

University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2018

Score study procedures and processes among instrumental music teachers and students of varying experience.

Jacob Mark Mitchell
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>



Part of the [Music Education Commons](#), [Music Pedagogy Commons](#), [Music Performance Commons](#), and the [Music Practice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mitchell, Jacob Mark, "Score study procedures and processes among instrumental music teachers and students of varying experience." (2018). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2962.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/2962>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

SCORE STUDY PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES AMONG INSTRUMENTAL
MUSIC TEACHERS AND STUDENTS OF VARYING EXPERIENCE

By

Jacob Mark Mitchell
B.M.E., Winthrop University, 2011

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
School of Music of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Music Education
in Music Education

School of Music
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May, 2018

Copyright 2018 by Jacob Mark Mitchell

All rights reserved

SCORE STUDY PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES AMONG INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC
TEACHERS AND STUDENTS OF VARYING EXPERIENCE

By

Jacob Mark Mitchell
B.M.E., Winthrop University, 2011

A Thesis Approved on

April 20, 2018

by the following Thesis Committee:

Thesis Director
Dr. Robert A. Amchin

Dr. William R. Land

Dr. Rebecca Jemian

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Robert Amchin for his guidance and support in the completion of this project. In addition, much gratitude to Dr. Rebecca Jemian and Dr. Reese Land for agreeing to serve on my thesis committee. Many thanks to Dr. Land for serving as my supervisor, mentor, and friend. I am eternally grateful to you for showing me what unrelenting kindness and unshakable optimism are capable of achieving. To my parents, Mark and Lori Mitchell, thank you for always encouraging me to pursue my goals and dreams. I am so grateful to have wonderful parents who believe in me. To my brothers, J.R. and Chris, thank you for supporting me in my endeavors and being there for me during life's most important moments. Finally, to my wife, Brittany. I could not have completed this project or this degree without your support, encouragement, and love.

ABSTRACT

SCORE STUDY PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES AMONG INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC TEACHERS AND STUDENTS OF VARYING EXPERIENCE

Jacob M. Mitchell

April 20, 2018

Score study is agreed to be an essential part of musical preparation by professional conductors. However, no single method for score study has been established. This thesis examines the score study habits of undergraduate music majors, graduate students with a minimum of five years of instrumental teaching experience, and highly-qualified instrumental music teachers with a minimum of ten years of experience. Qualitative methods are employed, and interview transcriptions are the primary sources of data. Findings showed that instrumental music teachers and those with instrumental teaching experience base many of their score study decisions on the abilities and needs of students and/or performers. Implications for conducting teachers are suggested that may improve the score study methods of students interested in teaching instrumental music.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Rationale	2
Research Questions.....	3
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
The Importance of Score Study	4
Score Study in Conducting Texts	7
Effects of Score Study on Error Detection	11
Professionals and the Musical Score.....	14
Novices and the Musical Score.....	17
Summary	19
METHOD	20
Subjects.....	20
Subject Groups.....	22
Procedures.....	25
Score Study Tasks.....	27
Interview Questions	27
Score Examples.....	28
Audio Recording and Data Storage	29
Data Collection and Analysis.....	30
Reliability.....	32

RESULTS	33
Score Study Definition and Origin	33
Teaching Experience.....	35
Influence on Score Study Procedures	36
Impact on Students.....	37
Rehearsal Grouping and Technical Skills.....	38
Score Study Approaches	39
Score Study Task #1 – <i>Three Ayres from Gloucester</i>	40
Summary – Task #1	44
Score Study Task #2 – <i>Ammerland</i>	44
Summary – Task #2	48
Score Marking.....	49
Familiarity with Score Examples.....	52
Score Familiarity Implications on Results	54
Recordings	55
Summary – Recordings.....	59
DISCUSSION	60
How Score Study is Influenced.....	61
Contrasts in Approaching the Score	63
Implications for Students and Teachers	67
Conclusion	68
Areas for Future Research	70
REFERENCES	72
APPENDICES	76
CURRICULUM VITA	141

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Demographic information and designators for subjects used in the study.....	21
2. Number of comments made during score study task #1.....	41
3. Percentage of comments made during score study task #1.....	41
4. Number of comments made during score study task #2.....	45
5. Percentage of comments made during score study task #2.....	46

INTRODUCTION

Preparation of the musical score is an essential part of teaching any kind of musical ensemble (Colson, 2015). While there are many reasons to study the score, it is generally agreed upon that score study will allow the conductor/teacher to form a mental picture or “sound image” of the composition (Battisti and Garofalo, 1990; Green, 1997). Through intense and thorough study, the conductor is able to discover details of the composition that allow for the development of an interpretation aligned with the composer’s intentions and compositional style. It is important as 1) a conductor and 2) as a teacher to form a sound image of the composition one intends to rehearse. This sound image provides a model within the mind from which the ensemble’s musical product may be compared and evaluated (Labuta, 2010). To have no understanding of the score or intention of its sound quality is to have no direction.

As a conductor, one responsibility is always constant, regardless of the age or level of the ensemble: *the conductor must lead the musicians to understand their individual parts and how their parts work together to form a piece of music* (Labuta, 2010; Hunsberger & Ernst, 1992). As it is shown in research and the opinions of professionals, conductors are not expected to assume the whole responsibility of artistic interpretation. Donald Hunsberger of the Eastman Wind Ensemble (in Williamson, 2008) states:

I believe the object is to get them (members of the ensemble) prepared. You are leading them, but you really don't know how it's going to go.

Many of us were brought up under a dictatorial system, where you may have practiced a set sequence of *fortissimo-to-pianissimo* a thousand times. I want to create an organized environment that encourages individual freedom of expression (p. 38).

These statements have implications for all conductors and teachers. In particular, it is important to note that band leaders are tasked with preparing the ensemble. In a significant amount of the literature, it is frequently stated that one of the most essential components of preparation is musical score study.

As teachers, score study is not only vital as a means for preparing the ensemble but also as a way to formatively evaluate students throughout rehearsals (Casey, 1991). Without a developing sense of the score, how is it possible for a teacher to provide useful feedback to students on their playing or singing? Regardless of age or skill level, all students deserve honest and consistent feedback on their performances.

Rationale

As the reader will see in the following chapters, a great deal of research has been performed that examines the score study habits of professional and novice conductors. These subjects include university professors, undergraduate music majors, conducting majors, graduate students, and pre-service music teachers. However, there have been no studies that attempt to explain the score study methods of undergraduate music education

majors, graduate music majors with secondary teaching experience, and highly qualified secondary music teachers. In particular, the researcher was interested in better understanding what is most significant to a high school instrumental music teacher when preparing for ensemble rehearsals.

Much research has focused on the preparation methods of either professional, orchestra-leading conductors or university faculty. While this research is vital, it is also plentiful. High school instrumental music teachers are teaching younger, often less experienced musicians, and the challenges of this profession are different than those that exist at the university level. Observation of the subjects meeting the above-mentioned criteria will allow for comparison opportunities that may prove useful to current and future music educators.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to better understand through observation and qualitative analysis how score study is approached by music students with and without teaching experience and educators who were teaching instrumental music.

The following questions were answered through the course of this study:

1. What factors influence score study procedures?
2. How is score study approached by teachers and students of varying experience levels?
3. What differences exist between score study processes of undergraduate students, experienced graduate students, and experienced teachers?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The topic of score study is discussed frequently in conducting texts, literature on score study methods, and in music research. A review of score study as it is discussed in conducting-based instructional material is included in this chapter, as well as summaries and results of several research studies that examine the score study methods of novices and professionals. The effect of score study on other musical skills is a topic in the literature that is also common, and findings from these studies are highlighted. The following review of literature is presented to allow the reader a better understanding of the need for further investigation into the score study practices of students and teachers of different experience levels.

The Importance of Score Study

In a study utilizing professional, semi-professional, and amateur musicians (n=89), researchers attempted to make more clear the definition of score analysis (Fine, Goldemberg, Wise, and Bravo, 2015). In this study, participants claimed that information obtained in the score analysis process was most often related to the structural and aesthetic aspects of a piece of music. Subjects participated in an online questionnaire. Questions attempted to reveal how professional, semi-professional, and amateur

musicians defined the terms *mental practice* and *score analysis*. Results showed that most defined score analysis as “studying or analyzing a score in detail” (p. 75). In a different set of sub-statements, subjects referred to score analysis as “reading through or looking at a score”. Participants explained score analysis as “having a theoretical focus” or “being for general enquiry” less frequently.

Several texts related to rehearsing ensembles advocate for score study as an essential step in preparing performers for rehearsals and subsequent performances (Casey, 1991; Colson, 2013; Colson, 2015; Green, 1987; Green & Malko, 1985; Leinsdorf, 1981; Prausnitz, 1983). These publications present the idea that without careful score study, it is difficult for the conductor or ensemble leader to establish rehearsal goals and create a valid interpretation of a piece that is aligned with the composer’s intentions. Failure to study the score may result in less efficient pacing in rehearsals, a lack of understanding of significant musical events, and a performance that lacks artistic depth.

In his book *Rehearsing the Band*, John E. Williamson (2008) provides transcribed interviews with some of the country’s most renowned wind band conductors teaching at the collegiate level. Subjects addressed in each chapter refer to tone, rhythm, intonation, and rehearsal preparation. In nearly every interview, each conductor makes at least some reference to the importance of musical score study. Frank Battisti states, “The conductor should come to the first rehearsal with a thorough knowledge of what is in the score and a clear musical image of the piece” (p. 6). Donald Hunsberger advises, “printed or handwritten symbols must come to some stage of realization *before* you go into the rehearsal” (p. 35).

And finally, Jerry Junkin explains,

After some time in this profession, most of us have learned that preparing along with the band is *not* the way to go through life. There should be a serious structured study process that ends with contemplating what the players should accomplish (p. 39).

Research by Ellis (1994) supports many of the statements made by conductors in Williamson's publication. For this study, five conductors from Big Ten universities who were also members of the American Bandmasters Association were interviewed on their rehearsal preparation techniques. All subjects insisted they study each score intensely, utilizing various techniques for creating a sound image of the work (playing at the piano or a different instrument, singing, or audiating). In addition, all claimed to mark the score minimally to increase rehearsal efficiency. Score study strategies were not limited to harmonic analysis, but included research on the composer's style, use of recordings, and historical background.

In a study by Silvey (2011a), participants who received score study prior to completing a conducting session claimed that familiarity with the score allowed for clearer development of musical goals. In another study by Silvey (2011b), evidence showed that conducting courses should be placing greater emphasis on rehearsal procedures rather than on conducting gestures. Much of the literature has shown that professional conductors view score study as an essential pre-rehearsal strategy for establishing rehearsal procedures.

Score Study in Conducting Texts

Score study is a skill that is most commonly taught in the undergraduate conducting curriculum. Provided a textbook is typically required for these courses, it stands to reason that a thorough understanding of the information contained within these materials is essential in creating a framework for the score study curriculum. Although the primary focus of most conducting texts is on the acquisition of physical and technical skills (Silvey, 2011a), nearly all conducting textbooks reviewed for this study contained at least one chapter pertaining to score study. Several offered specific instructions in the form of “steps” or “phases”. While previous research implies that score study methods and procedures of individuals are not based on specific models (Lane, 2004), there are several commonalities between conducting textbooks on the topic of score study.

Several conducting textbooks provide some type of list or step-by-step method for studying the score. In *The Art of Conducting*, 2nd ed. (Hunsberger & Ernst, 1992), the authors break score study down into “Three Phases”. Phase One refers to the extraction of information from the title page and a complete overview of the piece. Phase Two is an examination of structural features such as form, melodic development, harmonic organization, and texture. Phase Three involves developing an interpretation of the work.

Labuta (2010) writes about the “Three Basic Steps”. Similar in overall content to Hunsberger and Ernst’s phases, Labuta’s text suggests Step One involves the acquisition of an aural concept. Step Two is to anticipate potential problems related to conducting. Step Three is the anticipation of rehearsal and ensemble problems. Nowak & Nowak (2002) create a complex outline of how to prepare the score in Chapter 22 of their book.

Nearly all of the instruction in each of these texts is the same, however the formatting, order, and suggested approach for studying the score differs. Organizational patterns of these conducting texts are similar to those devoted solely to score study. *Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor* (Battisti & Garofalo, 1990) is a prime example of one of these texts.

Nowak and Nowak (2002) explain that the conductor should achieve “a broad view of the piece before any detailed decisions are made” (p. 309). The idea behind this instruction being that a mental sound image will allow the conductor to create an expectation within. From this model, the conductor will have something to compare to the ensemble’s performance. Labuta (2010) seems to agree with this, as the first step of “The Three Basic Steps” is to acquire an aural concept of the piece. Hunsberger and Ernst (1992) ask the reader in their “Phase 3: Interpretation” section, “How can you project your concept to the audience?” (pp. 53). Clearly, the development of a mental sound image is a prime concern in conducting materials.

Instruction regarding score study can take on various forms. Some texts provide a more philosophical approach to the score, whereas others focus primarily on the skills necessary to *read* a score. *The Art of Musical Conducting* by David Whitwell (1998) provides an example of the more philosophical approach to score study. Within this 220 page document, 68 pages refer to the musical score. Most of this book offers quotations from well-known composers, conductors, and performers intended to instruct and inspire the reader. Specific elements of the musical score such as rhythm, tempo, melody, harmony, and form are mentioned, but this is primarily as a means to “de-bunk” common misconceptions one may have about these terms when reading the score.

Elements of Conducting, 2nd ed. by Emil Kahn (1975) only mentions the score in regard to reading. Chapter ten, titled “Score Reading” focuses on the acquisition of skills necessary to read the musical score while conducting. While reading the score is obviously an integral part of the score study process, this text does not offer much in the form of score study instruction. It is organized in a way that technical skills of conducting are of prime importance, and expressive skills are less present.

Green (1997) writes in her textbook, *The Modern Conductor*, 6th ed. that scores should be read both vertically and horizontally. The reader is provided with very specific step-by-step instructions for studying the musical score. The author suggests multiple study sessions in which the conductor should note tempos, style changes, climaxes, and the type of ending. The piece should fit the ensemble and challenge the imagination of the conductor. Green suggests a complete phrasal analysis of the piece and a method for marking the beginnings of phrases. The reader is encouraged to seek out areas of the piece in which the conductor must remain in complete control. These may include difficult rhythms or cues after many measures of rest. The author is very specific as to where cues should be written (in the margins) and the color to mark percussion entrances in (red).

The only textbook reviewed for this study that did not contain any information or instruction on the topic of score study was *Basic Teaching of Conducting* by Kenneth H. Phillips (1997). This text is strictly focused on the acquisition of physical and technical skills necessary for conducting an ensemble. Each chapter addresses a specific technique, and assessments and musical examples are built in. However, this text is the *exception* in regard to the exclusion of the score study element.

In addition to conducting texts, the author also explored publications devoted solely to score study. One text in particular was cited in many studies addressing score study research. Battisti and Garofalo (1990) authored *Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor*. In this text the authors advise a four step process. These four steps include, respectively: Score orientation, score reading, score analysis, and score interpretation. Throughout, the authors utilize Percy Grainger's *Irish Tune from County Derry* as the primary musical example from which the reader may employ score study techniques suggested in the text.

Score Rehearsal & Preparation (Stith, 2011) offers a more contemporary viewpoint on score study. While many elements of this book are the same as those found in *Guide to Score Study for the Wind Band Conductor* (Battisti and Garofalo, 1990), the author seems to be addressing teachers in particular. Stith states, "Be reminded that conductors are always, first and foremost, teachers no matter what the level of expertise of the musicians entrusted to them" (p. 5). This tone employed by the author is consistent throughout the text, and many of the suggestions seem to be directed at those working or interested in working in an educational setting. Stith also employs a multi-phase approach to score study. Phase I is the initial overview of the score. Phase II addresses the compositional structure and preparation of the score. Phase III is devoted to the interpretation and preparation for the initial rehearsal.

After reviewing texts on conducting and score study, a few primary themes emerge from the literature. Most publications offer a process in which the score should be studied. Understanding of the musical elements, historical background, and the composer are all vital components of thorough score study. Nearly all texts relate interpretation of a

musical work to score study, and conducting gestures are often resultant decisions of interpretation. Score study allows for the conductor/teacher to predict potential issues and map out curriculum and instruction-based plans. The primary goal of score study is most frequently referred to as the development of a mental sound image of the piece.

Effects of Score Study on Error Detection

Research has suggested that undergraduate music majors feel least confident about error-detection and correction abilities after completing their conducting course requirements (Silvey, 2011b). Byo and Sheldon (2000) found that as knowledge of the musical score increased, as did the error-detection abilities of undergraduate students. Provided that score study style has been seen in other research as a potential variable in determining error-detection abilities (Grunow, 1980; Crowe, 1996), it seems this particular skill is worth examining. Understanding the effect of score study on error detection may provide further explanation of the differing approaches of professionals and novices when it comes to studying the score.

In a study by Crowe (1996), undergraduate students (n=30) enrolled in beginning conducting were asked to detect performance errors in examples drawn from band literature following the use of one of four score study methods. Score study methods included: no pre-study, study with the score alone, score study with the score and a correct aural example, and score study at the keyboard. Results showed that score study with a correct aural example was significantly more effective than study with the score alone. It was also found that the number of parts in the score affected error-detection. As

parts increased, error-detection abilities decreased, regardless of score study method used.

This study seems to demonstrate that the use of a recording may help undergraduate students detect errors in a rehearsal setting. It is likely that a recording is serving as the “sound image” often referred to by professional conductors. Evidence suggests that the ability to look at a score and hear what is on the page without any kind of sound model is a skill that improves with time and experience (Battisti, 2007; DeCarbo, 1982), but Crowe’s research alludes to the fact that any kind of sound image may enhance the conductors knowledge of the score, even if it is only from the memory of a model. Musical modeling (recordings) has also been studied as a potential variable in rehearsal procedures, evaluations, and conducting.

Montemayor and Moss (2009) utilized preservice music teachers (n=16) to determine if a recorded model in addition to a musical score would yield variations in rehearsal verbalizations, gestures, and assessment of students. Findings showed that expressiveness of conducting was virtually no different between conditions. However, teacher’s verbalizations reflected greater attention to accuracy in the model-supported group. In combination with Crowe’s findings, data suggests that a “model” or some sound-based representation of the score may be useful in allowing students to detect errors.

Other research shows how the use of a score may affect performance evaluations. Droe (2012) performed a study using band directors with at least two years of experience as subjects (n=41). All subjects were sent a C.D. containing two identical recordings of a wind band performance and an open-ended style comments sheet. However, some

subjects received a score (n=21) while others did not (n=20). All participants were asked to complete the comments sheet after listening to the first recording and during the second recording. Results suggested that directors are more likely to write more disapproving and critical comments of a performance when utilizing a score. In addition, those who evaluated the ensemble without a score made fewer comments, and comments tended to relate more to intonation and tone.

A similar study was conducted by Napoles (2009) who instead utilized a larger pool of subjects (n=240) and focused only on choral music. Subjects were university musicians who were asked to listen to four excerpts from Vivaldi's *Gloria*. All musical examples were evaluated for overall impression on a Likert-type scale. Some participants were given a recording of a professional chorus and orchestra, while others were given the same excerpts being sung by a high school choir. The counter-balanced design of this study split the total pool into four groups, and participants were either provided a score for all excerpts, no score for all excerpts, or only a score for two out of the four excerpts. Contrasting to Droe's study, the group not receiving scores for the listening examples provided much lower ratings than the group that had access to a score.

There is additional need for research that attempts to reveal the connection that exists between the musical score and musical evaluation. The contrasting results of the aforementioned studies imply there is a lack of consistency in the influence the score may have. Napoles writes:

It is possible that viewing a score can draw attention to specific musical elements, which might encourage a more negative response if these are not executed correctly. Alternatively, perhaps having a score while listening to an excellent

performance allows the adjudicator to rate that performance even higher, knowing that the intentions of the composer were followed (p. 274).

Understanding how use of the score affects musical evaluation may have strong implications for current undergraduate music majors and professionals alike.

Professionals and the Musical Score

Several studies have attempted to examine university conducting teachers' views on score study and the viewpoints shared by professional conductors (Barry & Henry, 2015; Bergee, 2005; Fine, Wise, Goldemberg, & Bravo, 2015; Manfredi, 2008; Silvey, Springer, & Eubanks, 2016). Trends and categories are easily extracted when comparing the methods of professionals. Most noticeable are the planning stages based on the "macro-micro-macro" framework and the consistent act of preparing the score well-ahead of the first rehearsal.

Silvey, Springer, and Eubanks (2016) examined the attitudes of 236 university conducting teachers on the topic of score study. All participants were members of the College Band Directors National Association and also taught undergraduate conducting. Research findings were based on data collected on source materials used to teach score study, personal score study habits, and methods employed to teach score study to undergraduate conducting students. Their findings indicated, "that 'developing an interpretation of how the music should be performed' was considered to be the most important reason to study the score. . . ." (p. 82). Also, it was found that one of the textbooks reviewed for the researcher's study (*The Art of Conducting* by Donald

Hunsberger and Roy Ernst) was the most popular choice of textbook by university conducting professors.

Few studies have been done that discuss musical score study and enlist high school instrumental music teachers as subjects. However, a study by Rohwer, Herring, and Moore (2014) attempts to unveil how Texas high school choral directors integrate musical knowledge (primarily related to music theory) into their personal score study. Participants were (n=20) high school choral directors who were asked to examine a grade four high school choral score. Observational strategies were used to collect data, and findings showed that the primary purpose of the initial score reading was to prepare for potential issues or challenges that may occur in rehearsal. This aligns with Barry and Henry's (2015) research results that established error prediction as a necessary part of score study.

In a qualitative study of three exemplary instrumental conductors (Barry and Henry, 2015), an attempt was made to better understand the educational philosophies, rehearsal decisions, and teaching approaches of those who have found "success" in the field of instrumental music education. Throughout data collection, researchers attempted to see if Eisner's (1998, as cited in Barry & Henry, 2015) description of "educational connoisseurship" in five dimensions was a sound framework in which conductors may self-evaluate their musical communication during rehearsals.

Participants in this study were chosen based on the reception of state and national awards, excellence at adjudicated festivals, submission of publications, and performances at professional conferences. Of the three conductors, two were university faculty and one was a high school band director. One of the research questions posed in this study asks,

“How do exemplary conductors prepare before the rehearsal?” (p. 113). All subjects discussed the importance of detailed score preparation before the first rehearsal. In addition, subjects made efforts to align score study findings with instructional planning and pacing. One subject (Alfred Watkins) highlighted the idea of predicting problems in musical instruction before they occur:

It was very early in my career everything was based on a checklist of what possible things could go wrong playing this passage of music. What possible things? And so I’ll write them down in a bulleted list at home of the 20 things that could go wrong playing these exercises, playing this song (Watkins as cited in Barry & Henry, 2015, p. 123).

Previous studies mentioned have shown that professionals view the development of a sound image and musical interpretation as the prime reasons for studying the score. This research affirms previous findings and adds error detection and error prediction as potential benefits of thorough score study for both professionals and novices. These findings are congruent with previous research (Crowe, 1996; Montemayor & Moss, 2009).

What is particularly striking about results from Barry & Henry’s study is that conductors refer to the “macro-micro-macro” method commonly used in score study (Battisti, 2007; Lane, 2006) as a framework for rehearsing the ensemble as well. Just as the score should be understood as a whole, then broken down into fine detail, then revisited as a whole, instructional planning is addressed in the same way. Conductors would create a long range plan (macro) that would encompass the first reading of a piece to the final performance. Day-to-day objectives and goals comprised the “micro” portion

of planning, and the final read-throughs and performance would require a return to the “macro” facet of instruction. Implications of this study suggest that more research is needed to understand the differences and similarities of cognition between exemplary conductors and novice conductors. In addition, more research should examine the score study habits of secondary school instrumental music educators who have experienced success in the field.

Novices and the Musical Score

Studies focused on the score study habits of undergraduate students, novice conductors, and pre-service music teachers (Bautista, Echeverría, Pozo, & Brizuela, 2009; Bergee, 2005; Crowe, 1996; DeCarbo, 1982; Lane, 2006; Marin, Echeverría, & Hallam, 2012; Silvey, 2011a; Silvey, 2011b; Silvey, Montemayor, & Baumgartner, 2017) are plentiful. In this context, “novices” most often refers to undergraduate music majors who have taken only one conducting course or have not had conducting instruction at all. However, musical novices who have no connection to conducting (i.e. performers only) are also utilized as subjects in some of the following studies.

In a study conducted by Bautista, Echeverría, Pozo, & Brizuela (2009), 215 piano students ranging from 12 to 29 years of age and attending 1 of 22 different Spanish conservatories were asked to serve as participants. Subjects were placed into one of three groups based on age and educational level. Each subject completed an open-ended pencil-and-paper task in which a hypothetical scenario placed them in the role of the piano teacher. Their student was described as an “average” pianist by self-comparison. Subjects were instructed to think of a piece they knew well and pull from that piece the

“five most important things” their student should learn in order to learn the piece.

Following data collection, researchers developed seven different response categories suitable for students’ responses. These included: Basic processing, syntactic processing, analytic processing, artistic processing, rote learning procedures, psychomotor dimensions, and sound physical characteristics.

Results showed that as the educational level and age of subjects increased, as did the complexity of their conception of the musical score. Students in Group I primarily based their responses on basic processes and rote learning procedures. Group II subjects took the perspective that within the score existed a set of musical problems to be solved. They focused more on the syntactic processing of the score and the psychomotor aspect of learning a piece. Group III subjects were the only participants that conveyed the musical score as an external representation that can be analyzed as a whole.

The results of this study suggest that strategies should be taken to better understand how students view the musical score. The authors of this study suggest their methodology as a sound way to gain insight into the student’s preconceptions of the score. By having students articulate how they intend to teach the score, one may be able to achieve a better understanding of those dimensions of the piece in which the student is not aware or at least has not explicitly stated. Future research should investigate what students do as they are analyzing scores as opposed to merely describing the elements of the score they believe are most important to teach.

Comparison of novices’ and experts’ conducting and rehearsal techniques may also help to explain trends in score study. In a qualitative study conducted by Bergee (2005) two undergraduate students, one graduate student, and one expert conductor were

asked to conduct the exposition and development sections of Brahms Symphony No. 2. All were provided with a score two weeks prior to their conducting session. Results of the study found that novice conductors tended to focus more on “surface aspects, especially rhythm and cuing” (p. 23), whereas the expert conductor focused on concepts related to balance and blend.

This is similar to findings in research by Lane (2006) who noted that higher levels of musical training and experience in undergraduate music majors led to the inclusion of more expressive elements when studying the musical score. Goolsby (1999) also noted in a comparison of novice and expert teachers that novices addressed notes, dynamics and entrances whereas experts commented on expression/phrasing, dynamics, and balance/blend.

Summary

As research has shown, score study has been related to novices (undergraduate music students, graduate music students, and preservice teachers), experts (university faculty and professional conductors), and various other musical skills (error-detection, error-prediction, rehearsal procedures, evaluation, and conducting). However, a gap in the research is visible in the apparent lack of studies that incorporate highly-qualified secondary school music educator’s currently teaching instrumental music, specifically band or wind ensemble. In addition, there is still a need for research that focuses on the score-study procedures of novice conductors (Lane, 2006).

METHOD

Subjects

Participants in this study ($n = 6$) were chosen based on specific criteria that would ensure the most accurate answers to the research questions stated previously. Of the six participants, three common groups were formed. Group 1 subjects were referred to with the designator, “T” for “Teachers” These individuals were two band directors serving in the public schools in two different Midwestern states. Both subjects had a minimum of ten years teaching experience. Group 2, referred to with a “GS” for “Graduate Students” were two graduate music majors at a major university in the Midwestern United States who had previously taught in the public schools for a minimum of five years. Finally, Group 3, identified with “US” for “Undergraduate Students”, were two undergraduate music education majors at the same major university in the Midwest. Both were currently enrolled in Conducting I and in their sophomore year of coursework. Table 1 below displays this demographic information.

Table 1

Demographic information and designators for subjects used in the study

Group #	Subject	Gender	Age	Teaching Experience (Years)	Highest Level of Education Achieved (At time of study)	Subjects Taught	Levels Taught
1	T1	Male	41	17	Doctorate	General music, Instrumental music	Primary, Secondary, Higher Education
1	T2	Male	36	12	Masters	Instrumental music, Music theory	Secondary
2	GS1	Male	30	6	Bachelors	General music, Instrumental music	Secondary
2	GS2	Male	30	5	Masters	Instrumental music, Arts and humanities, College music prep.	Primary, Secondary
3	US1	Female	19	0	High School	N/A	N/A
3	US2	Male	19	0	High School	N/A	N/A

Each group within the study is intended to represent an area of experience and academic level. One of the research questions asks specifically what differences exist in the score study procedures of these three groups. Group 1 (Advanced) served as the professional, highly-qualified pool that is currently teaching. Both subjects have completed post-graduate degrees and have a minimum of ten years teaching experience. Group 2 (Intermediate) consisted of participants who previously taught in public schools, have completed at least some post-graduate study and are not currently teaching. Group 3 (Novice) is intended to be the least experienced group. These students are new to the conducting curriculum and have no degree or prior full-time teaching experience. However, they both expressed an interest in teaching instrumental music in the future.

Subject Groups

Group 1 (n = 2) consisted of male, high school band directors teaching at two different public schools in two different Midwestern states. “T1” and “T2” were designators assigned chronologically based on the order of study session completion. For example, T1 completed his portion of the study before T2. T1 taught 6th through 12th grade instrumental studies (specifically band instruments) and 4th through 5th grade general music. Prior to teaching at the school in which he was serving during this study, T1 served as an instrumental music teacher and professor at one previous high school and three different universities/colleges. During this study, he also conducted a community ensemble consisting of sixty volunteer professional and paraprofessional musicians from the United States and abroad. T1 received a bachelors in music education from a university in the Midwest, and masters and doctoral degrees from the same major

university in the southern United States. At the time of the study, he had seventeen years of full-time teaching experience.

T2 was a high school instrumental music teacher responsible for teaching band, jazz band, and AP music theory at his public school. Prior to teaching at this school, T2 was responsible for teaching middle school and high school ensembles in four different school systems within the same state. In addition, he was assigned to teach one year of choir in the early part of his career. T2 received both his bachelors in music and his masters of arts in teaching from the same major university. At the time of this study, T2 had twelve years of full-time teaching experience.

The researcher decided to use these particular two subjects for this study because of their current positions as public school instrumental music teachers and their diverse backgrounds in subjects and levels taught. In addition, both subjects exceeded the expected ten years of experience criterion established prior to beginning the study. Combined, both subjects had an estimated twenty-nine years of professional experience.

Group 2 (n = 2) was comprised of two male, graduate students completing degrees at the same major university. Designators were again assigned in order of study session completion. GS1 was a graduate student in music education who had taught for six years at the same public school. During his time as a teacher, he taught full-time instrumental and general music at a middle school while also assisting with the partner high school's marching and concert bands. He completed an undergraduate degree in music education at a private liberal arts college.

GS2 was also completing a masters degree at the same institution as GS1. GS2 was in year one of his masters in music performance in wind conducting. Prior to returning to school as a student, GS2 taught full-time in the public school system for five years. During his time as a teacher, he assisted in instrumental music at various middle schools and taught high school band, arts and humanities, and college music prep. classes. He received both his bachelors in music and his masters of arts in teaching from the same major university, which is also the same university he was completing his second masters study.

Both GS1 and GS2 were excellent candidates for this study because they were both completing graduate work, had taught a minimum of five years in the public schools, and both shared an interest in conducting instrumental music ensembles in the future. Also, both subjects had experience in teaching middle and high school ensembles. Together, they shared approximately eleven years of combined teaching experience.

Group 3 (n = 2) were two undergraduate music education majors. Designators were assigned in order of study completion. US1 identified as female, while US2 identified as male. Both students were currently in their sophomore year, and both cited saxophone as their primary instrument. US1 was a music education major with a “jazz track”, which essentially requires the student to complete additional degree requirements that prepare them to perform and teach jazz. She had thirteen years of experience in playing instrumental music.

US2 was a music education major with an instrumental emphasis. He was a saxophonist but also had experience as a vocalist. Prior to and during the study, he

expressed an interest in teaching choral music in addition to instrumental music upon graduation. US2 had nine years of experience in playing instrumental music.

Neither participant claimed any full-time teaching experience, however both students were currently enrolled in Conducting I at the same major university. They were chosen as ideal subjects for this study based on their answers to the “Potential Study Participant Questionnaire”, which can be found in Appendix A. This questionnaire was distributed to the Conducting I section containing music education majors only and was designed to collect demographic and academic data. In their responses, both subjects claimed to have a GPA between 3.7 and 4.0. Also, when asked to rate how much they enjoy talking about music and music-related things (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree) both answered “1”. Based on their answers and the answers of other possible applicants, US1 and US2 were chosen as ideal subjects for this study.

Procedures

Subjects who participated in the study completed one, 1.5 hour session. Average interview time was forty-six minutes and twenty-two seconds. Due to scheduling conflicts, sessions had to be conducted in a variety of different places. However, in all interviews except one, subjects had access to a piano. This may seem like a significant issue within the study, except that no subject used or requested to use a piano for their score study tasks. All subjects were provided a pencil, a hard surface to write on (in the form of a desk or a music stand), and personal, printed copies of the musical scores being used for the study.

The study session was broken down into five interviewer-directed stages. Stage one was an “Introductory Interview” designed to collect background information on the subject. Information was provided to subjects intended to lower potential inhibitions one may have about answering questions related to one’s professional subject area. Questions were related to score study beliefs, experience, education, score study procedures, and score study influence.

Stage two was the “Score Study Task Instructions” and the score study task itself. In this section subjects were asked to study a musical score while performing a “think aloud”. In this kind of data collection, subjects speak their thoughts about the musical score as they are in study. In addition to studying the score, participants were asked to formulate a list of rehearsal topics or priorities they would like to address if they were to prepare this piece with a high school ensemble. Stage three was the “Score Study Interview Questions” section. This provided an opportunity for the interviewer to ask additional questions related to the prior score study task. Also, clarification on the rehearsal priorities established by each participant were the focus of this brief interview.

Stage four was titled, “Score Study Task #2”. Instructions for this task were the same as the first task, however the musical score was of a different style and length. Stage five, titled “Score Study Interview Questions” was of the same nature as stage three, but questions were generally related to the second score. All study sessions were audio recorded. In addition to asking questions, the interviewer also took frequent note of each subject’s expressions, demeanor, and use of time. The “Investigator Interview Guide” is located in Appendix B. The final step in each session was the completion of a “Study Participant Questionnaire” which collected demographic information and

information on each subject's musical and teaching experience. This document can be found in Appendix C.

Score Study Tasks

Use of score study tasks and “think aloud” methods were found to be an effective means of data collection in studies performed by Lane (2004) and Bautista, Echeverría, Pozo, & Brizuela (2009). It was for this reason I decided to duplicate this approach. However, contrasting to Lane's research, this study did not involve any form of score study using solo repertoire, and repertoire that was used was focused primarily on instrumental music, specifically music for the band. Also, this study method differed from that taken by Bautista, Echeverría, Pozo, & Brizuela as their subjects were instructed to write responses to various questions posed after studying the score. Most questions were geared at how one would teach the music they studied. It was also decided early in the research process that all subjects would have at least some familiarity with band scores due to their experiences as teachers or undergraduate students taking Conducting I.

Interview Questions

It was decided during the planning of this study that all interviews would be *semistructured*, as it is defined by Merriam & Tisdell in their book, *Qualitative Research*, 4th ed. (2016). The authors refer to the semistructured interview as being a more “open-ended” form of interview that is primarily guided by a list of specific questions. However, questions may be used flexibly, and this style of interview allows the

researcher to ask further questions when needed, either for clarification or additional information. Specific interview questions are listed in the “Investigator Interview Guide” located in Appendix B.

Score Examples

Score excerpts chosen for this study were expected to meet certain criteria. Both pieces of music were listed as a “Grade 3” on the researcher’s local state music association’s selective list of band literature. In addition to being of similar difficulty, it was also important that both pieces reflected contrasting musical styles so that data collected would be expansive and not merely focused on one particular style.

Score #1 was titled, “*Three Ayres from Gloucester*” Movement I: *The Jolly Earl of Cholmondeley* by Hugh M. Stuart. This work was published in 1969, and it was the product of the composer’s interest in a 10th century couplet. This particular movement (the first of three) is in cut time and the key of F major. It is approximately one minute and fifteen seconds long and exactly 66 measures. It is suggested that all three of the compositions within this piece are to be played in the early English folk song style. The tempo is marked, “Allegretto” with the half-note equal to 96 beats per minute. There is one fermata at measure fifty-eight and a “rall. e cresc.” marked four measures from the end. This piece was selected due to its slightly faster, more separated style. It is rather short at just over a minute, and the *alla breve* time signature was a facet of the piece I was interested to see if the subjects would address and if so, how.

Score #2 titled, “*Ammerland*” is by Jacob de Haan. It is a more recent work than the previous one, having been published in 2001. It is a single-movement work in four-four time, and the tempo marking suggests the quarter note be equal to 72 beats per minute. Terminology above the first measure explains the piece should be played, “Andante Espressivo”. It is 47 measures long, and performance time is approximately three minutes and ten seconds. *Ammerland* begins in the key of F minor, but at measure 31 the key changes to C major and remains there until the end of the piece. This piece was primarily chosen due to its slower tempo and contrasting complexity of harmony. There are plenty of opportunities to “stretch” and incorporate rubato playing also. There is a “poco rall.” at measure 15 and an “a tempo” at measure 16. These same terms appear at measures 30 and 31, respectively and in the middle of the change of key. There is a “molto rall.” at measure 45 and a fermata written over the last measure. It provides a stark contrast to score #1 in several different elements, and it was the researcher’s hope it would allow for a greater variety of observational data.

Audio Recording and Data Storage

All interviews were recorded using a ZOOM H1 Handy Recorder. For this study, it was essential that all speech be recorded in a high definition format in order to ensure accurate transcription. Also, the recording equipment needed to be quickly accessible and easy to set up for each study session. All files were recorded in mp3 format and transferred to the researcher’s laptop for transcription. Data files were also synced to an online data storage, Google Drive in case of technical difficulties with the researcher’s personal computer.

Data Collection and Analysis

All data collected was transcribed by either the researcher or a transcription service. All interview transcriptions were reviewed and edited by the researcher using the transcription recordings. Upon completion of all interviews and transcriptions, 278 minutes and 13 seconds of interview time was recorded, and transcriptions comprised 55 pages of interview data. Different sections from each subject's data set were analyzed in different ways. Interview responses were basic enough in their content that it was deemed most appropriate to provide findings in a narrative form. Most pertinent to answering the research questions were responses related to score study definition and score study influences. These findings are presented individually in chapter four.

Transcription data taken from the score study tasks was coded into the following themes: *Observational*, *Pedagogical*, *Procedural*, *Rehearsal*, and *Expressive*. After coding each section of each subject's interview, it was found that these categories allowed for the most practical and useful means of interpreting the data. In order for a statement to fall under the *observational* category, it had to be descriptive of items in the score, characteristics of the score, or simply some observation made about the score but not acted upon. *Pedagogical* statements included those related to teaching students. Comments related to decisions based on student ability, student needs, student learning, or potential student outcomes were also coded under this category. *Procedural* statements were related to score study procedures. These often included how the subject was analyzing the score and/or the order in which they were looking for various elements within the score. Statements coded under *rehearsal* pertained to musical rehearsal as the

primary subject. These were often related to rehearsal techniques, grouping of instruments for rehearsal, and rehearsal activities or strategies. *Expressive* comments referred to musical interpretation, balance/blend, tone quality, and general sound concepts.

Obviously, coding statements in this manner led to some unavoidable overlap. For instance, the statement, “I’m already seeing stuff that is similar, and so I’m going to be marking those things in the score” would be coded as *observational-procedural*. The subject has observed something within the score, and he then proceeds to explain that he will mark this observation in the score. A *rehearsal-pedagogical* statement would be, “If I don’t have my tenor sax in my concert band setup sitting in front of the baritones, then for this piece I would stick them in front of it and say, ‘You shouldn’t be able to hear your own self. You should only blend into the euphoniums.’” This statement is coded as *rehearsal-pedagogical* because it refers not only to a rehearsal strategy but also to a teaching strategy concerning a particular student.

In addition to the previous analyses, each subject was provided copies of score examples and given the opportunity to write in the score if they wanted to. Three of the six subjects chose to write in the score, so this data was analyzed as well. Each score was analyzed thoroughly, and all written items were coded as *bracketed*, *circled*, or *written*. *Written* items were explained further, and the measure and/or location within the score was observed.

Reliability

Once transcriptions were completed and edited for accuracy, subjects were sent a word document containing their personal interview transcription. If the subject determined that parts of the interview should be re-worded or certain aspects should be changed to reflect the subject's thinking, these changes were made. Of all the subjects, only one requested changes to his transcript. All changes made in GS1's transcript were related to grammar and wording. No changes were made that would affect the meaning or interpretation of raw data.

In addition to having participants read and suggest edits of their transcribed interviews, samples of transcribed material were reviewed by the researcher's supervisor. This individual had many years of experience assisting with qualitative research and analyzing qualitative data.

RESULTS

All data sets within this study were manifested in the form of personal, written notes by the researcher, transcriptions from interviews and score study tasks, and the actual score copies provided to each subject. Analysis of the results of the interviews were considered by qualitative means. Individual responses were transcribed, and themes were constructed based on interview responses. The major themes gleaned from conversations relating to score study definitions, interviews, and score study tasks are detailed below.

Score Study Definition and Origin

Asking each subject to provide their own definition of musical score study yielded some interesting findings. Both T1 and T2 provided responses that made some mention of preparation. T1 referred to score study as “Logical, sensible, and artistic preparation”. T2 described it as “knowing the score well enough that any problem or any teaching situation that arises, you’re already prepared for”. As will be seen throughout the presentation of results, many of the answers provided by Group 1 (current teachers) revolved largely around the students they had taught and were currently teaching. Instructional planning was often an “end” in which score study was the “means”.

Group 2 (graduate students with teaching experience) focused primarily on the importance of gathering and understanding the musical elements one can assimilate from examining the score. GS1 made specific mention of melody, harmony, melodic/metric development, and form. GS2 provided a more general viewpoint that covered many of the same ideas. Specifically, he suggested looking for the harmonic structure and the musical language and diction of the piece. He also emphasized interpretation through his definition of score study in the following statement: “to find the phrase shapings [*sic*], and go beyond what’s on the printed page so that when they do rehearse it and then subsequently perform it, they have the most intimate knowledge of the piece”.

GS1 explained extraction of the musical elements as a “first step” to score study. The next step was related to application in one’s classroom. This statement was viewed to imply early preparation of the musical score. GS2 was in accord with this, stating in their definition of score study “It is the conductor or performer’s opportunity to intimately get to know the score, preferably before they have performed it or started to rehearse it”. Like Group 1, Group 2 did imply the importance of early score preparation, but this was not as explicit. In addition, Group 1 provided definitions that had more concision overall.

Group 3 (undergraduate students) provided more general definitions of score study. US1 believed score study was an opportunity to find out everything about the score. Some specific examples used for “everything” were information on the composer and the historical period in which the piece was written. Instrumentation, musical style, and musical motifs were also cited as elements one may want to realize before conducting a piece with an ensemble. US2 stated the score was like a “map” the

conductor is responsible for reading and interpreting for the ensemble, adding that one should understand the composer's intentions and their own interpretive view.

Teaching Experience

Group 1 (teachers) and GS 1 all cited "teaching experience" as one of the primary means for achieving their personal understanding of score study. This was obviously not a possibility for Group 3, provided they were college undergraduates with no full-time teaching experience. GS2 did imply later in his interview that teaching had an influence on his definition of score study, however this did not contribute to his original explanation. All participants cited one or several different teachers that helped shape their definition of musical score study.

Group 3 (undergraduate students) attributed their definition of score study to their high school teachers and their high school experiences. Both US1 and US2 claimed to have at least minimal conducting experience as high school students. US1 stated:

I was a high school drum major. So, I went to _____ drum major camp for two years. There's conducting and score study sessions for those weeks . . . and then senior year I did a senior project where I got to work with the wind ensemble at my high school. And so I conducted and rehearsed parts of the Nutcracker suite.

US2 also stated he had some conducting and score study experience as a high school student, citing:

I recently started [score study] at my high school graduation. I had to conduct a piece for that because my band director was—His mom passed away a few days before. I had to conduct the graduation ceremony piece. I had to look into that and see what cues I should do. It was just the most basic score study you can think of.

While conducting and score study were past experiences of both Group 3 members, these were limited and in controlled situations where teaching of other students was not an expectation.

Influence on Score Study Procedures

Data analysis of all interview transcriptions led to the creation of themes related to score study influence. Categories constructed from existing data were: *technical*, *musical*, and *pedagogical*. It was observed that themes were closely related to each subject's prior and current experiences as either a teacher, student, or previous teacher/current student. All categories were designed to encompass a broad range of sub-categories, as the data collected between all subjects was widely spread in content.

The *technical* theme referred to anything related to: conducting, cueing, rehearsal grouping, error prediction and correction, and any data that is only descriptive of the score. The *musical* theme encompasses: musical characteristics such as style, period, and musical effect. Also, artistry and sound imaging are included as sub-themes in the *musical* category. The *pedagogical* theme is used to describe: student ability, student grade level, musical concepts, teaching strategies, and musical difficulty. These categories led to the discovery of several findings.

Impact on Students

The research showed that Group 1 subjects (teachers) were influenced in their score study most significantly by their students, their students' grade level and musical abilities, and teaching strategies. All of these factors are grouped under the *pedagogical* theme. When asked what influences his score study, T1 responded "I think it depends on the group" and "I think your approach to that (how one studies the score) is different depending on the group that you're with..." Score study decisions by T2 were also in direct relation to student abilities and grade level. His statement "Really, score study, I think band-wise, it's all been the same for me. The only difference is what I'm looking for is different, depending on the ability of the students themselves". Provided that both band teachers had experience teaching different levels of instrumental music, and T1 did in fact teach fifth grade through twelfth grade band at the time of the study, it's no surprise that so many of their comments were related to students.

GS1 also made clear that most of what influenced his previous score study was related to students and the musical goals he had set for them. All responses to the question, "What influences your score study?" were explained under the premise that he was hypothetically teaching middle school band or drawing from past experiences. He claimed he would evaluate the range of the piece, look for technical issues with fingering, check the number of percussion parts, and examine rhythmic complexity. There was also mention of rehearsal strategies in which the ensemble would perform complex rhythms together, regardless of whether or not the rhythm was present in every part. GS1 also made clear he would incorporate the elements of balance, blend, and style into his

rehearsals by gathering information from the score. Congruent with the findings from Group 1, pedagogy appeared to be the primary influence on score study procedures.

Findings in GS2's responses showed a greater emphasis on subjects under the "technical" and "musical" themes. He made comments related primarily to conducting, cueing, musical line, and error-prediction. GS2 alluded to student ability somewhat by stating

If I can predetermine some spots that they're likely to mess up, that doesn't mean that they're going to, but they're likely to mess up or likely to need help shaping the phrase or finding the line, then I'll try to mark that in advance.

This comment implies that student ability is a factor considered during preliminary score study, but relative to GS1 and Group 1, fewer comments were made about student impact.

Rehearsal Grouping and Technical Skills

Group 3 explained their score study influences based on what they believed to be true. Both subjects claimed to have no teaching experience and very little experience with score study. Due to this lack of experience, *influence* behind score study was defined more as *goals of score study*. While both subjects attested to having some high school conducting experience, responses were primarily technical in nature.

US1 explained that her band director had first instructed her to study the score when she was in high school as part of her duties as the high school drum major. As a senior project, she also conducted her high school wind ensemble on various excerpts

from *The Nutcracker Suite*. She explained her score study for these rehearsals as “It was just kind of necessary to know what you wanted to run and what sections needed to be rehearsed together, balance-wise”. Contrasting to US1, US2 did provide some insight as to what his ultimate goal is when studying the score. He stated “For me personally, when I first look at a score, I want to make sure that I have the general consensus of what the piece is, and the music starts to go in my head. . . .” This response falls under the *musical* category.

Data from these two interview sessions demonstrated there may be a gap in the knowledge of Group 3 subjects (undergraduate students) as to what factors influence score study. This supports the hypothesis of the researcher. Provided score study is a task that is typically reserved for those in a teaching position, and the fact that score study is often given less priority in conducting courses, it makes sense that study influences for both Group 3 subjects revolved primarily around rehearsal planning and the technical skills of conducting. It might be suggested that responses to interview questions were influenced by instruction provided in Conducting I.

Score Study Approaches

Data collected in score study tasks was coded as a means to discover trends that exist between the score study approaches of instrumental music teachers, graduate students with teaching experience, and undergraduate music majors. As it was stated in chapter three, two different score examples were used for each score study task. The purpose of this was to have examples of contrasting styles to collect an expansive amount

of data. Tables are used to reflect the nature of each subject's score study statements. Each table is reflective of one score study task.

Score Study Task #1 – *Three Ayres from Gloucester*

As shown in Table 2 and Table 3, all comments made during each score study task were categorized as either *observational*, *pedagogical*, *rehearsal*, *procedural*, or *expressive*. When a single comment overlapped into more than one category, it was counted as one comment for each category it pertained to.

Table 2

Number of comments made during score study task #1

Subject/Category	Observational	Pedagogical	Rehearsal	Procedural	Expressive
T1	17	28	9	10	5
T2	16	16	10	7	4
GS1	19	9	7	2	9
GS2	23	18	14	29	31
US1	14	1	19	2	0
US2	91	12	12	22	13

Table 3

Percentage of comments made during score study task #1

Subject/Category	Observational	Pedagogical	Rehearsal	Procedural	Expressive	Total Comments
T1	25	41	13	14	7	69
T2	30	30	19	13	8	53
GS1	41	20	15	4	20	46
GS2	20	16	12	25	27	115
US1	39	3	53	5	0	36
US2	60	8	8	15	9	150

It should be noted first that the number of comments provided by each subject varied considerably. There was no specified time limit on each score study task, and participants were allowed to look at and talk about the score as long as they desired. The

largest differences in the number of comments made were by GS2 and US2. Out of all the participants, these two subjects scrutinized each score the most intensely. While the number of comments is necessary to include in the findings, the large gap in total comments amongst participants led to the belief that percentages would be more effective at determining accurate results.

In the first score study task, most comments made by Group1 were related to general observations of the score and pedagogical statements. Expressive comments were the least prominent in this score study task. Both subjects in Group 1 were teachers, therefore it's likely that the emphasis on pedagogical comments is directly related to their daily work with students. The lack of expressive comments may be linked to the particular score example. This example (*Three Ayres from Gloucester*) was intended to extract data on the study of a score containing march-like rhythms and a faster tempo. It was intended to be different from score #2 (*Ammerland*), which is slower and more expressive in nature. Differences in procedural and rehearsal comments was no more than six percent between Group 1 subjects (teachers). These two categories were most likely less of a concern due to the length of the score, which is only about one minute of performance time.

Graduate students (Group 2) differed in their approaches to this score study task the most. GS1 made primarily observational, pedagogical, and expressive comments, whereas GS2 spent an almost equal amount of time on procedural and expressive statements. It is the researcher's belief that the marking procedures of GS2 led to this contrast. As he made observations about the score, he would then comment on the marking he intended to make to bring attention to his observation. All statements were

coded, therefore score markings contributed to procedural comments. In general, GS2 scrutinized many details of the score, whereas GS1 observed more of the “big picture” concepts.

Group 3 subjects (undergraduate students) focused mostly on one or two types of comments during this score study task. US1 made more than half of her comments on rehearsal procedures, and the second-most number of comments on observations. US1 tended to follow a pattern of “observe and rehearse”. For example, the comments “So at pick-ups to 13, the flutes, oboe, first clarinet, and cornets have that main line together. So in this section I would rehearse them together”. In addition, no comments related to expression were observed in this score study task. Most of the language used by US1 reflected the organization of rehearsal. There were many observations related to instruments having the same melodic or harmonic material, and the same rehearsal strategy of having those instruments play together was used repeatedly.

US2 focused mostly on comments related to observation of the score. 15 percent of comments were procedural in nature, and this is likely due to similar patterns found in the score study of GS2. As the subject would study the score, he would speak aloud that he intended to mark the score to bring attention to his comment. Expressive and pedagogical comments seemed to be the least visible in the undergraduate students’ (Group 3) data set. There was a stark contrast in the number of comments related to rehearsal between US1 and US2.

Summary – Task #1

Analysis of comments made during score study task #1 (*Three Ayres from Gloucester*) showed that highly-qualified participants who were teaching at the time of the study focused primarily on observing the characteristics of the score and how they will related to their students. Graduate students with teaching experience emphasized information taken from the score and the importance of being expressive. Undergraduate students spent most of their time observing the score and making comments related to rehearsal and their personal score study procedures. These findings will be further discussed and compared to other research in chapter five.

Score Study Task #2 – *Ammerland*

This task utilized a slower-tempo band piece with a more expressive style. Contrasts from score study task #1 are mostly visible in the comments of study participants shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4

Number of comments made during score study task #2

Subject/Category	Observational	Pedagogical	Rehearsal	Procedural	Expressive
T1	32	1	1	2	16
T2	16	13	11	14	14
GS1	22	10	8	0	5
GS2	36	20	18	22	33
US1	18	9	23	2	7
US2	60	3	8	5	5

Table 5

Percentage of comments made during score study task #2

Subject/Category	Observational	Pedagogical	Rehearsal	Procedural	Expressive	Total Comments
T1	61	2	2	4	31	52
T2	24	19	16	20.5	20.5	68
GS1	49	22	18	0	11	45
GS2	28	16	14	17	25	129
US1	31	15	39	3	12	59
US2	74	4	10	6	6	81

T1's comments were related to observation of the score and expressivity, almost exclusively. It should be noted that many of the comments (15 out of 32) coded as observational were related to harmonic analysis. Whereas very little harmonic analysis was done in the first score example, it was a prime concern of T1 in this piece. The next highest number of comments were related to expressivity. The following comment provides some insight as to the nature of T1's expressive comments: "At 32, probably the flutes and clarinets seem to be kind of high and ethereal, floating above the line. Not in your face, but very transparent and above throughout all that music". These kinds of descriptive comments that were not explicitly written in the score portrayed a clear image of what the subject wanted in terms of sound from his performing ensemble, therefore they were labeled as *expressive*.

T2 also made a majority of his comments in relation to observations of the score. However, there were an equal number of comments related to *procedure* and *expressivity*. Many of his procedural comments were stated in the form of a question to himself while reading the score. T2 asked hypothetically “If I was choosing this piece for my group, which is my best section”? These questions were documented as *procedures* because they are steps taken by the subject to study the score and make decisions. One comment by T2 shows the *procedural-expressive* nature of his statements: “I would literally go through in a piece like this and either circle notes or highlight notes that I want to specifically stretch and pull a little bit on the tempo”.

Group 2 subjects both made primarily observational comments. However, the second highest number of comments differed in category. Whereas GS1 focused on pedagogical concepts, GS2 incorporated more expressive elements into his score study task. Similar to score #1 (*Three Ayres from Gloucester*), GS2 commented on most of the markings being put into the score, which raised his overall count of *procedure*-based comments. GS1 had no *procedural* comments in this study task, as most information gleaned from the score was immediately translated into a teaching method (*pedagogical*) or *rehearsal* strategy.

Much like score study task #1, undergraduate students were found to focus their attention on specific details notated in the score and the rehearsal procedures they would utilize in relation to score observations. US1 did incorporate more *pedagogical* and *expressive* comments into this study task, but US2 provided fewer comments in these areas. Based on researcher observation and data analysis, there is an implication that

much of what the undergraduate student believes about score study is directly related to technical analysis of the piece.

Summary – Task #2

Subjects having the most experience (Group 1, teachers) spent most of their score study time making observations of the score and expressive comments related to observations of the score. Evidenced in the quotations from T1 and T2, both teachers immediately began to make interpretive decisions about the piece. Statements related to rehearsal were less present, and it seemed as though the nature of this particular musical example led them to utilizing the music as a means to teach expressive concepts.

Group 2 subjects (graduate students with teaching experience) showed contrasts in their types of comments about *Ammerland*. Whereas GS1 focused mostly on *pedagogical-rehearsal* type statements, GS2 spoke about *procedural-expressive* concepts. These differences are likely attributed to GS1 spending less time on specific details than GS2 and greater focus on *how* to teach those musical elements embedded in the score. GS2's approach was more rooted in emphasizing all the expressive aspects of the music as a means to create a musical final product.

Similar to task #1, undergraduate students primarily made observations about the score. A limited number of rehearsal strategies were used and often repeated, especially by US1. Data supports the idea that more expressive music may intimidate students with less experience and halt decision making. Between both subjects in Group 3, only 12 out of 140 comments were related to musical expressiveness.

Score Marking

All subjects in the study were provided with photocopies of the two scores utilized for the score study tasks. These copies included the title page and inside cover that contained composer information, program notes, and some rehearsal suggestions. I purposefully included this information as it was often cited in the research and score study texts (Battisti & Garofalo, 1990; Ellis, 1994) that professional conductors would examine these details before proceeding with the written music.

During each session, subjects were provided with a graphite pencil and told they may make any markings in their copy of the score they wish. While some of the participants claimed to make markings in their personal scores, they often chose not to mark in the sample scores for this study. For instance, neither GS1 nor any members of Group 1 made any kind of markings in their scores. GS2 and both members of Group 3 did make markings in both scores.

For the purpose of this study, a “marking” is defined as any pencil marking that is intended to identify or bring attention to a musical element that already exists within the score or may only exist in the subject’s mind. Also, if multiple markings of the same type are used to show the same thing, this is still considered one marking. For instance, if multiple brackets are used in the same measure and beat to begin a similar rhythmic or melodic pattern but in different instrument voices, it was assumed the subject was bringing attention to the melody, counter-melody, or harmony parts and/or their particular instrument groupings. Actual written text and sentences were considered to be one marking as well.

GS2 had the most markings in both score study examples. There were 33 markings in the first score example and 40 in the second example. Markings consisted primarily of bracketing, written text, and circling. Brackets were most often used to denote the beginning of a melodic or solo phrase. Text often referred to style, dynamics, cuing or the re-writing of an existing symbol at the top of the page. Circling was often used to draw attention to musical elements such as the time signature, tempo, and key signature as well as potential performance issues such as syncopated rhythms or conducting-related challenges. In both examples, bracketing comprised the majority of markings in the score at 44%. Written dynamics, symbols, and text made up 37% of the score markings and circling pre-existing text and symbols comprised 19% of the markings made.

US1 made a total of six score markings. Four markings were made in the first score and two markings in the second score. Brackets enclosing melody parts (two sets) and written measure numbers (two different numbers) at the top of the page comprised all of the markings in score #1 (*Three Ayres from Gloucester*). In score #2 (*Ammerland*), US1 circled the *molto rallentando* at measure 45 and wrote chord member names using solfège syllables next to certain pitches in the last chord. Of the three participants who did make markings in the scores, US1 had the fewest.

US2 made a total of 29 score markings. 18 were made in score #1, while 11 were made in score #2. US2 was the first to include “underlining” and “asterisks” as methods for bringing attention to various pieces of information within each score. In addition, he spent the most time marking elements found on the title page and inside cover of score #1. In the initial portion of score study task #1, US2 underlined the performance time of

the piece, *Ayres* from the first movement title, the composer's name, and *Gloucester* from the first movement title. He also made use of the "asterisk" symbol by putting it next to various instruments in the instrumentation list: Eb contralto clarinet, Bb clarinet, and Bb contrabass clarinet. He also circled the 1st/2nd Eb horns and the 3rd/4th Eb horns.

Circling, bracketing, and written text were also used to mark the score. Circling was used to highlight the tempo and tempo changes, key changes, some dynamics, and potential rhythmic issues. Circling comprised 28% of the markings done by US2. Bracketing (like GS2 and US1) was used primarily to enclose melodic lines and beginnings/ends of phrases. These were also occasionally used to enclose accidentals and potential performance (both tonal and rhythmic) issues. Bracketing made up 21% of all markings made. "Cue", "Light", "Horn", and "1 2" (denotes rhythm) were terms written at the top of the score page. From these bits of text, it was gathered that their purpose was to show conducting gestures, style, instrumental cues, and moving lines. Written text comprised 13% of all markings.

Although no markings were found in the sample scores of T1, T2, or GS1 for this study, participants did describe how they would often mark their scores. T1 claimed that he had no "system" for marking. He used a red pencil when marking because it was easy to see, and the use of post-it notes was sometimes incorporated as a means to jot down reminders about rehearsal groupings or teaching strategies. He explained in several statements that marking was less necessary for simpler repertoire, and that his experience allowed him to absorb score characteristics more quickly. GS1 claimed to make markings in the scores he used to teach his students, but these were often related to pitch tendencies of instruments and/or chord members. His reasoning was congruent with T1, stating that

repertoire written for younger ensembles does not require as much marking due to the more explicit use of dynamics and expressive notation. T1 did admit to making more markings for repertoire considered of a higher artistic level and greater length.

T2 made no specific mention of score marking technique. When asked if he ever made markings in the score, he stated he did. There was an implication that score marking was more frequent as rehearsals progressed. T2 stated

I know everybody uses the Michelangelo analogy. A lot of, ‘I start with a block and I carve away everything that’s not the statue’ kind of thing. In that macro to micro, large to small. That’s what I normally do.

This statement and others implied that many of T2’s score markings were also based on the pedagogical needs of his students at the time. His statement about working in a “macro to micro” method of study and rehearsal has also been identified in other studies and conducting texts.

Familiarity with Score Examples

Interview data revealed that some participants were familiar with the score examples used for this study. It was not a stipulation in the study procedure that subjects have no prior contact with score examples, however each participant’s prior knowledge of these musical scores was noted (if applicable), as it was believed this could potentially affect the data. Neither subject from Group 3 was familiar with either score example.

T1 explained that he was familiar with score example #1, but he could not recall as to whether or not he had performed it. He concluded that he did not believe he had

ever performed it due to individual section abilities with an ensemble he previously worked with and perhaps that the piece was often over-played. Score example #2 was a piece he had heard, but he had never studied the score. He had considered performing the piece with the ensemble he was teaching at the time, but he had never performed any analysis or viewed the notation.

T2 stated, “I’ve probably heard recordings of it (*Three Ayres from Gloucester*), but I have never looked down and played through it or looked through it”. He had performed score #2 (*Ammerland*) approximately seven or eight years before this study. He claimed the piece was a good selection for his band at the time due to the fact that he had a good euphonium player, and it was a good piece to work on musical expression. T2 performed the piece with a high school ensemble he had previously taught in a different position.

GS1 had never heard of *Three Ayres from Gloucester*. He performed *Ammerland* when he was in high school with a district honor band. In addition, he purchased the piece for his middle school ensemble while he was still teaching. He had looked through the score, but range issues in some of the high brass parts had led to not rehearsing or performing the piece with students.

GS2 was the only participant in the study who had experience performing and examining the scores of both examples. He had performed *Three Ayres from Gloucester* while in high school in an all-district honor band. Later, he conducted the piece, standing in for a different director who had fallen ill. Finally, he programmed the piece to take to concert festival with a high school band while he was still teaching. He admitted to having performed in-depth score study on the work previously. *Ammerland* had also been

viewed multiple times prior to the research study. GS2 had performed the piece as a member of his high school ensemble and his college ensemble. In addition, he programmed the piece for a concert at a high school he had previously taught at.

Score Familiarity Implications on Results

All teachers and graduate students expressed some knowledge of at least one piece used as a score example in this study. T1 had heard of both pieces, although he had not studied (or did not recall studying) the scores of either. T2 had studied *Ammerland* and performed it with students. GS1 had seen the score to *Ammerland*, and briefly studied it. GS2 was familiar with both score examples, having performed both as a conductor and clarinetist. Neither undergraduate student was familiar with either piece of music.

These findings may have implications for other results. GS2's score marking actions may have been similar to those actions taken when previously studying the score. Perhaps familiarity with both pieces allowed for greater initial knowledge of the score and/or the presence of a memorized sound image. It may be equally possible that the lack of familiarity with score examples from undergraduates had implications for their score study comments. Provided that most comments by Group 3 were observational in nature, initial viewing of the score with no previous contact may account for this concentration of statements.

Recordings

Subjects with more score study practice tended to have more comments on listening to recordings as a part of the study process. Undergraduate students implied through their score study tasks that the aid of a recording would help them greatly in their decision-making when it comes to studying the score and planning a rehearsal. Teachers and graduate students with past teaching experience discussed the pros and cons of using a recorded model, as well as their personal preferences.

T1 implied that his use of recordings is minimal in the following statement:

Yeah, I may listen to one [recording] at the beginning. But I have gone more and more away from listening to those and more and more to just thinking about it, and the thinking happens a lot when I'm not with the score.

T2 made no explicit comments about listening to recordings in his study session.

However, the researcher had an ongoing relationship with T2 as an adjunct instructor at his school. Observation of this subject, both while teaching and during his preparation time showed that recordings were used initially as a means to select repertoire, but use of recordings after the selection of music was minimal.

Those subjects teaching at the time of the study implied that recordings seemed to have a less important role in their preparation methods. Stronger emphasis was placed on student ability level and the playability of the music, pedagogical strategies, prediction of potential issues, and musical goals related to performance. Neither subject discouraged

the use of recordings, but it was not a topic either participant spent a great deal of time elaborating on.

Graduate students with teaching experience (Group 2) provided more detail on advantages and disadvantages of using recordings to prepare the score. GS1 specifically cited recordings as being useful when looking at musical scores of greater complexity.

A lot of times with the simpler tunes, even just looking at the score, I can get a pretty good feel for what it's going to sound like. . . . But for the higher level literature, I seek out as many recordings as I can find.

As GS1 continued to elaborate on this subject, it seemed that recordings were utilized as a means to research a piece of music, as opposed to just utilizing them as sound models.

[Speaking on the use of various recordings] ...those professional level groups and the North Texas Wind Symphony recordings are going to be pretty polished and give you a good feel for what it should sound like, and then those recordings of small universities with less-esteemed bands, that's going to show you the challenges you're going to find when teaching that piece.

This data suggests that access to a plethora of different recordings serves several functions. Whereas the use of a recording is most often referred to in the literature as having a singular purpose, GS1 implied it may be useful for predicting potential rehearsal and performance issues. In addition to these findings, GS1 explained a potential benefit of listening to recordings.

...that [listening to multiple recordings] just puts me in the sound space of the piece, because when there's more lines, it's a lot more challenging for me to hear, to audiate ahead of time with what it's going to be like.

This statement provides much insight into the challenges of how the musical score is internalized. Audiation was a skill mentioned in the interview of GS2 as well.

GS2 stated he did listen to recordings initially. He also implied that the influence of others suggests that the use of a recording at the beginning of study is not appropriate, stating "I know this is not what a lot of people say, but I really do like to hear a recording first. I know you're supposed to audiate it first according to most people. . . ." He elaborated further on his interactions with recordings as they relate to score study.

...when I pick a piece, I will have heard it before so I want to now be able to hear it and see the score along with it. Then I'll step away. I'll only listen to one, maybe two [recordings] to get a variety of styles, but then I'll step away from it because I do want to have my own interpretation, and I don't want my interpretation to just be the recording that I heard.

The only difference in responses from GS1 and GS2 on this topic seemed to be the variable of the difficulty of the music. While GS2 did not state explicitly that he does not use recordings for simpler works, it cannot be assumed that he does or does not. GS2 also explains in this data excerpt that there is a potential risk in listening to a recording in that it may sway the musical interpretation of the listener.

Group 2 (graduate students) spoke in much more detail about the use of recordings. Findings are mostly consistent with Group 1 (teachers), however there was

specific reference to the audiation skill in both Group 2 interviews. This may be viewed as congruent with T1, as he stated that a majority of his score study happens away from the score and without a recording, implying audiation as the primary means for internalizing the music. The element of interpretation was also suggested to receive influence from the overuse of recordings.

In score study task #1, US1 cited she would not use a recording of the piece as a model for her students, but she would use a piece of a similar style:

It's an English folk song, so I probably wouldn't play a recording... I would probably play a recording of a similar style. Just because I don't want kids to think that we need to play it exactly like a certain recording. Maybe present a few options of recordings to check out. But playing something in that style.

Again, recordings seem to be avoided as they have the potential to influence musical interpretation. US2 suggested that audiation is difficult when reading a new piece. “[Developing a sound image] . . . is hard for a beginning conductor to do, to actually hear the music of what you see and try to audiate it”. Additional comments in score study session #1 implied that US2 may have been able to increase musical understanding of the piece after hearing various parts.

I'm starting to wonder if it still should be light, or if you should drive through each figure. That's something I wouldn't know at the moment, but after hearing it I would decide and I could probably get a good sense of what the composer would want.

Comments listed above demonstrate that Group 3 (undergraduate students) may have found score study tasks easier with the aid of a recording. Both participants mentioned in their score study sessions several times that they would have students play through parts of their music and follow-up with suggestions or interpretive decisions. This may imply there is some reliance on students to model sound in order for subjects to internalize the sound and/or become more familiar with the score.

Summary – Recordings

Recordings seemed to play the most active role in the score study habits of graduate students with five or more years of teaching experience. More experienced conductors utilized recordings initially, but as internalization of the piece continued, recordings were phased out. Undergraduate students did not claim to listen to any recordings, but provided neither had any teaching experience and were enrolled in their first conducting course, the necessity to listen to a recording or study a score for the purpose of rehearsing an ensemble was virtually non-existent. Some graduate and undergraduate participants implied that the use of a recording has the potential to influence interpretation.

DISCUSSION

Findings in this research study have affirmed several of the results obtained in previous studies. However, the opinions, beliefs, procedures, and goals of the subjects at hand provide a contrasting point of view from those who have participated in similar studies of the past. Provided that a vast amount of research attempts to understand the score study habits of undergraduate students, graduate students, collegiate music faculty, and professional conductors, the main purpose of this study was to examine the often “passed over” high school instrumental music teacher. Schmidt, Zdzinski, & Ballard (2006) found in their study of 148 undergraduate music students from three different universities in the U.S. that 69.4% cited public school teaching as an immediate career goal, and 49.3% cited it as a long-term career goal. Providing research that captures the essence of successful music teaching in the public schools is necessary. *The current study supports this notion based on the responses of participants included in this investigation.*

High school instrumental music teachers were utilized for this study due to the researcher’s belief that factors influencing success in the field of public education are often different from those factors that exist in higher education. It was the researcher’s hope that the results of this study will help the reader understand the “best practices” of highly-qualified, successful instrumental music teachers who have chosen to work in k-12, public education. The following research questions guided the study and are

discussed below: (1) What factors influence score study procedures? (2) How is score study approached by teachers and students of varying experience levels? (3) What differences exist between score study processes of undergraduate students, experienced graduate students, and experienced teachers?

How Score Study is Influenced

Background information and academic interests of graduate students and teachers seemed to be prime factors in determining how score study was influenced. Group 2 (graduate students with teaching experience) demonstrated this most clearly. GS1 was a graduate student pursuing a masters in music education degree at a major university in the Midwest. This degree contained course content revolving primarily around music learning theories, research disciplines, and music education philosophy. GS2 was pursuing a degree in wind band pedagogy at the same Midwestern University. Course content in this degree focused on conducting, score study, literature, and performance ensembles. In addition to their chosen areas of study, it should also be considered that GS1 worked predominantly with middle school students while teaching and GS2 with high school students. Both subjects had taught in the public schools for approximately the same amount of time.

This information may help to explain some of the research findings. GS1 did no marking in the score, but instead chose to focus on a method of score study that considered the students' grade level, ability, and "proximal development". Having taught middle school in the past and pursuing a music education degree at the time, it makes sense that GS1's priorities when studying the score were often geared towards pedagogy,

rehearsal, and expressiveness. The need for marking likely felt “unnecessary” due to the simplicity of the score examples and GS1’s familiarity with pieces of similar difficulty while teaching.

GS2 made more markings in the score examples than any other subject. It is likely that he was more often engaged in score marking due to regular, private conducting and score study lessons requiring this type of score study analysis. In addition, GS2’s time spent teaching high school may account for his greater emphasis on observational, expressive, and procedural comments during his score study sessions. Several texts propose that more time is spent engaging in fundamentals and pedagogical activities at the beginning stages of music instruction (Rush, Scott, Wilkinson, 2014), whereas expression is more emphasized in higher levels of music instruction (Jagow, 2007).

Pedagogy played a limited role in the score study habits of undergraduate music students compared to graduate students with teaching experience and teachers. Group 3 subjects seemed most concerned with being able to identify musical elements within the score and creating possible rehearsal scenarios. Score study assumed a more utilitarian role, and incorporating expressiveness and pedagogical strategies were of secondary importance. Undergraduate students lacked a specific focus when studying the score, and there was frequently a feeling of “grasping at straws” during the interview. However, some strategies were mentioned by both participants that align with views expressed in conducting texts and research results where professionals are subjects.

US2 stated his primary goals for score study as understanding what the piece generally sounds like, and then deciding on where to make cues in the music. The idea of creating a sound image of the piece has been encouraged in multiple textbooks on

conducting (Hunsberger & Ernst, 1992; Labuta, 2010) and in the score study habits of professionals (Ellis, 1994; Silvey, Springer, & Eubanks, 2016). Technical skills such as cueing were also shown to be a common focus of novices in other studies (Bergee, 2005). While US2 seemed to have a clear understanding of what *should* be happening when one studies the score, neither member of Group 3 displayed clear goal-setting strategies outside of rehearsing groups that had similar melodic or harmonic material.

Those subjects teaching high school instrumental music (Group 1) at the time of this study addressed nearly every aspect of their score study through the lens of their current or past occupations. Student ability and past experiences with different levels of students most often influenced rehearsal procedures. Both subjects stated that the way in which one teaches the score may change, but musical goals and expressiveness are generally the same. The fact that both teachers stated the “approach” to teaching will often change demonstrates that the needs of individual students motivated their score study decisions and rehearsal/procedural decisions resultant from score study.

Contrasts in Approaching the Score

Findings of the current study showed that undergraduate students (Group 3) were more descriptive and general in how they observed musical elements within the score. Graduate students with teaching experience (Group 2) and current teachers (Group 3) made more comments that related specifically to a pedagogical concept, a teaching strategy, or some expressive interpretation of a musical element. These findings are similar to those of Lane (2006), who found that as experience increased in undergraduate instrumental music education majors, as did the specificity of their score study. *In*

summary, less experienced subjects tended to articulate what they were seeing in the score but rarely demonstrated how their observations would translate into different rehearsal procedures in the classroom.

It is quite possible that subjects who had previously taught or were currently teaching were able to utilize their current or past occupational experience to guide decision making. Research by Sheldon (2000) attempted to uncover perceptions of band music content and quality by preservice and in-service teachers. She makes the following statement about the differences in subjects groups:

It should be stressed that these studies were executed using two groups that differed in one fundamental way: the undergraduate group had no experience making curricular decisions because of their preservice status, whereas the in-service participants were all employed, had experience in selecting curricular materials, and had ensembles about which they might reflect while engaged in the tasks required in these studies. Because of their employment circumstances, in-service subjects may have made decisions in these studies while considering the factors listed above, as well as musical elements (p. 24).

This statement is applicable to the current study also. Subjects utilized for this study had markedly different backgrounds in both educational and musical experience. Contrasts between the three study groups revealed much about how decisions are made in the score study process. Score markings were found only in the artifacts of GS2, US1, and US2. This data suggests there is a clear difference in the score study approaches of those currently teaching and undergraduates. Although Group 2 was split in its decision to mark the score, the marking habits of Group 3, and the lack of marking by Group 1

correspond with research by Ellis (1994). This study found that five different university band conductors of contrasting age, experience, and background all marked the score minimally as a means to increase rehearsal efficiency and allow for more musical expressiveness in performance. It is possible that marking the score less or none at all may be the decision of those more experienced in the field, as marking is not necessary to create an aural picture of the composition. Based on findings below, difficulty level of the composition may also play a significant role in the conductor's decision to mark the score.

GS1 alluded to this, stating "A lot of times with the simpler tunes, even just looking at the score, I can get a pretty good feel for what it's going to sound like." He later mentioned that the more lines a composition has, the more difficult it may be to conceptualize. This statement is consistent with findings by Crowe (1996) who found that error detection abilities decreased as the number of parts increased, regardless of score study style. In both cases, the ability of subjects to create a sound model in the mind was more difficult with greater complexity in the score.

The grade levels of the repertoire utilized for this study were both grade three on a six grade scale on the state music association list. This repertoire was right in the "middle" in terms of difficulty level, therefore it may not have been necessary for Group 1 to do any kind of score marking. Statements made by other participants also showed that score marking was often related to other factors.

T1 made several statements suggesting that score marking was less necessary with simpler literature: "...I say this with humility... I can look at this (*Ammerland*) right here and know what I want by looking at it... But that's because I've listened to a lot of

music, and I've done this for seventeen years." Experience in the field of music education has been shown in several studies (Bergee, 2005; Goolsby, 1999; Marin, Echeverria, & Hallam, 2012) to increase efficiency and expressiveness when conducting an ensemble or studying the musical score. T1 also provided an example of a piece in which he has done significant score marking and provides an explanation for this procedure:

We just did the Maslanka Symphony No. 4 this past summer. I should have brought that score. That score's a rainbow...a lot of the notes in that score are artistic things that I need. That I want to say... that score, because it's at a high artistic level, it requires a different set of study.

"High artistic level" in this statement may also imply difficulty level and length. The piece mentioned is not on the state association music list utilized for this study, and the length of the piece is approximately 28 minutes. T1's statement about the need to say "artistic things" in the score was unique among other applicants in this study. This statement leads to further understanding about the subject's development of an internal sound image. *The "need" to express artistically is driven by a clear understanding of the conductor's conception of the music.*

Examination of score markings done by Group 3 (undergraduate music majors) revealed that markings served several different purposes, and no identifiable method was used. Both subjects identified tempo markings, changes in tempo, and some melodic lines, but most markings were random in nature. Lane (2006) also found that undergraduate music majors made statements addressing several elements in a mostly random manner when studying the full score. *The pattern of "identify and describe" was*

followed closely by subjects in both studies, but definitive rehearsal procedures were often avoided.

Of particular note is GS1's interest in using recordings to accelerate score study and the conception of the inner-sound image. This method has been discouraged in other research (Ellis, 1994), but Silvey, Montemayor, and Baumgartner (2017) found in their study that the use of a recording in initial score study was frequent among undergraduate students. In addition, they contend that the use of recordings from both strong and weak ensembles may be a strategy educators wish to employ, as both have their merits in helping students understand how to better prepare an ensemble. The researcher's findings support this practical implication.

Implications for Students and Teachers

Results from this study have implications for conducting and secondary methods instructors. Undergraduates were generally uncertain about their approach to score study. Most comments were observational, and did not reflect much in terms of decision-making or rehearsal planning. While it is generally agreed upon that one specific score study method is not appropriate for all conductors (Hunsberger & Ernst, 1992), *it may be beneficial for instructors to formulate score study procedures that easily translate to instructional planning and assist with locating areas of music that prove technically or expressively important.* In essence, assuming no method of score study to be the only method is not a reason to abandon a score study method altogether.

While research has examined the score study habits (Silvey, 2016), rehearsal procedures (Bergee, 2005), and general practices of successful university conducting

faculty (Barry and Henry, 2015), the apparent lack of research on high school instrumental music teachers leaves several un-answered questions about the practices and motivations of these educators. *It may be beneficial for conducting teachers to more actively consider and inform students about the score study practices of those teaching middle and high school instrumental and choral music.* Although the current body of literature is valuable in the understanding of best practices in musical preparation, there are certainly differences in the occupational challenges and experiences of secondary educators and professors of higher education.

Conclusion

This study attempted to reveal (1) What factors influence score study procedures? (2) How is score study approached by teachers and students of varying experience levels? (3) What differences exist between score study processes of undergraduate students, experienced graduate students, and experienced teachers?

Factors influencing score study were determined to be student ability/level and student needs (Group 1 and Group 2) and rehearsal strategies (Group 3). Those with teaching experience assumed their motivation for studying the score was to prepare a musical ensemble for performance. Preparing a musical ensemble encompasses a great number of details that were considered and explained in subject transcripts. Graduate students also seemed highly influenced by their current areas of study at the university. Undergraduates alluded more to the idea that score study was a means to create rehearsal groups. Surface details of the music played a greater role in how they studied the score,

but both admitted to struggles conceptualizing the sound of the music without a recording or model.

Group 1 subjects (teachers) approached the score in a broader manner. While they did take time to describe certain details, they generally focused on “big picture” concepts. Score examples were conceptualized in both musical and pedagogical ways. Often times, rehearsal procedures were extracted from elements of the score, but different approaches were maintained as options based on the level of students they may be teaching. Group 2 (graduate students) were split in their approaches to studying the score. While GS1 assumed a broader approach similar to that of Group 1, GS2 focused on small details and marked in the score a great deal. Musical lines, rehearsal procedures, style explanations, and conducting gestures played a more significant role in GS2’s score study. Group 3 (undergraduate students) did not demonstrate a specific method for analyzing the score or making rehearsal decisions. Markings in the score were largely based on bringing attention to tempo variations or conducting considerations. Parts containing similar melodic, rhythmic, or harmonic content were grouped as a means for more efficient rehearsing. Expressiveness and pedagogy (i.e. student characteristics) played a limited role in score study procedures.

This study found that those with teaching experience are more likely to understand the benefits and purpose of score study. The primary differences in score study procedures between the different levels of subjects were largely related to goal-setting. Whereas those with teaching experience had a past or current lens from which they were able to gauge their score study goals and translate them into rehearsal and performance goals, those without experience relied purely on what they had been told

was “important” in the score. Undergraduate students may benefit from more practical opportunities to rehearse young ensembles in situations that reflect their future career interests. Preservice teachers need additional opportunities to see what kinds of challenges students of different levels experience when rehearsing and performing various types of literature. Score study may be a subject best taught intensively during field experiences or student teaching practicums.

Areas for Future Research

As it has been shown in the literature (Barry and Henry, 2015; Bergee, 2005; Silvey, 2016), much research exists on the score study habits of professional conductors. The apparent lack of research on high school instrumental music teachers leaves several un-answered questions about the practices and influences of these educators. Further research should attempt to reveal the differences and similarities in score study procedures of university faculty and secondary music teachers.

The current study focused on teachers and students with an interest in teaching instrumental music. While some literature does exist on the score preparation methods of high school and college choral directors, further examination into how score study habits compare between these two subjects may be beneficial. In addition, the score study habits of novice choral conductors may also prove useful in developing choral education instruction.

This study helped to provide some explanation of what influences the score study procedures of high school teachers, graduate students with teaching experience, and undergraduate students. However, a lack of experience from undergraduate students

seemed to limit their ability to focus their observations and set clear rehearsal goals. Perhaps future research could attempt similar procedures utilized in this study while also incorporating hypothetical scenarios. More information is needed on what preservice music teachers deem important in their score study when addressing musicians of different levels.

One of the limitations of this qualitative study was the small sample size (n=6). Given this information and the fact that data collection methods were mostly observational, future research should attempt to answer specific questions related to score study in a quantitative format, utilizing a larger pool of subjects. Investigations like this one using a larger pool of subjects may yield different results.

It is the researcher's hope that this addition to the body of literature on score study will provide insight as to how score study is approached by students and teachers of various experience levels. Increased understanding of these approaches may allow educators to accommodate students more effectively when preparing them for future careers in music education.

REFERENCES

- Barry, N. & Henry, D. (2015). The connoisseurship of conducting: A qualitative study of exemplary wind band conductors. *Contributions to Music Education, 40*, 111-130.
- Battisti, F.L. (2007). *On becoming a conductor: Lessons and meditations on the art of conducting*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music.
- Battisti, F., & Garofalo, R.J. (1990). *Guide to score study for the wind band conductor*. Fort Lauderdale, FL: Meredith Music.
- Bautista, A., Echeverría, M. d., Puy P., Pozo, J. I., & Brizuela, B.M. (2009). Piano students' conceptions of musical scores as external representations: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 57*(3), 181-202.
- Bergee, M. J. (2005). An exploratory comparison of novice, intermediate, and expert orchestral conductors. *International Journal of Music Education, 23*(1), 23-36.
- Byo, J.L., & Sheldon, D.A. (2000). The effect of singing while listening on undergraduate music majors' ability to detect pitch and rhythm errors. *Journal of Band Research, 36*(1), 26-46.
- Casey, J.L. (1991). *Teaching techniques and insights for instrumental music educators*. Chicago, IL: G.I.A.
- Colson, J.F. (2013). *Conducting and rehearsing the instrumental music ensemble: Scenarios, priorities, strategies, essentials, and repertoire*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Colson, J.F. (2015). *Rehearsing: Critical connections for the instrumental music conductor*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Crowe, D.R. (1996). Effects of score study style on beginning conductors' error-detection abilities. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 44(2), 160-171.
- DeCarbo, N.J. (1982). The effects of conducting experience and programmed materials on error-detection scores of college conducting students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 30(3), 187-200.
- Droe, K. L. (2012). The effect of a score on band directors' written comments of a recorded performance. *Journal of Band Research*, 47(2), 1-10.
- Ellis, B. L. (1994). Selected band conductors' preparation to conduct selected band compositions (Order No. 9503182). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304116481).
- Fine, P. A., Goldemberg, R., Wise, K. J., & Bravo, A. (2015). Performing musicians' understanding of the terms "mental practice" and "score analysis". *Psychomusicology*, 25(1), 69-82.
- Goolsby, T. W. (1999). A comparison of expert and novice music teachers' preparing identical band compositions: An operational replication. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 47(2), 174-187.
- Green, E.A.H. (1987). *The dynamic orchestra*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Green, E.A.H. (1997). *The modern conductor* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Green, E.A.H. & Malko, N. (1985). *The conductor's score*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Grunow, R.F. An investigation of the relative effectiveness of four modes of score preparation on visual-aural discrimination skills development (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1980). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (288131494).
- Hunsberger, D. & Ernst, R.E. (1992). *The art of conducting* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Jagow, S. (2007). *Developing the complete band program*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music.
- Kahn, E. (1975). *Elements of conducting* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Schirmer.
- Labuta, J.A. (2010). *Basic conducting techniques* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Lane, J. S. (2004). A basic interpretive analysis of undergraduate instrumental music education majors' approaches to score study in varying musical contexts (Order No. 3140256). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305170925).
- Lane, J. S. (2006). Undergraduate instrumental music education majors' approaches to score study in various musical contexts. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 54*(3), 215-230.
- Leinsdorf, E. (1981). *The composer's advocate*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Manfredo, J. (2008). Factors influencing curricular content for undergraduate instrumental conducting courses. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, Winter*, 43-57.
- Marín, C., Pérez Echeverría, M. P., & Hallam, S. (2012). Using the musical score to perform: A study with spanish flute students. *British Journal of Music Education, 29*(2), 193-212.
- Merriam, S.B. & Tisdell, E.J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Montemayor, M., & Moss, E. A. (2009). Effects of recorded models on novice teachers' rehearsal verbalizations, evaluations, and conducting. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 57*(3), 236-251.
- Napoles, J. (2009). The effects of score use on musicians' ratings of choral performances. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 57*(3), 267-279.
- Nowak, J. & Nowak, H. (2002). *Conducting the music, not the musicians*. New York, NY: Carl Fischer.
- Phillips, K. (1997). *Basic techniques of conducting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prausnitz, F. (1983). *Score and podium*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Rohwer, D., Herring, M., & Moore, J. (2014). Score study practices of texas high school choir directors. *Texas Music Education Research, 29*-35.
- Rush, S., Scott, J., & Wilkinson, E. (2014). *Habits of a successful middle school band director*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Schmidt, C. P., Zdzinski, S. F., & Ballard, D. L. (2006). Motivation orientations, academic achievement, and career goals of undergraduate music education majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 54*(2), 138-153.

- Sheldon, D. A. (2000). Preservice and in-service teachers' perceptions of band music content and quality using self-report and behavioral measures. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 48(1), 10-25.
- Silvey, B.A. (2011a). Effects of score study on novices' conducting and rehearsing: A preliminary investigation. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 187, 33-48.
- Silvey, B. A., (2011b). Undergraduate music majors' perceptions of instrumental conducting curricula. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 21, 27-38.
- Silvey, B. A., Montemayor, M., & Baumgartner, C. M. (2017). An observational study of score study practices among undergraduate instrumental music education majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 65(1), 52-71.
- Silvey, B.A., Springer, D.G., & Eubanks, S.C. (2016). An examination of university conducting faculty members; score study attitudes and practices. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 26(1), 82-95.
- Stith, G. (2011). *Score rehearsal preparation*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music.
- Whitwell, D. (1998). *The art of musical conducting*. St. Louis, MO: Shattinger Music.
- Williamson, J.E. (2008). *Rehearsing the band*. Galesville, MD: Meredith Music.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Potential Study Participant Questionnaire

1. Name: (First) _____ (Last) _____

2. Gender: _____

3. Age: _____

4. Degree program (music, music performance, music ed., etc.)

5. Current year (e.g. freshman, sophomore, etc.)

6. Approximate GPA. Please choose from the following:

3.7 – 4.0 _____

3.5 – 3.7 _____

3.0 – 3.5 _____

2.9 or below _____

7. On a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree), please rate how much you agree with the following statement: “I enjoy talking about music and music-related things”

APPENDIX B

Investigator Interview Guide

Subject: _____

Date: _____

I. Introductory Interview

In this interview I will be asking you questions related to your beliefs and views of musical score study. None of these questions have a ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answer. The purpose of these questions is to collect data. In no way will your thoughts or ideas be challenged or will you be judged based on your answers. These questions are not intended to make you feel insecure. If you do not know or do not have an answer to one of the questions, simply say, “I don’t know”. This is an absolutely acceptable answer in this setting. Some follow up questions may be asked, if necessary.

1. How would you define musical score study?
2. Where or from whom did you receive that information?
3. What experience do you have with score study?
4. What methods do you use to study the score (e.g. audiation, singing, playing piano, playing on your primary instrument, marking, using recordings, etc.)
5. What factors influence your score study? In other words, how do you decide what information in the score is most important?

II. Score Study Task Instructions

I will now provide you with one of two full band scores. Score #1 is titled, *Three Ayres from Gloucester*, movement one. Please look at this score and study it as if you are preparing to rehearse an ensemble of high school students who are reading it for the first time. As you are studying the score, please speak aloud which elements of the music you are addressing. The end result should be a list of objectives you would like to accomplish with the ensemble during the first rehearsal. This list can have as many or as few tasks as you feel necessary. Once you have completed this list, we will continue with a short list of questions.

III. Score Study Interview Questions

1. What issue would be your first priority to address with the ensemble?
2. Describe at least one way in which you would address this issue.
3. What are the other issues listed, and how did you decide these were potential problem areas?
4. Describe at least one way in which you would address one or all of these issues.

IV. Score Study Task #2

Score #2 is titled, *Ammerland*. Instructions for this score are the same as Score #1. Please speak freely as you are studying the score. When you are finished, I will follow up with a short list of questions as before.

V. Score Study Interview Questions

1. What issue would be your first priority to address with the ensemble?
2. Describe at least one way in which you would address this issue.
3. What are the other issues listed, and how did you decide these were potential problem areas?
4. Describe at least one way in which you would address one or all of these issues.

APPENDIX C

Study Participant Questionnaire

1. Name: (First) _____ (Last) _____

2. Gender: _____

3. Age: _____

4. High School attended and year graduated. Please include the city and state in which high school is located:

5. Universities attended (attending) and year graduated:

Bachelors: _____

Masters: _____

Doctorate: _____

6. Degree program and current year (e.g. freshman, sophomore, N/A, etc.)

7. Years of full time teaching experience (N/A for undergraduates): _____

8. Grade level and subjects taught (N/A for undergraduates):

9. Schools in which you have taught full time (N/A for undergraduates):

10. How long have you participated in music? This time should account for when you first began playing an instrument.

APPENDIX D

Interview Transcript of T1

Researcher: How would you define musical score study?

T1: Logical, sensible, and artistic preparation.

Researcher: OK. And who or what would you attribute that definition to? Where did you come up with that?

T1: Experience... a lot of trial and error... teaching on different levels... classical homeschool education... and I guess, um, how do I want to say this... just the combination of seeing my teachers do what they do. So it has come from various experiences with people who were much better at it than I was. And then, um, from figuring out how to teach at different levels. So there has to be a logical approach or it's going to intimidate you before you even start. There has to be a practical approach because it has to be relatable to the people you're guiding in the process, and it has to be artistic because that's the ultimate reason that you're doing it.

Researcher: And so can you maybe highlight some of those experiences that you've had with your teachers? Maybe moments that you kind of had a big "Aha" moment?

T1: Sure. Um... I think that the practical portion... I think a lot of that has happened in the moment. I'll give you an example. My band right now is doing a piece that is completely in seven-eight, which is not hard once you establish that group, but it's a two, two, three division. Every bar is two, two, three division and there is a transitional section of four bars that uses a several accidentals, but they all make up major and minor chords, so it's very beautiful tonality, it's not awkward. The issue is that you have different groups that come in at different times, so it's very layered. So what's happening is the group that needs to count their rests aren't counting their dotted quarter accurately to come in on the downbeat. They're wanting to make it a half note rather than feeling a two, two, three subdivision. Now tied into that, is that the way that the composer has written it, is that the two quarter note divisions crescendo, and the dotted decrescendos. OK? So, what I did yesterday, just at the spur of the moment is I had those people play three eighth notes on the dotted quarter, so they played quarter, quarter, followed by three eighths. Those three eighth notes were on the pitch that was notated for them in the dotted quarter, but rather than playing a dotted quarter, they played three eighth notes. That locked everything up. That locked the rhythm up just fine. And then I had them that decrescendo the three eighth notes and then take the three eighth notes out. So, that fixed it. So that was just a practical fix that was an experience within that moment. I don't know that I thought about that ahead of time, but that seemed to work in that moment. Now, upon reflection, after it

happened, I immediately thought of [choral conducting teacher], who was my choral conducting teacher who had us in class on any sustained note, we would always sing the eighth notes because he wanted us to keep the pitch and the rhythm moving forward. And he knows that if you just see a whole note, your tendency is not to give it direction or air. So, that's you know, the inner-[choral conducting teacher] was channeled at that moment. Um, so there's a practical approach and it was also logical because that's what needed fixed. So, logically we went with what needed to be fixed, which was the two, two, three subdivision. Now we're playing it slower so that they can get all the accidentals because there's some weird accidentals written. Like, he's got e sharps written, b sharps that are written. So, we were breaking all of that down as well while trying to make it sound like major, minor chords. So A) they have to have the right notes or those chords aren't going to sound correct and (B) they have to be played at the right time. So, logically, how do we break that down? Let's play it slower, let's think it through, let's finger all those things and make sure that everybody's clarified on the right accidentals, and then we'll go from there. So after all that, they weren't getting the two, two, three subdivision. So, then we added in a more rhythmic component because that's what needed fixed. The notes were there, but the rhythmic component was not. So, let's put something in rhythmically to make that work. So that's how we did it. Um, and then from an artistic approach, you have to add in the nuances that he has requested... so, let's just play what he's written, and let's highlight those things and make that work.

Researcher: So, specifically with the musical score, um, when you're looking at it, what do you do? Do you mark things? How do you kind of prioritize, or do you... Do you sing it in your head? What are kind of some of the things that you find yourself doing when you're looking at a score?

T1: I sing it in my head. I will go to the piano after a bit. Um, if it's a slower work, I'm gonna do a lot more harmonic analysis. If it's a faster... well, let me take that back. I will do harmonic analysis in a slow work, but what I'm gonna do is figure out what the harmonic language of the composer is. Are they using octatonic scales or major scales? And then I want to try to look for those elements within their score. Um, I will take one score study session to go through and just read all of the written text. All of it. With mute. Louder. A sweet tune. Whatever the written language is. I'm going to ignore all the musical symbols and read all of the written text. Period. All of it. On every written line, and I will typically take a color, whatever I've got sharpened at the time and I'm going to mark all of those.

Researcher: What about program notes? Do you take time to read them? Do you bother with them?

T1: That's probably the first thing I read. Yeah. I just, I mean it's, it's the first page, so I'll just read that down. And sometimes there are rehearsal markings, and I kind of brush over those, of course. I mean, but I think a lot of those markings are written for younger directors, so I appreciate those and I'll skim them. But if there's a program note or biographical sketch, I'm going to read that, and I may read that again later after I've studied it some to see, OK, is any of that picked up in the score? Where can I find that within the score? So yeah. Yeah I read all the text. All the text, down to the copyright. I

read all the text. So, that will be one session of its own. And then the more and more I study it, I may go to the piano some. Um, the more and more I study it, I'm going to try to get away from the score and try to think about it. I, my, I personally try to see if I can see the score page in my head if I'm not with it. Um, I don't think I have a photographic memory, but I think I have a... I think I have a somewhat of one. Like, I can't tell you everything on the page, but I can find it so when I'm in rehearsal, I know what that page looks like already and can kind of see what's going on. Like, I know that that seven-eight section I just told you about is at the beginning of the left-hand page. I know that it's there and that the next rehearsal letter is C. So there are things that over time that I'm going to ingest just by looking at the score quite a bit.

Researcher: Do you... Do you listen to recordings or models? Does that ever come in?

T1: Yeah, I may listen to one at the beginning. Um, but I have gone more and more way from listening to those and more and more to just thinking about it, and the thinking happens a lot when I'm not with the score. So in my analysis I'm just trying to tear it apart and see how it works. But then the thinking is, how does that work together? So... yeah. So recordings, um... less now.

Researcher: And then, um, what factors kind of influence you in terms of what you start picking out. For instance, you say, "OK, that's what's going to happen in rehearsal today"

T1: Right. I think it depends on the group. So, the stronger the group... Ya know, John Elliot Gardner has this quote that he says, "My job is to get all the notes and the rhythms right, but then after that I have to make sure that we're getting the right idea". But then I look at who he's working with and I know that he's already thinking right idea, and he doesn't want anything to interrupt that idea. So whatever needs to be fixed, he's going to fix. But I think your approach to that is different depending on the group that you're with, but the goal should always be the same. You know, I read an article last week about percussion and doubling parts, and there's nothing wrong with what they said... And I agree with that because the point that they were trying to make was that it's more of an educational experience than an artistic experience. But I don't know how much of that I buy, because if it's not artistic then it's not true. And I'm not going to double the suspended cymbal part with four percussionists. Or I'm not going to double the hi-hat part with two. Unless, those two kids are driven to sound like one. Then that can be educational for them and artistic if it doesn't interrupt. But if you're trying to teach students that the reason we do all of these things is to try to achieve some sort of artistic goal, then your teaching has to go that way.

Researcher: Okay. Alright. Let's look at the score now. I will now provide you with one of two full band scores. Score number one is titled, *Three Ayres from Gloucester*. Please look at this score and study it as if you were preparing to rehearse an ensemble of high school students who are reading it for the first time. As you're studying the score, please speak aloud which elements of the music you're addressing. The end result should be a list of objectives you would like to accomplish with the ensemble during the first

rehearsal. This list can have as many or as few tasks as you feel necessary. Once you've completed the list, we will continue with a short list of questions.

T1: So if I'm doing this for a high school band, the first thing I want to do is actually see how long the piece is. Because if I've only got a certain amount of time, then I've got to figure out... So it looks like it's about sixty-six bars. Yes. Sixty-six bars. Um, so I'm gonna... OK, so the person it's about is apparently happy because he's the *jolly* earl. So that goes with the allegro, cut time, tempo, and the articulations. And somewhat of the chromatic lines that we have in the mid-brass. So... that could be like him laughing. Um, depending on the strength of the band, I may or may not ask the woodwinds to play cues. I won't know that until I hear them, but I may ask them to do that. Now, if the section that I've asked is weaker and doesn't help, then I'm going to ask them not to play the cues. What I might do if it's a first read is find the tutti sections, which there aren't many in this particular piece. So, uh, for this particular work, I'm not going... I'm not going to have that option to be able to do that. Um, if it's the first read, I'm going to see how well they can read it. And if they can read it well, then I'm going to start rehearsing them. But it may be a group that can't read well. And so in that case, I'm going to rehearse it in four. I'm just going to say, "we're gonna do this in four, and it's going to be at a much slower tempo than the performance tempo", but it's going to be at a tempo that they feel like that they can read. Now, there's a fine line there because if it's too slow, it becomes ineffective and then you can start saying, maybe I should program a new piece (laughs). Um, but I'm going to... I don't know, I'm going to read it, and I'm going to see how they respond, and I'm going to go from there. As far as the rehearsal is set up. Now as far as the score study is set up, I'm going to be looking at form. Um, I see that, uh, it looks like it's pretty much the same music at nine, uh It repeats this at seventeen. Uh, there's only some variation it seems in some of the parts. So I'm going to try to give them big form concepts like I'm giving myself here. Uh, I'm gonna see what music might be used over and over again and when that's used. Um, so form is the first thing I'm really gonna go for. I'm going to go for the form and then after that, um, I'm going to try to see who has predominant lines, but then I'm also going to be looking for counter lines as well. Uh, with a tune like this, because there is so much sustained music with the half notes, like in the reeds and the low brass, I am gonna see what those chords are and see how they work in harmonic context so that I can... I can rehearse those and tune those. Uh, at a certain point I feel like that if you can get all of those guys on the same page and get them moving together where they can hear their parts, then you can actually make some contrast with your, with your, um, with your textures because you can get all those guys to play softer and supportive so that the lead line doesn't have to play so loud. But I think you have to get those guys feeling good about what they're doing, understanding these chromatic tendencies and how they work so that they have a context to play them in and then you get that texture at a dynamic that you need it against the other texture that's the melodic content. So I'm going to spend some time working on that. I'm going to want my short notes to be resonant. For example, the downbeat of nine... nine, ten, and eleven. We don't want those just to plop, but they need to have tone because it's an f major chord. And then it's C7 with an f underneath, and it goes back to f major so... They need to hear those. So the first thing I would do is I would tune those, probably without the tuba because they have the f-pedal, and then put the tuba in so they can hear that dissonance over the f-pedal. And then everything else. I'm going to isolate with the half notes so that they can hear those lines,

so they can hear those chords move. And that gives them a chance to really understand that those accidentals aren't scary, but that they actually have a purpose and meaning. And then at seventeen, because there is a lot of similarity, I'm going to say, "Approach seventeen like your approach to nine because there's a lot of similarity". That's going to probably save some time. Uh, at thirty-three, I'm going to want them to think that it's all one line because you've got the brass pitted against the saxophones. It's a call and response. So I want the saxophones to feel like, and the trombones to feel like, they are part of the line that the trumpets and horns started (sings the line referred to). I want the saxes and trombones to feel like they're part of the forward direction within the dotted half rather than two separate things. Not Anti but... with one another, rather than against. Um, and then this line at twenty-five comes in again at thirty-three. And so I'm just going to tell them to. What I'm going to ask them to do is in the rehearsal is say, "look at twenty-five, and compare that to 33 on your line in the woodwinds and the clarinets. It's almost the exact same thing. Yes. So let's approach it in a way that we've rehearsed it and I think you understand that. Ya know, the classical education comes in at getting them to think as fast as possible, getting them to think as fast as possible rather than measure, measure, measure, measure, but holistic and teleological. So getting them to think... as much as they can, as quick as they can. So, what I'm essentially doing in the rehearsal is doing score study with them in that regard. But it looks to me pretty straight forward. Uh, so like I'm already seeing stuff that is similar and so I'm going to be marking those things in the score. Uh, like, uh, before 59 we see somewhat of that same type of music and the trumpets after 17, so I'm going to see if that's actually the case and... yeah. It is. There's a couple, there's a couple of differences, but not enough to warrant concern. And so that's going to say, hey guys, look at that. That's pretty much the exact same music. So approach it the same way. Approach it the same dynamic way, approach it the same directional way... just approach it the same way. Even though some of the notes are different, it's still the overall concept of the way you want to play it is exactly the same. So that starts to give them bigger chunks, bigger picture ideas, uh, and not being so isolated to the single line that they have on their sheet. And then, I'm gonna rehearse it, see what they give me, and then start rehearsing it from what needs to be fixed to get us to the goal that we need.

Researcher: So your score study continues to evolve as you rehearse the piece?

T1: I think the way that you teach the score will adapt as the students are able to grasp what you're giving them. So you know what the score sounds like, you've got that under your belt. But how they respond to it is what is going to adapt and change because you're going to have to give them what they need in order to meet that goal that you have... that you have in your head. How you want something to sound is probably going to stay the same. How you get them to sound that way is what may change. So, the how. How you get it to happen.

Researcher: I think we're good on that one. Um, I think you pretty much addressed every question I had, so I don't think we need to bother with the interview. Score number two is titled, *Ammerland*. Instructions for this score are the same as score number one. Please speak freely as you're studying the score, and when you're finished, I'll have a short list of additional questions, if necessary.

T1: It's minor. So that already tells me something there. So I'm going to start going through and seeing if that ever changes. Uh, it looks like it might be. Hmm. Not strophic, but... oh! Parallel major. Thirty one. Okay. I've thought about doing this with my group here. It's in harmonic minor. No, it's got raised thirds. Well yeah, it's using. OK. The counterpoint is fairly simple. Not that that's bad, but it's not complex. (Under breath) 16, it looks like it's the same. Then at 26, we get a little variance... 26 looks like it's a new section. So maybe a small transition before the gloriousness of c major. New descant line in the uppers at 32... some fanfare music in the brass. I would not call those flourishes because it's too slow, but it's flourish-y. How's that? Okay, big finish... with the flat third bringing back the borrowed chord from the minor... ending on major. So, I'm going to look at all of these flourishes, uh, even at the beginning. The little sixteenth note resolution in the horn and in bar four the dotted-eighth-sixteenth, I want the sixteenths to have life and not be cut. I also want the eighth notes after dotted quarters to have a lot of life on them. Anywhere we have this dotted-eighth-sixteenth, those essentially are, oh what do you call those... anticipations! I want those to be really brought out, so that we hear those. I want the sixteenth notes to have time to... to have time taken and not be compressed. Going into thirty-one, it's just a c scale alluding to the new key. At 32, probably the flutes and clarinets seem to be kind of high and ethereal, floating above the line. Not in your face, but very transparent and above throughout all of that music. Lots of leading from the euphonium first and the tenor sax later at 35. I don't want the fanfares to be overstated because it will probably get "pecky" and lose the resonance that it needs. I'm gonna make sure that the trumpet and euphonium are always complementing one another but never wanting to lose the color from the clarinets, and that's like in 39 and 40... And I want to make sure that the dotted quarters aren't too loud, like in five, six from the end, because if they are, it's going to cover the counter lines that are underneath it. Um, anytime that supportive harmonic movement moves, I want to hear that movement that is clear... but not schmaltzy (laughs). I don't like Schmaltz. And a piece like this could get that way really quickly. Really quickly. If you don't let it have contrast, then the schmaltz is on its way, and it has to have textural contrast, and it can't sound like one of those pieces that is trying to be profound. Because I don't think that it lends itself to that Gravitas. And so I think you have to be really careful with pieces like this because it's a good piece, but there's only so much depth that it can offer. It's not O Magnum Mysterium, and that's okay, but you can't make it O Magnum Mysterium. So you have to be very careful that you just let it have somewhat of a, almost a seamlessness to it so that it just sounds lovely for the sake of lovely, but that it's not over-romanticized. And the overwhelming sensation can come in by making too much of any chromatic line, which there isn't a lot of. So you want to be really careful that you're not overdoing that. The harmony looks pretty straightforward. There aren't a lot of accidentals. So, it's very diatonic. It's incredibly diatonic. All of the accidentals here lead to five chords. So that's not a big deal, you're not moving away from key. There's no pivot chords. Nothing like that at all. It's just diatonic. It looks like it's pretty much C major. There's not even anywhere where it really goes to Eb major in the first part of it. Bb to B-natural in 23 really solidifies C minor. It does look like there's a five of three in 26 going to three at 27, so you're kind of Eb-ish here. You have a five to three of three, you have a four chord in Eb, but then quickly he gets us back to what would be a two-seven in c minor. Yep, to five and then you're back in C Major at 31. So, you've got a

pivot chord, kind of, but that really just serves as going to the parallel major in 31. Then it's really diatonic again. Looks like you've got a five of six. Yeah, five-six of six in 36, but then it goes back to A minor. Four, two, five, one in 39. Stays there... five-six of six again before the end. It does a minor four plagal cadence at the end. So, I'm good to go.

Researcher: I have one other follow up. So you said that you had thought about doing this with one of your groups....

T1: But I haven't studied this score, if that was your question.

Researcher: Have you heard it before?

T1: Yes, but I was in the car one day and thought, "Oh, that might be a good tune". But I've never conducted it.

Researcher: How about the first one, Three Ayres from Gloucester?

T1: Um... have I conducted this? Yeah, maybe at [Major University] I conducted it. With one of those bands, I don't remember. I had three bands in the Spring...

Researcher: So, it's possible?

T1: It's possible I did this, but maybe I've avoided it for the simple fact that it's overdone. But I like the piece! I do. I really like the piece. But I think I didn't want to hear the second movement because I didn't want to hear the horns. Uh... (Laughs). And I remember that band having a pretty terrible horn section. And I thought, "Uh, no I don't think I'm putting us through that..." So maybe I didn't do it. But I do know it, and I do like it. And I would even think about doing it here at some point. But yeah, I'm familiar with both of them

Researcher: Great. And that doesn't have any effect on the study. It's just an important thing to know.

T1: I don't have a copy of this score. I haven't studied this one extensively, but I have heard it. Do you need anything else? I probably gave you more analysis for this one (Ammerland) than this one (Three Ayres from Gloucester).

(Continued to speak about score study practices)

T1: I probably would go to the piano and play through both of these at some level.

Researcher: Anything else? Would you make markings?

T1: Oh sure. The way I make markings, I don't have any system. I don't use certain colors for dynamics or articulations. Here at school, I'm gonna use a red pencil, cause I like red, cause I can see it. I don't use graphite because I can't see it. If I have something that needs to be worked on, I have these guys (post-its), and I stick them where they need to go. I've got highlighters, I may use them... I'll show you this (points to personal

score). I've got this here (post it) just to remind me how to teach them. Cause this is a canon at the bar. So the musical word is canon, and then at the bar I've got that marked down. This just helps me know when I'm having to work really fast who is in what group. So the more I study the score, the more I'm gonna mark that stuff in. But ya know, I say this with humility... I can look at this right here and know what I want by looking at it. Okay, contrary motion, I know what I'm gonna do there (under breath). But that's because I've listened to a lot of music, and I've done this for seventeen years. So there's things in here, yeah passing tones, passing lines, I can pick up on that. But I had a great theory teacher in college. His teacher studied with Hindemith. I took a year of composition with him. So, I can look at that and say, "mmhmmm, yeah, yeah, I see that bass line doing that, and I see what it's doing there, so I'm gonna teach them how I want that bass line to be phrased and give it direction, and that's gonna help everybody play their line better... yeah. Come back here, and that's homophonic rhythm, oh and look there's a suspension, and I know it's a suspension because everybody else is sustaining and there's one person that moves. You see what I'm saying, visually I can look at a score and see the harmonic implications just by the way it's written. And then I see if I'm right... yep.

Researcher: So that leads me to a couple other questions. First, when you mark the score, you mentioned it's for pedagogical purposes. Would you say most of your markings are related to that?

T1: No.

Researcher: Do you make markings for your conducting?

T1: I don't make markings for my conducting. I used to. But with this literature, I don't need to. If I do, I've got a problem. I paid too much money for something that I didn't get. Now... (pauses) it's at home. We just did the Maslanka Symphony No. 4 this past summer. I should have brought that score. That score's a rainbow. And I have each section with its own tab. Ya know? And I've named each section. Nature section, doxology... I have a name that I have given for each section. Now I have that there for rehearsal speed purposes. So I'm not flipping through the score and trying to find it. But a lot of the notes in that score are artistic things that I need. That I want to say. I have some harmonic analysis in that when I need to, but in that piece around the ten minute mark, when the doxology comes in with full statement, it's stated rhythmically three different ways super-imposed on each other. The organ and brass have it one way, then there's a really odd descant line, that's the doxology too, in the piccolo trumpet and upper-woodwinds, then horns have the doxology in three. But he's got everything written in four-two. So, how do I make that work? Well, the first thing everyone has to know is they have the doxology. Everybody has the hymn tune. And then, I'm gonna figure out how I make that work somehow. And there's some really great moments in there when the horns have these incredible, grinding dissonance. So, what do I say to the horns? Play the doxology just perfectly in time. And those boys and girls DO. So, when it's really grinding and dissonant, I'm gonna look at them so they know, "yeah, you wear that out." And so they do. But that score, because it's at a high artistic level, it requires a different set of study. That score, in yellow, every English word is marked. In yellow. And then

there are some things that I have scored up and down so I know where everything fits and lines up. Like the jazz section... could he have written that rhythmically any harder? He probably could have, I'm just glad that he didn't, because it's hard enough as it is. But I've got most of the big downbeats marked because there's so much interplay between people, that I need to know where 1, 2, and 3 are so they can get a good sense of where 1,2, and 3 are. Whether that's on a note or on a rest. So, it goes back to, I'm going to mark depending on what I need to do to help. There are no markings at the beginning. It's a horn solo. And then it's a reed choir that repeats that. And then it's done again. I don't need to. All I have to decide is how much of a warm blanket it needs to sound like. And how soft it needs to be when the full group comes in after the horn solo, cause it's marked piano and the horn decrescendos. So that piano that they come in at needs to fit inside of the horn's decrescendo. Because anything louder is going to be abrasive. So those are the things I'm thinking about. He's got piano marked there. What does that piano mean in context to what they just heard? Do I want it to be louder? I don't, personally. I want it to... *ex nihilo*. Come out of nothing. See, I look at the fourth symphony as a metanarrative to the gospel. That's how I look at that piece. It's the metanarrative of scripture. Creation, Fall, Christ, the Church, Final Consummation. So that's gonna guide my interpretation. David doesn't know that (laughs). But that's how I interpret it. So, and you don't have to put this in your study, but the transcendentals are the *good*, the *true*, and the *beautiful*. Okay? Those are the three transcendentals. The *good*, the *true*, and the *beautiful*. And I believe that all of those have been given to us as a gift from God. So, that's really what guides my score study. Is trying to make it good, true, and beautiful. We make it good by sounding like it needs to. We make it beautiful by letting it be as artistic as possible. And we make it true by giving the most clarity to the music and understanding of it. If I've got those three, I'm good to go. Because those three came from the author of creation. So, if music is something we create, go with the guy that knows what he's doing.

Researcher: Do you mind if I use this in my study?

T1: Yeah, it's up to you! Yeah. But that's really how I look at it. And I know people would say, "Ah, that's just crazy..." but... I don't see how you can spend as much time as we do studying something that someone else has created and not believe there is order. When we are dying to interview the composers that write it. When we have forums on composition and hang on every word of the composer, and we nod our heads in unison. Are we not at that point listening to someone who has created something? (Pause). So, I'm happy to hear whatever the composer has to say about their music because I want to know what they have to say. But why is that? Because it was their pen that put the notes on the paper. So, they're a credible source. Because they wrote it. So, that tells me there has to be some order, somewhere. And that it has to come from somewhere. So, in way a composition isn't apologetic. So, really score study is a hermeneutic. Right? It's how we approach the study of something being created. Just like the study of anything else, you have to have a hermeneutic to it, and what is your hermeneutic.... And even in very dissonant music, I can have that. The adage, "Oh, that piece is so musical". And what they really mean is that piece is slow and pretty. Or, "They played so musically". Man, that means they played a really slow, pretty piece that they liked. But Stravinsky played well is musical. Varese played well is musical. Druckman played well is musical.

Druckman played well is captivating! Is riveting! Is the most wonderful study in texture and orchestration that you could ever imagine. It's just outstanding! But if it's not played beautifully, then it's not musical. Corigliano played well is musical.

APPENDIX E

Interview Transcript of T2

Researcher: How would you personally define musical score study?

T2: In a teaching situation, which as a director, you're normally in a teaching situation, unless you're very top end professionals, knowing the score well enough that any problem or any teaching situation that arises, you're already prepared for. That's a long definition.

Researcher: Where would you say that definition comes from? Does it come from someone else? What is it based on?

T2: I don't think at any point during my undergraduate or graduate, anybody said the words "score study" until I took private conducting lessons. Other than that, that definition really just comes from experience of doing it.

Researcher: What experience do you have with score study?

T2: College on through professional teaching. I'm trying to remember what year I'm on... I think I'm on year 11 or 12. During that time of 11 or 12 years teaching, I did one year choir, actually. That was interesting. I've done middle school band and high school band, both. As part of that, you're going to have small ensembles, large ensembles, like a full gamut instrumentation-wise. Is that what you're asking, as far as the background?

Researcher: Yes. Can you elaborate on score study for choral, middle school, high school? Tell me a little bit about that.

T2: The chorale part, I really treated it like you treat music theory in college, because it's four parts. It's very similar to that. But, I'm definitely not the expert to ask on that, because I only did it only for one year, in a pinch, because I had to. Really, score study, I think, band-wise, it's all been the same for me.

The only difference is what I'm looking for is different, depending on the ability of the students themselves. But the quality of writing or how you approach it is the same. It's just maybe less technically difficult, depending on the age and what you're doing it for.

Researcher: What methods do you use to study the score? Are you audiating? Are you singing? Are you writing in the score a lot, making notes? What are some ways that you approach it?

T2: I can make your study really short and say yes.

[Laughter]

T2: Yes, to all of that. I know everybody uses the Michelangelo analogy. A lot of, "I start with a block and I carve away everything that's not the statue," kind of thing. In that macro to micro, large to small. That's what I normally do. The first score study is before I've even chosen the piece.

That's all just looking at ranges, and can the students that I have play it. I don't go too much more in depth, because if I went much more in depth, I would never be able to look at enough scores to determine what my kids are going to play.

Once I know, "Okay, we've picked this piece. It's going to work well for our group," then I get into all the smaller stuff that's going to come up in rehearsals.

Researcher: What factors influence your score study? In other words, how do you decide what information in the score is most important? Let's say, when you pick a piece.

T2: It depends on the piece. For example, right now in our band, we're doing the piece by [local composer], [*piece by local composer*]. It's a very 20th century piece. It's entirely rhythmic and it's more like sound effects at certain times, because it's very 20th century. To where, if we're working on a Bach chorale, I'm going to start in a different direction.

It depends on what is the piece's purpose and what style it is and what's going to be most important to convey what that piece is. Then, you work down the list of what's more important.

Researcher: All right. I'll now provide you with one of two full band scores. Score number one is titled *Three Ayres from Gloucester*, movement one. Please look at the score and study it as if you're preparing it for a group of high school students or rehearsing an ensemble of high school students who are reading it for the first time.

As you're studying the score, please speak aloud which elements of the music you are addressing. The end result should be a list of objectives you would like to accomplish with the ensemble during the first rehearsal. This list can have as many or as few tasks as you feel necessary. Once you've completed the list, I have a short list of questions.

T2: Feel free to repeat all those instructions as we go, because I don't want to forget steps as we go.

Researcher: The most important thing is speak aloud. Tell me everything that you're thinking about as you're looking at it.

T2: Okay. The first thing, literally just looking at pages through so, I'm in the stage of, "Would I play this or not?" thought process. The first thing that I see is it's going to be woodwinds versus brass, not versus, but woodwinds-brass back and forth. The beginning's all brass, stuff like that. Just the quick glance, rhythmically, if I'm preparing this for a high school group, it is rhythmically very simple. Dotted quarter notes are the hardest thing, really, rhythmically.

Vertically, I look like overall, do things line up, vertically. That tells me how easy it is going to be to put together. Just from the standpoint of, "Can we play it from A to B?" All these half notes line up together, so it's going to be groups of people playing stuff rather than individuals.

There's a couple of solos. It looks like trumpet has a solo a couple of times. You look, "Can my player handle that? What's the range?" I just went through all of those pages and those are the things that I saw within that.

Then, I start to think, "The challenges to this piece are going to be, "Does my brass choir sound good individually? Does my woodwind choir sound good individually? How do I put those together, so that I have both of those equal sounds when they are playing?" I think the back and forth between that is important.

Researcher: That's referring to balance?

T2: Yes. Again, I'm starting from bigger to smaller. I'm not even looking at specific numbers or anything yet. If I'm teaching it in a class, the high school group I may not have to go back and teach all these things. But if I had a group that I had to, most of the rhythms are similar within the group, so I might make a short-- "Here are the three or four rhythms in this piece that you're going to see." Everybody plays them and we go through. I see some of examples for that, like the dotted-quarter note rhythm, stuff like that.

I'd probably do the same thing with the melody. The melody that keeps coming back, that type of thing. The parts that really stick out to me, rehearsal wise, are a lot of these trumpet and horn parts where everybody else has half notes. The moving part is not in the first parts, necessarily, because second and third trumpets aren't going to be as independent as your first. Bringing out this eighth note moving stuff would be important.

There's some spots where the flute solo looks like it's a little bit thinner-- Orchestration. Percussion wise, it's pretty simple, because of the nature of the piece, to make sure that I don't exclude them from that. Because sometimes, really, a percussion part can be a wind part, sometimes in these things.

Then, I guess I'd go back. This is the first time that I'm actually looking at the key signature. Obviously, if you're going to teach it, you'd play some stuff in the key signature. But, that's not necessarily always the first thing that I look at.

As in, being in cut time, all that kind of stuff. I'd rehearse it probably in four first. Then, do it in cut time. The reason being is it's still-- I would treat it like a chorale first so the kids can understand. Measures three and four, as an example, there's all these descending quarter notes and it looks like there's some pretty tight harmony in the horns.

There's an F sharp and an E flat next to each other and all that. I would take that very slow and independently until we go faster. The quality of when we go faster sounds like a chorale that happens to be fast instead of a 2/4 march where everything's short, because there's some staccatos in here, but I wouldn't interpret any of the staccatos "march" style. It would be very light.

I don't know. It's hard, because I don't have somebody responding to me and I know that's part of it. Am I missing anything? Any of the questions as I go through? You said to do several things. I'm trying to--

Researcher: Let's pretend now that we're going to put the piece into rehearsal. Think about the amount of rehearsal time you would have even, say, for your ensemble. Can you give me a priority list of what you're going to address first of all those things you just discussed?

T2: Yes. I would definitely pull the key parts out first. If this was the first day of rehearsal, we'd have the little sheet that says, "These are the elements that you're going to see" and look through those a little bit for everybody, so when they see them, they'll understand a little bit better. But then I really would--

If I'm reading this just to sight read it for one day, I would take it at tempo and read through and talk more about rhythmic and key signature and technical issues. But if it's something that we're doing for contest, I want them to learn it straight away, because I don't want them to develop bad habits.

I literally would go through as if it's a chorale and look at each measure and what needs to be brought out and look at what's primary, what's secondary, what's third. Tertiary, I guess, is the word for that. Because there are parts where, maybe there's two things going on that should be equal, but then there's other parts where it's definitely melody, harmony, accompaniment.

I saw a really good article one time, and I really keep it in the back of my head at all times. Four elements of melody, counter-melody, harmonic long-note stuff, and then rhythmic stuff. The rhythmic stuff, necessarily, isn't always percussion. People make that mistake.

Then, the percentages of that, it was 40% melody, 30% counter-melody, 20% long-note harmony stuff, and then 10% rhythmic. In a piece like this, I think that works probably fairly well, because it's traditional. Now, if you're doing a 20th century piece or something crazy, all that's going to flip on its head.

I've even done before-- I would go through and I've done the thing where-- Highlight all the melodic stuff in pink, and then all the counter-melody stuff in orange, so you can clearly see all that. There are some times in here like the snare drum part at the beginning, I would actually highlight that as melody. Not for them to play out, but they have the rhythm of the melody. Rather the bass drum is actually the rhythm part.

Where we get later on, like before 43 here, five or six measures. The baritone part... oh, bari sax, sorry. Low clarinets. It's like outlining chords, because it's sort of like a bass line, but because it's staccato and it's lighter, I would almost treat that as rhythm. If I use that section as an example, I would say flutes and oboes, melody.

Then, the long note stuff would be the harmony, and then that other stuff would be the rhythmic stuff, except for when they go [sings] at the end of it. That's the continuation of the melody. Does that answer your question at all about how I got there?

Researcher: Sure. Yes. You good with this one?

T2: Yes, I think so. One thing that I don't do very much is I actually don't go through and - I don't put roman numerals under my score or do any of that stuff. But I will look ahead when I look at key signatures and chords and stuff like that and pull out stuff that I think will be a problem. This piece is not bi-tonal or anything like that.

We would just play in this key a lot in warm-ups to get used to that key and used to some of the I, IV, V, and I. That would usually take care of most of the issues, unless there's a specific chord that's out of tune, that I would break down.

Then, I would go back in roman numeral and say, "Who has what?" and the third has to be this flat or whatever. But I don't really address that too much in score study until it becomes a problems with the group.

Researcher: Okay. Would you say that most of your decisions are based on pedagogical things that are happening in class? Would you say that a lot of your score study is guided-
- ?

T2: Yes, and knowing the players. When I'm looking at the clarinet part, I know that's Joe, and Suzy, and Rob, and Rob can't play this and Joe can. That's how I'm going to plan out my rehearsals from there. With the overall goal in mind for everybody to get to the same place, but you're going to have to teach them differently based on where they are.

Researcher: You talked about predicting potential issues. Can you elaborate on that just a little bit?

T2: The simple ones are trumpets and range or any instrument and range. A clarinet part that has a trill between A and B natural, because that's above and below the break. I probably wouldn't choose that piece, but the weird things that are unexpected that the kids haven't seen before. The more I know my kids--

If I'm a middle school teacher, I know what they've seen in sixth grade, I know what they've seen in seventh grade. I know to expect what they already know and the things that are new, that's why I probably chose the piece to do in the first place.

Believe it or not, just counting rests and stuff like that, those are the problems that you anticipate more than any others. Not the while I'm playing stuff but like, "Do you guys have rehearsal numbers on your part that match mine?" That's part of the anticipation process too.

Researcher: I just have a few questions and you've addressed several. Alright, we talked about what you would address first. Can you talk just a little bit about how you would address some of those issues?

T2: You mean maybe a specific issue?

Researcher: What was the first issue that you—? I think you said, you'd play it as a chorale, you'd look at what's primary or secondary. How would you accomplish that?

T2: I'd split it up and have them play it individually. Sometimes, I work from primary down, and sometimes I work from secondary up. I don't know if I have a scientific-- This is always the way I do it because of this. Maybe how I feel that day, or how I feel about the piece, or how stuff layers in. Breaking apart the individual players that play the same things together.

Another thing that I like to do when it comes to style, like looking at the first measure the trumpets have, they have a dotted-quarter rhythm that's got staccatos on it. To get that the same, and if it's something that re-occurs through the whole piece, use the trumpets as the example, but I might put the rhythm on the board for everybody.

While they're playing it, have everybody else count it or do air through it and things like that, so they're actively listening to the part that I'm fixing, so that when it comes up in their part, they can reference that in their brain. That fixes a lot of the stylistic kinds of things. I do a lot of, especially on staccato stuff, a lot of just air through the horn, because they can hear the starts and ends of notes and isolate that only.

It's a lot of, "What is the problem and how can I make you not think about all the other parts of the music while you're thinking about that one problem?"

On a complicated rhythmic section, I say, "Okay, guys, play everything on concert F," because the band sounds darkest and best on average, except for clarinets, on concert F. Approach it in a way where they're going to have success with the thing that you're working on, because you've taken everything else out.

Then, when you add everything back in, it's an element that they're going to master. Now, another element is the next thing. Did that make sense?

Researcher: Absolutely.

T2: I always tell kids in marching band, "The reason why we're still fixing mistakes in October, when we learned this thing at band camp is because I'm always fixing the worst thing." What I fixed in October, that was probably still happening and it was probably a mistake at band camp, but it wasn't the worst one. We haven't gotten to it yet, so it's that constant refining thing.

Researcher: Okay. Score number two is titled *Ammerland*. Instructions for this score are the same as score number one. Please speak freely as you're studying. When you're finished, I'll ask a few more questions.

T2: Is this high school too?

Researcher: I beg your pardon?

T2: High school ensemble?

Researcher: This piece?

T2: Yes. Think of it in that way?

Researcher: Yes, exactly.

T2: Am I missing the first page? It was just turned around. Okay. Because this has a melody that goes through the whole thing over and over and over, and this one is a chorale. The worst key for bands to play in is the one at the end. That's the last thing that your audience is going to hear, so I would take that one melody that's constant throughout and write it out for everybody and play it in all three keys and refine it in the easy key and then compare, "Can you play it as well as you just did in those other keys?" Because when you get into the key of C at the end, it can be the exact same notes, the exact same construction, which it mostly is, except for there's a little fanfare, trumpet-y, horn, trombone-y kind of thing. It can be the exact same notes and the exact same melody. Because it's in a new key, all of a sudden all the stylistic things go out the window, because they're thinking, "I'm going to miss this sharp, or that sharp," or whatever.

I would do a lot of-- It's more rehearsal stuff, but I would concentrate my rehearsals on going back and forth between the three different key signatures here and comparing the sound. Do we sound the same and the most comfortable in all of them? And yeah, the melody. Does everybody understand the melody? At the beginning, in this piece, there's primary melody, and then the horns maybe have a little secondary thing.

Every once in a while, the low harmony part turns into a moving transition every four bars or whatever, where they have moving notes—It's what [previous conducting professor] calls the hinge. I'd have to make a choice at the beginning. If I was choosing this piece for my group, which is my best section? Clarinet, tenor saxophone, or euphonium? Most of the time, unless I just have superstar woodwinds, I would say, "Everybody has to play into the euphonium sound."

I like that little clarinet-- This is really good arranging, because everybody can blend. The one that's going to stick out is the tenor saxophone, I think, because it's going to sound reedier than the others, so him blending in-- I would even look at this, and I think band setup in my head. If I don't have my tenor sax in my concert band set up sitting in front of the baritones, then for this piece I would stick them in front of it and say, "You shouldn't be able to hear you own self. You should only blend into the euphoniums."

I would do a lot of exercises with the kids with tempo variations, even if it's just on a concert F or whatever, where they just have to follow me and I speed up and slow down, even on just single quarter note pulses, because I think there's a lot of room here for speed up, slow down, speed up, slow down. As far as my own study, I would literally go through in a piece like this and either circle notes or highlight notes that I want to specifically stretch and pull a little bit on the tempo.

A lot of the crescendos on three, four, going into one, I would definitely stretch all those out. There's a big, it's not call and response, but it is at like measure 25, 26, 27. There's back and forth, back and forth, back and forth. It would be something to look at like, "Are

we matching style?" It's more understanding, coming up with the potential issues and fixing it rather than necessarily looking at it as if, "Do I have to understand what the composer exactly meant on this chord?"

I think you get to a certain level and that makes a difference, but the first things that I look at are the more practical things. Then, I get into the decisions like-- I think this one is cool, because it's ambiguous in some places, because of the way that the melody is written. Let's see. Now, I'm actually looking at chords. Going to look back at the beginning. Here's something interesting on the deeper level of things and understanding for my own benefit, but that would help the kids. The tuba starts on the C, but it's in the key of E flat. In the end, the tuba ends on a C, but it's in the key of C. He's obviously thought through the key relationships, trying to bring out in the balance little things. If we're really at that level, that's very ambiguous to me, because if you're in E flat, but he's got a C down there, it could also be C minor, but he's not really, because the melody circles around what we-- let's see. It starts on the third if we're in the major key. It's very ambiguous. It could be all of that. You can analyze it all of those ways, which is the cool part about the piece.

That's where you get into the like, "What decisions do I make as a conductor, because I may not understand everything that he thought in his head, but I can make some choices to bring out to the audience, my thoughts on what should be primary in the tonality and stuff like that, which is the fun part of picking good literature to do. Does that make sense?"

Researcher: Yes.

T2: Then, I would go through and say, "How many other places does that happen?" That's when I start doing actual chord analysis, is when it matters more to the intent of what you want to get out of the piece. On this one, I think I like at 16, so the trumpets and flutes and clarinets have the old melody and the euphonium has the new stuff. This is basically like a euphonium feature. I'd even have the kids close their eyes, the euphonium play the melody and me not conduct and everybody else has to follow along as the euphonium player practices the expression that they want to do.

The more advanced group you have, the more you can let them play and say, "Express something. Make a choice." If they make a wrong choice, you say, "This might be better." That would be a cool thing to do there, and take all the long note stuff out of the equation for a minute and just add it back in afterwards, which would be cool. Am I answering all the points there?

Researcher: Anything else?

T2: No. I do see at the end, the triplet stuff is going to be heavier, so that's a stylistic change. There's a little bit of style change throughout, but for more chorale to-- Heavy is not the right word, but weighted. Percussion is more important than it looks like.

Here's a good rehearsal thing. Like at measure 38, the horns have the triplet stuff with the euphonium on beat one, trumpets have it a bit later and you have 16th note stuff in the woodwinds going up and down, which is cool, I guess three against four or whatever. But the snare part has all the triplets, so I'd have the snare part play with both of those, so that

the trumpets and horns could hear that they have one part together that is the snare part. They just have the pitches of it. Does that make sense?

Researcher: Yep. Okay, I have a couple of questions. Right before we got to this piece, you asked, "High school?," which I'm glad you asked that, because it is part of the instructions, and I'll need to put that stuff in the script for my next participants, so I'll put that in. But it made me think, would you approach this differently if it were with middle school students or college students?

T2: The rehearsal, yes. The score study, it's a matter of detail, because you're dealing with different performer issues. I think what's harder about advanced high school or college, even if you're playing an easier piece is getting everybody's concept to be the same, because they all have enough experience to do something, but it might be something different and they don't agree.

Unifying that is harder. Where in middle school, they are whatever you tell them to be for the most part. If they get it, they are what you are telling them to be, so you don't have to worry about that as much.

I would probably play through the score more if it's a middle school score. Actually get out the instruments of each one and go through, because I'm thinking very much about, "My pinky does this for this lick for middle school." A normal high school too. I'm lucky that I've got a wind symphony and a concert band at high school level.

If I was doing a concert band, which is the lower group for us, I would still be doing some of that fingering stuff and looking through, and where's the mechanical-- Sometimes, what looks easy like, "Oh, this is just 1e&a 2e&a 3", for clarinets, one of those licks could be super easy, and one of those licks could take three months to get because of some technical fingering issue with the pinkies or something like that.

With a more inexperienced group, I would actually, instead of looking at the score vertically, I'm looking, "What's the problems in this part? What's the problems in this next part? What's the problems in this part?" Whereas with a more advanced group, I'm going to be thinking about the layers more immediately. I'm going to trust my players to play it. Now, how do I get them to express what I want them to? It's almost like in marching band, you have a general effect. That's more what I'm thinking about, the more advanced group.

What is the purpose of these four bars emotionally, physically, sound-wise, dynamically, what it doing, so I can convey something. Whereas at a middle school or a beginner level, I'm thinking like, "How do I get them to be comfortable with this first?" I know all the issues, so when they raise their hand and they have a question about a fingering, I know it. Whereas I can trust my more advanced kids that they can figure out the fingerings on their own. But the quality shouldn't be different. The end goal is the same, it's just a different approach. If that makes sense.

Researcher: Okay. Just one other thing. Are either of these pieces familiar to you prior to today and how?

T2: Yes, *Ammerland*, I played probably now about seven or eight years ago, because I had a really good euphonium player and I had a small band. I didn't have very good clarinets, but a lot of the clarinet stuff was in the low register, so it was good for just having them play out. It fixed a lot of the stuff in our band. It's a good piece to play to work on expression.

There's technical issues in it, but it's not so outlandish that you can't do really good stuff. You can spend a lot of time on that piece, because every measure has something in it to explore. I've heard of the *Three Ayres*, I've never done it myself. It's around there in the literature, I've probably heard recordings of it, but I have never looked down and played through it or looked through it.

Researcher: What was the level of your group that you did *Ammerland* with?

T2: The *Ammerland* I did with a high school, but it was a small school. I had 35, 40 kids in the whole entire program. I think it was my third year in, maybe?

They trusted me enough to be able for me to spend a lot of time, because a piece like *Ammerland*, if the kids don't trust you, you don't want to spend a bunch of time talking about a chorale at every single note, because they're not going to have the attention span for it. You have to build that trust first.

APPENDIX F

Interview Transcript of GS1

Researcher: How would you define musical score study?

GS1: It's interesting because it defines itself, score study. I guess if we break it down, the score is the music that you're going to be teaching. The study part of it is really the more interesting aspect I guess. Getting to know what's in the score, getting to know perhaps the musical elements first. Learning about melody versus harmony, chord changes, melodic development, metric development, form, your basic theory components of the score. For educators, the next step is the application of how you're going to take that score and apply it in your classroom. The next steps of score study for a teacher would be comparing instrumental parts, finding the most challenging parts, making sure it fits with your ensemble, making sure you'll have all the needs for it. Probably, those two things, getting to know the music itself and then studying, figuring out how you'll apply it and teach it.

Researcher: Where or from whom do you think that definition was most solidified? Where do you feel like you got that information?

GS1: Probably teaching. I don't remember much of that from my conducting courses in undergraduate classes. That was also eight or nine years ago. It's a little bit rusty in my memory. I would say the theory aspect, more recently at the graduate level but then the applicable part of it in trying to figure out how it fits with my ensemble and how to teach the melody and how to break the melody down and how to inform the ensemble of who's got the harmonies and who's playing the third, and all that different stuff that you pull out of the score, I probably learned in the field in front of kids.

Researcher: Just to clarify, more theory and analysis in school?

GS1: Yes.

Researcher: Can you talk about your experience with score study? You can mention specific pieces, or you can just kind of give me a general overview on what you've done with it in your career and in your school.

GS1: Sure. For me, there's two levels of-- I don't know if I should say of difficulty but with easier stuff like grade 2—2.5 literature, you see a lot of homophonic writing. You see melody and block chords in the background. You see, maybe if you're lucky some counterpoint, and you see large swaths of music in one key area. For that literature, it's pretty easy to do. Okay, the trumpets and clarinets have the melody. We'll rehearse them together, etcetera, through the score. So for those easier pieces, there's not a lot of resources

involved. You don't really need to dig in to texts about pieces. You can figure most of that stuff on your own and the chordal analysis is very basic. Then, when it comes to the more technical literature grades 3.5 and up, where you get into some more of your standard high school literature or music of "serious artistic merit", you'll find that a lot of material has already been written on that music. For instance, what I'm doing with the Holst, Second (Suite) right now is pouring through the resources that have already been written. I went to the "Teaching Music Through Performance in Band series because it's in the very first edition, and reading about the history of the piece and the folk songs in the piece and the formal analysis and the chordal analysis and the Picardy third at the end of the third movement, stuff like that where I could sit down with the score and really pour through it and spend hours and hours, or I could avoid re-inventing the wheel and go find what somebody else has already done. Its two different approaches. If you put a middle school band piece in front of me, I'm probably going to open it up and start sight-singing the melody and do it on my own. If you put something more complex in front of me, I might flip through the score first, but then I'm going to go elsewhere to get some help.

Researcher: Okay. I like that you've broken this down into two levels because that helps a lot. Now, what methods are you going to use to study the score? You just mentioned a little bit about singing through the melody if it were a more basic piece. Maybe like the Holst Suite: Are you going to do similar things? Are you going to sit at the piano? Do you play it on your instrument or mark the score? Do you use recordings? What's your approach between the two?

GS1: A lot of times with the simpler tunes, even just looking at the score, I can get a pretty good feel for what it's going to sound like. With the more complex music or more challenging or more difficult, I'm not sure what the right word is.... I don't know if complex is the right word for it, but for the higher level literature, I seek out as many recordings as I can find. Start with the Corporon, Fennell, and Tokyo recordings and then work your way down through some of the lesser YouTube videos because those professional level groups and the North Texas Wind Symphony recordings are going to be pretty polished and give you a good feel for what it should sound like, and then those recordings of small universities with less-esteemed bands, that's going to show you the challenges you're going to find when teaching that piece. Also that just puts me in the sound space of the piece because when there's more lines, it's a lot more challenging for me to hear to like audiate ahead of time with what it's going to be like. Finding recordings... as I go through the score, I will try to conduct with it as I go across so that I could see how well the piece flows with metric changes. I'm not sure if this is answering your question, but the more experienced you get, the more you see how things-- like just looking at the score, how things pass through the ensemble. Seeing numbers of instruments playing the melody and then things like full tutti sections versus solos and solis, and noticing what different timbres they're going after. Those are just different things that help you get to know it. Does that answer the question?

Researcher: Yes. Absolutely. You taught middle school for six years. In that time, did you do any kind of marking in the score, or if you did, what was it geared towards? Or maybe you didn't, I don't know.

GS1: With the easier music, there was not a whole lot to mark. If I did, it was usually pitch tendency sorts of things related to third of the chord, helping trombones raise that fifth position, G-flat, when it's the 3rd of the E-flat minor chord, or something like that but because those pieces are so easy to diagnose just at a glance, there wasn't a whole lot of need for queuing or dynamic contrast or anything because it's usually a hairpin crescendo, decrescendo in every single part. It's kind of hard to miss.

Researcher: What influences your score study then? Your experience is in teaching, so it seems like most of your score study is motivated by the pedagogical aspect. Would you agree with that, disagree with that? Would you say that it changes? What kind of motivates it?

GS1: The first thing, evaluating whether or not I'm going to perform a piece, the first thing to do is to find the zone of proximal development. You look for the most challenging parts to see if it's going to be too much for your ensemble. I will look for trumpet range, clarinets across the break and challenging pinky fingerings, numbers of percussion parts and rhythmic complexity. Also if it's too easy, you gotta pass on it because then they'll just get bored. That would be the first thing is finding the difficulty level of the piece. If it's appropriate for the ensemble. Then to teach it, I would start looking for again the most challenging parts to try to get ahead of the game. If I knew I was going to pass out a piece in January, I would start working on certain rhythmic aspects from it in November and December to get ahead of the game, so those rhythms weren't a complete shock when I passed the piece out. I would also take the most challenging melodic or rhythmic aspects, like little chunks of music, and I would write them out for the entire ensemble just in finale, just plug in the part and then copy and paste down the score. Rather than spending 15 minutes of rehearsal working with just the clarinets on the melody, the entire ensemble would practice that. In order to find those parts, you have to delve into the score. I would think about balance and blend, looking for numbers of people on the melody versus numbers of people on the harmony. For instance, one year, I had a particularly small trombone section, so I had to find those parts where they had the melody and re-write so that I could boost those numbers with the euphonium or a tenor saxophone or something along those lines. Style. My kids played marches, three or four a year at least because it's just our thing. It's the history of what we do and I felt like stylistically and historically, my kids needed to play marches. You teach the length of notes a little bit differently for those than you do for a ballad or a Richard Saucedo, fast and furious kind of piece. Looking for those types of things and then how can I incorporate those into a warm-up to get them playing with the lifted staccato but full sound and stuff like that.

Researcher: We'll go to the score study test now. I will now provide you with one of two full band scores. Score number one is titled Three Ayres from Gloucester, movement one. Please look at the score and study it as if you are preparing to rehearse an ensemble of high school students who are reading it for the first time. As you are studying the score, please speak aloud which elements of the music you are addressing. The end result should be a list of objectives you would like to accomplish with the ensemble during the first rehearsal. You can literally write those down if you like or you can merely speak them aloud. This list can have as many or as few tasks as you feel necessary. Once you have completed the

list, I'll have a short list of questions for you. Go ahead, and from start to finish tell me everything you're thinking about.

GS1: The first thing I noticed is the alla breve, cut time... and cornets and snare drum immediately start with the equivalent of a dotted-eighth-sixteenth rhythm. I would want to see... oh, and there it is again in measure seven. A lot of high school students don't subdivide. I'd want to do something with the ensemble to help them delineate a dotted-eighth-sixteenth from a kind of a more triplet feel.

[Silence]

There's a lot of snare drum rolls, which would concern me with technique and consistency through the rolls because they also have to do that with a lot of dynamics. It might be something to talk with them about if there's a chance to get to the back of the room and work on stick height and consistency through the roll. And are they going to buzz roll or are they going to use a rudiment. A lot of slurs. I see the melody and after 9, 12 into 13 has a slur, "dit-daaa, dit-daaa". I would want to make sure that the note that's slurred to is not clipped. The same thing after 17. Triangle technique at 25. A lot of percussionists, especially at the high school level, don't really care and just play with really bad technique. There's a lot of softer playing. I've noticed lots of mezzo pianos. Especially in the accompaniment role. I would want to have some consistency of air flow for everybody, but I'm noticing at 43, "and oone and oone and one, two". I would want to work a little bit with some consistency of air flow in the low brass, the low reeds to get a nice, full, warm sound at that softer dynamic. A lot of younger students, when they see soft dynamics, they don't take full breaths, and so their softer dynamics are not a good quality sound. Just in general, I would want to talk about foreground, middle ground, background... helping point out. It looks pretty obvious who's got the melody, who's got the accompaniment. It would just be one of those things where it would probably just take pointing out once, and also it looks like Mr. Stuart did a pretty good job of writing that into the dynamics. Most of the melodies are mezzo forte and forte, and most of the backgrounds are mezzo forte minus. The horn part gets just a little rang-y maybe for some freshmen or sophomores. It's got, like before 59, all four parts up toward the top of the staff, yeah after 17. A little chromatic passage. D, D-sharp, E... That E is not a very good note for horn. Really, the only tempo thing I saw is the rallentando right before 59. There's nothing real complicated about that. Just keeping it steady, light and lifted. I'm assuming from the title and the bounciness of the melody that it's more of a courtly festival, courtly air kind of march. Keeping things nice and steady. A slower British march.

Researcher: Now, we're in front of the high school band, what's the first priority? What's the very first thing that you dive in with?

GS1: With this tune?

Researcher: Yes. You can tell me your exact process. Whatever it is you would do.

GS1: My first goal with sight-reading, usually was just to get through the piece. Get them in the sound space, get the tune in their ear, give them an idea of what the music is like. I

would usually just tackle it under tempo, maybe even a moderate four, if it's not quite an experienced ensemble in cut time. Maybe transition to conducting in cut time a little bit later on. Just get through the piece and cue as best I could and talk them through it. Yell out measure numbers to help everybody stay involved, stop and restart if you have to, encourage good sight-reading techniques.

Before starting would be a scan of the piece, talk through it. It takes 30 seconds to say, "All right, let's scan this music and look for any dynamic contrast or any rhythms you don't understand or articulations." Like I said, that usually takes just 30 seconds to a minute. Unless there's something that is really out of their reach, then you might actually have to break it down. Then just jump in and play. Then once you've done a run, then they've got a feel for what it's supposed to sound like and you've got a feel for the worst sections.

Instead of spending 15 minutes rehearsing the first 12 measures, which might not actually be that bad, you can dig into some of the stuff that didn't go quite as well.

Researcher: Do you notice anything specific that you almost guarantee will be a specific problem? Is there anything in there that you can predict before?

GS1: [laughs] Yes, there's some accidentals. Trombones, baritones, F-sharp, Tenor saxophone, G-sharp, those are all together. Tuba B -natural in measure 50. The key of F is not bad. Well, in the Key of F you're going to have a lot of students miss E-naturals-- Concert E natural, so, that's definitely something to point out at the beginning. Rhythmically, it's not challenging. Just like I said a little bit earlier in the interview, making sure that the dotted eighth-sixteenth rhythm or in cut time, the dotted quarter-eighth rhythm is really precise.

Researcher: All right. I think you pretty much answered my other questions as you were going through, so we'll skip those. I'll take that score back. Thank you. Score number two is titled, "Ammerland." Instructions for this score-- I do have one more question, actually, before we get to that. Are you familiar with this piece?

GS1: No.

Researcher: You never heard it or seen it? Okay. The next one's titled 'Ammerland'. It's the same instructions as score number one. Speak freely as you're studying the score and when you're finished I'll ask a few questions if there remain any.

GS1: I do have experience with this piece. I performed it in an honor band, when I was in high school, like a district ensemble. Then bought it for my library but never programmed it because the trumpet part is just a bit too high. There it is. Measure 35, that A above the staff. For my eighth grade trumpets, it was just out of reach, comfortably. I maybe had one that could pull that off nicely with a good tone quality. Andante Espressivo. We like that. Basic melody, harmony, stays in the softer dynamic realm for a while. Like he wrote in basically some phrasing, it looks like. His dynamics are kind of like a musical guide. Abrupt switch from that soli playing to a full tutti at 16. Little tempo change. Long slurs with eighth notes in the euphonium. Oh, just the euphonium line. So, that would be something with a younger ensemble if you've got them playing by themselves... Like what

I mentioned before with the homophony, there's at least three parts here. There's a melody, there's a background and there's a counterpoint line. That's nice, to get some different texture for the ensemble to hear. Full ensemble forte at 24, but then one measure later, he's got the full ensemble decrescendo. Again, it's almost like he wrote in the musicality saying, "Swell here, go away here," which those young students need because they don't have experience with making music like that yet. Key change. I would want to work in C major before starting this piece. There's going to be some nasty missed B-naturals in a lot of sections, probably. I would want to work this clarinet and flute line at 31. It's just a high G for the flute, that's not that bad, but it's a fingering some of the younger ones might not be that used to. They might try to put their thumb down instead of leaving it off.

I would try to find some way before this to work with the brass section to play a little bit in that more upper register before-- at least in the warm-ups so they would at least have played all these notes before getting to this piece. The euphoniums are getting up to a G above the staff, horns are sitting up towards the top of the staff a couple of times, then that first trumpet part. The 16th note triplet in measure 38 at the beginning of the measure in the horns and euphonium, and then later in the measure the trumpets. C major scale, or what is that? G-mixolydian or G-lydian, in 38. There's plenty of stuff in here to really dig into. Snare drums playing sex-tuplets in 38. Molto rallentando to the end. I've noticed that from 31 on, it's forte. Then the trombones have a big final push at the end, last two measures before the decrescendo out. I would want to try to play with the ensemble some longer sections of forte to keep the air moving and to keep them from dying off, and with a good sound. Finding a comfortable forte that's not going to push the high school ensemble to a bad sound.

At this slower tempo it's all about keeping the air moving, sustaining pianos and fortes, so both extremes of the dynamic levels with good sounds. Working the three parts like in measure 16 and then later on where there's some counterpoint. Measure 31 there's very clearly three different levels, trumpet melody with euphoniums, then the flute-clarinet counter line, then everybody else on the chordal accompaniment. Helping them find that balance of who has the most important parts. There's some more dotted eight-sixteenth rhythms. Measures 26, 28. Those are echoes of the other instruments in 25 and 27. Making sure that 16th note is precisely on the "a (uh)". Then practicing that key change, maybe even taking them through some 1-4-5-1 progressions in E flat and then in C so they can hear those two different chordal areas.

Researcher: What do you think is the big-picture glaring issue that you'll have to address first?

GS1: Tempo. Being able to maintain 72 beats per minute without rushing or slowing down. Sometimes these can drag out. That's usually the conductor's fault. The speeding up is something that a younger ensemble's going to want to do with eighth notes falling in the hole. Especially like these euphonium parts, where there's a whole strain of eighth notes in a row, or the clarinets back in measure 7, and just getting them to keep that steady time. I'd say maintaining the tempo, and then sustaining the long sounds. Not breathing on the bar lines for the accompaniment instruments. It's kind of two things.

Researcher: You are familiar with this piece? Was it middle school? High school?

GS1: I think I was either sophomore or a junior. It was like an all-district ensemble that performed this.

Researcher: Were you preparing it, you said, at one point with your 8th graders?

GS1: No, I thought about teaching it. I had ordered the piece. It was in my library. The score was like one of those that was just-- I considered it every year but it always seemed just out of reach for my 8th-grade ensemble. It's a really pretty piece.

APPENDIX G

Interview Transcript of GS2

Researcher: How would you define musical score study?

GS2: It is the conductor or performers opportunity to intimately get to know the score, preferably before they have performed it or started to rehearse it. To take time to find the harmonic structure, the musical language and diction of the piece. To find the phrase shapings, and to go beyond what's on the printed page so that when they do begin to rehearse it and then subsequently perform it, they have the most intimate knowledge of the piece.

Researcher: Where or from who would you attribute that definition? From a particular person or experience?

GS2: That would probably be just an amalgamation, if that's the right word, of all the professors that I have had, specifically conducting professors, so [conducting professor 1], [conducting professor 2], and [conducting professor 3] who was here before [conducting professor 2]. They were the ones who I've most learned that from. Then again I also have picked up on solo score study, looking at a clarinet part with a piano part and that sort of thing from my clarinet professors. It's a hodgepodge of really every musical instructor that I've had related to rehearsal, conducting, performing, those sorts of things.

Researcher: What experience do you personally have with scores study?

GS2: My first opportunities to score study were as a drum major in high school and college, and that's when you haven't really learned about it so you learn the time signature and where to show a crescendo and a decrescendo, and that's about it. Then of course I had conducting classes in my undergraduate and then the bulk of my score study came as a teacher when I taught for five years in the public school system and definitely feel like that was some of my best score study but also just being a teacher. That's also where I had some of the least amounts of scores study. Maybe the piece would come in, and we really needed to read it that day, so I'd be conducting blind, literal sight-reading.

Like I said, the best and worst. And then my most recent experience is now that I'm back as a conducting graduate student, and I'm learning to go beyond what I had done as a public school teacher and do even more work with the score in advance of conducting. I'm doing it for conducting lessons. I have pieces that I'm conducting with different ensembles that I get to spend some time, and that's fun because when I was teaching, I was the only person who ever saw the work that went into my score study. Now I've got somebody usually looking over my shoulder. Some of the things I've done, like nobody really score studied

the orchestra piece with me, that was my own thing. Stuff I'm doing with the bands, I've got people saying you didn't mark this or what a good mark there and that sort of thing.

Researcher: What methods are you using or have you used in terms of studying the score. Some examples may be audiation, singing, playing piano, playing on your primary instrument, do you mark the score, how do you mark the score, do you listen to recordings?

GS2: I know this is not what a lot of people say, but I really do like to hear a recording first. I know you're supposed to audiate it first according to most people, but because most of the time when I pick a piece, I will have heard it before so I want to now be able to hear it and see the score along with it. Then I'll step away. I'll only listen to one, maybe two to get a variety of styles, but then I'll step away from it because I do want to have my own interpretation, and I don't want my interpretation to just be the recording that I heard. I may listen to one when I first have the score in front of me, but then I'll step away from it.

First thing I do is very, very basic just marking the time signature changes if there are any, nice and big so I can see them. Marking the key signature changes so I'll know when my students are going to play the wrong notes as they often want to do. Then just marking whose got melody, foreground, middle ground, background. That's my first big snapshot of the piece, and if I haven't listened or even if I have but just trying to get my own sound, I will really try to hear it as I'm going through that first one. Then, what I've learned in my return to college is to take it a step further, and I'll go in and I'll really start to work on the phrase shaping. A lot of times as a teacher, that didn't really come until I was with the students rehearsing and I was saying, "Okay, now that you know the notes and rhythms, we need to do something with it." And we would decide in the moment.

Now that I have a deeper understanding of it, I can already have done that in my preliminary score study. I'll go in and I'll do things with musical line and note grouping and implied syncopation and emphasis to repetition and all these "[conducting professor 1]" buzzwords. They seemed like buzzwords to me six months ago when I was just starting. I was like, "he says that a lot but I don't know what it means", but now I get it and I see it for myself. Six months ago I never thought I would. Now he's saying, "Oh I really like how you've marked that." It makes me feel like I've found that inner-side of music.

Short goes to long and those sorts of things. I'll get those marked. I don't do color. I was just talking with the other graduate students today about -- they like to do different colors for different things and I think that would be cool, but I think I'm a little too, like that would probably be a little bit too much information for me. I wouldn't process it so I do just use plain black pencil. If it's something really important and I need to grab a red pen, I'll mark that. Most of the time it's all the same color and it's usually pretty illegible to anybody but me.

Researcher: And what kinds of things influence your score study? The nice thing about your situation is you can talk maybe about how there's a contrast or is there a contrast between when you were teaching and now. You've already talked about some of the things that you're looking for. How do you decide what's most important?

GS2: I mostly think about what is going to be important for me to remember during the performance. If there's a certain cue that needs to be shown every time, then I've got to mark that in because I may forget. I may get in the moment and forget. If the baritones are really counting on, "Oh, we're doing festival prelude right now", and they have this sudden tempo change and I have to be in their neighborhood every time.

I've got that marked in the score. Now that's one that I probably would not have thought of during my preliminary score study but rather as I'm teaching the piece and I'm seeing that, "Oh, they're just not getting this with a simple cue, I really have to show it to them." That probably wouldn't have made it in the score until we'd started rehearsing. Those things that I have to know during the performance.

Now things that I'll put in during preliminary score study, I'm thinking about what's going to be important during rehearsal, what are the things I really need to go after to make sure that they understand the line, to make sure that they understand their role in the bigger piece and, I had a third thing and I forgot it... Yes, they have to know their part in the overall big picture. If I can predetermine some spots that they're likely to mess up, that doesn't mean that they're going to, but they're likely to mess up or likely to need help shaping the phrase or finding the line, then I'll try to mark that in advance.

Researcher: Are all those things pretty much the same now as they were when you were in classroom?

GS2: None of that stuff about note grouping and line shaping. I didn't really have a knowledge of that. Certainly phrasing and phrase shaping was part of my musical dialect. That was it, making sure they had the same musical dialect, that was the third thing. I had what I would call a very, not basic, because I do think that we were able to, especially my top ensemble, we were able to go pretty far with some pretty musical ideas but even the younger groups as well. I had it, but definitely now that I've come back to school, I've found that next level of it. I did certainly have a lot of markings for phrasing and shaping the line and musicality because, I mean that's really the difference between a good band a great band. You can hear one band play *October* and they'll play all the notes on the page. They'll do some big and small dynamics. Then you hear another group that plays it with phrases that go somewhere. Just this shape that shows that they've gone beyond what's printed on the page.

That's a good indicator that that conductor has done their score study in advance. Then they've, even more importantly, shared it with the students and helped them understand it. Hopefully, students' score study, they only have one line on their page, but there's a lot that can be marked on that for their purposes as well. I also have just realized that most of what I'm talking about is the shaping and phrasing and stuff because that's what I'm better at.

A huge part of score study that I haven't even scraped the surface of is the harmonic. I'm looking this way (motions horizontally) but the vertical, and how the parts fit together into chords and where the chords go is a big part of it too. That's never been my strength. The first two years that I taught, I had an assistant director. He was incredible at building chords

and honing technique, and musical listening with the students. Whereas my stuff was the articulations, the musicality, the dynamics and the phrase shaping.

We really fit together well, and I think an opportunity we missed was to score study each other's scores. We occasionally would trade pieces to rehearse with the students. If we had had the opportunity to go in and say in his score, I could have said, "Oh here's a line you're not phrasing the way I would" or "you haven't addressed it." He could've gotten in and said, "Oh, here's a great diminished 7th chord that you haven't isolated."

If we had traded scores for a while, we could've both made ourselves better at score study, but also made it to another level with our pieces. Then when he was gone, and I had two years on my own, I tried to force myself to be better at that and to find some more of that harmonic language, but then I also just continued to work with my strong suit which was the musical phrasing.

The one score that I really got in depth with, both in terms of musicality and harmonic language, was *Blaze* by Steve Rouse. When I left my job, I went into the library. We had multiple copies of that score, but I took that score with me because there were so many markings in it, that I've never marked a score in detail as I did with that piece. It was one of the more challenging pieces that I've ever done, so I kept that as a souvenir.

Researcher: We'll go ahead and go to the score study task.

GS2: Okay.

Researcher: I'll now provide you with one of two full bands scores. Score number one is titled, *Three Ayres from Gloucester*, movement one. Please look at this score and study it as if you are preparing to rehearse an ensemble of high school students who are reading it for the first time. As you are studying this score, please speak aloud which elements in the music you are addressing.

The end result should be a list of objectives you would like to accomplish with the ensemble during the first rehearsal. This list can have as many or as few tasks as you feel necessary. You can write it down if you like or you can maintain a train of thought. Either way is fine. Once you've completed the list, I'll have a few more questions for you.

GS2: Okay. Question though, just the first movement or the whole piece?

Researcher: You just have the first movement. Yes.

GS2: Okay. Good to know. You just want me to narrate as I--

Researcher: Absolutely. Everything that comes across your train of thought.

GS2: The first thing I see is our key signature here which looks a lot like F. Got the key signature of F. We are in cut time so, I'm marking that a little bit bigger up top. Smaller scores, I tend to miss that. Allegretto, 96 for the half note, so I've circled that just to remind myself. The allegretto really tells me it's probably going to be a light style. I put a little

bracket around, we've got a trumpet/cornet melody here, right at the beginning. “Di, di, dit, dit” and it's staccato so, it's definitely going to be light. That first rehearsal, we'll probably sight-read right through but I can almost certainly tell you the first thing we'll have to do is lighten up, put some space in between those quarter notes. Then almost immediately go into a more smooth style so, I made a smooth—matter of fact, I'm going to write smooth up at the top in that third measure. Get some contrast there and then immediately back to light style. I'm putting some tenutos underneath these beat four quarter notes. Not for a longer style but for the idea of four going to one. These pickups can get dropped a lot of times, and so I know I'm going to have to emphasize da, di, tat, tat, tat, tat, tah, ti, tat, tat, tat, tat, tat, tah. Four, always going to one.

The inner beat eighth notes, they also might get swallowed up. I'm circling the two and three so that that gets brought up. I'm going to note this decrescendo here, and draw it up top for myself in case I need to show it. At nine, I'm going to circle this mezzo piano and my next probably rehearsal task is going to be that-- The accompaniment is probably going to play that too loud and cover up the clarinet solo so, I'm going to put a little plus, mezzo forte plus for the solo, get them to play out a little bit more and then just really with a good sound, not holding them back but keeping the accompaniment at a low dynamic. I'm going to put a little tenuto on these quarter notes in the accompaniment so they play a full quarter note and not just a “dat”. I'm going to definitely rehearse that. [Pause] A little crescendo here is important, but I will make sure to rehearse with the students that it's a crescendo by addition.

More people are playing so they're not going to have to force that. They're just going to relax and as more people join in, it will get louder. Put a little bracket around a cornet melody that comes in here along with flutes. I want to be able to just see as I'm scanning the page. Clarinets have the melody, now its flutes and trumpets, so I like to do a little bracket to give me a heads-up there.

They can handle that. Then a little decrescendo here going into 17, back to the clarinet solo so, same items as before. This is a repeated section so, if they remember it more or less, small changes. A little bit more active cornet line here. One of my biggest things to work with students on is that, the audience is going to get bored if they hear the same thing twice in a row so, we want to bring out what's new.

Cornet two, I'm even writing cornet two above it to make sure that I don't forget about that. That's a new line, so that's going to need to come out a little bit more. A nice big fade out there. I want to make sure the release is together but not clipped. I'll just put a little lift there at the end of the third beat. Now we have a flute melody. Again, we're going to want to make sure-- and I like it when the composers have marked the accompaniment dynamics softer. Some will just put forte down the page and then they all try to play forte. The fact that they're marked mezzo piano is really going to help not cover up this flute melody. [Pause] We'll spend a few minutes with the flutes here on our “dits” and our “da”, the accent. I'm going to make sure that those are clear and then our “doo” the tenuto. I want to make sure those are very distinct.

Then, I see this little interjection here, our fourth measure of this section, from the lower voices. The baritone, some of the low reeds, bassoon, we'll make sure that's heard and in time. Then, we're back to flute, and they get their interjection again right at the end. When we get to 33, we get this brass color. It's a different color altogether. I'm even writing, "New color" up at the top. New dynamic of forte. I would probably rehearse this "bopped" or just with the accents so we get that trade-off of dat, dat, da, dat, dat, da, dat, dat, da. I'm going to make a note to do that, rehearse attacks only. So a little note to myself which, once we've rehearsed the piece and they've got that, I might erase or I might leave it so that three months later, when we're getting ready to go to the festival, might be good to refresh our memory on what we did the first day. I may leave that note in there for myself. And then we get the color shift back to flutes and the accompaniment, so we want to play in a similar style to what we did before. Nice big decrescendo there and our little interjection from the low voices again, and then our cornet solo.

I want to make sure we get a nice warm color out of the accompaniment, and I'm going to pay attention to the staccato on beat 4. Making sure that's not too short, just nice and light. Again, here is a crescendo that's not going to need a whole lot of help because more people start playing. So, a nice crescendo by addition there. Nobody has to force the sound. The woodwinds and other trumpets that come in on the melody are going to want to blend with that trumpet solo. It should be a color change but not hugely different. We don't want to disrupt things. And then the decrescendo back into the trumpet solo. Again, that addition of players will automatically make it louder.

Here is an interpretive moment that I may not catch if I didn't know the piece. We've got this rallentando there before 59. Prior to that, I would slow down just a little bit in the measure before. I am going to put-- and to mark a rallentando, I usually just mark a backwards arrow. Then I'm going to slow down just a little bit right before (sings the line, slowing down)... and that's probably a little bit more aggressive of a slowdown than I would do, but I like to set that up a little bit. I think it's a little jarring if it happens right there on that last measure. I put that ritard there, and I am going to circle the second note and that's something I would rehearse with the students. The ones who have the whole note should start fading pretty quickly so that we hear the second note. More than likely, they would all just get to it and hang out there and you wouldn't hear that change of pitch. Even though a lot of people have it, the whole note people can still cover it up.

Then we are back to the beginning, and I am even going to write that like the beginning, so we get that same style, (sings line) nice and light, then smoothe again, (sings line) nice rallentando here that is going to last almost all the way to the end. So we've got a long arrow, four measures, (sings) not too much at first, (sings) and 4 and 1. And I would slow it down enough that I would probably need to show 3 and 4 and 1. So I'll write in 3 and 4 and 1 at the top. And I'll likely show all of that because I am a control freak. I can't just let them do it on their own.

If they really understand 3 and 4 and 1, then I would probably take that out but certainly not within the first week of rehearsal at least. Get them really comfortable with how it should sound, then step back and let them go a little bit on their own. Yeah, those tempo changes... In a rehearsal, we would probably, I think the first thing I would do, call their

attention to the time signature, the tempo and the key, have them sizzle through it [Mouth generated music sounds], maybe through the whole piece. If not, then at least the first chunk of it and really make sure that their attention has been drawn to the articulation, then we take a play through of it and see what they get on their own and what they don't. And if not, I've made that list of, "Here's some of the major things we'll need to talk about."

Researcher: Okay. Very good. You answered a lot of my questions already. A couple of additional things though.

GS2: Yes.

Researcher: When you are reading it for the first time, how are you going to read it differently from that first reading versus concert festival, for instance?

GS2: So you mean when we are playing in the ensemble?

Researcher: Yes.

GS2: That first time, I am going to be fighting the entire time not to stop, because my natural inclination is, when I hear something that isn't how it's supposed to be, I want to go ahead and start fixing it. So that first read, I have to actually be actively thinking keep going, keep going. Trying to take some mental notes on what went wrong so that I-- and maybe even stopping and making a note in the score, versus on the concert... if something goes wrong, I try not to really take note of it because then, I am going to get frustrated. I try to just let it pass unless it's something that's gone wrong, that's affecting what's coming after. Then I have to take on a surgeon role and get in and say, "I've got to fix this, you are not playing in the right style, and you are out of time." If it's something that happened and it can't be -- I can't worry about it. There will be time for that if we want to analyze it, when we're going back and listening to it. If it's a pre-festival concert and there's still time to fix it, great, but even then, in the performance, I am not going to worry about it unless it's directly affecting what's going to happen next. In the concert itself, you just have to let it go because you're just going to make yourself frustrated or you're going to look at the kid and it's going to make them frustrated. They're are going to think oh he is upset at me and then they're going to make ten more mistakes. That was a problem for me the first year or two. I would, "You didn't do that right", just give them that look and then I realized that then, I ruined the rest of the concert for them. For that one child, they couldn't play anything else right. So I cut that then I try to just give positive feedback unless it's a "Come on, we can fix this" kind of gesture, then that can help.

Researcher: Okay. Did you say you were familiar with this piece?

GS2: Yes, did that ruin my participation in this study?

Researcher: Absolutely not, but I would like you to elaborate on how.

GS2: Well, it's funny too. I had played it when I was a sophomore in high school, just for an all-district band though. I didn't get super acquainted with it, and actually at that point in my life, I didn't like it. It was not what I would consider at that time, an exciting piece.

Plus I was second chair and I didn't think the first chair guy was playing the clarinet solos very well. Interestingly enough, I ended up student teaching with the conductor of that all-district band. My second time to encounter it was when I was not an actual teacher of record at the high school. I was waiting, trying to find a job and I was helping out at a high school.

They were getting ready to do this piece for a festival and they were doing a preview performance on an arts festival program, and both conductors were unavailable that day. One had a funeral and the other had a wedding and they were just like, "Think you can step in and do it?" and I was like "Okay" and so my score study that time was, "Okay, there's cut time and then it slows down, okay here we go!" I really got thrown into it, so there was very little score study. Side note was that the principal was at that performance and wanted to know who the stranger was that was conducting the band, was impressed and when the assistant director job came open about three months later, she called me up and said... so this piece is kind of special for me.

Then a few years later, I had programmed it for my concert band, and I programmed a grade four piece for my symphonic band, my second band. That wasn't going to work, so we ended up combining the two and sticking with this piece as our piece to take to festival and that's when I- I mean, heavy duty score study after I had developed my interpretations. Some heavy duty listening to many different recordings, heavy duty conferencing with other conductors I knew had conducted it before and then last of all, heavy duty guest conductors to come in and rehearse, including the teacher that I student taught with who I had played it with the first time but also the middle school director because it was in his library, my former assistant band director came back and that was a massive-- since I combined my two lower bands that year, it was almost a hundred member band. It was like, when [former assistant band director] came in and guest conducted, it was like he was doing an honor band because it was so big. They conducted off my score and I actually-- the reason I mentioned having these guest conductors in, is because I actively encouraged them as you're teaching things that aren't marked in my score, please mark them in there. I kind of regret not having stolen that score too because it was a really well-marked score, but it's just a very functional piece for a variety of levels but you could do it with a really good middle school band. You could do it with a really good college band.

If future me could go back to that 10th grade me and say, "You're actually going to have a lot of experience with that piece." Tenth grade me would probably say, "Shut up, you're a nerd." [Laughs] Yes, it's a great piece.

Researcher: You by far have the most experience with this piece

GS2: That's awesome.

Researcher: Very interesting. Good. I think that covers it for this one, we'll go on to the next one.

GS2: Cool. I didn't realize when you handed it to me that it was just the first movement or I wouldn't have asked that dumb question.

Researcher: No, not at all. No dumb questions. The score number two is titled Ammerland. The instructions for this score are the same as score number one. Please speak freely as you study it, and when you're finished I'll see if I have any remaining questions.

GS2: Awesome. Thanks. Probably just because they're in another language, but I'm immediately drawn to the notes here at the start of the piece. I think for this one, the previous one as well, because people are going to be trying to figure out how to say, "Cholmondeley" which is actually "chumley"... That's something I should have taken note of too, because if you can get that out of their mind, okay, they know what that is, they're not going to be distracted by that.

Here I'm looking at this, they're going to want to know what Ammerland is. So it's good to read the background, plus it paints a really nice picture of yellow blossoms and lush meadows and endless country roads and an exquisite lakeside. That's already going to put in their minds what they should be picturing when they're playing this. What kind of picture are they trying to paint? I think that's really important for them to know and it's a part of score study that often does get bypassed when we're going, "Okay, here's our first chord and it's built on that and the inversion is...", we can quantify music a little too much sometimes. It's good to know what the story is with the piece, Ammerland. I'll probably, before we even play it say, "Here's what you should be thinking." And don't just let me dictate what you should be thinking. What do you hear?

Most the time that I was gone, like when I would take kids to all district band, and I'd be gone for two or three days, one of the assignments I would leave would just be a CD of recordings of our festival music and make them write. They hated it, but they knew what I was going for with it. Make them write and just tell me a story of what do you hear when you-- and I would get the most fantastic stories about space cowboys and love stories between a girl and her cat, and all kinds of things.

It really benefited the music. We see our key signature here of three flats. Gotta point that out first. Three flats of course for our C instruments. Regular common time, four-four pattern. 72, andante espressivo. Espressivo is a dangerous word for me to see because it means I get to do what I want. I get to take some time here and there. I would even put the word rubato above that because I know it's going to be important.

Okay, so we've got melody in clarinet 1/2/3, tenor saxophone and euphonium. I would actually probably, possibly even before putting accompaniment in, just hear that group because that's not a group that always gets to play together. I'm going to make a note that I want these guys to just hear each other and work on blending. Maybe even by going one on a part first and then adding the others so that it doesn't get clarinet dominated or euphonium dominated. I want all those colors.

That being said, being a clarinet player, I want the clarinet color to be predominant and supported by the tenor saxophone and euphonium. I think a lot of non-clarinet players would agree with that too. Next thing I see is here in measure four. We've got this "And-Four-And-One" actually I skipped-- We've got "One-And-A-Three", so I'm bracketing that in our French horns. Putting a little star that, depending on what the French horn content

of the band is, we may want the saxes to play that as well, but if I can just have French horns, that color is what I want.

Bass clarinet, Bari sax: and four and one. That's great. It needs to gently push into the next measure. Then we go back to clarinets, tenor saxophone and euphoniums. That first measure (sings) I'd like to really have them go for that low note and then relax as they come off of it. Although, I'm open to having the band try some different interpretations. Maybe backing away from the low note and pushing into the top. I prefer it the other way, but sometimes when you play with a different band than you have before, they find some things that they sound really good on, but I would tend to push to the lowest note and then relax as we come up. That sets you up really nicely for this crescendo into measure 9 which I marked above so I don't forget about. This is one though that we don't want to -- clarinets could get really dramatic there and really push, but it's only the ninth measure in the piece. I'm going to say note too forte there.

That is really the most dramatic moment of this opening phrase, so it does get-- I put a little star above it. Once again, this composer has, and or editor, whoever has done it has done a really nice job of just putting a nice mezzo forte in the accompaniment so that they don't cover the melody. That is another spot where it would be really easy for them to get too excited on their whole notes.

And then we get this nice tradeoff section here between the French horn one: two and three and four a one... and then it gets passed to back to the clarinets and they're just going to trade that back and forth for a while. So we want to make sure that as soon as they get to their long tone, they immediately decrescendo. I'm writing one in that's not written there. They want to decrescendo these long held tones in the clarinets and the French horns, and not just keep wailing away on them because they're the melody. At the other times when they get to that whole note, they're really not anymore. So, that's a huge rehearsal moment that I'm putting a little note to myself for.

Then we're going to build this crescendo into our next phrase. We don't want to do too much because then suddenly now we have tutti scoring and everybody's playing, so it's just naturally going to be louder. We just need that inertia, that movement and motion into 16, but then really the players who were already playing can actually probably back down just a little bit because we have the full group playing and it's only mezzo forte.

We get our melody in flutes, oboes, clarinets, again. Trumpets in with it now. That's going to be our foreground, and I would probably jot all those instruments down with foreground and then middle ground here, got this moving euphonium line. That would be easy to miss if you were just focusing on this main theme we've had before. Then our background players.

I'm probably, since we're all marked mezzo forte, I'm changing that to mezzo piano minus maybe even piano would work fine there. It's too early to be playing too loud. Tenor saxes and French horns get there, and euphonium this time, get the little interjection, and our low voices: and four and one. We're going to want to think back to how we played that before and imitate that same thing with "and one and two", and I'm going to tenuto underneath

the pick up to 22 so that we don't lose "and one". It's a short going to, well technically another short, but that pick up gesture, four going to one, also the emphasis through repetition of that same pitch. We really want to bring that out "and one and two". Crescendo forte but not too forte. Now, here I complimented the editor and now it is full page forte. A lot of the accompaniment is going to need to get marked down to a mezzo probably, or just listening. They don't have to change it if they're just listening and supporting the melody. That's going to be a moment where it's going to be easy to lose.

Then a nice big decrescendo, I'm marking that. Then we have our trade-off section again so the long tones they have to decrescendo. Then bring out the moving lines, some marking where those are in a full group decrescendo. But wait, it's a trap, because then it immediately, huge crescendo into really our biggest dynamic so far. I'm going to point out to the kids that 31 is marked forte just like 24 was. But its got to be a different forte. Melody in second and third clarinet-- Oh, I skipped over that. Lots of air at the bottom of that woodwind crescendo. The sixteenth note run. Lots of air on that first set of notes. We have our big key change here. Lot of naturals for our C instrument, lots of sharps for everybody else. I am marking that and encouraging them in their parts to go through and mark what was flat is now natural, and what was natural is now sharp. Melody in second and third clarinet. Trumpets, euphonium again, and also the glockenspiel. We don't want to forget our percussionists because they'll let us know we've forgotten them. There is some cool, moving lines in the flutes and clarinets when the melody is on a long tone, bringing those out. Lining up the eighth notes together, with it being a slower, smoother piece. You still have to move the fingers very accurately and swiftly as though they were playing a fast piece, so we don't get a mushy or molasses-type sound. Again, reminding the accompaniment to not get too aggressive because we want to hear these moving lines. Marking those so I don't forget where they are.

Then we get this cool fanfare here at 38. We are going to want to make sure that's articulate and in time between the French horns and euphoniums. And in our trumpets, we want them to have the same musical dialect even though there on different instruments so that it sounds unified amongst the group. I don't want to say the same. We are going to go ahead and mark a crescendo underneath the 16th note run in the woodwinds, so they've got lots of air to push through that.

Melody comes back. Major sounding version of our original theme. Still smooth, still very beautiful even at the larger dynamic, the bigger dynamic. Then our molto rallentando here at 45. I don't want to do that too soon because then it just becomes dirge-like at the end if you do it too soon. I think that "three and four and one and two and three e and". That's a perfect place to do it. And actually, I drew a long arrow but now I immediately regret that, because I really only want the rallentando to happen in that measure.

And then, "two and three, four and" can be back in time, not too fast, but back in in time. Then, the last measure will have some rallentando. In fact, this one I will almost certainly show "one and two and three". So I better mark that at the top. That's with the big fadeout. I'll circle that decrescendo. Then a nice gentle release. And that's Ammerland.

Researcher: First priority to address with the ensemble?

GS2: Balance, both of the color- we want to get a good color from the sound and we don't want to cover up our melody.

Researcher: Some ways in which you are going to address that?

GS2: Starting by identifying, making sure that they know what the melody is. Some people think that there eight whole notes in a row are a melody. And maybe in a Mahler Symphony, that might be, but probably not in this piece. Letting them hear, have the soloists play the melody. Now, everybody play your parts but one on a part so that we can balance and hear. Now, we'll add a few in at a time until we have the whole band playing, but we've kept that good balance that we had when it was one on a part. Again, addressing that when is your dynamic...

We talk about how well-- It says forte on the page but that's a group dynamic. The students don't necessarily know since they don't see the score. When is it marked forte all the way down the page or when is the melody marked forte and everybody else marked mezzo forte. Making sure that they know the difference and when they can play out and when they need to back down, and what is their role, foreground, middle ground or background in this great piece to let all students be all three at different points in the piece.

Sometimes they get to be the main thing and sometimes they're the secondary important thing. Sometimes they're- I hate to say important. This is something I always caught myself. I didn't want to say, "You're not important here". All the parts are important but you're important to be the background character right here, not the star of the show.

Researcher: Then secondary issues?

GS2: Smoothness. This is got to be the opposite of that nice and light style that we had in the other piece. This is got to be just beautiful, rich sound. The only time you really get to step outside that is that (sings fanfare). This fanfare here in the middle. Making sure that that has a nice contrast too is important. Then, as I'm emphasizing smoothness remembering that it's not slurred from start to finish. We do need to get that articulation in there. One thing that's really important on this piece is there will be a slur to a note and then the same note.

Many times, especially on our first read of this piece, they won't re-articulate it or they'll re-articulate so light that it sounds like the same note. That was one thing I always try to go after as a conductor, is when you have the same note, twice in a row, it can sound like it's tied through. You have to hear that but you also don't want to "tee-a-tah". You don't want to overdo it either. That's a big one as well.

Researcher: Are you familiar with this piece?

GS2: Yes. High school senior year we played it on my last concert. Then I played it again in my junior year of symphonic band here at [Major University]. That's when I learned that yes, you can play pieces that you've played before and maybe do some new and different things with them. Then, when I first got the job as the director of bands, at [Midwestern County] High School, the wind ensemble had really been going after some high level

literature, and this is not me speaking ill of anybody that taught before me, but they really weren't getting it.

I think the students just thought that they could play this high level stuff, but they really hadn't learned what it meant to take a piece to festival and play it like you were going to make a recording of it, like the composer was going to come listen to it, like every note on the page was being played as it was intended to. My very first concert cycle, a fall concert, during marching season, I said, "Guys, you're trying to play these—" They were trying to play grade-five, they thought it was grade-six but it was just five.

I said, "Guys, we're doing a reset here." Our fall concert was three grade-three pieces. They kind of hated it. They liked the pieces well enough. *Fanfare and Flourishes*, *Ammerland*, and *Unravelling*, but I tried to get them to understand what we were doing. They still struggled, but it was also nice because it was during marching season, we had not really done a lot of fall concerts during marching season. They had a lot on their plates. They liked that it was easier but they saw that they were getting more in-depth with it. At the concert, all three of them just went—except for when the kid knocked over a trap table full of tambourines during unravelling. It hit the ground in time, so it was fine.

Except for that, it was really a fine, like publisher recording quality level piece. All three of them. The parents came up and they said, "We've never heard..." They didn't know that it was lower level music. Not lower level but easier music than what that band had been playing before. They just knew that the sound quality and the performance level was higher. They said that to their kids. Kids went, "Okay, we get it now". I said, "Now, we can start- we can kick it up a notch".

By festival time, I'd love to be at a grade-five. As it happens, we went at a grade-four that year. Then, in the next year, took it to another level and played grade-fives from then on out. But for the wind ensemble having to start at a grade-three, that was a huge adjustment for them. It also showed them that a piece like this might be on the list as a grade-three, but there's some tough musical stuff in there. That was the last time. That's been five years or so since I've seen this. Another one that I've encountered several times and is very special to me.

Researcher: So you programmed it for a concert but not festival?

GS2: That one was not a festival piece. I very well could have. I think- I was only the director for four years. I was trying to- had I been there for one to two more years, it probably would've come back for a festival at some point. Yeah, that one was not a festival piece but it could've been.

As a public school teacher, when you take your group to festival, you've got your three prepared or however many prepared pieces you do. You maybe just do one big one. Then there is another level that you can't 100% be prepared for, and that is the sight-reading. I know we do it in [Midwestern State]. I don't know what other states require it. I know you don't do it at state festival, it's just at your district festival but you walk in and you get two minutes with the score, on your own. No talking, it's just you and the score and the kids are

just sitting there looking at you. There's nothing for them to do but sit there because they can't look at their parts and then they get to flip it over and so you have to do a microcosm of the five or ten or however long I've bored you with all of my details of these two pieces.

You have to do that in two minutes, so you really have to-- I was taking my time and looking for every little detail, kind of the perfectionist sight-reading but your score study has to be, "oh well, there's a key signature change here, and oh there's a time change here, and oh they're going to be too loud here, you don't get to mark on it and then you have five minutes and you need to leave at least a minute of that for questions because somebody is inevitably not going to know what a word on the pages is or something you're not expecting them to ask. You've got to leave that minute for questions.

So you've essentially got about three and a half minutes to say, "Okay guys let's go through here and who's got the melody in, who oh, we got to sizzle this rhythm." It's stressful. That's not to say that you can't be prepared for it. I tried, one year I was on top of it and we sight-read every Friday and then other years, it was the week before the festival so I said, "guys we got to site-read something so here we go" and it was just hard to- I thought it was hard to pick pieces to practice sight-reading because I would already be looking at them, and I wanted as much as possible to be put in that environment of seeing the score for the first time.

So often [name of middle school band director], my middle school band director would bring me some pieces because they were going to be of the right level. Everything in our high school band library is going to be too hard, and that can be good too. If you're going to sight-read - if you're going to play something for your spring concert you can go ahead and put it in their hands, but when you sight-read the theme from Jurassic Park, that's going to have a lot more challenges in it than what they're going to see, and they might get more stressed about it.

Honestly though, that's not a bad thing if you get them really stressed when they're doing it in the safety of your band room, then when they get to festival, and it's not quite as hard as when they sight-read *The Incredibles* music, and that's so jazzy and hard, this is not going to be like that, it's going to be a good bit easier and so then because they've gotten stressed in that practice environment, then the performance is easy.

Researcher: So just to clarify, would you say that your experience as a specifically [Midwestern State] music educator has influenced your score study?

GS2: Yes, I would say a little bit because like you say you have to kind of do it on the spot. You have to say, "If we're going to perform this piece in five minutes, what are the things..." and that happens I mean I've got called to do performance and I had one rehearsal so I did have to say, "Okay this is like we're doing it at festival for sight-reading." What are the important things I have to hit and make sure--?

Definitely, trying to spot what's going to be a challenge for them and alerting them to it. It definitely has. Now at the same time, it's an interesting exercise but at the end of the day you're never going to play a piece with truly only five-- I mean with the rare exception of,

"oh no, we're supposed to play--", it is a little bit of unrealistic situation to be put in because you're usually going to have your prep time with the piece and they're going to be able to play through it some before you... but, to test your true skills of what you identify-- I mean sight-reading is more on the teacher than it is on the students.

They're almost judging you and your instruction that you give, and that's not a thing that we really get prepared for here and that's fine because of all the performances you're going to do as a public school teacher, only one of them probably amounts to about 4% of your full school year. It is something that when you do it, it's only that small sliver of your year, but the rating that you get, it's a quarter of your rating. Three of the judges are judging your prepared stuff, and then one is judging your sight-reading so it's an important skill to have and it's whether you only have time to do it once or you're smart enough and you do it every Friday, getting them comfortable with that is really important.

I even talked through with them one time when we were practicing site-reading. "Here's what I'm looking for—", I let them look at the piece and I said, "Okay, I'm looking at the score and oh, I see that double tonguing in the trumpets, and I know that we're going to have to really sizzle through that before we get started." and so it was fun for them to get to have a peak into how I score study just in the fast version. [Laughs]

Researcher: It leads me to one other question, and bear in mind that there's no judgment placed on your answer, but it seems like you have referred to a lot of pedagogical things when it comes to studying the score, so would you say that your score study is more guided by pedagogy, specifically how to facilitate the needs of your students or is it more guided by artistry?

GS2: Yes, because I come from a teaching background and I know that I'm going to have anywhere from 11 hours because it's for an honor band or 3 months because I'm preparing it for my band's festival, I know I'm going to have to work through it with them. However, it's pedagogical with an eye towards the artistry. I want them to find the craft in the piece and what the composer had intended. It definitely, if you put a gun to my head and made me pick one, it definitely would be the pedagogical, but always with the direction towards the musicality and the piece. Always with that as the end goal.

Researcher: Do you believe that pedagogy guides artistry or vice versa?

GS2: What a good question, because I'm sitting here thinking about my lessons and seminar conducting lessons with [conducting professor 1] and how we are always looking at the note grouping and the shape of the line, and so I'm thinking that that falls more in the artistry, but then when I think about it, we're talking about that because we're trying to draw that out of the students, then it becomes a pedagogical thing that even at the collegiate level, we're having to instruct or teach or.. Not even to say that they don't know it, but to coax it out of them.

Man, it is such a combination of both, and I think that just from my personal background, I would have to say it really depends on the day you ask, honestly. I mean when I'm sitting down with the score by myself for the first time, yes, it is all about the art and what's the

band in my head sound like that I want this piece to sound like, and then as we are diving into it, looking at that festival exercise of doing the sight-reading room. That one is certainly going to be more of the pedagogy.

We want to get the bonus points for having a beautiful tone and shaping the line, but really it's about getting through the piece and not falling apart and having it sound as close as we can get to what the composer intended. But yes, and then once I've rehearsed with them and I go back and I do further score study, then it is pedagogical. I ask, "What have we not talked about that isn't happening, how can I be the best facilitator, the best helper at getting them to perform this the way, again, the artist intended. So it's always one going to the other, but I would say it probably just depends on the day.

APPENDIX H

Interview Transcript of US1

Researcher: How would you define musical score study?

US1: I would define it as identifying everything you need to know about the composer, the historical time it was written, the instrumentation, the performance aspects. Like, identifying musical motifs present, different instrumentation, the style. Just finding out everything that you need to know before you're going to conduct the ensemble I guess.

Researcher: OK. And who or what would you attribute that definition to? Where did you receive that information?

US1: I feel like I've learned more of the historical aspect from [conducting professor], being in her conducting I class with doing score study guides and more research on that. But I guess in a band setting, more in high school.

Researcher: And so what experience do you have personally with score study?

US1: I was a high school drum major. So, I went to [name of drum major camp] drum major camp for two years. There's conducting and like score study sessions for those weeks, so there was that... and then senior year I did a senior project where I got to work with the wind ensemble at my high school. And so I conducted and rehearsed parts of the Nutcracker suite. Probably pretty poorly (laughs), but it was good experience, ya know.

Researcher: Did you look at any specific scores when you were at camp?

US1: Um, ah man, yeah there were two specific ones, but I don't remember...

Researcher: That's okay, just checking. So, what methods do you or have you used to study the score? Are there things you go right to? Do you start marking right away, or are there some other methods?

US1: In the past, just because drum majoring isn't like conducting an ensemble in a controlled setting... it's just kind of showing where people are and... not really necessary (laughs). In the past I've used highlighter to show where sections come in. But now I guess I do phrase markings. And, uh, how long the phrases are. And entrances, but not in highlighter anymore.

Researcher: And so, what was your motivator for doing score study? What factors influenced it? This can be anything from your band director telling you to do it, or was there something in particular that was motivating you to do it.

US1: I think my band director told me I needed to do it.

Researcher: Okay, did he ever tell you why?

US1: I mean with the senior project, I ran rehearsals. It was just kind of necessary to know what you wanted to run and what sections needed to be rehearsed together, balance-wise.

Researcher: This was on the Nutcracker, you said?

US1: Yeah.

Researcher: So, when you're running rehearsals, it's necessary to get ready so you know what sections you want to rehearse. So you're planning out exactly what it is you're going to do with the ensemble, right?

US1: Yeah.

Researcher: Did you ever have a preconceived idea of exactly what it is you wanted to accomplish, or was it more just dividing up the sections?

US1: I feel like in high school it was more just working on a section, it wasn't as much about musical concepts.

Researcher: Okay, so what we're gonna do now is go through the actual score study task. I will now provide you with one of two full band scores. Score number one is titled, *Three Ayres from Gloucester, movement I*. Please look at this score and study it as if you were preparing to rehearse an ensemble of high school students who are reading it for the first time. As you're studying the score, please speak aloud which elements of the music you're addressing. The end result should be a list of objectives you would like to accomplish with the ensemble during the first rehearsal. This list can have as many or as few tasks as you feel necessary. Once you've completed the list, we will continue with a short list of questions. So most importantly, whatever it is you're reading, thinking, looking at, just say it out loud.

US1: Okay, cool. Right now I'm looking at instrumentation. That's a good place to start. I mean I guess the first place I would start is... there's just a lot of extraneous woodwinds. So just making sure there's a contra-alto clarinet. Feel like that's not very common in a high school band. And a contrabass clarinet. In the first rehearsal I would cover the style, that it's an English folk song. And the form. Just covering how it's going to be structured. And is this just the first movement?

Researcher: Yes.

US1: I'm not finding like a publishing date on the front... okay, well we can skip that. In my rehearsal, I would start at the top... it looks like woodwinds are all at cues. So, I would just have brass playing. After sight-reading probably the first section, I would go back and work with cornets specifically. And then I would move on to... I mean the horns, trombones, baritone, and tuba move together. But horns and trombones are primarily together with moving quarter note lines. So, that would be nice to rehearse together. (Hums a little). Looks like the first cornet has a presentation of the melody. It might be nice to have the entire band play or sing that. Or sing that B-flat clarinet line at 9. Just so that everybody has that in their ear, at least for the first section. So at pick-ups to 13, the flutes, oboe, first clarinet, and cornets have that main line together. So in this section I would rehearse them together. The second clarinets have like a counter to their melody. So I would either rehearse them with the melody or just include them with the rest of the ensemble? Maybe have second clarinets with the melody and thirds with the... uh, yeah. And then I would rehearse bassoon, bass, contra clarinets, tenor, baritone, horns, trombone, baritone, and tuba for that next section until... actually I could have them continue until just before 20. Looking at it again it seems like at 9 it has this... yeah, I don't know if you would call it four or eight bar phrases, because 9 has that beginning of the melody, and then at 13 either like "b-part" of that first phrase, uh you could say like A, B... these are like little A, little B. 17 is A, and then little B prime... you could call them sub-phrases to big A from 9 to 17. So, just covering those chunks (flips pages for a while). Probably after rehearsing those sections, I would identify that 25 is different. It has a different texture. Not only does the flute have the melody, but the brass is really minimal. So the texture completely changes there. So, for a first rehearsal I would probably cover from the beginning to 25 maybe. And just focus on that because the phrases are similar and the texture is similar. Yeah, I would probably just focus on that.

Researcher: Okay, satisfied with that one?

US1: Yeah.

Researcher: Okay, so I'm gonna clarify more than anything. You said your first priority would probably be related to style. You still think that?

US1: Yeah.

Researcher: Okay, and the second thing you said was form.

US1: Yes.

Researcher: Okay. Anything else? It's okay if not.

US1: I guess not.

Researcher: Do you have any idea on how you would teach the style? How would you express that to the students? The kind of style you're interested in.

US1: It's an English folk song, so I probably wouldn't play a recording... I would probably play a recording of a similar style. Just because I don't want kids to think that we need to play it exactly like a certain recording. Maybe present a few options of recordings to check out. But playing something in that style.

Researcher: How about form? How would you teach that to them?

US1: Um, I would probably teach them that by identifying melody and singing it as an ensemble. Then asking where that melodic material changes. And how long does that melodic material last? Yeah.

Researcher: Okay. Anything else to say about this one?

US1: No, I don't think so.

Researcher: Score # 2 is titled *Ammerland*. Instructions for this score are the same as score #1. Please speak freely, and when you're done I'll have a short list of questions.

US1: Are there translations?

Researcher: Yeah, at the top.

US1: This is only a grade two and a half? Really? There's so many... No offense, but in order to play a soprano sax in tune, you're gonna want an experienced band. It might be like a piece that's maybe easier, notated easier. But it's definitely for a more experienced ensemble, in my opinion.

Researcher: Do you have other reasons for thinking that or...?

US1: That's what catches my eye initially. And tempo... that's a really difficult tempo to keep and play full with good air and air support. 72 is really easy to not sound good.

Researcher: What are you looking at right now?

US1: The small ensemble at the beginning. It looks like all the band enters at 16, not percussion but all the winds. No, percussion doesn't come in for a long time. Yeah, I guess in my beginning rehearsal it might be nice... um, the piece is based on "the enchanting region" of some sort of lake. So maybe painting a picture of that. Putting it on the board, ya know? That would be good. Yeah, after sight-reading the beginning I would go back and work with that opening chamber ensemble, identifying the moving eighth melody in the euphonium, clarinets, and tenor sax. Yeah, that's a really warm instrumentation. Warm and low. So trying to get that sound off the bat right away. And then going back and working with the other parts of that small ensemble: bass clarinet,

bari, horn 1 and 2, and bass. Yeah, so the entire ensemble could either read... we could sing the melody from the clarinet part at the beginning. Or I would have flutes read it as sixteen. Trumpet, clarinet, and Eb read the melody line first so the ensemble gets that in their ear. Looks like countermelody... Yeah, so establishing that melody line at the beginning with the entire ensemble, making sure they have that. At 16, the entire winds come in. And so with that section I would rehearse the melody: flutes, oboe, Eb, Bb clarinet 1, trumpet 1. And then probably pull out the euphoniums alone, just because they have a nice countermelody in that section, to make sure everyone can hear that, to balance to that part since they're the only ones that have that counter-. And then pull out bassoon, clarinet 2/3, bass clarinet, all saxes, trumpet 2/3, horns, trombones, and bass to rehearse that foundation. Then I would pull out those sections up until... 26. Actually, probably just stop at 24, because that begins a completely different texture with a call and response in the different lines, so after rehearsing balance and all of that through 23, I would start at 24 and pick out the call and response lines. The eighth notes. So, I'd have flutes, oboes, clarinets, trumpet 1 play together, and then pick out 2/3 clarinet, trumpet 2/3, and horn 1 and have them play together. Then put those two groups together making sure the lines with whole notes back off and decrescendo so we can hear the moving lines as they overlap. Because everyone's supposed to be at a forte, but that's open to interpretation. Yeah, before we would sight-read this I would identify there is a key change so they're not surprised. Next rehearsal section would definitely be at 31. This is the fullest part of the score for sure. Percussion finally comes in. There's this big woodwind run and crescendo among all the parts to 31. Identifying in this section there's definitely eight-bar phrases from 31 to 38. That phrase ending at that tied half to a sixteenth. Yeah, and identifying the high point of the piece. It looks like it would be 31, but I would honestly say 39 would be the high point, just because it's that second repetition of that melody in this section. It's that second phrase. And having the phrase going somewhere, so actually not having 31 as such a big forte. Percussion leads to the high point at 39. So, yeah identifying that phrase structure would be good to do in a first rehearsal. In this section I would rehearse flute, oboe, Bb clarinet, Eb clarinet together. And then I would rehearse clarinet 2/3, euphonium, trumpet 1/2/3... and mallet percussion has a very similar part to that, so I would probably include them in that rehearsal. And then have those two parts play together because they both having moving lines at different times but also at similar times. So identifying when there part is most important or when they can balance to the other. And then I would also rehearse bassoon, bass clarinet, bari sax, tenor sax, horns, trombones, and bass as a section until the end of the piece. They stay together, so it'd be good to rehearse all of those together. Yeah, and then with the second half of this section, from 31 to the end, starting at 39, getting the band to decrescendo to the end, that is mezzo piano. Or getting them to know the hierarchy... that 39 is going to be the highest point. Rehearsing that rallentando at the end. It's just marked in the trumpet 1, so... that's interesting. I don't really know how that would be performed if it's just marked in one part. Maybe it's just marked in the middle of the score? Yeah, it is, never mind.

Researcher: Satisfied with this one?

US1: Yeah, I guess so?

Researcher: That's fine, that's fine. So, just to clarify. Feel free to change any of these. I'm just repeating back to you what I took note of. First priority, melody line?

US1: Yes.

Researcher: Okay, and then after that you're going to look at the melody in measure 16?

US1: Yes.

Researcher: You said euphonium alone for the countermelody?

US1: Yes

Researcher: And then rehearse the harmony. So, I'm kind of seeing a pattern of taking foreground, middle ground, background and rehearsing those sections separately. Is that what you're thinking?

US1: Yeah, initially for that first rehearsal. So then once students can hear parts, you can work on balance.

Researcher: I forgot to ask you a question about the first score. Are you familiar with that one?

US1: Nope.

Researcher: How about the other.

US1: Nope

Researcher: Alright. Do you anticipate any potential issues when you rehearse this for the first time? Has this come into your score study yet?

US1: Ya know, I don't. Probably if I studied it a little more. And had more experience... I mean, other than like tempo changes. Just getting those transitions into sections, tempo-wise would be somewhat of an issue. I mean, just because I'm a saxophone player, just having tenor with the melody at the beginning, that's gonna be so out of tune... I play tenor sax in symphonic band right now, and it's ugh... Yeah, tuning-wise at the beginning, with horn 1, that's gonna be a tuning nightmare. As more of the ensemble comes in, that will be a lot better. Tuning the last chord at the end is going to be an issue as well. Trombones and second euphonium plays that third. But you have pretty much low woodwinds and brass at the end. Yeah, saxophone 1 has the highest note in that, and it's gonna be super sharp because it's an E. So, yeah that fifth is gonna be super sharp if you don't tune it. Yeah, like I said it's a slower tempo too at the beginning, so that may be an issue. Keeping the tempo same as well as breath support, for a maturing ensemble... which is why two and a half, it might be a little harder for an ensemble. Not note-wise but maybe just endurance-wise. Yeah.

APPENDIX I

Interview Transcript of US2

Researcher: How would you define musical score study?

US2: Musical score study. Well, the score is a map, I would say, for score study. You use the map in order to convey different messages to your specific ensemble and you are the only one that can give that direction. In reality, it's like a different way of reading, and then you have to convey it into a different language so that musicians can understand what the composer is trying to say as well as what your idealistic views are on said piece.

Researcher: Who or what would you credit that definition to? Where do you feel like you came up with that?

US2: There's a lot of different people. I would say just an accumulation of both my mentors and some conductors I already am aware of and have dug deeper into their info.

Researcher: Can you give me some examples of them?

US2: Yes, sure, of some of my mentors or conductors?

Researcher: Yes, just who they were. You don't even have to mention their names.

US2: Yes, sure. Well, my band director is obviously one, some honor band directors that I've been a part of, college band directors, and then as well as famous conductors such as Gustavo Dudamel. I can't think of them right now but yes, you understand the gist.

Researcher: Yeah, that's fine. What experience do you personally have with score study?

US2: I have little experience, but since I'm in Conducting I at the moment, I have conducted in the past which makes me very excited for the class. For score study, specifically, I would say I recently started at, actually my high school graduation. I had to conduct a piece for that because my band director was-- His mom passed away a few days before. I had to conduct the graduation ceremony piece. I had to look into that and see what cues I should do. It was just the most basic score study you can think of.

Researcher: Do you remember what piece?

US2: *October* by Eric Whitacre. Try doing that in ninety-degree heat, it's not fun [laughs].

Researcher: No, probably not. Then, how about Conducting I, have you looked at any particular scores?

US2: Yes, we looked at *Jupiter* so far from the Holst Planets suite. We're about to finish on Monday and then on Wednesday, we are going to introduce Danny Boy. I think it's Grainger but I'm not sure, it could be another arrangement. Yes, but I know the tune is Danny Boy at least.

Researcher: When you have looked at scores in the past, whether it be *Jupiter* or *October* or whatever, what kinds of things were you doing to study the score? The research has provided a lot of different approaches to score study, so what I'm curious about is are you audiating what you are seeing on the page? Are you singing? Do you play piano? Do you play it on the saxophone? Do you mark? Do you use recordings? Anything you've done in the past.

US2: I'm a very heavy marker, especially marking on the score. I like the idea of using little post-it notes for reminder symbols. I'm also a line reader. I do a lot with singing since I have a choral background, but I like to follow the lines and try to phrase dynamics that way. I can recognize cues pretty easily, especially if it's just silence and then entering in on something or we can get a little bit more complex and there's a specific note that's articulated or that just doesn't belong and then you have to emphasize that.

Just anything that's unique within the score, I mark it, and then I see how I'm going to cue it to the ensemble.

Researcher: It seems to me based on that last question that cueing influences a lot of what you are doing in the score and maybe that's not true. What factors influence your score study? Are you looking to do something specific when you're studying the score? What's most important to you?

US2: What's most important to me? When I'm only in my personal score study, is that what you are asking?

Researcher: Sure.

US2: Okay, personal score study.

Researcher: Or if you're getting ready to prepare an ensemble, really it's open-ended.

US2: For me personally, when I first look at a score, I want to make sure that I have the general consensus of what the piece is, and the music starts to go in my head, which is hard for a beginning conductor to do, to actually hear the music of what you see and try to audiate it. In order to speed that process up, I will take the line off on the melody and then I'll sing the melody and then I can imagine the chord structure and below it seeing if it's minor, if it's atonal, if it's major, any specific things like that.

Finding out what the piece generally sounds like is definitely my priority in my score study. The second one would be, like I said, cues and seeing which parts, how they intertwine with another part. It's extremely interesting.

Researcher: Sound and then cues?

US2: Yes.

Researcher: The sound of the piece and then what you're going to be doing in cueing?

US2: Yes, that's about it. Of course, there's a lot of other stuff after that but the most important ones would be those, and then we start to build on everything ensemble-based like balance and dynamic structure.

Researcher: All right, well that's pretty much the extent of the interview.

US2: Oh, wow [laughs].

Researcher: Yes, it's not long. Now, we are going to do a couple of different score study tasks. I'll now provide you with one of two full band scores. Score number one is titled, *Three Ayres from Gloucester*, but it's just movement one. Please look at the score and study it as if you are preparing to rehearse an ensemble of high school students who are reading it for the first time, and as you're studying the score please speak aloud which elements of the music you are addressing.

The end result should be a list of objectives you would like to accomplish with the ensemble during the first rehearsal, and the list could have as many or as few tasks as you feel necessary. Once you've completed the list, we'll continue with a short list of questions to follow up on some of your thoughts about this. The most important thing is whatever you are looking at, whatever you are reading, do that out loud so that I can record it.

Then, if you would like to mark something, you may. You certainly don't have to. I want you to do whatever you would naturally do.

US2: Do you want me to write down a list or anything like that?

Researcher: You can or you can just articulate it at the end, it's totally up to you. If you need me to repeat any of the instructions just let me know.

US2: The first thing I'm looking at is I'm looking at the cover from top to bottom. I can see that performance time is going to be four and a quarter minutes. I know that's probably a good filler-piece for a concert. *Three Ayres from Gloucester*. I don't know what Gloucester is but it's most likely a city or a town or something like that, and three Ayres is more like three songs.

I'd probably mark that and say a song, question mark? I figure out before I even get to the actual music, I want to make sure I know who Hugh M. Stuart is and basically what the title means, because first of all, I'm not entirely sure what Ayres are and also Gloucester, where the heck is that. Songs from a town, somewhere I'm assuming England, but I could be wrong. I just want to make sure.

Then if we go further down, you finally get to one, two, and three songs which is the Jolly Earl of Cholmondeley, and Ayre for Eventide and the Fiefs of Wembley. Now, fiefs, I do know because fiefs are instruments. I would assume that it's a part of England but still, like

I said, I can't be sure so it's extra research I need to do in my own personal score study before I go on.

We're just going to skip that part for right now. We look down on the instrumentation, and it seems like there is a pretty full symphonic band. What catches my eye is that there's a part for contra alto clarinet, which is kind of rare I would say, in a sense. Then we have contrabass clarinet, also a little rare because not a lot of high schoolers, if I was going to prepare for this, would be willing to play contrabass clarinet yet even own one.

Saxophone section's fine, cornet section's fine, horn section is fine. No, wait. E flat horns, that's different. I would make sure I mark that. I'm kind of wondering if E flat horns are going to double F horns, and it's like a substitute maybe? So, I would look into that. Same for trombones. Of course there's a natural euphonium, tenor clef part to go with the bass clef club part club just in case. Then we have tuba and percussion.

Just automatically, I would make copies for everyone because I don't want them to mark up my original scores. I would waste my money on that [laughs]. Oh, look, it's about the composition. That's really cool. *Three Ayres from Gloucester* came into being as a result of fascination with an old 10th-century couplet. "There's no one quite so comely as the Jolly Earl of Cholmondeley. The resulting three competitions blah, blah, blah. Ah, it's pronounced, "Chumley", okay, interesting... Are early English folk songs. Perfect.

We now know it's from England, so I was right about that. In Wembley Castle, like I said, the fiefs are instruments and then it has rehearsal suggestions. When it says rehearsal suggestions, the Jolly Earl, the first movement, the strict observance of this staccato and legato indications so this might be a good movement for articulation, clarity, and difference are essential to performance and being light. Not necessarily a march but it could be jolly, perhaps? Wow. [Laughs]

Ayre for Eventide says legato and much heart are essential here, so you can assume it's a ballad. It's pretty simple. Do not rush any section but take moderato so that could be correct.

Researcher: Just to clarify, this is just movement one. You're welcome to look at whatever you like, but just so you know.

US2: Okay, thanks for reminding me. Hugh M. Stuart is an American composer, perfect. He also taught public school, so probably a great composition for learning. Do you know the grade of this piece?

Researcher: It is a grade three on the state music association list.

US2: Grade three on the state music association list. It's probably good for an improving band as just a step up piece, so that would be nice. I'm officially looking at the score now. Okay, so it's in cut time. 96, so it's going to be quite quick. First thing I realized is that cornets definitely have more rhythmic variety from everyone else and it is just... just brass, but it has woodwind cues. In the first page, I definitely know that. Cornets themselves have a melody that's intertwined with harmony as well.

Even between measures one to measures three you can tell there's already staccato mixed in with slurred phrases. That would be something to make apparent in not only your conducting, but also in the teaching of the style. I'm definitely going to mark at least the cornets going here. It's also a transposed score so that helps with rehearsal. Doesn't help with my transposing skills, but... F horns in measure two and trombones on beat three have accidentals and third cornet, so chromaticism is definitely going to be a part of that, so stressing that.

Nothing is super interesting in percussion. Just make sure to keep it light. I'm also observing the dynamics. He actually writes them out pretty well for the shape of the line, so that's interesting. He's very, very clear on what he wants. It's just generally, the first page with the brass is very, very stylistically different so almost every other measure is a different style than the previous one, so that's good for me to know. I have to convey that to the ensemble.

All right. Next page. B-flat clarinet solo. That's definitely something. It last for 4 measures with a pickup. Everyone else has, except for the second and third clarinet, has quarter notes on beat one. Just a quarter note on beat one, so articulating the measure. This is definitely about the solo, but considering the cut time tempo I know that it's not going to have free tempo from the clarinet. It still has to have strict time.

Clarinets do have long notes in between those so that provides the harmonic structure, so perfect. There's not really any dynamics we can do with just bar-line quarter notes, but the soloist is still the soloist so... they can do what they think is best. Then as soon as you get into after the solo, he or she and lands on a dotted-half note, right when everyone else comes in, so on the fourth measure of his or her solo.

Still some chromaticism in the tenor lines. If I had to split it into SATB, it would be tenor has the most chromaticism from this point on, so that's definitely interesting to know-- Oh no, there's alto. That's also the chromaticism too. It just seems like chromaticism is going *to* somewhere. It'll be interesting to view or do some more research. First, I'd have to hear it. Right now, I'm not at the point to where I can hear everything, so it's strictly I'm looking at the music and I'm reading the score down. [Hums]

Generally, keeps the same style from the solo but I'm starting to think it's just the first half of the phrase is a solo player and then the second half of the phrase is actually controlled by the soprano voices, such as flutes, oboe, clarinet one, cornets one and two, but cornet two provides harmonic structure and everybody else either has long tones and perhaps chromaticism. Tuba's a boring part at the moment [laughs] with A and D and then G and C and stuff.

As soon as we get two before 17, it starts to change just a little bit. Still, almost every measure has a different stylistic approach. Lots of slurring. One specific measure two before 17, everybody on the page actually has D-ah, daht, daht (sings rhythm) depending on your tempo that you want to sight-read it at, but leaning into the first tone, and still driving the intensity through the second tone. Then, finally, as soon as you heard the third

the tone, it will be light, very apparent of the style and articulation. Just making that very clear to your students.

We get on the 17. Again, it's a solo, the exact same thing as what happened at 9. Nobody had it. I think it's just repeating. I think 9 to 17 would be one phrase then 17, the next phrase would probably be an A prime phrase, I'd say because the first half is completely the same. The second half, the first thing I notice is that when I look at the top of the score, four after 9 is the pickup for the flutes is a D, and then four after 17, the pickup is a C, so it's probably going more towards a dominant resolution to a one chord or a minor. I wouldn't know. That's another thing that I don't know at the moment. It's major. It will be going from five-seven perhaps to one or two, five, one, something like that.

This is interesting. Here's a difference: the cornets and the horns. Horns is definitely something that I would cue right here. Like I said, four after 17, they have one, two, three, four, one, two, three, four, two and three. Everybody else has long tones, so you can definitely bring those in, very strong. It just seems like this is more of a horn moment, and then cornet two doubles that. The composer is emphasizing that he wants that brought out, so that's what I would say.

Since that's a new and interesting part, it would be relatively the same as just difference in pitches, trying to go to a different place back to "home", which would be one, or F major. Yes, F major. Definitely, cue in the horns there. I wouldn't even bother cueing the second cornets because as long as you make them aware that they have a part that's already prominent, it's just support at the moment. That's interesting. Like I said, stylistic change. Percussion, still not doing anything super interesting.

Here we go, 25. All drum percussion comes out, and then we have cute little triangle moments. One, three, one—one, three, one, and the score is definitely scarce in instruments now. There's only seven or eight lines that are prominent out of this full symphonic band score. Flutes definitely have the melody, and it's only flutes at the moment. Bassoons have a little bit of an accompaniment, I would say. They are the counter line, but they're still [hums] within the second measure of 25. That's something.

Alto and contrabass clarinet and the bass clarinet and contrabass clarinet, they have the same thing, but they're only cues. No, they're not, never mind. Its bassoon, alto clarinet, alto-contrabass clarinet, contrabass clarinet and then bass clarinet, also have that with bassoons. Bari sax has it too. All soprano clarinets and alto and tenor saxes along with horns have long tones, which provide the harmonic structure.

Through the entire page, flutes continue to have melody and the same exact instrumentation has the same exact purpose. Since those have low instruments on the accompaniment I was talking about, the counterpoint, I would say, you still have to keep that light, and you have to stress to keep it light because they're going to want to... they already have to fight the instrument enough, it's just having control over the instrument. You could have an option, or you can make that change just by the way you conduct and the way you present yourself. That's really cool.

Going into 33, you have pickups from cornets and horns, specifically horns, all horns actually. It's just there in octaves, so one and three, and then two and four and then in octaves. Saxophones, and trombones, and tuba, it's like a clock, I would say, starting at 33. That's [sings] but it just switches between certain sections that are in unison or provide harmonic structure. The trombones have sixths, actually. That's interesting.

I would say this is forte, and we also add the snare drum and the bass drum again. I'm starting to wonder if it still should be light, or if you should drive through each figure. That's something I wouldn't know at the moment, but after hearing it I would decide and I could probably get a good sense of what the composer would want. This is new material, so definitely interesting. Going on to page 8, this is all one phrase. That's going to be interesting because it's—yeah, this is a 10 measure phrase.

There's always a point where-- Any time I think of a phrase that isn't a multiple of its time signature, for example, if there's a six measure phrase for three-four. It could be eight measure. I specifically remember one-- Anything that happens where it's like an extension, I definitely think of Brahms Variation on a Theme of Haydn because they have-- I could sing it but I'm sure you know what I'm talking about. [Sings]

Finding out which two measures are the extension, and seeing what the composer, on what chord, or what idea that he's latching onto that he doesn't want to let go of yet, that needs to be stressed as well. In order for it to seem natural, because naturally you would have eight-bar phrases in a four-four measure, or 16 bars or 4 bars. It's just that's how natural it is, but since it's not, since it's a 10 bar phrase, that's something to consider.

Now getting into the content of eight. We still have the counterpoint baseline mix going on between the clarinets that aren't sopranos, as well as the baritone saxophone, euphonium cues, and bassoon. As well, in the second half of the phrase, oboes and flutes now have the melody in octaves, so tuning could be a concern since they have tenuto quarter notes in some sections but it's mostly very light because it is at a mezzo-piano.

Oh, that's interesting. Now looking back at seven, I see that half of the phrase in the “clockwork” eighth notes between the low voices or the more “meaty” voices have drum percussion in it and then once we transfer a different stylistic melody up to the flutes and oboes the triangle comes in again and then the drums drop out. It's extremely interesting. I can't tell you exactly why that happens or what effect it has, but I can tell you that's something that I can learn, which is why I'm at music school.

Am I taking too long, by the way?

Researcher: No, you're fine. You do have another score to go though.

US2: Okay, cornet solo at 43. Everyone else has dotted-half notes going into quarter notes. [Sings] First half of the phrase is just a solo. It's the same thing going back to the beginning of the movement where the B-flat clarinet has a solo as well and then everybody joins in either on harmonic structure or the melody in a different stylistic approach. It goes on for two phrases. It's repeated material, but it's just different instrumentation. Like I said, same thing. Horn cues, we have a fermata, one before 59.

Conducting-wise, this will be a two-part fermata. There's people that have whole notes such as flutes, oboes, bassoons, tenor saxophone, third trombone... or second trombone, I'm sorry. Then you have beat two, which changes the harmonic structure as well for mainly the low voices and some of the upper alto, lower soprano voices. Then we go on to 59-- one, two. I also marked out there one, two so that I know that there's two motions to the fermata before I can cut off and go back at a tempo at 59.

Same material in the cornets as the beginning, so it's a restatement. It's not until two before the end of the movement where any woodwinds are present. This is not necessarily a fanfare of brass, but you could assume that it's going to be-- Not sure how to put this in words, because it's not a fanfare but you want it to sound more like a brass quintet since you have the brass instrumentation without any woodwinds. Very majestic, I would say, majestic and light.

Then you finally get to pickups two bars before the end and then it's [sings] off. That would be the upper-woodwinds doing that. Yes, *rallentando* too. Not only are the brass, cornets specifically, going eighth notes into the *rallentando*, but we need to understand who has moving figures because that would be because everyone needs to know what to listen to, not only watching me but realize the parts around them in order to understand how the *rallentando* works.

For sight reading, conducting-wise I would make it not necessarily extremely big but make my hands very present that I'm strictly keeping tempo, and I'd worry about tempo less than what the actual-- like any cues or anything. I would still cue the woodwinds to come in on beat four, three before the end. That was my process for this page. Sorry it took so long.

Researcher: That's fine. So, if you're satisfied with that one, what's your first priority, what's the very first thing you are going to address with the ensemble?

US2: The research of the piece, after I've done it. Like I said, if you're in my ensemble, I wouldn't go with this piece just yet because I didn't know quite exactly what I was talking about on the title page. It gives me for a little bit of information on the composition, the rehearsal suggestions, and performance times, but I think I need to know a little bit more so everybody has an idea of what the composer saw and what he wanted to convey through music.

Researcher: Okay. So you would do that by providing the information on the second page there?

US2: Correct.

Researcher: Okay, so maybe a second priority? Maybe a little bit more rehearsal-oriented? Is there something, in particular, you would choose to work on right away? Let's say if you have an hour-long band class.

US2: An hour-long band class.

Researcher: And if not, that's fine too. Maybe just tell me what you would do in that class.

US2: Like I said at the beginning when I started to do this score study, there's a lot of switching between articulations and stylistic approaches. This page is marked up so much just by the ink it's printed on, because you see dots, you see staccatos and then two measures later you can see full-on phrases over two bars of slurs. My priority then is to make sure that the students know what to do with those articulations because being light to me conveys something different than being extremely—like being in a pool, I would say for the slurs.

Researcher: Style then, would probably be-

US2: I could've just said style, but yes.

Researcher: No, I'm just trying to summarize what you're saying.

US2: Right, yes, style is going to be the number one thing assuming that they follow me in tempo. Of course, I'll take another tempo. I would say those are my priorities.

Researcher: Score number two is titled *Ammerland*. The instructions for this score are the same as score number one. Please speak freely as you're studying the score and when you're finished I'll have a short list of questions for you.

US2: *Ammerland*, Jacob de Haan. That's definitely not an American name as far as I know. Thinking-- I'm thinking Latin or French. I wouldn't know though. Full score, concert band. He's from the Netherlands. Studied at a Netherlands conservatory. Minor in trumpet and wind band direction. Okay. He's a heavy conductor too, that makes a difference. Okay, [reads program notes] "*Ammerland*: Get an impression of this enchanting region by the Zwischenahner Lake! The rural parts of Ammerland combine fields covered with yellow rape blossoms, lush meadows, seemingly endless country roads, and an exquisite lakeside. Let yourself be lured away on a short musical trip to beautiful Ammerland. Enjoy nature, the lakeside, and the brilliant colors of a unique landscape."

Automatically what I assume after reading this is that he's going to want to take you on a journey. I'm assuming since it's very lakeside, it's going to be extremely beautiful and enlightening. Let's see.

Looking at the parts, seems very normal. There's only two horn parts, but they can be either in F or E flat. Okay. There's a bass part but no tuba part so it should be fine... But knowing that he wrote for double bass as well is pretty interesting. Separate part for timpani, I know it's going to be apparent throughout, as well as mallet percussion, so there are four percussion parts.

Okay. Looking at the score. Interesting combination. Euphonium, the soprano clarinets and tenor saxophone have melody. You can definitely tell since everyone else has whole notes and half notes, long tones. Also, I should've said this earlier, but as soon as I opened to this page, I noticed that the marking was at 72. I was like okay, it's definitely a journey but it's more of wow, this place is beautiful but I have to leave. We'll see. It also has horn cues, if we don't have horns, so I know that I can trust them.

Okay, here we go, here is a conducting little snippet for you. Four in, melody has the-- well horns have the counter line, but four in horns have [counts rhythm] one—and a three and then transfer that into the bass voices with and four and. It's going to be a lot of shifting depending on if you're going to cue the horns in that little motive and then shift back over on beat three in order to emphasize the and of three for the basses. And same regular melody...

Now we get to some fun stuff in the melody line. Straight eighth notes from 7 going to 8. There's chromaticism in the bass line, going into nine. That's something to intensify. Horns are doing their own thing. Nine into ten: nine melody players. Sopranos and euphonium play their line. Everyone rests on a whole note except for horn one which gives a kind of a response. You can tell that's a call and response thing. I'd bracket the horns, also bracket some of the melody so I know exactly who I need to turn to or what needs to be emphasized. This goes on for about four bars between each other. There's an extension in the *rallentando* measure. Two before 16, starting that. The horns have the entire melody while everyone else has a whole note tied to another whole note. It's like a solo moment for them.

Then we get back into the same melody in the upper-woodwinds instead of euphonium having it there, euphonium has an ostinato figure in eighth notes and some syncopation. The one thing that I realize through this piece is that there is quite a bit of call and response. There's never usually a place where everybody holds a tone. There's always something moving, which makes me wonder if it's him driving through this park, if it's him walking through this park. Things are constantly moving, he's constantly looking everywhere. I'm just trying to get an image of what he's seeing or to convey the information. That goes on.

One of the first things I said when I was talking about the score study was the same thing with the French horns where they have [speaks and snaps rhythm] “one—and a three”, and then move on to the basses which have “and four and”. That comes back again into the second part of the phrase. Euphonium has the little eighth note ostinato while the upper woodwinds and B-flat trumpet now, first trumpet, have joined in the melody. It just seems like it's a natural crescendo from adding voices not only onto the melody but onto different harmonic long tones. That's cool. Let's see.

Then we start to introduce a different rhythm between, again, call and response but the response this time is going to be different because it's [speaks rhythm] “one, two and, three and, four a one, emphasizing the same tone in the “a of four” into the next beat which is ironically the same tone, just making sure that that's still intensified while the melody takes over. It's exactly the same thing, call and response back to back on the entire page.

Low brass... low brass and woodwinds have long tones. I've actually completely disregarded percussion, but there's barely any percussion in the first four pages. There's some suspended cymbal rolls and a timpani roll, not a huge thing. Okay. Going on to the next page, I think we are almost done. Interesting. Before 31, it is a *rallentando*, but we have upper-woodwinds doing 16th notes into a key change and it's at *forte*. This definitely seems like something where they can lead their crescendo extremely well.

Yes. They start the measure at forte, so that'll be something to cue because it's on the "e" of three, [speaks rhythm, snaps pulse] so, e and a four-e and a one" but then we have to correlate that. I know that's going to be a future issue depending if the section is strong enough in tempo to do that. I have to be extremely clear with how slow we're going to go or what's the tempo change. Then it's a tempo at 31 in a completely different key. Mark that as well. Still a transposed score by the way. Good for rehearsal. Here's a different thing, glockenspiel actually has melody along with trumpets and clarinets two and three. And then the call and response kind of flips on itself to where now the people that were doing the response, with the exception of glockenspiel, are now doing the call, and then upper-woodwinds are doing the response. And it flips back and forth and-- it's just this entire piece is intertwining with each part. Which is, like I said, I don't know what this sounds like in my head quite yet, but it's going to sound extremely interesting because it's like the texture is so thick in some places but also he picks and chooses where he's going to make the thick texture thicken ink or not. Everything still has not only rhythmic texture, instrument color but also harmonic structure and... just any other situations.

Okay, going on, tenor sax euphonium at 35 have a counter line to the melody that's not a response, it's just something in order-- not really a filler, but to keep time as well with harmonic structure. 38 is definitely something. Horns and euphoniums, as well as percussion one have an eighth note followed by 16th note triplets for beat one, as well with accents, because that's the first time I've ever seen an accent in this score. You'd be sadly mistaken if you don't emphasize that in your conducting as well. Once you hit one, you want to make sure it's more jarring so that they have reactionary time.

Yes, and trumpets have it on the "and" of beat three as well. So (sings) fanfare-like and realize that it's only in the brass as well and percussion one, which makes this extremely interesting because this is on snare drum, so he wants a fanfare like ending or fanfare-like at least with this piece or this section. Melody is still going on, texture is extremely thick. Then we start going on a little bit and it starts getting less thick, but there's a lot of people that have melody. There's high woodwinds, trumpet one and euphonium with mallet percussion. Then everyone else has harmonic structure and long tones to add to the texture. That's basically what goes on. There's a snare drum roll for four bars straight as well as suspended cymbal on each downbeat going into the end. Then finally, you get to the chord where it's a fortissimo, then the woodwinds back down and then the last measure. The only woodwinds that will be playing are bass clarinet and saxes, which is interesting because bass clarinet is the most prominent low voice in the woodwinds that composers and conductors want. Saxophones are always told to emulate the horns. Just for sound reasoning, I believe the last measure includes those specific woodwinds to emulate the brass. That's how he wants it to end. So fortissimo, a constant decrescendo from the last two measures down to the last note which is a held fermata on beat 3. Actually, there's a held fermata on beat 3 but then you have timpani that strikes a C as well, so that would be the root. Yes. That's my thought process on this.

Researcher: Okay. Very first priority in rehearsal?

US2: Very first priority. Know when-- I would stress to know when you have an important part or not, because there's a lot of-- there's parts that go with the melody, there's parts that

are considered counterpoint or counter melody, and there's also parts that emphasize or contribute to the harmonic structure of the piece. I've probably said that 47 times, I'm sorry, but it's worth it.

Researcher: How do you do that?

US2: In conducting?

Researcher: Well, just with your students, however. How do you get them to know whether or not they have the important part?

US2: Right. As a general rule, if you have in a piece like this where it's 72 and it's very beautiful, I can see that it's very beautiful. Any black notes you have are going to be out, or moving lines in general. If you see a line is going somewhere and you can physically see it, 9 out of 10 times it's going to be a part that's pretty important. Seeing their visual on their parts in general, look at the shape of the line. If you have something that goes somewhere and you know where it's going to stop, then that's fine. Please bring that up. Euphonium has that a lot, especially with the melody but when euphoniums start the ostinato section in measure sixteen, that can easily be taken as they have melody but they don't. I'd want to make sure that in my conducting or in discussing the piece beforehand, that I've mentioned to them, especially them, the euphoniums that have the ostinato motive, you're still background. It just adds more flavor to the texture. That's important.

Researcher: Other things?

US2: Yes, this has nothing to do with the score, but the control, because this ranges from pianissimo to fortissimo in the entire score, to have control over the instrument and to make sure that the more sound that you control, the higher the effect is going to be for the listener. That's what matters in music, it's for the listener. Not only is it challenging for you, but you want to make sure that you keep the listener frankly, awake in pieces like this. Yes, that control-- if I had to throw another one in... control would be dynamic contrast. In the conductor's eyes, that would be dynamic contrast.

Also, realize that this isn't strict time. Realize that if you have something that's interesting, as long as everyone else is on the same page, you can stretch it a little bit. Kind of like jeans because the funny thing is, if you wear dress slacks, they're not at all going to stretch because they're made specifically to look very sleek and smooth. Making that notion to where you can connect it to something that they already know of, like imagine concert black. You never want to sit down in tight pants in concert black because they are going to rip, but in jeans, it's really comfortable because they're made to stretch a little bit. It just feels like if you had to compare this piece to jeans, you could. That's a little interesting. Yes, it stretches a little bit.

As long as-- it may not be for the sight reading section but if they need to, once they get accommodated with this piece, then they can start to really pull out their instincts and what they think it should sound like. Then it's just a musical conversation between you and I. Then we could compromise, and then we finally have a piece that is music that is specifically designed for us. That's what makes a performance so great.

CURRICULUM VITA

NAME: Jacob Mark Mitchell

ADDRESS: School of Music
105 W. Brandeis Ave.
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40208

DOB: Sedalia, Missouri – May 26, 1989

EDUCATION

& TRAINING: B.M.E., Music Education
Winthrop University
2007-11

M.M.E., Music Education
University of Louisville
2016-18

AWARDS: Teacher of the Year, Greenville County Schools 2014-15
Presser Undergraduate Scholarship 2010
South Carolina Teaching Fellow 2007-11

PROFESSIONAL

ASSOCIATIONS: The National Association for Music Education
Kentucky Music Educators Association
Pi Kappa Lambda Honorary Music Fraternity