspiring conductor;
- 3) acquaint students with a suitable, challenging, developmental, and interesting repertory;
- 4) apply performance techniques that provide continuous music benefits;
- and 5) introduce teacher-conductors to rehearsal techniques that offer long-term music benefits.

(p. 51)

Although few would dispute the need for evaluation of choral events to determine their effectiveness in achieving music education goals, little information exists on the evaluation of specific events and the development of valid evaluation tools. Barresi (1979) made specific suggestions for evaluating the event. Nierman (2002) was encouraged by the interest in doing a quantitative search for answers to the questions that follow many all-state events. Wis (2003) did not specifically address all-state events but rather the festival, which shares a number of concerns with the all-state experience. Specific topics included advanced planning, the conductor, the accompanist, goals and

objectives, repertoire and schedules, and facilities. Wis also stressed the importance of clearly defined goals and objectives (p. 47).

In a study of the development and status of the Indiana State Choral Festival Association (ISCFA), Greenlee (1982) gathered the opinions of choir directors, students, and administrators connected with the ISCFA regarding "the values of the association's noncompetitive district and state choral festivals and the contributions it has made to developing the secondary choral music in Indiana" (p. 2). In response to a request by the Indiana Music Educators Association (IMEA) for a contest evaluation method that assessed more than performance skills, Hoffer (1976) proposed several ways of assessing comprehensive musicianship.

The purpose of a study by Rentz (1994) was to examine various components of the Texas all-state process as related to various influences such as teacher experience, rehearsal time used in preparation, repertoire selection preferences, and perceived participation benefits. Directors responding ( $n = 30$ ) provided suggestions for improving the all-state experience. These included learning more of the music at the convention rather than at the local school, limiting the number of auditions required of students, and discontinuance of blind auditions (p. 68).

A group of Texas band directors addressed the inequities of opportunity for students in the small school band programs. Griffin (1996) describes how they grouped together to form their own all-state experience for students attending A, AA, and AAA schools. In the evolvement of all-state practices, the issue of equity of opportunity is being addressed in Texas.

Lockhart (1935) felt that directors and students should be given criticisms that would enlighten the contest or festival participants and provide opportunities for growth (p. 279). Using an existing national contest adjudication form, Lockhart offered definitions of terms that would help the participant understand the comments set forth by the judge. Following the definitions, he provided examples as to how the choir might attain optimal results. Research into the process of judging performers and performances continues to spark dialogue among music educators.

In an article on adjudication criteria, Batey (2002) observes that "assessment is by its very nature subjective. Adjudicators tend to give more weight to items they believe are important" (p. 41) and suggests factors that influence their judgments of success in various categories listed on adjudication forms. In a review of research, Fiske (1983) found the adjudication reliability to be quite low. Experienced judges frequently had only a 25% consistency and others had an even lower percentage of reliability with scores of 9% to 16% (p. 7). The use of more judges seems to raise the level of reliability, especially if the number of judges is increased to five or more. Better reliability existed when a panel of adjudicators was employed. Increased age and training of adjudicators may correlate with increased reliability in the studies reported (p. 8). The judge's performance ability did not improve reliability. Strong theory and history grades actually predicted a low reliability (p. 9). Fiske concluded that "few positive recommendations can be made concerning the choice of judges for formal adjudications" and observed that

[t]he ability to evaluate performances appears to involve some distinct problem-solving strategy unrelated to one's own playing ability and inversely related to one's ability to identify correct answers in non-performance music tasks. (p. 9)

In contrast to Fiske (1983), Perkins and Allen (1991) found high levels of agreement between the judges in Texas MEA all-state orchestra string auditions (p. 22). Dugger (1997) studied the interjudge reliability for Oklahoma auditions, which use an Olympic style system in which the low and high scores are discarded from the final score tallies. Dugger's study did not find a significant difference between the reliability of the Olympic scoring and the score that would be determined from a straight tally of all scores (p. 73).

Forbes (1994) makes the following suggestions to improve objectivity, validity, and reliability:

1. Persons in charge of festivals should make an effort to ensure that performers are evaluated solely on the basis of their performance. Methods include securing judges with no prior knowledge of the performers they are to evaluate, recording performances and coding them for anonymous evaluation by the judges at a later time, and eliminating the use of auxiliary information sheets.
2. Festival managers should work to improve judge reliability. One option is increasing the size of the normal judge panel to five or more and engaging only those judges who have demonstrated high reliability. Unfortunately, the identification of reliable judges today is difficult because a standardized test and procedure for identifying and certifying judges has yet to be developed.
3. Persons or groups responsible for festivals should implement procedures to improve interjudge reliability and the validity of the process. This could be accomplished by eliminating ratings for the various criteria categories and

implementing a global approach to performance evaluation or reexamining the descriptors of the various criteria categories to ensure that the descriptors have meaning for all adjudicators. It would also be helpful if some form of judge training were implemented that included the use of exemplars to ensure that adjudicators have a common understanding of the terms and their use in arriving at final ratings. (1994, pp. 19-20)

Although these recommendations are focused on the festival event, the recommendations concerning consistency, anonymity, audition methodology, and adjudicator training are also applicable to all-state auditions.

Campbell (1960) investigated both district and all-state festivals for choir, orchestra, and band in Pennsylvania to discover long-term benefits of the music festivals for student participants, directors, and school music programs. Festival participants, teachers, and principals were surveyed to ascertain their satisfaction with the all-state festivals. All groups surveyed believed that all-state events raised performance levels in schools, motivated students to continue participation in music as adults, and encouraged professional growth in music educators (pp. v-vi).

Fuller (1989) endeavored to determine factors related to student success in auditions for the Texas All-State Choir and investigated selected factors of student experience and background and their relationship to success in All-Region and All-State choral auditions in Texas. Fuller's results indicated, "previous audition experience was the strongest predictor of success at each level of audition. The total enrollment of a student's choral program was the strongest school-related predictor" (p. iii). The influence of school size on student selection is relevant to the procedures established by the state.

Temple (1973) completed a study of the relationship between participation in competition festivals and music achievement. No significant difference in sight-reading was found between achievement among members of bands that participated in competitions and members of bands that were rated outstanding by experts but did not compete. Students in noncompetitive bands demonstrated a higher level of music achievement skills on two published music achievement tests than those in competition bands (p. 99). Temple concludes, "participation in the competitions experience did not enhance and perhaps even limited the student level of music achievement" (p. 108).

Austin (1990) concurs, arguing that "students' educational needs have frequently taken a back seat to the pursuit of competitive treasures (money, awards, or notoriety), the standardization of performance practices, and the enhancement of music industry revenues" (p. 21). Austin lays out myths that he believes perpetuate the use of competition in music education. The myths include (a) the belief that competition prepares students for life in the real world to come in their future careers; (b) competition is part of human nature and integral to our society; (c) competition motivates the student to achieve more; and, competition builds competence (pp. 22-23). For each of the given myths, Austin (1990) provides documentation for countering the reality of these myths. Austin argues one of the best reasons for countering competition as effective for teaching is that competition by its very nature has a limited number of winners.

Carole and Russell Ames outline three goal structures: competitive with students working against one another; cooperative with students working towards a common goal; and, individualistic where students work on personal independent goals (pp. 40-41). The

article continues with how these structures “influence how various types of performance cues are processed, how success and failure are experienced, and how children perceive themselves in relation to other students” (p. 40). All-state competition is somewhat like a cooperative goal in that the individual student reaches for a standard where the student can apply his or her own interests and strategies. Austin supports the cooperative model in which “. . . a most positive aspect of cooperative learning is that children begin to explain success in terms of effort more than of ability” (p. 24). All-state competition also falls into the next goal category, which is the individualized goal structure. The individualized goal structures promote task mastery.

In this approach, students value directed effort as the key to success and tie positive affect to reaching some absolute standard or to progressing beyond prior achievement levels. When students are provided with opportunities for self-improvement over time, they develop a 'task engagement' attitude, focusing on how to do the task and on the quality of their own effort or strategies. (Austin, p. 24)

In spite of this model, students quickly reinstate the competitive slant by being encouraged to out perform or out score classmates and students at other schools. An observer of the competitive event will often see a music education curriculum being judged on the basis of a single performance seldom lasting more than fifteen minutes. The adjudication process can be criticized as it is frequently lacking in a proven objective assessment tool. Because of the focus on the competition, repertoire is often limited and the mastery of musical skills is focused on the chosen competition rather than a comprehensive developmental plan. The all-state experience may be considered

competitive and cooperative when viewed from Austin's perspective and therefore warrants review of the policies and practices endemic to the event.

The history of massed choral events is well documented as it pertains to the music contest and contest related events. The history of all-state events has not been pursued in explicit studies. Most extant information about the history of all-state events can be found in several studies that are state specific yet not all-state choir specific. As for all-state practices, including audition/adjudication practices and all-state conductors, there are several studies that address these issues. Most of these studies are specific to band and orchestral events although there are several that study the choral all-state event and conductors. Effectual music education practices in the massed choral event have yet to be explored with any depth.

## CHAPTER 3

### PROCEDURES

The purposes of the study were (a) to provide an overview of national practices and procedures pertaining to all-state choral events; and (b) to assess the effectiveness of such practices based on the opinions of active all-state choral clinicians. To these ends, two researcher-authored surveys were designed to collect data: the *Survey of Current All-State Policies and Procedures* (SPP) and the *Survey of All-State Clinicians' Opinions Regarding Current All-State Policies and Procedures* (SCPP).

#### Subjects

Subjects for the SPP were individuals in each state and in the District of Columbia who were identified as being responsible for the organization of all-state events. Several sources were used in the subject-identification process. The national office of MENC: The National Association of Music Education (MENC) provided the names of some all-state coordinators; others were identified through the state Music Education Association (MEA) offices which were listed on the MENC website link, MENC State Affiliates <<http://www.menc.org/connect/stateinf.html>>. A description of the study was sent to all MEA offices with a request for the name of an appropriate respondent. During the subject-identification process, information was also gleaned directly from MEA managers, presidents, editors, and university music education faculty.

Subjects for the SCPP were identified from published and unpublished lists of all-state clinicians compiled by Rebecca Reames (1997, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2000, 2002a,

2002b) active all-state clinicians. Via an *Excel* spreadsheet, 265 names were sorted to determine which conductors had directed three or more all-state events during the five-year periods between 1996-1997 and 2001-2002. The resulting list identified 51 qualified subjects.

### Survey Design and Distribution

The first questionnaire, the *Survey of Current All-State Policies and Procedures* (SPP), addressed both logistical and musical issues including scheduling, event location, rehearsal and performance venues, types of ensembles, repertoire, audition procedures, selection of clinicians, and current changes in policies or practices (See Appendix A). A pilot study was conducted to ascertain the appropriateness and clarity of the items.

Subjects ( $N=4$ ) for the pilot were selected middle- and high-school choral conductors with a documented record of having students participate in all-state events.

Unsatisfactory items identified by the pilot study were revised. A cover letter (See Appendix C), the revised 28-item survey, and a self-addressed stamped envelope were then mailed to the identified respondents in each state and the District of Columbia.

Follow-up tactics included phone calls, postal and email reminders, and re-mails of the entire survey packet.

The second instrument, the *Survey of All-State Clinicians' Opinions Regarding Current All-State Practices and Procedures* (SCPP), was designed to determine the perspectives and opinions of a selected representation of all-state choral conductors. The focus of the instrument included both logistical and musical practices and included student preparation and audition procedures, event scheduling, number of rehearsals and

rehearsal hours, repertoire selection, performance and rehearsal venues, equipment, types of ensembles, communication with organizers, and event evaluation practices (See Appendix B). A pilot survey was mailed to selected choral conductors ( $N=3$ ) who had conducted at least one all-state event. A number of changes were made for item clarification. A cover letter (See Appendix D), three survey instruments, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to each of the subjects. Each of the survey forms applied to a different, but specific, all-state event they had conducted. As with the SPP, follow-up tactics included phone calls, postal and email reminders, and re-mails of the entire survey packet.

Before mailing, both instruments were submitted for critique to the University of Georgia Institute for Behavioral Research. The language and format were judged acceptable. The Institute suggested that the researcher might find it helpful to have the respondents identify themselves by region (northwest, south, etc.). The suggestion was not accepted. The researcher was concerned that this information might, in some instances, identify the subject and therefore inhibit responses. The University of Georgia Institutional Review Board also reviewed the surveys. This review is required to ascertain that activities involving human subjects fully comply with regulations and guidelines defined by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office for Human Research Protections, and to ensure that basic ethical principles outlined in the Belmont Report (1978) are not violated.

### Treatment of Data

Responses from both surveys were recorded in the form of an *Excel* spreadsheet. A column was assigned to each possible response and a row to each respondent (identified by number). Quantitative data were downloaded to statistical software, *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS, 2002). Manipulated data were reported via percentages and graphs.

Nonquantitative data were recorded in tabular form for purposes of comparison. Categories were derived from examination of nonquantitative responses, and categories were then ranked according to the number of repetitions observed in each category.

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS

The purposes of this study were: (a) to provide an overview of national policies and procedures pertaining to all-state choral events; and (b) to assess the effectiveness of such practices based on the opinions of active all-state choral clinicians. To these ends, two researcher-authored surveys were designed to collect data: the *Survey of Current All-State Policies and Procedures* (SPP), and the *Survey of All-State Clinicians' Opinions Regarding Current All-State Policies and Procedures* (SCPP). Data were recorded by means of a spreadsheet and tables and reported by means of tables and percentages.

#### Survey Response Rate

The SPP was sent to the coordinators of all-state activities in each state and the District of Columbia ( $N = 51$ ). Forty-nine responses were received, yielding a return of 96.07%. Data were not received from New Jersey and Hawaii. The SCPP was sent to conductors identified as having directed at least three all-state events in the five-year period 1996-1997 to 2000-2001 ( $N = 51$ ). Thirty-seven responses were received, yielding a return of 72.54%. One conductor was not able to participate due to illness. Another respondent chose to respond in a letter. These responses were translated to the survey categories and included in the data. Another conductor responded by telephone. In this instance the researcher recorded the responses and these were also included in the data.

The conductors survey also solicited conductors' opinions of the effectiveness of said policies and procedures.

## Data Analysis

### *Survey of Current All-State Policies and Procedures*

The findings from the SPP are reported below by category, the first of which concerns the types of choral events held in each particular state. Forty-eight (98%) of the responding states reported having an all-state chorus. The bulk of additional cooperative events fell under two categories: 17 (34%) held regional honor choruses and 26 (52%) held district honor choruses. Additional events reported at the school-system level included American Choral Directors Association (ACDA) Honor Choirs, an International Choral Festival hosted every three years, a madrigal festival, and several choral events sponsored by organizations other than state ACDA and MENC units. The state Music Education Associations (MEA) of MENC: The National Association of Music Education hosts events in 40 (81.6%) of the states. Other organizations sponsor a choral all-state event in 13 (26.5%) of the states reporting. These organizations include: various vocal associations, cooperative ventures between state MEA and state ACDA units, MEA convention programming units, public schools, and the International Association of Jazz Educators.

*Logistical Practices*

The logistical concerns of the all-state event include issues such as time-of-the-year scheduling, conflicts with other regularly scheduled events (all-state band, orchestra, etc.), number of rehearsal days and hours, performance and rehearsal venues, equipment, and utilization of assessment procedures.

*Scheduling.* Time of the year chosen for all-state events varies from state to state, with most being held during the winter and spring months. Data for reporting states is as follows: fall (September-December), 11 (22.4%); winter (January-February), 20 (40.8%); spring (March-May), 22 (44.9%); summer (June-August), 2 (4.1 %); other, 6 (12.2%).

Variations from the above include a music camp held during the first week in August with a two-day reunion in February. This particular state schedules a repeat of the culminating camp performance during the school year, any time from late February to early April. The respondent explains: “The variability of dates is primarily due to scheduling difficulties with the primary venue in which our All-State is held.” Other states host showcases that present the best of elementary, middle school, and high school all-state choirs. One state reports that students audition in February, come together for a three-and-a-half-day summer camp in June, and reconvene the following October for the performance held at the state music conference.

All-state choral events are frequently coupled with other events or with all-state events featuring other performance media. The SPP yielded the following combinations: choral and all-state band performances, 38 (77.6%); choral and all-state orchestra performances, 38 (77.6%); choral with some type of conference, 37 (75.5%); choral and other, 11 (22.4%). In the conference category, 10 of the events reported were MEA conferences. Also listed were a youth arts festival, ACDA state conferences, and teacher inservice conferences. All-state groups other than band and orchestra, which are coupled with all-state choruses, include collegiate all-state band and chorus, children's chorus, all-state jazz band, all-state jazz ensemble and wind ensemble, and all-state parade. One state MEA offers nine state-level honors groups, all of which perform during the October state music conference. The nine groups include high school state honors band, orchestra, jazz ensemble, vocal jazz ensemble, treble choir, and mixed choir, and middle level state honors band, orchestra, and choir.

*Rehearsal.* The duration of all-state events varies from state to state and sometimes varies for different events within a state. No state reported less than two consecutive days scheduled for an all-state chorus event. The number of days dedicated to the event were reported as follows: 2 days, 2 (4.1%); 3 days, 32 (65.3%); 4 days, 2 (4.1%). Several states reported holding additional rehearsals in preparation for the event: one state holds two three-hour additional reading rehearsals/sectionals; another requires

students to attend one regional rehearsal prior to the event. As previously mentioned, one state meets for six days in August and two days in February, while another requires a three-and-a half-day honors camp in June and a one-and-a-half-day rehearsal with performance in October.

Rehearsal hours per day vary from four to ten hours. The maximum number of hours reported by respondent is listed in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1

*Maximum number of hours students are in rehearsal for any given day*

Number of hours	Frequency	Percentage %
8	15	30.0
7	9	18.0
9	6	12.0
6	5	10.0
10	4	08.0
8.5	2	04.0
7.5	2	04.0
6-8	1	02.0
5	1	02.0
4	1	02.0

One state reported that the on-site rehearsal schedule was less for the junior chorus (seventh to ninth grade) and that only one of the three days reported was a “long” day of rehearsal. It was also noted that “hours of rehearsal” do not indicate actual hours of singing; if this were so, it would, in some instances, be harmful.

The total number of hours given to rehearsal during an event varied from ten to thirty. The respondents’ reports are given in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2

*Rehearsal hours consumed in one all-state event*

Rehearsal hours	Frequency	Percentage %
20	7	14.0
16	5	10.0
17	4	08.0
18	4	08.0
12	3	06.0
14	3	06.0
15	3	06.0
11	2	04.0
13	2	04.0
30	2	04.0
8	2	04.0

Rehearsal hours	Frequency	Percentage %
10	1	02.0
11-12	1	02.0
15-18	1	02.0
15.5	1	02.0
19	1	02.0
21-25	1	02.0
22	1	02.0

Relating to this item, it was noted that the total number of rehearsal hours was not necessarily spent on consecutive days during the event. For example, one respondent reported 13 hours on the site and 4 hours at a regional rehearsal before the actual event.

In a response to question seven of the SPP, one subject explained that the maximum number of hours reported were spent on site. However,

each student receives a custom audiotape with the concert literature accompaniment and their voice part highlighted on the tape, along with the concert music. The tape may also contain pronunciation guides for languages. Each student must prepare sufficiently to pass an audition on-site on the concert literature (relative to audition requirements). The on-site auditions are done in octets with the accompaniment tape with one teacher facing the students. If a student is having difficulty, the student is

heard in a different octet with a choral board officer present. If the student is not able to maintain the vocal part, the student is dismissed. We do not have records of the time that individual students and their teachers spend in preparation before arrival on-site.

*Rehearsal and performance venues.* Responses to this item indicated that venues might change from year to year, even when location does not. Three coordinators also noted that the location of the event changes from year to year and therefore also the venue. The types of rehearsal space utilized at the time of the survey were as follows: conference room, 18 (36.7%); gymnasium, 15 (30.6%); auditorium, 30 (61.2 %); church, 20 (40.8%); various, 27 (55.15).

Quality of acoustics in rehearsal and performance venues were judged as follows: superior, 6 (12.5%); adequate, 41 (83.7%); poor, 7 (14.3%). Types of performance space reported were conference room facility, 7 (14.3%); gymnasium, 10 (20.4%); auditorium, 35 (71.4%); church, 4 (8.2%); various other venues, 4 (8.2%). Quality of acoustics in the performance venues were reported as follows: superior, 24 (49.0%); adequate, 22 (44.9%); poor, 6 (12.2%).

*Miscellaneous procedures.* The survey dealt with directives that were a consistent part of policies and procedures, rather than practices occurring by chance or at the discretion of a particular organizer. The following indicates those practices that were specified in the states' policies and procedures: piano(s) to be used are tuned, 39 (79.6%);

monitors provided for choir if necessary, 23 (46.9%); clinician does workshop or meets with directors, 13 (26.5%); complimentary recordings given to guest conductor, 29 (59.2%); formal assessment of event success by directors, 10 (20.4%); formal assessment of event success by students. 5 (10.2%); formal assessment of event success by clinician, 3 (06.1%); sound system provided for clinician, 28 (57.1%).

### *Musical Practices*

*Choir Voicing, Literature and Accompanist Selection.* More than 20 different types of all-state ensembles were reported. At the high school level, mixed choirs and senior high women's groups were most frequent, while men's groups ranked considerably lower. Jazz choirs ranked higher than men's groups, and college choirs and show choirs appear to play a very small role in all-state events. Combinations and various titles reported under "other" included: mixed choir (grades 11-12); mixed choir (10-12); intermediate mixed (9-10); senior women's chorus (10-12); junior high mixed; SATB (7-8); SSA (7-8); junior chorus 6-8; middle school treble (6-8); mixed (7-9); junior high women; elementary (6 states indicated some form of all-state events for elementary grades); upper elementary; junior high treble; elementary mixed (5-6); and, elementary (4-6). Numbers and percentages for this item are reported in Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.3

*Types of choral ensembles/voicing*

Performance medium	Frequency	Percentage %
Mixed 9-12	36	77.5
Senior High Women	24	49.0
Mixed 6-8	16	32.7
Jazz	13	26.5
Other	13	26.5
Senior High Men	11	22.4
College	07	14.3
Show Choir	06	12.2

A large majority of states reported the choral clinician as highly influential in the selection of repertoire. Twenty-three states (49.6 %) indicated that the selection was made solely by the all-state conductor; 25 states (51%) appoint a committee that selects repertoire from a list proposed by the all-state clinician. Only one state reported that an all-state choral committee was solely responsible for the selection of repertoire. Some variations on the numbers reported above were offered. In the event that the all-state clinician is responsible for repertoire selection: (a) finalization of the selection may require approval by the all-state chair or other designated party; (b) the state chair may provide feedback (language difficulty, unavailability of resources such as instruments, etc.); (c) clinician's recommendations must be approved by the organization's executive

board or committees appointed by executive boards of cooperative organizations; (d) repertoire must include at least two selections from a state-approved list. Repertoire lists submitted by the all-state clinician may also require: (a) approval of an executive director and/or the music supplier; (b) meeting criteria based on price and length of selections.

On the other hand, selection of accompanists is usually the task of the all-state choral committee. Only two states (4.1%) reported that accompanists were selected by the all-state conductor. Thirty-four state choral committees (69.4%) provided professional accompanists for all-state events; 10 states (20.4%) use volunteer choral directors as accompanists; and 3 states (6.1%) reported using students as accompanists. One state reported asking the clinician if they have a preference; if not, a local professional is usually employed. Another indicated that the university that hosts the event provides the accompanist. Four respondents said that the event chair exclusively selects the accompanist. One state using student accompanists requires a taped audition of standard repertoire for the selection process.

*Audition policies and procedures.* Respondents were asked to select the closest description of the audition process used for all-state events. The description and results are reported in Table 4.4. The large majority of states, 29 (59.2%) reported holding regional live auditions with some variation in format. Eight states (16.3%) used only one site, and 4 states (8.2%) held auditions at both district and regional levels. Taped auditions were used in 8 states (16.3%): 7 (14.3%) divided the tapes among a group of judges; In only one state (0.2%) did each judge hear all of the tapes. Three states (6.1%)

allowed students to take part in all-state events solely on the recommendation of the teacher.

TABLE 4.4

*Audition procedures*

Procedure	Frequencies	Percentage %
Regional sites provided for hearing auditioning students from that region only.	21	42.9
Regional sites provided for hearing all auditioning students (auditions scheduled so that judges can be present at each site).	8	16.3
One central site provided for hearing all auditioning students.	8	16.3
Taped auditions are submitted for adjudication and tapes are divided among a group of judges for adjudication.	7	14.3
Multi-level (e. g. District winners proceed to a regional audition)	4	08.2
Teacher recommendation only	3	06.1
Taped auditions sent to one state-appointed committee and each judge hears all auditioning students.	1	00.2

Variations on the descriptors in the table were also reported. Of those states using tapes, one reported that the tapes were divided by voice part (Soprano I, Soprano II, Alto I, etc.) and one or two judges listened to all the tapes in a given category. Locations of regional auditions are variously determined: some are chosen so that students need not travel more than two hours; others are organized so that a teacher might take students to a site other than their assigned region ("zone") but all students of that teacher are required

to go to the same site; others are organized in regional quadrants or some other regional composition, and the students selected by the judges in the regional event advance to one central site for the final auditions; still others form eight regional choirs chosen by audition, and the all-state choir is chosen by audition from these regional choirs.

The makeup of adjudication panels also varies from state to state. A central site in one state uses a panel of 5 judges (participating teachers) to hear all auditioning students. One alternate judge takes the place of a teacher whose student(s) are auditioning. The judges used for auditions are drawn from a variety of potential sources. Table 4.5 describes adjudication personnel as reported by respondents.

TABLE 4.5

*Adjudication personnel used by responding states*

Adjudication personnel	Frequency	Percentage %
In-state directors	36	73.5
Retired teachers	28	57.1
College/University Teachers	27	55.1
Private voice teachers	21	42.9
Church musicians	08	16.3
Out of state teachers	05	10.2

The number of judges employed for a given audition varies from state to state (See Table 4.6). The most common practice, reported in 19 states (39.6%) is to have one judge per audition. Also common are three or more judges per audition (16 states, 32.7%)

and two judges per audition (12 states, 24.5%). In one state the number of judges varies depending on the grade level. One state reported one judge per voice part, and another reported two judges per voice part. In states where more than three judges are used, several variations occur. Students are first heard as a quartet by four judges. They are then heard on several criteria including a short solo line, sight-reading, and other requisites by a different judge. In another state, there are three judges per voice part (SSAATTBB).

TABLE 4.6

*Number of judges used in the audition process*

Number of judges	Frequency	Percentage %
Single judge for each audition	19	39.6
Three or more on each audition	16	32.7
Two judges each audition	12	24.5
Judges confer after audition	4	08.2
Independent decision	3	06.1
Judges confer during audition	3	06.1

Adjudication decisions are handled in several ways: in the 28 of the states (58.3%), each judge makes an independent decision; in 11 states (22.4%), judges confer after the audition; and in 6 states (12.2%), judges confer during the contest. In the independent decision by a single judge, during the first round in one state, the judge may accept,

reject, or recall each singer. Another state requires that the judge render a numerical score for each singer. Where multiple judges are used, one state reports the cumulative score derived from the rating assigned by each judge. One state reports that adjudication sheets are tallied during the day. Names of those students selected are then faxed to directors.

No scores are given. One state provided a detailed description of their process:

We use a series of steps to keep the audition process fair and maintain a consistent standard of performance. The choral board judges a videotaped audition of a student and determines the grades for each category of the audition. These grades become the state standard for the particular audition. On the day of auditions, every judge must go through an orientation that includes viewing the judged video of the audition and a review process to establish whether the individual judge is in line with the state standard, too lenient or too strict. (Students are assigned a registration number so that no names or schools are part of the process.) The judge uses a CD of the accompaniment as well as the pitches for the folk song, and the scale and tonic chord of the melodic sight-reading sections. The script for the audition is on the CD. Each judge must maintain all his or her audition scores and registration numbers on a Gaussian Distribution chart, again, to align their scores in keeping with the normal mix of students who audition. In the rare instance that a particular judge has a chart that is out-of-line, they must provide a written explanation. (Example: if scores in a particular room are consistently low all day, but the judge is aware that nearly every student coughed and had evidence of a sore throat, the numbers would not align in a normal fashion and the explanation would justify that.) Once all scores are checked for correct math, a

statistician takes all the audition scores and produces an "adjusted score" based on a mathematical standard deviation for each judge and all the scores. The "adjusted score" becomes the final score and the chorus selection is done by determining the desired number [for the all-state choir].

Where the judges confer after audition, several specific conditions exist. The president and president-elect in one state review audition sheets and make final decisions regarding the choirs. They compile the information and choose the choirs. Another state reports that a computer program averages the judges' scores. Judges in one state make recommendations, and an independent selection committee actually chooses the students who will participate in the all-state choir. The auditions in this state are also anonymous, meaning the audition number identifies the students to the judge only. According to the respondent, "This is done to keep the process fair and equal for all students."

In live auditions, 54% of the states have the students face the judge and 20.4% audition from behind a screen. Students audition in a small mixed group in 85.7% of the states. In the group audition, three of the states (6.1%) used one judge per student. In another state using multiple judges, the event coordinators used four judges (one from each region of the state) to adjudicate the group of students. Other variations include having the judge's back to the auditioning student; groups of students (up to 10) from an individual school are in an audition room together and the students audition individually; a recall round is sung for two to three judges; and three judges adjudicate each student and the scores are totaled. Another respondent commented on procedures that are presently in flux:

This is a detail we haven't completely worked out yet. In one region, it was one judge per student. In both other areas one judge may actually have listened to two students simultaneously. This was due to number of students to be heard and available judges. I think the consensus for future will be one judge per student, however the entire panel (including an extra judge or two in each room) will agree to pass or fail an auditioning student.

The number of students auditioning for all-state events ranges from 300 to 14,000 students. The median number for the states reporting is 1,200 students. The number of those selected for each state ranges from 120 to 1,450, with a median of 355 students. Audition requirements are summarized in Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.7

*Audition requirements*

Audition procedure	Percentage %
Sight-sing a monophonic line	53.1
Sight-sing a vocal part within a choral texture	18.4
In an ensemble, sing vocal part found in the selected all-state literature	24.5
In an ensemble, sing vocal part in a required audition selection	24.5
Sing required solo	34.7
Sing solo of student or teacher choice	14.3
Teacher recommendation	18.4

Audition procedure	Percentage %
Sing literature in foreign language	12.2
Tonal memory test	22.4
Written theory test	2.0
Sung theory test (ex. sing a given interval)	4.1
Sing major/minor scale	20.4
Sing major/minor arpeggio	26.5

One state reported that the students sing the all-state required piece with a "music minus one" CD. Another state requires the student to sing his or her vocal part from the selected all-state literature. These selections are sung at both the quadrant auditions and the final auditions. During the first audition students are given four of the eight performance repertoire selections and required to sing their vocal part on three of the four selections. Students are informed of the "cuts" in the warm-up room 90 minutes before their audition time. The same procedure is followed at the final audition. Solo requirements used in some states are: "America the Beautiful" sung a capella; a solo of a specified unaccompanied folksong in English; or "America the Beautiful" sung in a specified key. One state requires a song sung in Italian. Another state requires the "singing of the ensemble part (S, A, T, or B) with a CD of the accompaniment of specified literature (sometimes in Latin or Greek [i. e. Kyrie eleison])". Only one state reported having a required theory component; in that state students are required to identify key signatures.

Additional requirements reported were the singing of a chromatic scale, major triad, minor triad, diminished triad, and/or an augmented triad. Other states listed a tone quality audition factor and rhythmic sight-reading. Others require the singing of vocal parts found in the selected all-state literature, or an unaccompanied arpeggiated vocalise ascending chromatically. According to one procedure, required audition selections are not revealed until the morning of the auditions, so that all students must know all of the selected literature.

One respondent reported a procedure, new to that state, whereby at the regional level students auditioned alone on an accompanied excerpt of their vocal part from two all-state pieces. Under this system each region has complete autonomy in selecting their students at the first tier. The selected students then move to the state level, where they sing, in an ensemble, an accompanied excerpt of their part from the all-state literature. Another state reported that students prepare all literature to be performed at the all-state concert. They must sing at least two selections, and one of the two selections must be in a foreign language. Students sing a third selection at the discretion of the judge. The third selection is required only if the judge is seeking confirmation of the evaluation. Students have the option of singing a scale and arpeggio. This is a solo audition with the student singing his or her part of selected portions of the all-state literature.

Audition music is selected by state committee in 19 states (38.8%), from the current year's all-state repertoire in 13 states (26.6%), from a list provided by the state in 8 states (16.3%), by the teacher in 6 states (12.2%), by the student in 5 states (10.2%), and by a regional committee in 3 states (6.1%). One state reported that the state event chair makes the audition selection, and another state stipulated that the chair plans the

audition requirements, which are then approved by the organization's executive board.

Another state clarified the category of "list provided by state" by explaining that one part of the audition is the most difficult section of the most difficult piece in the previous year's repertoire. For music selected by the teacher, the organization explains that there is a scoring category for "appropriate repertoire" and that their guidelines indicate that it should be "an age-appropriate art song—not big arias, or popular music."

*Student Preparation, Additional Conductor Responsibilities, and Assessment.*

Selected all-state students receive their music more than two months in advance in 44.9% of the states reporting. Only 6.1% receive their music less than four weeks in advance and another 38.8% receive music four weeks to two months in advance. One state said that although the goal is four weeks to two months, the actual time is usually less than four weeks. Two states said that the time available is often shortened because individual teachers place the order. Another said that there is a delay as the teachers wait for the music selection to be made. Another state reported, "Our high school Honors students sight-read their music at the June summer camp. They learn it together (correctly), and perform a "Work-in-Progress" concert 3-1/2 days later. It's always amazing! (Our Middle Level State Honors students receive their music 2-1/2 months prior to their October concert.)" One state supplies a "learning" CD with the music order.

Among those states with more than two months to learn music, one reported that the students get the music three to four months in advance. In another state, a music rehearsal occurs in early August, and the auditions are the third Saturday of October (that

is, the student preparation of music is regarded as part of the audition process). One state sends scores in August; the first rehearsal is in September, and there are three other rehearsals before the two days of rehearsal at the convention. In yet another state, the music list is made available in April, and the all-state event is held in November.

The majority of states, 38 (77.6%), expect the all-state conductor to do nothing except rehearsals and the performance. However, 5 states (10.2%) require a lecture; 3 states (6.1%), a workshop; 2 states (4.1%), a repertoire seminar. In one state, the MEA conference planning committee decides whether or not to invite a conductor to present a session at the state conference. Most conductors in this state are invited to do a session on conducting techniques or literature selection. Another state invites at least two clinicians to do other workshops during the year. Production of rehearsal tapes by the all-state clinician is requested in one state.

Assessment procedures are integrated into the planning and policies in 12 (24.5%) of the responding states. Of these states, 6 stated that they used an evaluation form or questionnaire to gather data. Descriptions were provided by several states as follows:

1. "The directors, students, and members of the community evaluate the event using a questionnaire provided at all-state. The community evaluation comes from the audience in attendance."
2. "Evaluation forms are sent to directors in the state and the board meets 3 times per year to evaluate. The chorus division holds an open meeting through district chorus representatives to discuss the event."
3. "Directors' surveys are collected at the all-state event. Town hall meetings of choral directors and bandmasters are held for discussion."

4. “Board has evaluation forms available and the data collected is discussed and assessed at an executive meeting.”
5. “Teachers complete an evaluation form and students have an option to complete an evaluation. Students, judges, staff, and clinicians fill out evaluations that are reviewed by the hosting organization.”

One state reported having a newly appointed person to develop and set in motion an assessment process. Four states report that they have informal meetings to gather feedback. Additional descriptions of these meetings are as follows:

1. Director input after all-state or honors choir event.
2. Directors are from 12 districts—each district has officers with whom all teachers can communicate. The state board meets three times per year to entertain questions/problems submitted by any member.
3. “Teachers meet in a choral meeting once a year at conference and discuss the event. We feel very good about the quality of our All-State because students are not left alone to prepare. The students know the music when the guest clinician comes. Teachers cannot enter students unless they are present at all rehearsals.”

In one state, statistics are kept on regional acceptance rates by voice part; the state choral council acts upon suggestions for changes and improvements. Another state does not have a formal assessment tool but solicits positive communications by e-mail before, during, and after the summer camp and after the fall concert.

*Survey of All-State Clinicians' Opinions Regarding  
Current All-State Policies and Procedures*

*Performance Media Surveyed*

Conductors for this survey were selected based on their participation in a minimum of three all-state choral events between the years 1997 and 2002. Of the conductors ( $N = 51$ ) identified, 34 (72.54%) responded. Each conductor was sent three surveys and was asked to complete each survey to reflect his or her opinions and observations of one specific all-state event of his or her choosing. Ninety-three surveys were returned. On each survey the respondent was asked to identify the type of ensemble (mixed, women, men, jazz, and show) and the level (high school, middle school, and elementary). The type of group most frequently reported was high school mixed chorus (52 surveys, or 52.5% of the total number of surveys completed), with high school women's chorus (20, or 20.2%) and high school men's chorus (13, or 13.1%) also well represented (See Table 4.8). Fewer surveys were completed for middle school mixed, elementary, jazz, and show choirs; and no respondent returned a survey for middle school men's or women's groups.

Table 4.8

*Types of Choirs Represented in Surveys*

Performance media	Frequency	Percentage %
High School Mixed	52	52.5
High School Women	20	20.2

Performance media	Frequency	Percentage %
High School Men	13	13.1
Middle School Mixed	6	06.1
Elementary	3	03.0
Jazz	3	03.0
Show	1	01.0

### *Logistical Practices*

Conductors were asked to use a Likert-type scale to identify policies and practices existing in specific all-state events. Responses are summarized in Table 4.9, where the stems are presented in abbreviated form; the questions in full form are presented in Appendix B.

Table 4.9

### *Policies and practices found to exist in current all-state events*

Policy/Practice	Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Disagree	
	Strongly		Somewhat				Somewhat		Strongly	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
SPP 2. Time of the year is appropriate.	56	56.6	30	30.3	6	06.1	2	02.0	2	02.0
SPP 3. Event is held in conjunction with other events.	43	43.4	30	30.3	9	09.1	8	08.1	6	06.1

Policy/Practice	Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Disagree	
	Strongly		Somewhat				Somewhat		Strongly	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
SPP 4. The number of days is sufficient.	59	59.6	26	26.3	2	02.0	6	06.1	3	03.0
SPP 5. Total number of rehearsal hours is adequate.	58	58.6	28	28.3	2	02.0	6	06.1	3	03.0
SPP 6. Number of rehearsal hours per day is appropriate for students.	24	24.2	43	43.4	4	04.0	18	18.2	6	06.1
SPP 7. Number of rehearsal hours per day is appropriate for event.	33	33.3	38	38.4	5	05.1	13	13.1	06.	06.1
SPP 8. Rehearsal space is excellent.	19	19.2	42	42.4	2	02.0	18	18.2	16	16.2
SPP 9. Rehearsal space acoustics are adequate.	31	31.3	34	34.3	2	02.0	20	20.2	10	10.1
SPP 10. Performance space is adequate.	40	40.4	28	28.3	2	02.0	17	17.2	9	09.1
SPP 11. Performance space acoustics are	45	45.5	20	20.2	3	03.0	17	17.2	11	11.1

Policy/Practice	Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Disagree	
	Strongly		Somewhat				Somewhat		Strongly	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
good.										
SPP 12. Piano tuning	61	61.6	31	31.3			3	03.0		
meets expectations.										
SPP 13. Monitors/ microphones are	50	50.5	16	16.2	7	7.1	7	7.1	13	13.1
available for choir.										
SPP 14. Monitors/ microphones are	55	55.6	23	23.2	5	05.1	4	04.0	6	06.1
available for conductor.										
SPP 15. Before event, I am asked for my logisti- cal preferences.	57	57.6	12	12.1	3	03.0	14	14.1	9	09.1
SPP 16. Before event, I received logistical information.	27	27.3	39	39.4	1	01.0	19	19.2	10	10.1
SPP 17. Assessment of event is made available to conductor.	9	09.1	17	17.2	7	07.1	24	24.2	39.	39.4
									4	
SPP 18. Conductor formal assessment.	3	03.0	9	09.1	3	03.0	28	28.3	53	53.5

*Musical Practices*

Conductors were also asked to give opinions, using a Likert-type scale, on musical practices such as age grouping and gender grouping of performance ensembles; who should make repertoire selections; preferred method of accompanist selection; proficiency level of selected students; and choral ensemble size (See Table 4.10).

Table 4.10

*Musical policies and practices*

Policy/Practice	Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Disagree	
	Strongly		Somewhat				Somewhat		Strongly	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Ensemble age grouping is appropriate.	79	79.8	16	16.2	—	—	1	01.0	—	—
Gender grouping is appropriate.	81	81.8	12	12.1	—	—	—	—	2	02.0
Conductor is best suited to select music.	69	69.7	26	26.3	1	01.0	—	—	—	—

Policy/Practice	Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Disagree	
	Strongly		Somewhat				Somewhat		Strongly	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
All-state committee is best suited to select music.	—	—	10	10.1	4	04.0	28	28.3	53	53.5
Music selection should be a joint decision.	17	17.2	29	29.3	5	05.1	23	23.2	21	21.2
States should develop a repertoire list.	3	03.0	9	09.1	6	06.1	36	36.4	42	42.4
Conductor should select accompanist.	7	07.1	19	19.2	13	13.1	31	31.3	25	25.3
Committee should select accompanist, from choral directors.	7	07.1	29	29.3	22	22.2	18	18.2	19	19.2
Committee should select professional accompanist.	43	43.4	36	36.4	7	07.1	3	03.0	7	07.1

Policy/Practice	Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Disagree	
	Strongly		Somewhat				Somewhat		Strongly	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Students are selected based on high standards.	38	38.4	49	49.5	4	04.0	5	05.1	—	—
Number of students selected is about right.	46	46.5	43	43.4	—	—	3	03.0	4	04.0
Students have adequate sight-singing skills.	14	14.1	41	41.4	25	25.3	12	12.1	2	02.0
Students come well prepared.	30	30.3	50	50.5	1	01.0	8	08.1	7	07.1

#### *Additional Event Requests and Availability of Information to Conductors*

Conductors were asked about additional duties (i.e., responsibilities other than conducting rehearsals and performances) during the all-state event. Twenty-three respondents (23.2%) reported that they were asked to give a lecture on a given topic during the all-state event. Nine (9.1%) were asked to lead a conducting workshop during the all-state event. Only five (05.1%) were asked to conduct repertoire seminars.

Conductors were also asked to rank the importance of certain factors in the success of the event. An overwhelming number of conductors felt that the student preparation of the music was the most important factor. The performance facility was ranked second in importance, with group discipline management following. Next came two descriptors with equal ranking: rehearsal and performance acoustics, and motivation from sources other than the guest conductor (i.e., school directors, repertoire, peer influences, etc.). Support from event organizers and facility set-up was ranked as least important. Several conductors indicated that all descriptors were equally important. One conductor responded to this question by writing in “Communication.”

One section of the survey instrument dealt with the kinds of information that are made available to conductors before the event. Conductors were asked whether selected items of information were provided in a timely manner, provided only if requested, or never provided. The information most frequently reported as being provided in a timely manner was a contract detailing responsibilities and expectations (88, or 88.9%), followed by rehearsal schedule (83, or 83.8%), transportation arrangements (81, or 81.8%), amount budgeted for conductor expenses (74, or 74.7%), and information on accommodations (71, or 71.7%). The information most frequently reported as never provided was the fee of other all-state conductors under contract (85, or 85.9%), biographies of instrumentalists (71, or 71.7%) and accompanists (62, or 62.6%), and specific goals and objectives of the all-state event for the given state (55, or 55.6%). Table 4.11 summarizes data on the availability of information.

Table 4.11

*Information availability*

Information	Provided in		Only provided if		Never provided	
	a timely		requested			
	manner					
	Freq.	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Rehearsal schedule	83	83.8	9	09.1	2	02.0
Accompanist biography	6	06.1	24	24.2	62	62.6
Instrumentalist biography(ies)	3	03.0	17	17.2	71	71.7
Amount budgeted for conductor expenses	74	74.7	9	09.1	13	13.1
Rehearsal facility descriptions	33	33.3	36	36.4	27	27.3
Performance facility descriptions	44	44.4	37	37.4	15	15.2
Contract detailing responsibilities and expectations	88	88.9	4	04.0	3	03.0
Agreement to record event and distribute recording.	30	30.3	16	16.2	49	49.5
Previous all-state programs.	71	71.7	21	21.2	3	03.0
Specific goals and objectives of the all-state event for the given state.	22	22.2	20	20.2	55	55.6
Fee of other all-state conductors to be contracted in a given year.	8	08.1	4	04.0	85	85.9

Information	Provided in		Only provided if		Never provided	
	a timely		requested			
	manner					
	Freq.	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Transportation expense limits.	58	58.6	14	14.1	22	22.2
Transportation arrangements.	81	81.8	7	07.1	6	06.1
Information on accommodations	71	71.7	13	13.1	10	10.1
Accommodation address, contact phone numbers and e-mail addresses	67	67.7	16	16.2	9	09.1
Computer and copying access/availability	34	34.3	23	23.2	33	33.3

### Open-ended Questions Presented to Conductors

#### *Contributions to the Participant's Education*

Conductors were asked what they considered to be the chief contribution that all-state choral events make to the participants' total music education. Their replies were categorized into topics, arranged in Table 4.12 from most to least frequently presented.

Conductors stressed the importance of the all-state experience in both the education of the student and the overall contributions to the students' musical skills. One described it as an "ensemble experience that inspires and synthesizes other subparts of complete music education." It was also reported that the chief contribution was "to

provide an opportunity for a peak musical/aesthetic experience for the students” and “an opportunity to refine choral and musical skills.”

Many conductors mentioned the social aspects of all-state participation: “meeting singers and conductors from other areas and social backgrounds” and the recognition that the event “gives the top choral musicians in the state the opportunity to perform at a high level with talented peers.” Others mentioned the opportunity to perform advanced literature: “To rehearse and perform quality literature at a higher level than previously experienced” and “by bringing together the highest achieving choral students in the state, the choir members can, through rehearsal and performance, experience a higher level of mastery of musical skills and aesthetic ideals that can serve as their musical standard throughout their lives.” One conductor reported: “We had a rare ‘musical high’—Musicianship and ‘Bonding’ were close behind in importance.” Another contribution mentioned was “motivating [students] to improve their technique.” One respondent identified “[n]ew repertoire, high level of performance, working with other equally talented musicians, high motivation level, working with skilled conductor” as important benefits of all-state participation. Recognition of the challenge of competition was expressed: “Develops musicianship by meeting expectations for selection/membership through competition.”

Table 4.12

*Contributions of the all-state experience*

Contributions	Freq.
Musical skills; aesthetic; higher level of musicality; goals of music education	23
Social	13
Rehearse and perform quality literature; new repertoire	11
Inspiration; motivation	8
Work with skilled conductor	5
Challenge of competition	2

*Goals and Objectives*

Conductors were also asked what they consider to be the goal(s) and objective(s) for all-state events. Six categories emerged (See Table 4.13), with the largest number of responses (24) classified in the category "Refined performance; high quality ensemble; aesthetic." Least often cited were social goals (3 responses).

Conductors who affirmed the importance of aesthetic goals said that they hoped "to provide an opportunity for a peak musical/aesthetic experience for the students". They also hoped that they could "present a standard of performance to teachers." One conductor wrote:

Molding the singers into a responsive, sensitive whole that is able to understand and experience the heart and soul of the music studied; letting the music speak and live for the choir participants through the all-state rehearsals and ultimately

offering that gift through the all-state rehearsals and ultimately offering that gift to the audience.

Many of the conductors emphasized the goal of inspiration and development of the individual singer. They felt that it was important that the students leave with a positive musical experience. In their opinion, the event should facilitate a “discovery of self and others through singing meaningful literature,” enable singers “to get in touch with their artistic and creative selves,” and “[i]nspire, inspire, inspire.” Reinforcing the goals and objectives of music educators and learning new repertoire were equally important to the responding conductors. One sought “[t]o reinforce the good work of the music teachers in the state,” and another hoped to provide “ensemble experience that inspires and synthesizes other subparts of complete music education.”

One conductor who mentioned social goals said that such experiences “help young people become a part of a co-operative and cohesive unit.” Another described the all-state event as a “combination of music and personal growth for the student through the pursuit of music excellence in a musically and socially new/unique/challenging environment.” A third pointed to “peer inspiration; a musical experience for all. Social growth.”

Table 4.13

*All-state goals and objectives*

Goals and objectives	Freq.
Refined performance; high quality ensemble; aesthetic	24
Inspiration; reinforce joy of singing, development of the individual singer	14

Goals and objectives	Freq.
Reinforce efforts of teachers; teacher edification; reinforcement of music education goals	8
Learn new and better repertoire	8
Social	3
Non-specific positive statements	2

### *Factors that Contribute to All-State Success*

Conductors were asked what contributed most to the overall success of any given choral event and what detracted most. Overall, responses were overwhelmingly positive. However, 21 clinicians cited deficiencies having to do with poor facilities and acoustics, length of rehearsals, poor organization, lack of teacher support, weak procedures, and scheduling deficiencies—time of year and daily schedules. Among the negative comments were the following:

1. “Rehearsal spaces were not good (small room—low ceiling).”
2. “Although the event contributed somewhat positively to the goals and objectives, the acoustics of the gym detracted from the music experience.”
3. “Except for the acoustics of the performing area, the event met everyone's expectations.”
4. “Too many long rehearsal days starting too early in the a.m.”
5. “Too much rehearsal each day.”

6. “The goals and objectives are usually met in rehearsal. By the time of performance, students are generally worn out. Consequently, performances are not always inspiring!”
7. There were “ineffective audition procedures; some students had no music; very poorly prepared.”
8. Event procedures were handled “negatively—students were very ill prepared. Performance was not up to all-state standards.”

Positive comments include the following:

1. “[T]he singers were very committed to the goal of creating beautiful music, resulting in great excitement, satisfaction and a feeling of being a part of something totally unique. [We] were pleased with their efforts as well as their teachers work in helping them prepare.”
2. “[S]tudents were challenged musically and intellectually and they rose to the occasion. Several stayed in touch via email and it's exciting to know how they felt good all-state events contributed to the quality of their lives.”
3. “The support/rapport of the teachers with each other and the students made a big positive difference.”

### *Suggestions for Change*

The final question presented to the conductors was “What changes would you suggest to improve the all-state choral event?” Responses divided into categories. The category into which most responses fell was “Student preparation and auditions,”

followed closely by facilities, and scheduling/rehearsals. Much less often mentioned were equipment, voicing and balance, and communication and assessment. These categories are listed in Table 4.14 in order of frequency.

Table 4.14

*Suggested changes to the current all-state policies and procedures*

Category	Frequency
Student preparation and auditions	18
Facilities	16
Miscellaneous suggestions	13
Scheduling and rehearsal issues	12
Communication and assessment	6
Voicing and balance	4
Equipment	3

Specific suggestions included the following:

1. “Level of preparation—check all students.”
2. “More stringent auditions.”
3. “Adopt an audition procedure to insure that choir won't have to "chase notes" and learn music.”
4. “Eliminate ‘tapes’ for learning parts—replace with musical literacy to accommodate musical learning.”

5. “For the most part successful. However, this particular all-state does not expose the students to the music ahead of the event. So a lot of time was spent learning notes, and not enough time making music. I prefer to have the notes learned ahead of time. This all-state policy made rehearsal too tedious and exhausting for both the students and teachers.”
6. “More comprehensive musicianship components in audition processes.”
7. “More preparation of students and more selectivity.”

Many conductors felt that an improvement in the choice of facilities would improve the all-state event. Some of their responses included:

1. “Performance facility was like a big barn - very disappointing. Students really couldn’t experience the full extent of their excellent performance level.”
2. “Provide times and rooms for sectionals; make sure section leaders attend all full rehearsals.”
3. “Perhaps rehearsal not in a church sanctuary, because the girls were really spread out and distant.”
4. “Better rehearsal facilities.”
5. “Better performance venue.”
6. “I did not rank ‘acoustics’ or ‘performance facility’ among my most essential factors necessary because if the students aren’t prepared and there is no support from the event organizers, the event cannot be successful, even if the acoustics are great. I also don't think directors have much choice in their venues for performance. However, that said, a wonderful

hall with great acoustics would result in an experience that had the potential for maximizing and culminating the rehearsal process. To me, concerts that are held in gyms encourage both performers and audience to act and feel more informal, minimizing the professional concert behaviors we hope to encourage. As mentioned, this is apart from the obvious acoustical drawbacks of a gym which detract from possible maximum aesthetic outcomes.”

7. “Ensemble needed to be larger for the performance space.”

Representative comments concerning scheduling and the dress rehearsal are as follows:

1. “Perhaps one more day would allow the rehearsal schedule to relax a little, and also open up more time for working with soloists and vocal improvisation.”
2. “First weekend in December is an awkward time.”
3. “Rehearsal time was limited (pianist was fine, however) .”
4. “Less hours of rehearsal provided the preparation is excellent. Hours of rehearsal during the day need to be more reasonable. 8:00 a.m.!!!”
5. “Schedule dress rehearsal any time except the hour before the concert.”
6. “Do not sing more than 6-7 hours in one day.”
7. “Organize a ‘movie night’ the night before the concert . . . 3 different shows—comedy—animated—action—etc. NOT a dance or ‘screaming’ talent show.”
8. “Allow for sectionals in early stages of rehearsal.”

9. "Maximize the down time for kids."
10. "Too many long rehearsal days starting too early in the a.m."
11. "By the time of performance, students are generally worn out.  
Consequently, performances are not always inspiring!"
12. "Avoid extended rehearsal segments without rest breaks."
13. "Suggest making sure the singers do not rehearse more than 4-5 hours a day over a 10-hour period. Other activities (educational) could be planned using the conductor as a lecturer, etc."

Miscellaneous suggestions included:

1. "Memorization of the music."
2. "[C]ombine with another small state?"
3. "The instrumentalists were not consistently good [or] bad."
4. "Do not commission new work!"
5. "Provide time to work with accompanist in advance."
6. "Not so geared toward those economically [able] to afford it."

Conductors proposed interaction between clinicians and teachers and more teacher support. The establishment of a requirement that section leaders/teachers must be present at rehearsals would assure more effective rehearsals. A desire to have better communication prior to and during the event was stated in the survey and assessment was also requested. Specific suggestions were:

1. "Have more interaction with teachers and guest conductor."
2. "[S]tronger teacher support."

3. “Provide time to have dinner and conversation with other coordinators—both guests and local.”
4. “Send feedback: How did the event impact choral music in the state, was it a worthwhile experience for the kids and their directors.”
5. “The director [clinician] needs to interact with state choral directors—before the event, during and after the event!!!”
6. “Perhaps one more day would allow the rehearsal schedule to relax a little, and also open up more time for working with soloists and vocal improvisation.”

Specific suggestions concerning voicing, balance and choir size included:

1. “Use rotation system for female singers so that the women's choir is not the ‘2nd or left-over’ choir.”
2. Choose more altos than sopranos.
3. “Eliminate 9th graders from the event as their level of musicianship and vocal ability is far below that of students in upper grade levels.”
4. “Smaller, more selective chorus.”

Equipment suggestions included:

1. “Provide sound equipment for playing of CDs—provide recording equipment so choir can hear and analyze rehearsals (final and dress) .”
2. “Equipment for performance came late. Preparation of final concert logistics.”
3. “When conducting a choir of 250—Do not use an upright [piano] for rehearsals.”

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As previously stated, the purpose of this study was (a) to provide an overview of national practices, and procedures pertaining to all-state choral events; and (b) to gather opinions of active all-state choral clinicians regarding the effectiveness of national trends, policies, and procedures. Both logistical and musical practices were addressed in two researcher-authored surveys: *Survey of Current All-State Policies and Procedures* and *Survey of All-State Clinicians' Opinions Regarding Current All-State Practices and Procedures*. The review of literature revealed an array of isolated studies on all-state events spanning from 1927 to the present day. Many of these concerned instrumental rather than choral events. No synthesis or cohesive document covering these studies has been produced. No comprehensive history of all-state events in the U.S. was found. Where they exist, historical accounts concerning all-state events are incorporated into state histories.

The study revealed that both logistical and musical practices vary widely from state to state. In summary, the findings were as follows.

#### Logistical Practices

##### *Scheduling*

All-state events are scheduled to fit the agendas of the various states. Not all conductors felt that the events were held at the most appropriate time of year. Two to four consecutive days are generally allotted for choral events, although some states have

instituted unique all-state formats that include summer camps and additional regional rehearsals.

Other all-state performance media are frequently scheduled concurrently and at the same location as the choral groups. This arrangement received general approval from the clinicians, although in certain instances, it limited the rehearsal time in the performance venue.

### *Rehearsal Hours*

In general, clinicians found the number of days and total rehearsal hours allocated for the events was appropriate. Some, however, expressed concern about the number of hours per day that students are expected to sing. Those clinicians expressing concern generally agreed that the maximum number of hours of vocal use should be no more than four to six per day. It was suggested that other musical activities be incorporated into the day to limit vocal stress. Thirty-nine states indicated that students rehearsed more than seven hours per day. It was suggested that reducing the number of rehearsal hours per day might result in adding days to the length of the event.

### *Rehearsal and Performance Venues*

Rehearsal facilities proved to be a general concern of the clinicians. The SPP survey found that the selection of rehearsal venue was highly influenced by cost, needed size, and availability. A slim majority of states reported the use of an auditorium, reported by the clinicians as being satisfactory. Other venues commonly used, i.e. conference rooms, gymnasiums, and churches, were reported as less than excellent by more than a third of the clinicians. Approximately a third of the clinicians expressed concern about the acoustical quality of rehearsal venues. All-state coordinators generally rated the acoustics adequate, but only 12.5% rated them superior. Open-ended comments

of the clinicians indicated that, in some instances, the venue prevented them from meeting rehearsal objectives.

An auditorium was reported being the most frequent site for performances. This venue, including available equipment, warm-up rooms, etc., was perceived by both coordinators and clinicians as being generally more satisfactory than the usual rehearsal spaces. The acoustics were judged superior by half of the coordinators; more than two-thirds of the clinicians agreed with the judgment.

#### *Routine Procedures*

More than half of the states routinely provided the following: piano tuning, sound systems for the conductors, and complimentary recordings of the performance for the clinician. Less than half of the same respondents indicated that coordinators provided monitors for the choir; required the clinicians to provide inservice events for teachers; and/or gathered assessment data from teachers, students, and/or clinicians. Clinicians reported that the piano tuning met their expectation in most situations. The clinicians also reported that monitors and/or microphones for the choir's use were made available in half of the situations. Monitors and/or microphones for the clinician's use were made available in most of the situations.

More than half (63%) of the states routinely ask the clinicians for their preferences regarding facilities, instruments, equipment, etc. Thus, a higher percentage of states consult the clinician than those who set their own agenda regarding the provision of facilities. This may reflect a conscious effort by coordinators to foresee the needs of the clinicians. Conversely, only half of the clinicians reported that the states provided information on facilities and equipment before they arrived at the site.

### *Assessment*

Assessment was absent from many of the states' procedures. Some (20.4%) commented that although no formal assessment of all-state events was required, informal assessment was obtained via word of mouth, phone calls, and e-mails. A number of coordinators reported obtaining a degree of feedback from clinicians, but few states routinely asked clinicians for a formal assessment, and students rarely were asked for an evaluation. Clinicians concurred that they usually were not given the opportunity to supply a formal assessment. In those instances where a formal assessment was made by directors and students, only 28.9% reported that results were made available to the clinician. Open-ended responses from the clinicians indicated a desire to receive the assessment results when they were available.

### *Musical Practices*

#### *Types of Choirs*

State coordinators identified 24 different all-state choir voicings, with most of the variations occurring in the 16 states holding all-state events at the middle school and junior high levels. Clinicians agreed (strongly and somewhat strongly) that the age and gender groupings were appropriate; only one disagreed about the age grouping for one event. Two clinicians voiced strong disagreement with gender groupings, but no comments were provided to explain these responses.

#### *Selection of Literature and Accompanists*

Half of the states reported that the clinician chooses the music for all-state; half reported that the all-state committee was actively involved in the literature selection. In all except one case, the conductors judged themselves to be best suited to select the literature. Most (87.7%) disagreed "strongly" or "somewhat strongly" that the all-state committee should make decisions regarding literature. When asked if the "selection of

music should be a joint decision by an all-state committee and the guest conductor,” only 46.3% of the clinicians found this to be acceptable. When asked if states should develop a list of repertoire from which to select music, the clinicians disagreed in 80% of the surveys.

Professional musicians accompany all-state events in 69.4% of the states surveyed. Clinicians had varying opinions on the selection of accompanists: 29.2% preferring to select the accompanist; 59.5% indicating that the choice be made by some other source. Approximately 41% agreed that the choice could be left to the all-state committee.

### *Auditions*

Clinician surveys indicated that students did appear to be selected on the basis of vocal technique, musical knowledge, and musical standards. The procedures used for auditions varied considerably from state to state. More than half the states provided some regional system for hearing the students. Taped auditions were utilized in eight states. Four states have a district audition prior to the regional audition. The majority of audition judges were active classroom music directors, retired teachers, or college/university teachers. One to three judges were used in most of the audition procedures. When one judge was used, the decision was made independently. When multiple judges were employed, 12.2% conferred during the contest and 22.4% conferred after the contest.

The most frequently used audition requirements included: sight-singing a melodic line; singing a single part from the selected all-state literature or a required audition selection; performing a required solo; passing a tonal memory test; singing major and/or minor scales and arpeggios. Theory tests were required in 3 states. Several respondents noted that the audition included singing a chromatic scale. In 38.8% of the states, audition music was determined by a state committee; 26.5% used selections from the

current year all-state literature. In 10.2% of the states, students selected the audition material; in 12.2% of the state, teachers made the selection.

Thorough student preparation for the all-state event is crucial for a superior performance. In 44.9% of the reporting states, students selected for all-state receive the music more than two months in advance. At the extreme, one clinician reported that students did not have their music prior to the event and rehearsals were spent in note learning. Only 31.1% of the clinicians strongly agreed that the students came well prepared with notes and rhythms correctly learned. Several states indicated that final selection depends on whether or not the student has mastered the music. When this was not the case, clinicians reported being disappointed with the event or, at least, disappointed that rehearsal time was spent learning notes rather than attending to more advanced musical matters.

#### *Inservice Responsibilities.*

The states reported that in 77.6% of the contracts prepared for clinicians, inservice for teachers was not included. Only a few of the clinicians (20.0%) reported that they were asked to present a lecture on a given topic during the all-state event. Conducting workshops (0.08%) and repertoire seminars (.045%) were rarely requested. In open-ended questions, clinicians expressed an interest in more time allotted to communicating with the teachers in the state.

#### *Dissemination of Advance Information*

Clinicians are at a decided advantage when all-state event parameters and organizational arrangements are clearly dictated and executed. They reported that the following is provided in a timely manner in more than half of the events: rehearsal schedule, conductor-expense budget, conductor responsibilities, travel and living accommodations, and contact information. Information lacking in more than half of the

events includes: accompanists'/instrumentalists' biographies, recording and distribution agreements, and specific goals/objectives of the all-state event. Information about the rehearsal and performance facilities was provided for some events. However, in the majority of cases, this information was not provided or provided only on request.

#### *Contributions, Goals, and Objectives of the All-State Event*

Clinicians were asked what contribution all-state events should make to the total music education of the students. Several responses surfaced repeatedly: (a) the development of a higher level of musical skills and aesthetic appreciation; (b) the experience of performing advanced choral literature not possible in most local school environments; (c) increased motivation to experience the joy of fine musical performance. It should be noted that although these objectives were tacitly considered to be the chief purposes of the all-state event, formal statements of such were nonexistent and generally were not made available to clinicians, teachers, or students.

In general, clinicians indicated belief that all-state events should and did positively influence the musical development of the individual students and that; ideally, these students shared the benefits they had reaped with their local school in terms of motivation and enthusiasm.

Finally, clinicians were asked what contributed most to the success of a given all-state event and what detracted most from its success. The overwhelming response for success was well-prepared students. They strongly encouraged states to assure that auditions be stringent and comprehensive, and that students be checked for mastery of the literature to be performed. Inadequate facilities were listed first as contributing to an unsuccessful event. Long rehearsals and those scheduled too early in the day were also cited as being detrimental to success.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

The following conclusions and recommendations are suggested by the findings of this study and the research literature.

1. All-state events potentially make an important contribution to the music education of students. As an educational event, greater attention should be given to the formal statement and assessment of objectives. In general, assessment should review organizational aspects, quality of rehearsals and performances, and effectiveness of clinicians.
2. The inservice education of teachers is generally neglected in the context of the all-state event. It is recommended that all-state formats allow clinicians to spend more time with teachers. Specific events such as workshops, roundtable discussions, etc., should be organized in all states to facilitate communication between teachers and clinicians.
3. The preparation of students to participate is the single most important ingredient leading to the success of the all-state event. Audition requirements should be stringent and comprehensive. Students should come to the event with a thorough knowledge of the literature that is to be performed.
4. The role of the conductor is vitally important to the musical product and to the motivation and inspiration of students and teachers. Results of this study confirmed the importance of the clinician in the selection of music. This study as well as studies by Parker (1955), Barresi (1979), Rittenhouse (1989) and Clarke (1997) affirmed the necessity of the conductor presenting an enthusiastic example to the chorister.
5. Teamwork between teachers, the state organizing committee and selected clinicians is essential to the success of all-state events. In this interest, communication on all aspects of the event should be improved. Consensus on

procedures and practices should be reached before the event, and all parties should clearly understand and agree on their roles.

6. Facilities and scheduling greatly impact the success or failure of an all-state event. In particular, attention should be given to adequate acoustics at the rehearsal site; satisfactory sound systems; and adequate space for sectionals and non-conventional choir formations. Rehearsal schedules should be arranged carefully with the vocal health of the student in mind.

#### Suggested Topics for Further Study

Implied in the findings of this study are some issues that require further study:

1. Relationship between vocal stress and the all-state event;
2. Effectiveness of innovative/alternative all-state formats;
3. Development of objectives and assessment plans for all-state events;
4. Development of national standards and a unified plan for all-state events throughout the country;
5. Development of a research-based handbook to aid in the planning and implementation of all-state procedures and policies;
6. Genres and styles of literature recommended by all-state conductors for various types of choirs;
7. Perceived value of the all-state experience as reported by students, teachers, parents, and the public at large; and,
8. Articulation between choral all-state events and local and state curricula.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES CITED

- Alfred, E. E. (1985). A model for all-state percussion auditions. *Music Educators Journal*, 71 (9), 37-38.
- Ames, C. & Ames, R. (1984). Goal structures and motivation. *The Elementary School Journal* 85 (1), 39-52.
- Austin, J. R. (1990). Competition: Is music education the loser? *Music Educators Journal*, 76 (6), 21-25.
- Barnes, G. V. (2001). All-state orchestras: A survey of practices and procedures. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 20 (2), 16-20.
- Barresi, A. L. (1979). Music objectives for choral festivals. *Music Educators Journal*, 65 (7), 50-53.
- Beach, F. A. (1934). "Festivals and Contests Committee" annual report. In *Yearbook of the Music Educators National Conference: Twenty-Seventh Year 1934, Vol. 5.* (pp. 314-315).
- Best, F. C. (1927). State choral contests. *The Music Supervisors Journal*, 13 (3), 9, 11.
- Burdett, N. D. (1985). The high school music contest movement in the United States. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47 (02), 458A.
- Burnsed, V. & Sochinski, J. (1983). Research on competitions. *Music Educators Journal*, 70 (2), 25-27.
- Campbell, W. P. (1960). A study of district and all-state music festivals in Pennsylvania Music Educators Association. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, PSU18, 363.

- Clarke, S. D. (1997). Eph Ehly, all-state choir conductor: A video presentation of his philosophy and rehearsal techniques. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58 (03), 627A.
- Cory, P. B. (1951 a). High School Competitive Music Festivals. *Music Educators Journal*, 37 (4), 38-40.
- Cory, P. B. (1951 b). A survey of noncompetitive music festivals. *Music Educators Journal*, 37 (5), 34, 36.
- DeCarbo, N., Fiese, R. & Boyle, J. D. (1990). A profile of all-state instrumentalists. *Research perspectives in music education: A bulletin of the Florida Music Educators Association*, 1, 32-40.
- DeuPree, D. D. (1968). An analysis of the Colorado large group music competition-festival system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, Fort Collins. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 30 (02), 750A.
- Elliott, C. A. (1995). All-state band practices and procedures: A nation-wide survey. *Journal of Band Research*, 30 (2), 87-94.
- Fiske, H. E. (1983). Judging musical performances: Method or madness? *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 1 (3), 7-10.
- Forbes, Guy W. (1994). Evaluative music festivals and contests—Are they fair? *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 12 (2), 16-20.
- Fuller, C. L. (1989) Factors related to success at all-region and all-state choir auditions in Texas. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50 (09), 2694A. UMI 9005981

- Greenlee, D. W. (1982). A study of the Indiana State Choral Festival Association and its contribution to secondary choral music programs. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43 (04), 1074A.
- Griffin, K. (1996). Personal perspective: All-state for small schools. *The Instrumentalist*, 50 (10), 80.
- Hoffer, C. R. (1976). The music contest steps off in a new direction: In Indiana, musicianship is being recognized as more than performance skill. *Music Educators Journal*, 62 (5), 67-69.
- Keller, E. M. (1931). *A survey and evaluation of music contests and competition festivals*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Lockhart, L. M. (1935). Constructive criticisms for contests and festivals. In *Yearbook of the Music Educators National Conference: Twenty-eighth year 1935*. (pp. 279-286).
- Maddy, J. E. (1936). The competition-festival of the future. *The Music Supervisors Journal*, 13 (3), 9-11.
- Mason, V. E. (1985). On being a choral conductor. *The Choral Journal*, 25 (6), 5-7.
- McClung, A. C. (2001). Sight-singing systems: Current practice and survey of all-state choristers. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 20 (1), 3-8.
- McRaney, J. T. (2001). A history of the Georgia Music Educators Association, 1922-1993. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (09), 3363A.

- Morlan, G. (1966). Programs of action for state music educators associations. (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 27 (12), 4286A.
- Music Educators National Conference. (1941). *National School Band, Orchestra and Vocal Associations, School music competition-festivals, 1941*. Chicago: Author.
- National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1978). *The Belmont report: ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Neuen, D. (1988). The sound of a great chorus. *Music Educators Journal*, 75 (4). 42-45.
- Nierman, G. E. (2002). *An examination of the desire for modification of the Nebraska all-state chorus configuration*. Poster session presented at the national convention of MENC: The National Association for Music Education. Nashville, Tennessee.
- Oldham, H. G. (1966). The organization and administration of all-state bands and orchestras. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 27 (06), p. 1854 (UMI 9005981)
- Parker, R. C. (1955). *The role of the music contest and festival in the development of a well balanced program of music education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teacher's College, Columbia University, New York City.
- Parkes, M. B. (1983). Who learns from competitions? *Music Educators Journal*, 70 (2), 34-35.
- Perkins, D. W. & Allen, M. L. (1991). An investigation of inter-judge reliability of the Texas Music Educators Association all-state orchestra string auditions. *Texas Music Education Research, 1991: Reports of research in music education*

*presented at the annual meeting of the Texas Music Educators Association San Antonio, Texas, 1991, (pp. 21-23). Austin, Texas: Texas Music Educators Association.*

Pooler, F. (1984). Checklist for guest conductors. *The Choral Journal*, 25 (2), 9-10.

Reames, R. R. (1997). Repertoire and conductors of fifty all-state choirs 1995-96. *The Choral Journal*, 38 (5), 29-32.

Reames, R. R. (1999a). Repertoire and conductors of fifty all-state choirs 1996-97. *The Choral Journal*, 39 (7), 45-57.

Reames, R. R. (1999b). Repertoire and conductors of fifty all-state choirs 1997-98. *The Choral Journal*, 39 (8), 49-63.

Reames, R. R. (1999c). 1998-99 all-state choirs: Choral literature and conductors. *The Choral Journal*, 40 (5), 61-70.

Reames, R. R. (2000). 1999-2000 All-State Choirs: Choral Literature and Conductors. *The Choral Journal*, 41 (5), 47-50, 56-64.

Reames, R. R. (2001). High school choral directors' description of appropriate literature for beginning high school choirs. *Journal Of Research In Music Education*, 49 (2), 122-135.

Reames, R. R. (2002a). [2000-2001 All-state choirs: Choral literature and conductors]. Unpublished raw data.

Reames, R. R. (2002b). [2001-2002 All-state choirs: Choral literature and conductors]. Unpublished raw data.

Rentz, E. (1994). The effect of the all-state choral experience on participation, repertoire selection, opinion, and time spent in rehearsals. In R. A. Duke (Ed.), *Texas music*

*education research 1994: Reports of research in music education presented at the annual meeting of the Texas Music Educators Association, San Antonio, Texas, 1994* (pp. 65-71). Austin: Texas Music Educators Association.

Ritchey, M. S. (1954). *A survey and evaluation of the music competition-festival*.

Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow.

Rittenhouse, J. H. (1989). Competitive and non-competitive choral festivals at the secondary level. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50 (06), 1477A

Sandlin, William P. (1973). A comparative study of differential perceptions of the functionality of the competition festival among high school principals and music teachers in the secondary schools during the academic year 1969-1970.

*Dissertation Abstracts International*, 33 (09), 5227A.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. (2002). *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences: SPSS. (Version 11.1)* [Computer software]. Chicago: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Stehn, J. H. (1947). The music contest and music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 33 (4), 48, 50.

Temple, C. P. (1974). A study of the effectiveness of competition festivals in the education process. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 34 (08), 4827A.

Tremaine, C. M. (1934). An outlook on festivals and contests. In *Yearbook of the Music Educators National Conference: Twenty-Seventh Year 1934, Vol. 5.* (pp. 262-265).

University of Georgia - Institutional Review Board/Human Subjects Office. [Data file H2002-10554-3]. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia.

Wine, T. R. (1996). All-state choruses: A survey of practices, procedures, and perceptions. *The Choral Journal*, 36 (8), 21-27.

Wis, R. M. (2003). Redefine and redesign the choral festival experience. *Music Educators Journal*, 89 (3), 47-51.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, M. J. (1990). *A classified index of American doctoral dissertations and dissertation projects on choral music completed or currently in progress through 1989*. Lawton, OK: American Choral Directors Association.
- Ames, W. H. (1950). *A survey of public high school music teacher's opinions concerning competition music festivals in the State of Washington*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, State College Of Washington.
- Armstrong, D. (1979). Clinic-festival. *The Choral Journal*, 18, 16.
- Broomhead, P. (2001). Individual expressive performance: Its relationship to ensemble achievement. *Journal Of Research In Music Education*, 49 (1), 71-84.
- Cole, L., Jr. (1986). All-State instrumentalists—who are they? *Georgia Music News*, 47 (1), 37-38.
- Coleman, D. (2001). All-state events. *Georgia Music News*, 62 (1), 13.
- Ferraro, G. M. (1984). *Criteria for repertoire selection for use in Kansas State High School Activities Association sponsored festivals*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Pittsburg State University.
- Findlay, J. S. (1983). The organization of a festival. *Masters Abstract*, 22 (01), 19.
- Fiske, H. E. (1983). Judging musical performances: method or madness? *Update: The Applications Of Research In Music Education*, 1 (3), 7-10.
- Foxx, J. O. (1969). *A comparative study of the all-state and evaluative choral festivals in Arkansas, 1968-69*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, AR.

- Fransham, R. W. (1951). *School music competition-festivals in Montana*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Montana State University, Bozeman.
- Fuller, C. L. (1989). Factors related to success at all-region and all-state choir auditions in Texas. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50 (09), 2694A.
- Garman, B. R., Boyle, J. D., & DeCarbo, N. J. (1991). Orchestra festival evaluations: Interjudge agreement and relationships between performance categories and final ratings. *Research perspectives in music education: A bulletin of the Florida Music Educators Association*, 2, 19-24.
- Green, F. P., Jr. (2000). Choral music performed at Northwest Division conventions of the American Choral Directors Association (1976-1998): An index with an annotated bibliography of selected works. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61 (08), 2982A.
- Heslop, C. (1994). *Competitions and festivals*. London: Rhinegold Publishing.
- Leppla, D. (2001). The goal: Music as a lifelong interest æ does competition help or hinder our efforts? *Indiana Musicator: The Official Publication of the Indiana Music Educators Association*, 56 (3), 17, 20.
- Matheopoulos, H. (1982). *Maestro: Encounters with conductors of today*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Minnesota State High School League. (1991-92). *Music manual (Vol. 14)*. Brooklyn Center, MN: Author.
- Moore, E. B. (1938). *A survey of inter-scholastic music contests in the United States*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Oklahoma. Norman.

- Morgan, J. & Burrows, B. (1981). Sharpen your edge on choral competition. *Music Educators Journal*, 67 (8), 44-47.
- Music Educators National Conference. (2000). FYI: What the music education-minded want to know. *Teaching Music*, 8 (1), 54.
- National Interscholastic Music Activities Commission. (1954). *Standards of adjudication: A manual of suggestions regarding the adjudication of music competition-festivals*. Chicago: Music Educators National Conference.
- Neuen, D. (1988). The sound of a great chorus. *Music Educators Journal*, 75, 42-45.
- Tagg, B., Galvan, J., & Ferreira, L. (1994). The honor choir: Purpose, organization, outcome. *The Choral Journal*, 35 (02), 21-22.
- Tunison, F. E. (1888). *Presto! From the singing school to the May music festival*. Cincinnati, OH: E. H. Beasley & Co.
- Tynon, M. J. (1995). *Development and validation of an adjudication instrument for high school vocalists: case study of the Idaho State Solo Contest, 1995*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Wager, J. (1991). *Conductors in conversation: Fifteen contemporary conductors discuss their lives and profession*. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co.
- Webb, G. B. (1994). Literature forum: Repertoire performed by ACDA Honor/Festival Choirs. *The Choral Journal*, 35 (2), 25-39.
- Wiley, C. A. (1950). *The status of the music competition-festivals in Texas*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Texas, Austin.
- Wisconsin School Music Association. (1991). *Wisconsin School Music Association Handbook*, 62 (1). Madison, Author.

## QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fink, A. & Kosecoff, J. (1998). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Developing a questionnaire*. New York: Continuum.

Hague, P. (1993). *Questionnaire design*. London: Page Ltd.

Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire, design, interviewing and attitude measurement*.

London: Pinter Publishers.

Peterson, R. A. (2000). *Constructing effective questionnaires*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications, Inc.

Sudman, S. & Bradburn, N. M. (1982). *Asking questions: A practical guide to*

*questionnaire design*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc., Pub.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

## SURVEY OF CURRENT ALL-STATE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The following questionnaire should be returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. For additional information, you may contact:

G. Dawn Harmon McCord  
 University of Georgia School of Music  
 250 River Rd.  
 Athens, GA 30602-7287

770/535-8199, home  
 770/287-8246, fax  
 dmccord@arches.uga.edu  
 dawnmccord@earthlink.net

### Background Data

1. Does any organization in your state host a/an (check all that apply):

All-State Chorus..... \_  
 Regional Honor Chorus ..... \_  
 District Honor Chorus ..... \_  
 Other ..... \_  
 Please list \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

2. Does your state music education association of the MENC: The National Association for Music Education sponsor and organize a choral all-state event?

Yes \_                      No \_

If yes, please forward this questionnaire to the person in your association who is responsible for implementing procedures and overseeing the operations of the all-state event. Should there be various choral coordinators for different levels, any one person familiar with the overall policies and procedures will be acceptable.

If no, is there another organization that sponsors a choral all-state event?

Yes                       No

If there is another organizing sponsor, provide the organization's name and contact person in the space below and return the questionnaire in the envelope provided:

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Contact person \_\_\_\_\_

Complete address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Phone number with area code \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

## Logistical Practices

3. The time of year the event is held is:

Fall (September-December).....

Winter (January-February) .....

Spring (March-May).....

Summer (June-August).....

Other .....

Describe \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. If your choral all-state event coincides with another event, check all concurrent events that apply:

All-State Band.....

All-State Orchestra .....

Conference .....

Identify Conference(s) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Other .....

Describe \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. How many days are scheduled for the all-state ensemble rehearsals and performance?

- One day .....
- Two consecutive days.....
- Three consecutive days.....
- Four consecutive days .....
- Five consecutive days.....
- Other .....

Number of days and schedule (e.g. 3 consecutive Saturdays)

---



---

6. The maximum number of rehearsal hours in one day is \_\_\_\_\_ hour(s).

7. Approximate hours of rehearsal time in preparation for one all-state ensemble event is \_\_\_\_\_ hours.

8. Types of rehearsal space utilized. Check all that apply:

- Conference Room.....
- Gymnasium.....
- Auditorium.....
- Church .....
- Various venues .....

9. Rehearsal space acoustics are:

- Superior.....
- Adequate .....
- Poor.....

10. Types of performance space. Check all that apply.

- Conference Room Facility .....
- Gymnasium.....
- Auditorium.....
- Church .....
- Various venues.....

11. Performance space acoustics are:

- Superior.....
- Adequate .....
- Poor.....

12. Which of the following are dictated in the yearly procedures rather than at the discretion of the organizer (check all that apply):

- Piano(s) to be used are tuned.....
- Monitors provided for choir if necessary .....
- Clinician does workshop or meets with directors.....
- Complimentary recordings given to guest conductor .....
- Formal assessment of event success by directors .....
- Formal assessment of event success by students.....
- Formal assessment of event success by clinician .....
- Sound system provided for clinician.....

## Musical Practices

13. Types of Choral Ensembles/Voicing. Check all that occur in your state:

- Mixed 9-12.....
- Mixed 6-8.....
- Sr. High Women.....
- Sr. High Men.....
- Jazz .....
- Show Choir .....
- College.....
- Other .....

List other performance ensembles and grade level of ensembles:

---

14. Selection of the all-state choral program/literature is made by the:

- All-state choral clinician alone .....
- All-state choral clinician who provides a proposed list to an appointed committee. The committee then selects the program from the list .....
- All-state choral committee .....
- All-state choral committee who selects the music from a state mandated choral list of approved repertoire .....

15. Selection of accompanist is made by:

- All-state choral clinician.....
- All-state choral committee who chooses from:
  - Volunteer choral director.....
  - Professional accompanists.....
  - Students .....

16. Check the description that best describes your state audition process:

- Taped auditions sent to one state-appointed committee and each judge hears all auditioning students.....
- Taped auditions are submitted for adjudication and tapes are divided among a group of judges for adjudication .....
- Regional sites provided for hearing auditioning students from that region only .....
- Regional sites provided for hearing all auditioning students (auditions scheduled so that judges can be present at each site .....
- One central site provided for hearing all auditioning students .....
- Multi-level (e. g. District winners proceed to a regional audition).....
- Teacher recommendation only .....

Describe any additional variations that occur in your state: \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---

17. If judges are used, which of the following describes adjudication personnel (check all that apply):

- In-state directors .....
- College/University Teachers .....
- Retired teachers .....
- Out of state teachers .....
- Private voice teachers .....
- Church musicians .....

18. The following seeks to determine the number of judges used in the audition process.

Check all that apply:

- Single judge for each audition .....
- Two judges each audition.....
- Three or more on each audition.....
- Independent decision.....
- Judges confer during audition .....
- Judges confer after audition .....

19. At what point do the judges render their decisions? Check all that apply:

- Independent decision by single judge .....
- Judges confer during contest .....
- Judges confer after audition .....

20. If students participate in a live audition rather than a taped audition, which of the following describes the physical arrangement in your state. Check all that apply.

- Students face the judge.....
- Students are behind a screen for anonymous audition.....
- Students audition in a small mixed group .....

*If in a group audition:*

- There is one judge per auditioning student.....
- One judge hears and adjudicates all students .....
- Other.....

Please describe: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

21. How many students auditioned in the past year for all-state? \_\_\_\_\_ (number)

22. How many students were selected in the past year for all-state? \_\_\_\_\_  
(number)

23. Which of the following are audition requirements? Check all that apply:

- Sight-sing a monophonic line .....
- Sight-sing a vocal part within a choral texture .....
- In an ensemble, sing vocal part found in the selected all-state literature .....
- In an ensemble, sing vocal part in a required audition selection.....
- Sing required solo .....
- Sing solo of student or teacher choice .....
- Teacher recommendation .....
- Sing literature in foreign language.....
- Tonal memory test .....
- Written theory test .....
- Sung theory test (ex. sing a given interval).....
- Sing major/minor scale .....
- Sing major/minor arpeggio.....
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

24. What is the source of audition music selected for audition:

- Student.....
- Teacher.....
- Regional committee .....
- State committee .....
- List provided by state.....
- Selection from current year all-state repertoire .....
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

25. When do students get copies of all-state music:

- Less than four weeks in advance.....
- Four weeks to two months in advance .....
- \_\_\_\_\_ months in advance.....

26. Which of the following additional responsibilities do you request from the guest conductor (mark all that apply):

- Lecture .....
- Conducting workshop.....
- Repertoire seminar .....
- None .....
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

27. Does your state have in place any systematic means of collecting evaluative data regarding the all-state choral event?

- Yes       No

If so, Please describe briefly:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

The following information is being requested for purposes of recording questionnaire responses. This page will not be used to tally responses and will be discarded once we have noted receipt of the completed questionnaire. This page and the questionnaire should be returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. For additional information, you may contact:

G. Dawn Harmon McCord  
University of Georgia School of Music  
250 River Rd.  
Athens, GA 30602-7287

770/535-8199, home  
770/287-8246, fax  
dmccord@arches.uga.edu  
dawnmccord@earthlink.net

Your name \_\_\_\_\_ Your state \_\_\_\_\_

Your title \_\_\_\_\_ and organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number with area code \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B

**SURVEY OF ALL-STATE CLINICIANS' OPINIONS REGARDING  
CURRENT ALL-STATE POLICIES AND PRACTICES**

Questionnaires should be returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. For additional information, you may contact:

G. Dawn Harmon McCord  
University of Georgia School of  
Music  
250 River Rd.

Athens, GA 30602-7287  
770/535-8199  
dmccord@arches.uga.edu  
dawnmccord@earthlink.net

### **Logistical Practices**

All of the following questions pertain to your experiences in conducting all-state choral events. Consider your overall observations of the events in the past three all-state choruses in which you have conducted. Use one questionnaire per event.

The answers given on this questionnaire refer to the following level (circle or provide one):

- |                      |                     |                   |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1. High School Mixed | High School Women   | High School Men   |
| Middle School Mixed  | Middle School Women | Middle School Men |
| Elementary           | Jazz                | Show              |
| Other _____          |                     |                   |

2.	The event is held at an optimum time of the school year.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
3.	Choral all-state events that are held in conjunction with other events such as conventions, band, or orchestra are learning enhanced by the cooperative experiences.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly

4.	The number of days scheduled for the all-state ensemble rehearsals and performance is sufficient to prepare an outstanding performance.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
5.	Given adequate preparation, the total number of rehearsal hours is adequate for performance preparation.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
6.	The number of rehearsal hours in one day is appropriate for the student.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
7.	The number of rehearsal hours in one day is appropriate for the event.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
8.	The rehearsal space is excellent.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
9.	Rehearsal space acoustics are beneficial to the rehearsal goals.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
10.	The performance room is well suited for an all-state choral performance (e. g. equipment, instrument(s), space, warm-up, etc.).	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
11.	Performance room acoustics are good for choral music.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
12.	The piano tuning meets your expectations.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
13.	Monitors and/or microphones are available for the choir if needed.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly

14.	Monitors and/or microphones are available for the conductor if needed.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
15.	Prior to event, I am asked for my logistical preferences, i.e. facilities, instruments, and equipment for preparation.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
16.	Prior to event, I am given comprehensive information on facilities, instruments, and equipment for preparation.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
17.	Assessment of the events by directors and students is made available to the guest conductor.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
18.	Opportunity for a formal assessment by the conductor is made available following the event.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly

### **Musical Practices**

19.	The age grouping of performance ensembles is appropriate.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
20.	The gender grouping of performance ensembles is appropriate.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
21.	The all-state conductor is best suited to make music selections.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly

22.	An all-state committee in the state in which the event takes place is best suited to make music selections.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
23.	Selection of music should be a joint decision by an all-state committee and the guest conductor.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
24.	States should develop a list of repertoire from which to select music.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
25.	The guest conductor should make selection of accompanist.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
26.	An all-state committee should make the selection of the accompanist, from a list of school choral directors.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
27.	An all-state committee should make the selection of the accompanist, from a list of professional accompanists.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
28.	Students appear to be selected based on high vocal technique and musical knowledge standards.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
29.	The number of students selected for the chorus is about right.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
30.	The students have adequate sight-singing skills.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly

31.	Students come well prepared with notes and rhythms correctly learned.	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Undecided	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
-----	---	----------------	----------------	-----------	-------------------	-------------------

Indicate if the following questions are true or false by circling the correct answer:

32. I was asked to give a lecture on a given topic during the all-state event.

Yes            No

33. I was asked to lead a conducting workshop during the all-state event.

Yes            No

34. I was asked to oversee a repertoire seminar during the all-state event.

Yes            No

35. In addition to the guest conductor, the following are areas of influence identified as essential to a successful all-state choral event. Rank the following in their order of importance with "1" being the most important and "8" being the least important.

\_\_\_ Motivation from sources other than the guest conductor (i.e. school directors, repertoire, peer influences, etc.)

\_\_\_ Support from event organizers

\_\_\_ Group discipline management

\_\_\_ Facility set-up

\_\_\_ Acoustics

\_\_\_ Performance facility

\_\_\_ Student preparation of music

\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---



---

The following seeks to determine what information is commonly made available to the guest conductor. Mark the response that best describes your experience.

36.	Rehearsal schedule	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
37.	Accompanist biography	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
38.	Instrumentalist biography(ies)	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
39.	Amount budgeted for conductor expenses	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
40.	Rehearsal facility descriptions	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
41.	Performance facility descriptions	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
42.	Contract detailing responsibilities and expectations	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
43.	Agreement to record event and distribute recording.	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
44.	Previous all-state programs.	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
45.	Specific goals and objectives of the all-state event for the given state.	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
46.	Fee of other all-state conductors to be contracted in a given year.	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
47.	Transportation expense limits.	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
48.	Transportation arrangements.	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
49.	Information on accommodations (hotel or home description; telephone;	Provided in a timely	Only provided if	Never provided

	internet access; television)	manner	requested	
50.	Accommodation address, contact phone numbers and e-mail addresses	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided
51.	Computer and copying access/availability	Provided in a timely manner	Only provided if requested	Never provided

52. What do you consider to be the chief contribution that all-state choral events make to the participants' total music education?

---



---



---

53. What do you, as the conductor, consider to be the goal(s) and objective(s) for all-state events?

---



---



---

54. How did the event contribute (positively or negatively) to the satisfaction of the goals/objectives?

---



---



---

55. What changes would you suggest to improve the all-state choral event?

---



---



---

The following information is being requested for purposes of recording questionnaire responses. This page will not be used to tally responses and will be discarded once we have noted receipt of the completed questionnaires. This page and the questionnaires should be returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. For additional information, you may contact:

G. Dawn Harmon McCord  
University of Georgia School of Music  
250 River Rd.  
Athens, GA 30602-7287

770/535-8199

[dmccord@arches.uga.edu](mailto:dmccord@arches.uga.edu)  
dawnmccord@earthlink.net

Your name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number with area code \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C

## COVER LETTER TO ALL-STATE ORGANIZERS

- 1215 Chestatee Rd. NW
- Gainesville, GA 30501
- 770-535-8199, home
- 770/287-8246, fax
- 
- dmccord@arches.uga.edu
- dawnmccord@earthlink.net

Date

Name  
School or business  
Address  
City, State, Zip

Dear {Name}:

I am writing to ask your assistance in a study “Choral All-State Policies And Practices: A Survey-Based Analysis And Critique”. Your response to the enclosed questionnaire will aid coordinators such as yourself in making better plans and decisions for future all-state events. The purpose of the research is to collect data on current all-state policies and practices. Conductors of all-state chorus will also be surveyed so that current practices can be compared to their experiences in the field. Your participation in the survey is of course voluntary, and if you participate, you need not respond to all the questions unless you wish to do so. Dr. Mary A. Leglar is the major professor for this research study and she may be contacted at:

Dr. Mary A. Leglar, Associate Director for Academic Programs  
School of Music  
University of Georgia  
250 River Rd.  
Athens, GA 30602-7287  
706/542-3737

The report will present questionnaire results and analysis in the aggregate or anecdotally without attribution to individual respondents or {State}. Your voluntary participation will assist in strengthening all-state policies and procedures in the United States.

Would you please complete the survey (it will take about twenty minutes), and return it by fax, e-mail or if received by postal service, mail it back in the enclosed postage-paid envelope as soon as possible. Included with the survey, you will find a separate sheet that requests your name and address. This information will enable me to cross your name off the list and still maintain your confidentiality that will be respected. I will discard the identifying information once receipt of your survey is recorded. Your name will only be used to remove you from our rosters so you will not receive a second questionnaire. A summary of the results may be published in my dissertation. If you would like a copy of the results, please let me know of this interest and I will send this to you. Should you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact me at 770-535-8199 or dmccord@arches.uga.edu.

Thank you for your help in this important research.

Sincerely,

Dawn H. McCord

Enclosures (2)

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

## APPENDIX D

## COVER LETTER TO ALL-STATE CONDUCTORS

- 1215 Chestatee Rd. NW
- Gainesville, GA 30501
- 770-535-8199
  
- dmccord@arches.uga.edu
- dawnmccord@earthlink.net

Date

Name  
 School or business  
 Address  
 City, State, Zip

Dear {Conductor's name}:

I am writing to ask your assistance in a study “Choral All-State Policies And Practices: A Survey-Based Analysis And Critique”. Your response to the enclosed questionnaires will aid conductors and all-state planners in making better plans and decisions for future all-state events. The purpose of the research is to collect data on current all-state policies and practices. All-state coordinators of all-state chorus in each state and the District of Columbia have been surveyed in order to identify current practices. This information will be compared to your all state conducting experiences in the field. Your participation in the survey is of course voluntary, and if you participate, you need not respond to all the questions unless you wish to do so. Dr. Mary A. Leglar is the major professor for this research study and she may be contacted at:

Dr. Mary A. Leglar, Associate Director for Academic Programs  
 School of Music  
 University of Georgia  
 250 River Rd.  
 Athens, GA 30602-7287  
 706/542-3737

The report will present questionnaire results and analysis in the aggregate or anecdotally without attribution to individual respondents. Your voluntary participation in this research will appreciably assist in strengthening all-state policies and procedures in the United States.

Three surveys are enclosed and each questionnaire should be answered in reference to one of the past three all-state choruses you have conducted. Your opinions will provide this study with information on three separate all-state events for which you have unique experience. Would you please complete the surveys (it will take about twenty minutes each), and mail them back in the enclosed postage-paid envelopes as soon as possible. Included with the surveys, you will find a separate sheet that requests your name and address. This information will enable me to cross your name off the list and still maintain your confidentiality, as I will discard the identifying information once receipt of your survey is recorded. A summary of the results may be published in my dissertation. If you would like a copy of the results, please let me know of this interest and I will send this to you. Should you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact me at 770-535-8199 or dmccord@arches.uga.edu.

Thank you for your help in this important research.

Sincerely,

Dawn H. McCord

Enclosures (4)

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

1215 Chestatee Rd. NW  
Gainesville, GA 30501

[dawnmccord@earthlink.net](mailto:dawnmccord@earthlink.net)

dmccord@arches.uga.edu

## VITA

### G. Dawn Harmon McCord

#### Education

2003 University of Georgia Athens, GA  
D.M.A. in Music Education; Minor in organ

1988 Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, LA  
M.M., Choral Conducting  
Studies in Voice and organ

1971 Florida State University Tallahassee, FL  
B.M. Ed., Music Education (Choral)  
Piano principal; voice secondary

•

#### Experience

1999 – Present University of Georgia Athens, GA

#### Graduate Teaching Assistant

Teaching responsibilities included: MUSI 3110 (Music Techniques and Experiences for Children); MUSI 3120 (Music Literature for Children); MUSI 2020 (Lecturer for Introduction to Music); MUSI 3050 (Teacher

Record for Music Methods in the Elementary Classroom); GRSC 7770 (Coordinated presentations for teaching assistants' graduate seminar on teaching); and, supervision of student teachers.

For Introduction to Music, brought in National Champions in Ethnic American singing; and, live world and symphonic instrument demonstrations. Developed PowerPoint presentations for multimedia lectures.

For Music Methods in the Elementary Classroom, guided students in video production for teaching music elements; established course supplements on WebCT.

For Graduate Teaching Assistant Seminar, incorporated student-requested teaching needs into weekly presentations and utilized guest professional in addressing these needs. Also, presented current research in teaching music as found in literature over the past fifteen years. Additional topics included guided use of available technology in the School of Music, determining quality assessment tools, and incorporating writing assignments into the classroom.

1996–Present                      Friendship Presbyterian Church - Athens, GA

### **Choral Director and Organist**

Increased participation in music program (Adult choir, new children's program, new handbell program, and choir tour.)

Provided performance opportunities for UGA musicians.

1991 – 1999      Brenau University      Gainesville, GA

**Assistant Professor of Arts & Sciences – Music**

Choral Director.

University Organist.

Professor of History, Music Education, Choral Education, Diction,  
Freshman Studies.

Recruiting.

Accompanist for students, faculty, convocations, and guest artists.

Teacher of applied voice, piano, and organ.

College supervisor of student teachers.

Progenitor and disc jockey of classical music radio show, “Panorama”  
for WBCX.

Associate Director for “Firespark” – summer program for secondary  
students in the arts.

1991 – 2001      Brenau Academy      Gainesville, GA

**Academy Faculty**

Choral Director.

Chair of Fine Arts

Choir performed in Italy - November 7-14, 1998

1994 – 1996      Riverside Military Academy      Gainesville, GA

### **Organist**

1988 – 1991    St. Tammany Parish Schools    St. Tammany, LA

#### **Instructor for Gifted/Talented Program in Music**

Certified state evaluator for Gifted/Talented student identification in music.

Curriculum development for grades 1-12.

Teacher for Gifted/Talented music students.

Initiated and developed a music computer lab for use with high school students for composition and ear training. Program served as model for other G/T sites.

Coordinated parish wide student performances.

1986 – 1988    Louisiana State University    Baton Rouge, LA

#### **Teaching and Research Assistant**

Taught music methods class (MUS 2170) for elementary education majors.

Assisted in music education research for Dr. Cornelia Yarbrough and Dr. Rosemary Watkins.

Supervised and evaluated student teachers.

1978 – 1986    Aldersgate United Methodist    Slidell, LA

#### **Director of Music**

- Built music ministry from one adult choir of 11 members to

numerous performing groups which included: an adult choir of 70 members; children and youth choirs with membership of more than 170; 5 handbell ensembles; and various vocal and instrumental ensembles.

- Initiated youth choir tours, recital series, choral and handbell clinics, adult choir retreats, and performances with members of the New Orleans Symphony.
- Acquired new organ, grand piano, handbells, and Orff instruments. Established an extensive choral library as well as children's music resources.
- Planned and oversaw the design and building of a music rehearsal suite.
- Responsible for worship planning, choral and instrumental ensembles, and keyboard (organ and piano) performances.

1974 – 1975 Fulton County Board of Education Atlanta, GA

**Choral Director, High School**

Directed choral ensembles

Acquired guitars and initiated a guitar curriculum

Taught general music. On lunch break went to feeder schools and taught music classes.

1971 – 1974 Orange County Schools Orlando, FL

### Classroom Music Specialist

1971 Nassau County Schools Fernandina Beach, FL

### Middle School Choral Director

#### Publications

“The Literature Says . . .” in Spotlight on Teaching Chorus, 2002 published by Music Educators National Conference.

With Grace Muzzo, “About Sightsinging” in Fall, 1999 issue of *Georg Music News*.

“William Byrd’s Music and its use Within the Anglican Rite” in *The American Organist*, January, 1991.

#### UGA Events

Performed for Provost Event presented for incoming Freshman, July 27, 2000.

Performed for WUGA “Once in a Blue Moon”, August 25, 2000.

#### Adjudication and Workshops

Adjudicated South Carolina State Concerto Competition, SC Music Teachers, Spring, 2000.

Adjudicated piano competitions for the Gwinnett County Music Teachers Association, yearly from 1994- present.

Firespark! – School for gifted students in the arts, 1991-2001, Choral director (1991-99) Associate Director and organ studies (1992-01).

Kaleidoscope – School for gifted students in the arts, 2002, Choral director and Assistant Director (1992-01).

#### Awards and Organizations

Phi Kappa Phi, Chapter 032, November 19, 2002

Marquis’ Who’s Who of American Women, 23<sup>rd</sup> edition, 2002-2003

Marquis' Who's Who in America, 57th edition, 2002-2003

April, 2002 – Granted the Graduate School Dissertation Completion Award

April 30, 2001 – University of Georgia School of Music; Director's Excellence Award

April 2001 – University of Georgia Outstanding Graduate Teaching Award

Pi Kappa Lambda, 2002

Beta Tau Chapter

Marquis' Who's Who in the South and Southwest, 24th edition

1993 GMEA District IX Honor Chorus director

Marquis' Who's Who in the World, 14th edition

Marquis' Who's Who of Women, 14th edition

Marquis' Who's Who in the South and Southwest, 25th edition

Recipient Lake Como (Orange county, FL) NEA Teacher of the Year Award, 1973

American Choral Directors Association

Past Georgia ACDA Repertoire and Standards Chair for Women's Choirs

American Guild of Organists

Atlanta Chapter

Northeast Georgia Chapter

Charter member and current editor

- Secretary, 2001-2002

Music Educators National Conference

Georgia Music Educators

Music Teachers National Association

Georgia Music Teachers Association

Piano Coordinator State Auditions, 2002-2003

Northeast Georgia MTNA Chapter Presbyterian Association of  
Musicians

Sigma Alpha Iota

Music Educators National Conference Collegiate Chapter Growth  
Award – 1991-1996

National Education Association Teacher of Year Nominee Orange  
County, Florida – 1973

College Music Society