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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this applied research study was to determine how Composition/Theory Model Cornerstone Assessments (MCAs) could be adapted for a church music arranging curriculum that utilized popular music pedagogy and Nashville Numbers for notating brass, woodwind, percussion, and/or bass guitar orchestral sweetening. Orchestral sweetening referred to the addition of riffs (short repeated musical figures or melodies), pads (sustained harmonies), and punctuations (rhythmic and harmonic emphases of lyrics or chord changes) to an existing rhythm and vocal arrangement. While Composition/Theory MCAs had been pilot-tested for composition tasks, the MCAs had yet to be applied to an arranging context, particularly one pertaining to popular church music focused on orchestral sweetening. This study sought to determine the effectiveness of such a curriculum on Family Christian Academy junior high and high school students’ arranging, performing, rehearsing, and evaluating skills. The researcher implemented a one-group pretest-posttest design with a pre- and post-measurement using a sample size of two students (n=2), both of whom were percussionists. An adaptation of Dimitra Kokotsaki’s self-assessment in music learning survey was administered for both measurements, and a paired-samples t-test was performed that determined that there was no significance between the measurements because of sample size. However, qualitative data analyzed from MCA documents, observations, recordings, and interviews supported the idea that students grew in their arranging abilities and were able to demonstrate basic understanding of rehearsing and performing. Recommendations for future research include repeating the study with a larger sample to determine significance as well as to test the curriculum with brass and woodwind instruments and bass guitar to determine its effectiveness for students who play those instruments.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

American music education witnessed a pivotal shift in direction with the publishing of the 2014 National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (NCCAS). Prior to this point, music educators worked with the previous 1994 music standards which primarily emphasized attaining musical skills and knowledge. Additionally, these standards were not customized to the various types of high school musical courses offered in American schools.\(^1\) The new standards, however, emphasize the “processes” of music learning rather than the “technical skills” involved.\(^2\) The NCCAS also offer four different strands of performance standards for high school music courses rather than one, including assessments known as Model Cornerstone Assessments (MCAs) within each strand.\(^3\) As “curriculum-embedded measures,” the MCAs are designed to measure student achievement of the performance standards that make up the three artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding.\(^4\)

The Composition/Theory MCAs, a set of MCAs for one of the four strands, include examples of musical “tasks” that provide a practical and authentic method for applying the MCAs to the music classroom.\(^5\) While these music tasks offer excellent examples of MCAs in

---


\(^3\) Shuler, Norgaard, and Blakeslee, “The New National Standards,” 44.


the composition process, they do not address MCA application for other composition-related activities like arranging. Additionally, the composition tasks approach the creative process from a classical music perspective, neglecting the composition and arranging processes of popular church musicians who utilize non-traditional notation like that of the Nashville Number System. Therefore, the literature has not fully addressed the implementation of Composition/Theory MCAs in a popular church music arranging curriculum that utilizes the informal pedagogy and practice of popular church musicians and the Nashville Number System.

**Statement of the Problem**

The National Coalition for Core Arts created the new arts standards to offer the music education profession “better… expectations for the artistic processes” that students should learn through school music programs. These standards emerge from a broader, decades-long advocacy movement in American education to establish “rigorous academic standards” that define what students are expected to learn in schools. An integral aspect of meeting the arts standards, as with any standards, is assessment. Assessment allows educators the ability to collect evidence of student learning to satisfy the ever growing demand for “educator accountability” in the current educational and political climate. Model Cornerstone Assessments (MCAs) were created to fill this purpose, acting as “curriculum-embedded measures designed for music students to apply relevant knowledge and skills while demonstrating learning in the

---


7 Ibid.

standards that define the artistic processes.” The MCAs address assessment in various musical contexts, such as ensemble, harmonizing instrument, and composition/theory classes.

In the case of the Composition/Theory MCAs, three potential authentic composition “tasks” are included on the National Association for Music Education’s website, each addressing a different achievement level for students in high school composition classes. Each musical task is designed as a unit of related activities that deal with the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding. These processes are further divided into “process components” or smaller “steps” inherent within each larger process. For instance, the artistic process of creating involves four steps: Imagine, Plan and Make, Evaluate and Refine, and Present. For each process component, one or more performance standards specify what musical skills and behaviors students should exhibit through each step of the process. These all relate to the authentic composition tasks that are outlined on the provided MCA Task Scenario sheets, or the forms that describe the musical context, purpose, and criteria of the composition activities.

While these musical scenarios offer practical authentic examples for applying MCAs in composition courses at different levels of musicianship, none address the application of MCAs to composition-related activities like arranging. This is problematic as arranging is a significant component of popular music, particularly in the genre of church music. Additionally, for the world of Christian private education, instructing high school and junior high students to engage in musical activities that can easily be integrated into church worship services remains important.

---

12 Ibid., 60.
for training new generations in the worship of Jesus Christ. The research literature, then, has failed to address how Composition/Theory MCAs can be effectively applied to arranging church music in junior high and high school band classrooms.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this applied research study was to determine how Composition/Theory MCAs can be effectively applied to a curriculum for arranging church music in the junior high and high school band program at Family Christian Academy. While research existed on the implementation of MCAs to composition in the music classroom, there was a need to explore how Composition/Theory MCAs could adapt to a curriculum pertaining to arranging church music that utilizes the Nashville Number System (NNS) and other aspects of popular music pedagogy. While the creation of two musical arrangements was central to this curriculum, the artistic processes of performing and responding were also integral.

The curriculum included twenty 48-minute class days (ten days for arranging one song and ten days for another) structured around the seventeen performance standards that were used in the Proficient Composition/Theory MCA. Each of these segments for the curriculum were assessed using adapted rubrics and forms provided in the MCAs. In addition, a survey was administered before and after the implementation of the curriculum project to determine the perceptions of student skills in arranging, rehearsing, performing, and evaluating their own arrangements as well as their peers’ arrangements. After the implementation of the curriculum, one-on-one interviews were conducted with the students to help explain the perceived effectiveness of the curriculum.

---

The curriculum was implemented with a small sample of students. These students were enrolled in a single junior high and high school band class at Family Christian Academy for the 2022-2023 school year. The enrollment of this class was at eight students during the time of recruitment. The small enrollment was deemed ideal for the student-directed nature of the curriculum activities. Two students participated throughout the entirety of the study.

**Significance of the Study**

This applied research study assessed the effectiveness of a curriculum that utilized Composition/Theory MCAs in an arranging context catered to popular church music and the pedagogical ideals of Popular Music Education (PME). With the increase in PME popularity and acceptance in American education, it has become necessary that MCAs meet the diverse musical interests of American society.\(^\text{14}\) In addition, it has become more important that this assessment feels authentic—a common emphasis in the world of PME. In order for PME to be authentic, its pedagogy must be “learner-led” and “self-directed,” as the traditional “teacher-directed approaches… are antithetical to a classroom that supports creativity.”\(^\text{15}\) By adapting Composition/Theory MCAs into an arranging context that is based on the learning practices of popular church musicians, this study sought to determine if the MCAs could be effectively utilized in a way that is authentic to church arranging scenarios.

While this study’s focus on testing the flexibility of the MCAs is apropos for music educators, the informal practices of popular music pedagogy utilized in this curriculum are significant for education as a whole. With the influence of the educational law, the Every


\(^\text{15}\) Ibid., 3.
Students Succeeds Act (2015), American education continues to shift its focus towards developing “dispositions and skills” that will aid students in both college and the workforce during twenty-first century.16 This curriculum project utilized the informal learning of popular musicians, involving student-led activities that required “critical thinking, problem-solving, creativity, innovation, communication, and collaboration.”17 Because the activities of the curriculum also centered on arranging music, students were challenged to be “flexible and adaptable,” qualities which are essential in the ever-changing world of the twenty-first century.18 Accordingly, this study added to the increasing body of research regarding the application of formal and informal music pedagogy when teaching popular music, discussed by authors like Rescsanszky and Green.19

Practically, this curriculum project gives a tangible adaptation of the MCAs for arranging. For popular music educators who teach NNS, this curriculum provides a format for teaching arranging according to the NCCAS, while allowing for the necessary flexibility to adapt it to their own musical context. Finally, the call for “testing the [MCA] rubrics using a variety of curricular content” adds this applied research study to that body of literature.20


18 Ibid., 89.


Research Question and Hypothesis

As applied research, this study was concerned with “solving a problem of practice or making educational improvements.”21 Accordingly, determining the appropriate adaptation of Composition/Theory MCAs in the proposed church music arranging curriculum and the effectiveness of such a curriculum implemented in the FCA seventh-through-tenth-grade band program was the focus of this study. The following question guided the study:

RQ1: How can Composition/Theory MCAs be effectively applied to a church music arranging curriculum that utilizes popular music pedagogy and uses Nashville Numbers as the primary notational device and communicative medium?

The following hypothesis was offered in response to the research question above:

H1: Implementing the MCA-based arranging curriculum in the seventh-through-tenth-grade FCA band will result in improved student perception of student arranging, performance, rehearsing, and evaluating/responding.

Additionally, statistical analyses were performed using the following null hypothesis:

H0: Implementing the MCA-based arranging curriculum in the seventh-through-tenth-grade FCA band will result in no difference in student perception of student arranging, performance, rehearsing, and evaluating/responding.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions convey the intended meaning of this researcher within the scope of this paper:

National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (NCCAS) are K-12 standards “designed to help students develop artistic literacy” in “creating new music, performing existing music with understanding and expression, and responding to others’ music with understanding.”

Assessment is “a process that includes measurement and evaluation.”

Model Cornerstone Assessments (MCAs) are “curriculum-embedded measures designed for music students to apply relevant knowledge and skills while demonstrating learning in the standards that define the artistic processes.”

Nashville Number System is a “method of transcribing music so that a song can be understood and performed. Nashville chord charts substitute [Arabic] numbers for the chord letter symbols found in traditional notation.” Additionally, these numbers can represent individual notes in the scale to designate riffs found in the music.

Arranging is the “adapting [of] an existing composition into an appropriate form for a specific instrumental ensemble,” often with the addition of “counterlines...background lines and rhythmic figures.”

Riffs are “short repeated musical figure[s],” usually melodic in nature.

Pads are “sustained slow moving harmon[ies] that [support] a melodic line.”

---


25 Chas Williams, The Nashville Number System (self-pub., Chas Williams, 2019), 6.

26 Tom Boras, Jazz Composition and Arranging (Belmont, CA: Thomson Schirmer, 2005), 1.

27 Ibid., 6.

28 Ibid., 217.
Punctuations, sometimes described as “punch chords”\textsuperscript{29} or as “rhythmic/percussive backgrounds,”\textsuperscript{30} are defined in the present study as rhythmic and harmonic emphases of lyrics or chord changes.

Popular Music includes “all vernacular forms of music making under the popular music label such as rock, country, jazz, folk, and R&B.”\textsuperscript{31} This also includes the styles of Gospel and Contemporary Christian Music, which are relevant to the current study.

Popular Music Education refers to “any courses and classes in popular music studies, popular music performance, stagecraft, live sound, recording songwriting, production, beat making, arranging, and areas of music technology.”\textsuperscript{32}

Popular Music Pedagogy refers to any combination of “informal/formal/non-formal, traditional and contemporary, [or] analog and digital approaches to teaching and learning.”\textsuperscript{33}

An Informal Approach to teaching and learning is “learner-centered and learner-driven… it does not follow a set curriculum, and it does not have defined learning outcomes.”\textsuperscript{34}

A Non-formal Approach to teaching and learning is “determined by the student and ‘teacher’ as co-learners in a more democratic learning environment… the curriculum is less structured and flexible, and has generalized learning outcomes.”\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{29} Boras, \textit{Jazz Composition and Arranging}, 217.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 241.


\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 16.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., Preface, Different Approaches for Different Styles of Music.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
A **Formal Approach** to teaching and learning is “teacher-centered, based on a defined curriculum, and has defined learning outcomes.”36

---

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

While American music education advocacy attempts frequently champion the inherent creativity of music education and its value to education as a whole, creative activities like composition, arranging, and improvisation have often been neglected components of curricula.\(^{37}\)

The recent inclusion of “Create” as one of the three artistic processes in the NCCAS, however, has resulted in an increased focus on reforming school curricula to include such musical processes. Concurrently, many music teachers have questioned the traditional large ensemble form of music education, a model that commonly stresses competition and technical prowess over “understanding, creating, or responding to the art of music.”\(^{38}\)

Consequently, a large number of these educators have chosen to support Popular Music Education (PME) because of its emphasis on creativity and student-centered instructional practices.\(^{39}\)

As PME garners followers, some scholars have questioned the authenticity of assessment practices in music education and their use in the popular music classroom.\(^{40}\) Additionally, others have questioned whether the “formal assessment” of creative activities like composition is ideal,

---


given its subjective nature. Despite these objections, the NCCAS included Composition/Theory Model Cornerstone Assessments (MCAs) for assessing the process and product of student compositions. This assessment is done largely through rubrics designed to “demonstrate learning in multiple ways.” While pilot tests of the MCAs in schools demonstrated some success, there remained the need to test MCAs in new contexts and with different musical creative processes. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine how Composition/Theory MCAs could adapt to a church music arranging curriculum that integrated the informal pedagogy of popular musicians. Determining the effectiveness of such a curriculum and its adherence to the authentic, learner-centered practices of popular church musicians were the principal concerns of this study.

**Theoretical Framework**

This researcher adopted constructivism as the theoretical framework for this study. As a learning theory, constructivism describes the role of the learner in constructing knowledge and understanding through the interactions with his or her environment, particularly in “social activity” with other people. The attention given to the student’s part in the learning process makes the theory a practical framework for a student-centered arranging curriculum. Additionally, the theory’s emphasis on interacting with others supports its utility in the

---


44 Kladder, “Songwriting in Modern Band?”, 5.
collaborative activities of creating and peer assessment included in the Composition/Theory MCAs. Constructivism also aligns with the informal learning practices of popular musicians.  

Constructivism has been applied to other types of music teaching contexts. Kladder illustrates a constructivist songwriting curriculum situated in a Modern Band (MB), a format of PME that centers around popular music pieces and instruments. Clauhs and Powell also asserts that MB aligns with constructivism because it empowers students to choose “music that connects with their ‘interests, experiences, understandings, and purposes.’” Likewise, Randles attributes both “constructivist and direct instruction modes of teaching and learning” to the pedagogy of Little Kids Rock (LKR), a non-profit organization largely responsible for the MB movement in public schools. Additionally, constructivism is implied in the many informal practices found in popular music pedagogy.

Social interdependence theory was also considered for this study. The theory, called “Cooperative Learning” when applied to education, underscores group collaboration. The framework relies on the “intrinsic state of tension within group members [to motivate] their progress toward the accomplishment of the desired shared goals.” While the theory’s emphasis on collaboration made it attractive for this study, its excessive concentration on group influence

---


46 Ibid., 9; Ibid., 4.


49 Holley, Coaching A Popular Music Ensemble, 2.

50 Whitener, “Using the elements of cooperative,” 224.

51 Ibid.
in the learning process appeared to neglect the individual student’s role in learning and motivation, a major concern in PME. This literature review, informed by the student-centered principles of constructivism, addresses the history of PME, its learning and pedagogical practices, and the creative processes it emphasizes. The discussion continues with the historical background of music education assessment, the philosophical discourse surrounding it, the views regarding authentic music assessment, and the difficulties of assessing creativity. The review concludes by examining MCAs and their application to PME and, by extension, the present curriculum project.

**Popular Music Education**

**History of Popular Music Education**

Popular music, or music that is categorized as distinct from classical music, has long held an important place in American culture. Popular music encompasses a large portion of music styles including R&B, pop, soul, rock, EDM, and salsa—most of which are considered commercial music. Early popular music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was propagated through method books and sheet music. With the invention of recording technology in the late nineteenth century, however, popular music gained greater attention of American society as records could be quickly distributed to consumers. Even as popular music grew to be

---


53 Holley, *Coaching A Popular Music Ensemble*, Preface, “Can’t We All Just Get Along?”

54 Krikun, “Historical Foundations of Popular,” 34.
favored by many, it was designated an inferior status to classical music because of the “cultural hierarchy and racism” prevalent at the time.\textsuperscript{55}

Because of classical music’s superior status and the coinciding negative attitudes toward popular music, schools in America have been slow to adopt popular music.\textsuperscript{56} Despite some inclusion of popular music in schools during the 1920s and 1930s and the subsequent efforts of the Tanglewood Symposium (1967) and other national music education reforms to incorporate popular music in school curricula, popular music gained minimal acceptance in the American music education profession as a whole during the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{57} For instance, while music educators present at Tanglewood discussed the importance of using “popular teen-age [sic] music,”\textsuperscript{58} the complexity of the music was debated.\textsuperscript{59} Accordingly, Gurgel notes that, “Perhaps unintentionally, and perhaps because an analysis of how popular music is learned and composed did not take place [at the Tanglewood Symposium], the suggestion to view popular music as a rigorous addition to school music curricula was met with mixed responses.”\textsuperscript{60}

In Britain and other European countries, however, popular music was more easily accepted and gradually incorporated into formal settings starting in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{61} This contrast between American and non-American music education is further elucidated in Mantie’s literature

\textsuperscript{55} Krikun, “Historical Foundations of Popular,” 34.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 35.

\textsuperscript{57} Kladder, “Songwriting in Modern Band?”, 2.


\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 61.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 62.

According to Mantie, while the music education discourses of non-American countries focus on how to improve the teaching of popular music already present in classrooms, American discourse centers on arguing for the inclusion of popular music, attempting to convey the “legitimacy” of popular music as a valuable part of formal education. These American-focused scholarly journals also often address concerns over the possible degradation of “quality teaching of quality music” if popular music is included in curricula. While Mantie’s article is nearly a decade old and likely does not reflect more recent trends in American discourse, it demonstrates the slow acceptance of popular music into formal American music education even into the 2000s.

Mantie’s article also highlights the non-American focus on improving the pedagogy of popular music teaching in schools. For instance, while the last four decades of the twentieth century witnessed the inclusion of popular musical repertoire and instrumentation in the United Kingdom, music researcher Lucy Green noticed that much of this music was taught through the Western classical paradigm of formal education, neglecting the manner in which popular musicians learn. In response to this, Green, in 2002, published one of the most influential texts on the ways popular musicians learn (to be discussed in the next section of this paper), spurring an increasing adaptation of popular music and its informal learning and pedagogy in the twenty-first century.

---


63 Ibid., 343.

64 Green, How Popular Musicians Learn, 6.

section supports the adoption of a constructivist framework for the popular music classroom and for this curriculum project.

**Popular Music Education Learning and Pedagogy**

As briefly noted above, Green related the informal learning practices of popular musicians in her book *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music Education*. Basing her conclusions on her interviews with fourteen musicians in the London area ranging from the ages of fifteen to fifty, Green found that learning occurred in both individual and group contexts.\(^{66}\) While individual learning practices most frequently included listening and imitating recordings, group learning revolved around peers teaching one another songs or occurred “as a result of peer interaction but in the absence of any teaching.”\(^{67}\) Additionally, creative acts like composition and improvisation commonly occurred in these group contexts as musicians worked collaboratively to make musical products.\(^{68}\) These principles of group learning found among popular musicians, particularly in the realm of creativity, were most relevant to the this study as this aspect of group collaboration was included in the arranging curriculum.

In Green’s later work, *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy*, she sought to apply these informal learning practices of popular musicians in the classroom context. Testing her pedagogy, she performed an empirical study that included “21 secondary schools, 32 classroom teachers and over 1,500 pupils [students].”\(^{69}\) The curriculum

---

\(^{66}\) Green, *How Popular Musicians Learn*, 8; Ibid., 76.

\(^{67}\) Ibid., 75; Ibid., 76.

\(^{68}\) Ibid., 80.

project involved seven separate stages of differing pedagogy, but the focus of the research revolved around the informal pedagogy of the first stage.⁷⁰ Students in this stage chose their own music and instruments. They then listened and learned their group’s song by ear. Throughout this stage, Green and the teachers involved noticed students started off well but then appeared to “deteriorate” in focus and progress after a few lessons.⁷¹ However, the teachers discovered that the students eventually “righted themselves without help, or with minimal help.” Additionally, the informal learning resulted in performances that were surprisingly “well in time” and, according to the teachers, “were better than usual, and better than expected.”⁷² While this first stage of the project did not focus heavily on creativity, students were required to adapt their songs into arrangements that fit the skill level of the players, a skill that was deemed necessary for this curriculum project. Notably, the strategies of learning utilized during this stage’s implementation also align closely with the theoretical claims of constructivism.

Green’s findings have since encouraged further exploration of informal pedagogy among the international music education community. Expounding upon many of the ideas presented in both of Green’s books, Holley describes three different frameworks for popular music classroom instruction: the “formal,” “non-formal,” and the “informal approach[es].”⁷³ He describes the formal approach as “teacher-directed,” informal as “learner-directed,” and non-formal as a balance between the two approaches.⁷⁴ Accordingly, he advocates a blended approach to

⁷⁰ Green, Music, Informal Learning, 23.
⁷¹ Ibid., 52.
⁷² Ibid.
⁷⁴ Ibid., 26.
pedagogy, adapting to the nature and the needs of the musical group.\textsuperscript{75} He also notes that, while much PME involves informal learning, it does not have to be learned in this manner in order to be authentic.\textsuperscript{76} He cites his personal experiences in popular groups as evidence that some music groups are more formal while others are more informal. Contextualizing Holley’s claims, Powell reports that the discourse regarding informal and non-formal learning is one of the five major categories of MB literature he recognized in his literature review.\textsuperscript{77} His article illustrates that blended pedagogy is common in MB classrooms.

While Holley and Powell both note that authentic PME practices are not restricted to informal practices, several scholars argue for the importance of creating more space for student-centered learning. For instance, while Byo’s ethnography study of a middle school MB program in downtown Manhattan, New York City, revealed a blended pedagogy for classroom instruction, he suggested including more elements of informal learning such as “permissible ‘mucking around’” and “music listening and playing by ear.”\textsuperscript{78} Kladder, in his article on adapting constructivism for a songwriting curriculum in MB, agrees with Byo’s statement, adding that “As students ‘muck around’ in social groups, they ‘figure out’ what ‘works’ or ‘doesn’t work.’”\textsuperscript{79} Additionally, Kladder’s article demonstrates constructivism as a proper match for the pedagogy of PME.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[75] Holley, \textit{Coaching A Popular Music Ensemble}, 22.
\item[76] Ibid., 23.
\end{footnotes}
Following a similar sentiment as Byo and Kladder, Gurgel warns against adapting popular music and instrumentation without teaching it in the authentic learning practices of popular musicians. In her view, popular music pedagogy should be student-centered and concerned with “student collaboration.” Class size, however, is essential to consider when determining pedagogy, as facilitating student-centered instruction grows in difficulty as student numbers increase. Powell and Burstein address this point in their article about the guiding principles of MB. They note that large class sizes, a commonality in American public schools, typically need more structure. They maintain that the MB format allows for larger class sizes while incorporating popular music “repertoire and instrumentation.” In addition to their discussion of class size, Powell and Burstein argue that the MB format lends itself to more composition and improvisation because students are encouraged to “speak” musical ideas in much the same manner that “people acquire a second language.” While the MB model may necessitate a more teacher-directed classroom, its potential for creative processes demonstrates that it aligns with constructivist values of education as well as with PME’s emphasis on creativity.

Creative Processes in Popular Music Education

This applied research study was concerned with the creative process of arranging in PME. However, the literature is relatively silent on the issue of arranging, only mentioning it for
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a brief moment in some places.\textsuperscript{84} Even so, there is agreement that composition is an inherent process in arranging.\textsuperscript{85} As well, the process of improvisation shares similarities with composition and arranging. Because of the similarities of these processes, sources that focus on composition or improvisation were deemed relevant to this study.

Notably, despite claims of PME groups like Little Kids Rock, composition and improvisation remain largely neglected components of curricula. Randles analyzed the results of a teacher survey administrated by LKR and discovered that only 32 percent of LKR teachers reported that their students had engaged in composition, songwriting, and improvisation activities.\textsuperscript{86} These data are concerning, considering that LKR programs claim to instruct “kids to perform, improvise, and compose using the popular styles.”\textsuperscript{87} While this neglect of creativity is alarming, Randles notes that there is an increasing body of research regarding creativity and inclusion in music education.\textsuperscript{88} An article by Whitener about incorporating cooperative learning in the band classroom supports Randles’ observation. Whitener advocates for reforming traditional pedagogy in the traditional band classroom to accommodate the creative processes into curricula.\textsuperscript{89}

In agreement with Randle and Whitener’s call for expanding music curricula, van der Schyff recognizes a need for including more artistic creative processes in Western formal study.
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that is often void of them. He reports that improvising, despite its widespread presence in music cultures worldwide, remains largely ignored in formal education. He states that most formal study concentrates curricula on reproducing classical music compositions while overlooking instruction focused on extemporaneous melodic and rhythmic creation.\textsuperscript{90} Van der Schyff argues that even jazz education, largely regarded for its inclusion of improvisation in music curricula, limits improvisation to a “technicist” approach that revolves around scales and harmonies.\textsuperscript{91} Instead, he adopts a view that improvisation should not be taught as much as fostered through a musical environment that encourages its exploration.\textsuperscript{92} Like Randles and Whitener’s research, van der Schyff’s article belongs to a growing body of literature on creativity in music education.

The NCCAS’s inclusion of “Create” as one of the three central artistic processes is partially responsible for this increasing emphasis on the creative processes of music. Clauhs and Powell, in their article “Teaching the Core Arts Standards in Modern Band,” discuss the adaptability of MB to the artistic processes found in the NCCAS. They claim, contrary to the findings of Randles, that “songwriting and improvisation activities are essential components of modern band.”\textsuperscript{93} The act of covering songs, they argue, involves creativity as students arrange songs “to fit their instrumentation and experience level.”\textsuperscript{94}
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Another more recent factor leading to an increased focus on creativity is the COVID-19 pandemic. As music educators were forced to teach online for safety reasons, it quickly became apparent that traditional music education curricula and assessment may not be appropriate for this type of distance learning. Accordingly, it is believed the crisis resulted in a greater “variety of musical content (e.g., music culture, history, theory) along with increased occasions for student creativity (e.g., arranging and composition).” Even though COVID-19 may have increased engagement in creative processes during this time, it is not clear whether this aspect of curricula has been retained as students have returned to normal in-person learning. As music education continues to integrate the NCCAS in the post-COVID-19 era of education, assessment practices become increasingly important for measuring whether these goals have been attained in music classrooms. The remainder of this literature review discusses the history of assessment in music education, the philosophical discourses surrounding assessment, the concerns about its authenticity, the challenges of assessing creativity, and the recent publications regarding MCAs and their relevance to PME.

Assessment in Music Education

History of Assessment in American Music Education

The beginnings of assessment in American music education can be traced to the advertisement efforts of the Band Instrument Manufacturers Association. The organization
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established the “School Band Contest of America” in 1923 to “promote its members [sic] products to the education market.”\(^9\) Since that time, assessment and the competition that frequently accompanies it has characterized music education. However, political educational movements, starting with the “National Assessment of Education Progress” in the late 1960s, began an increasing emphasis on national assessment in education.\(^9\) Educational policies, such as Goals 2000 of 1994 and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2002, drove education to adapt standards and stress assessment to determine school and teacher quality.\(^9\) Most recently, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 amended NCLB, alleviating some its negative effects. It, however, continues to stress assessment in education.\(^10\)

Music education, in response to these reforms, has had to reconsider its assessment practices. Most recently, the publication of the NCAAS spurred the development of standards-aligned measurements called Model Cornerstone Assessments.\(^10\) Music educators, however, are not in full agreement about assessment practices, and not all support MCAs for PME.\(^10\) The next section deals with the definition of assessment and the differing philosophies regarding assessment in music education.
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Philosophical Discourses on Music Assessments

Coming to an agreement about the definition of assessment and its various components is problematic within the international music education community. For instance, participants of the eighth International Symposium on Assessment in Music Education noticed the great difficulty in coming to a consensus on the term *assessment*. Some described assessment as only “[referring] to student growth” while others claimed that assessment involved “comparing the number [given by the process of measurement] to the [numbers measured from the larger] group.” With both of these participants, the terms of *measuring* and *evaluation* were treated as distinct from assessment. Still others held separate views from those mentioned above. While the symposium eventually settled on a definition of assessment as “the process of measurement and evaluation of the learning process,” they further qualified this definition, stating that this assessment is “informed by specific goals, contexts, and cultural settings.”

In the context of American music education, Payne, Burrack, Parkes, and Wesolowski describe assessment as “an action or instance of making judgment about intended learning, such as a test of knowledge or skill.” They note the importance of measuring in assessment and collecting data in varied ways to aid in the evaluation and analysis of student learning. Likewise, Parkes emphasizes the process component of assessment as an interaction between
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measurement and evaluation. Additionally, Rawlings and Parkes, in reflecting upon the increase of data collection via technology in the COVID-19 crisis, also describe “*assessment as learning*” (italics original), seeing the very process of assessment as an opportunity to learn. Given that most of the authors who wrote these articles were involved in the process of developing the MCAs, it is reasonable to deduce that many of their concepts of assessment are embedded in the MCAs.

While the authors of the MCAs relate assessment as involving measurement and evaluation, Richerme argues that the authors’ promotion of the MCAs indicates a perspective that the assessments measure student learning from a distance without interfering with it. To frame her argument, Richerme draws from the discipline of physics, applying the measuring methodologies of reflection and diffraction to music education. Reflection, she explains, involves the researcher measuring a phenomenon from which the researcher is completely separate. Diffraction methodologies, on the other hand, differ in that the “observer and object are not fixed but emerging and contingent on each other.” She contends that the MCA authors intend to pass off the assessments as reflective measurements. She, by contrast, believes assessment to be a diffractive measurement, one in which the student and teacher interact in the learning process.
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Authentic Music Assessment

While Richerme’s concerns about the representation of the MCAs are valid, it does appear that the authors of the MCAs share many of the views she relates. As well, while the purpose and functionality of assessment are important topics to consider in producing a philosophy of assessment, the issue of authenticity might be one of the most important to the music education profession, particularly PME. Hallam addresses the issue of authenticity in her article on the benefits of assessment on the learning process. Like Richerme, she illustrates how assessment has an important role on music learning. However, it is this quality of assessment that causes her to stress the importance of authentic formative and summative assessments, or assessments that reflect the musical contexts of musicians found outside of the formal schooling setting.113

Powell and Smith also reflect Hallam’s concerns for authentic assessment. They, though, deal with authentic practice and assessment in PME. They question the traditional assessment practices of rubrics, noting that such measures “may be antithetical to the nature or aims of learning (in) music.”114 Additionally, the authors scrutinize whether MCAs remain flexible to the needs of the various musical traditions found in Popular Music.115 The authors also express the difficulty in assessing creative products.116 They suggest “negotiated assessment,” an assessment method that involves the student in the decision process of what needs to be assessed, as an appropriate strategy for assessing creative activities.”117
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recommendation promotes tremendous flexibility, it lacks the objectivity that is typically desired in education. Even so, the authors address concerns of authenticity with the MCAs and their incorporation with PME, a necessary intersection in this study.

Assessing Creativity

As Powell and Smith discuss in their article, creativity is difficult to assess. The subjective nature of creativity makes measuring student learning a problematic endeavor. While Powell and Smith suggest negotiated assessment as a potential solution to this problem, authors like Edmund and Edmund propose that assessment criteria for creative activities like composition, improvisation, and arrangement should center on the musical elements present in each musical product, as focus on these observable features of products helps with “minimizing subjectivity.” They also, however, pose the question of whether creativity is an “innovation” or simply a continuation of previously established musical practices. In response to this question, the authors view the definition of creativity as changing depending on the musical context. Assessment criteria of creative processes such as arranging, then, must adapt and emphasize musical elements in accordance with the task’s purpose and nature. Additionally, Edmund and Edmund highlight the importance of self- and peer-evaluation throughout the process of creating, allowing also for additional chances for students to “explain their creative decisions.”
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Van der Schyff, like Edmund and Edmund, views self-assessment as important in assessing the creative process of improvising, arguing that other methods of assessing often limit students to “carefully prescribed technique[s] centered around tonal harmony and regular rhythms.” Accordingly, such teaching and assessing methodologies fail to encourage students to attempt new ways of improvising that “adapt and transform… such frameworks” to form “new approaches… that resonate with and express their individual and shared experiences in unique and sometimes unexpected ways.” Self-assessment, in contrast, allows students to improve their improvising (or other creative activities) without trying to mold themselves to the rigid technical standards that so often dominate music education. While van der Schyff’s ideas of self-assessment were deemed relevant to the current study, it seems he advocates an approach to improvising (and creativity in general) that is difficult for students to engage with, as it involves less structure than many students require. Even so, van der Schyff and Edmund and Edmund’s ideas of self- and peer-reflection are present in the MCAs’ composition tasks, as they offer opportunities for students to reflect on each other’s compositions. This aspect of the MCAs tasks was retained in this curriculum project.

Model Cornerstone Assessments and Popular Music Education

Parkes defines MCAs as “curriculum-embedded measures designed for music students to apply relevant knowledge and skills while demonstrating learning in the standards that define the
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artistic processes.” As such, MCAs focus largely on formative measurements of the processes of creating, performing, and responding. While these formative measures allow for extensive opportunities to evaluate student work and give feedback before summative assessments are given, the large emphasis on writing caused this researcher to question their authenticity. For example, the pilot tests for the Composition/Theory MCAs revealed that “both teachers and students identified the abundance of paperwork…as repetitive and cumbersome.” While the researchers reduced some of this paperwork following the pilot study, the extensive writing was thought to potentially threaten the authenticity for a church arranging curriculum that implemented the Composition/Theory MCAs. However, given that the “teacher participants praised the authentic nature of the assessment task” included with the Composition/Theory MCAs, an authentic arranging curriculum was deemed possible if the task was presented authentically.

While the authenticity of assessment remained a valid concern for the study, this researcher decided that pedagogy was the greatest factor in determining the authenticity of the learning experience within the arranging curriculum. Drawing inspiration from the frequent application of a blended pedagogy in PME, this researcher designed the arranging curriculum to feature both non-formal and informal learning formats. While some teacher-centered instruction occurred for the successful implementation of the MCAs, the constructivist approach to learning was central to instruction.
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Summary

As has been demonstrated, this literature review demonstrated that popular music education continues to find acceptance in formal schooling as its non-formal and informal pedagogy align with modern constructivist theories of learning. Additionally, its student-centered format also lends it to the creative processes of music such as composition, improvisation, and arranging. While PME aligns with the NCCAS, it still requires authentic assessment practices to measure whether students experience and understand the artistic processes. These assessments, however, are not distant measurements of student learning but are inherently involved with changing the understanding of both the teacher and the student.

While the MCAs risk compromising some elements of authenticity because of their use of rubrics and writing, they offer excellent opportunities for evaluating and giving feedback to students. As well, the analysis of the literature suggests that assessment practices for creative processes like arranging are most effective when they involve self- and peer-assessment and the measuring of pre-defined criteria centered on musical elements. Finally, while Composition/Theory MCAs had been pilot-tested via the researcher-created assessment tasks, they had not been applied to a church music arranging curriculum that incorporated popular music pedagogy, NNS, and constructivist learning theory. This study sought to fill this gap in the research literature.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study implemented an applied research design. Applied research involves implementing a study in a specific setting, and its results are typically more difficult to generalize to larger populations.\textsuperscript{129} The study was applied because it involved implementing a church music arranging curriculum into the FCA seventh-through-tenth-grade band program and collecting data using qualitative and quantitative methods.\textsuperscript{130} Because FCA was a small private school, the number of students involved in the study represented a much smaller sample of seventh-through-tenth-grade private school band students from a city in Louisiana. Thus, the study’s results were difficult to generalize to the greater population.

Creswell and Creswell describe independent variables as “those that influence, or affect outcomes in experimental studies.”\textsuperscript{131} Additionally, these variables are “manipulated” by the researcher.\textsuperscript{132} Following this definition, the independent variable of this study was the arranging curriculum itself, as it was hypothesized that it would affect participants’ perceptions of their abilities to arrange, perform, rehearse, and evaluate arrangements. The dependent variable, by contrast, is “the response of the criterion variable presumed to be caused by or influenced by the independent treatment conditions.”\textsuperscript{133} Therefore, the dependent variables of this study were the students’ abilities to arrange church music, perform and rehearse their arrangements, and
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evaluate both their arrangements and their peers’ arrangements as measured by a student self-perception survey. These variables related to the three artistic processes assessed in the MCAs: create, perform, and respond. Together, these variables illustrated the effectiveness of the curriculum.

**Data Collection Approaches**

Quantitative Approach

The quantitative aspect of this study followed a “one-group pretest-posttest design.”\(^{134}\) This design is considered a “pre-experimental design.”\(^{135}\) Because of the low number of students and class offerings at FCA, researching with two separate groups where one was treated as a control group and the other was treated as a treatment group was not possible. Accordingly, the one-group design was most appropriate for the study’s academic setting. The one-group pretest-posttest design involved a measurement taken before and after the treatment, here the curriculum, was administered to the research group. Thus, the students were measured using a pre-test and post-test self-assessment survey that measured their perceptual understanding of arranging, performing and rehearsing original arrangements, and evaluating both their own arrangements and those of their peers. This survey was adapted from Kokotsaki’s self-assessment survey which was designed to measure student perception of their own ability in musical areas such as “performing, composing [adapted as arranging for this study], listening, reviewing and evaluating.”\(^{136}\) (See the adapted form of the survey in Appendix E).
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Kokotsaki’s instrument was administered to measure students from six different schools in England, many of whom were eleven years of age, an age group close to the seventh- and eighth-grade students of this study. The survey comprised a Likert scale of three numbers. Students responded with “3 (‘I can do this well’), 2 (‘I can do this some of the time’) or 1 (‘I can’t do this yet’).” The survey was useful for this study because it dealt with many of the musical processes that the MCAs measure. Additionally, the composition and performance questions were easily adapted to the arranging context, and questions irrelevant to the current study were be omitted. The final reason the instrument was selected was because it was described as highly reliable (see section on instrumentation for the report on reliability).

Qualitative Approach

After the administration of the pretest survey, the curriculum was implemented. During the implementation phase, four qualitative methods were used to help determine the effectiveness of the curriculum. The first method of data collection was document analysis, or a process that examined “qualitative documents.” As “curriculum-embedded measures,” the MCA documents acted as measurements of student learning throughout the processes of creating arrangements, rehearsing and performing them, and evaluating them. The curriculum was divided chronologically into two halves: one devoted to arranging the song “Glorious Day” by Passion and the other devoted to the song “1,000 Names” by Phil Wickham. For each song the students arranged, an entire set of Composition/Theory MCAs was administered. This resulted in
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each participant having two copies of every MCA document, though an exception occurred in the case of the Peer Review Form, as one participant was absent when the worksheet was administered.

In addition to these documents, the researcher conducted “qualitative observations,” recording “notes on the behavior and activities of individuals at the research site.” Following an Observation Protocol Form, the researcher noted issues of student engagement and classroom management after the end of every class (see Appendix C for the Observation Protocol Form that was used). Following a checklist, the researcher noted behaviors and activities of the class that he observed each day. Students who did not conform to the majority of the class were also noted on the forms. Additional explanations of the classroom observations were written under the “Additional Comments from Observer” section at the bottom of each form. These data were used to determine if the activities of the curriculum inspired all students to engage with the musical processes of the MCAs. This consideration was deemed important for group work, as some students might not have fully participated because other students performed extra work for them.

Besides the methods of document analysis and qualitative observation, this researcher audio recorded student performances as “qualitative… digital material.” Implementing the MCA rubric as a point of reference, the recordings were analyzed qualitatively and compared to one another. By recording student performances, the MCAs were given an audio component, something that was recommended by some in the pilot studies of the Composition/Theory MCAs. This audio component also allowed the researcher to hear whether students had
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successfully created an arrangement, the central purpose of the curriculum. Formative assessment audio was recorded using Voice Memo on the researcher’s iPhone. Summative assessment audio was recorded using a Shure SM7B Cardioid Dynamic Vocal Microphone mounted on a microphone stand. The microphone signal was boosted by a Cloud Microphones Cloudlifter CL-1 1-channel Mic Activator and was run through an M-Audio two-channel pre-amp into the researcher’s MacBook Pro. The researcher implemented the digital audio workstation Logic Pro to record.

The final qualitative method implemented in this study was “qualitative interviews.” Conducted one-on-one with participants, these interviews featured “open-ended questions that [were] few in number with the intention to elicit views and opinions from the participants.” These interviews granted the researcher additional information on student experience of the curriculum. The questions asked of the students were:

1. How has this study affected your understanding of arranging?
2. How do you feel about the arrangements you and your classmates made during the study?
3. How has this study affected your understanding of rehearsal and performance?
4. How do you feel about the activities you participated in during this study?
5. How would you change this curriculum to make it more effective?

The interviews were recorded via the Otter.ai app on the researcher’s iPhone and notes were taken in on a separate sheet of paper in case the conversations failed to record properly.
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Data Analysis

Once the pretest and posttest surveys were administered, this researcher implemented the SPSS Statistics software to perform a paired-samples t-test to determine significance. A paired-samples t-test is typically implemented “when [researchers]… need to examine the differences in means between either the same group of individuals that has been tested twice (repeated measures design) or two groups of individuals that have been paired or matched.”\(^{146}\) Because the one-group pretest-posttest design involved two measurements of the same group, the paired-samples t-test was a logical choice. The threshold for significance was set at \(\alpha = .05\).

For the qualitative segment of the study, the data from the MCA documents, observations, recordings, and interviews was transcribed using Otter.ai software or examined for visual and auditory elements. The researcher typed descriptions of the visual and auditory aspects of MCA documents and recordings. All qualitative data was then organized for coding. The computer software Delve was used to help code qualitative information, aiding in the data analysis process.\(^{147}\) Codes were assigned as they “emerg[ed] during the data analysis.”\(^{148}\) The discussion of the results, found in Chapter 4, deals with the themes that emerged from data analysis.

To ensure the validity of data, the researcher triangulated data from various methods, including documents, written observation notes, recordings, and interviews.\(^{149}\) Also, the researcher reviewed interview quotes with participants and discussed the themes discovered from


\(^{148}\) Ibid., 196.

coding. To address the reliability of the qualitative data, codes were clearly defined to certify that tagging was performed consistently. Finally, the finalized form of the data included in the final report was member-checked for accuracy.

**Participants and Setting**

The population of this study was the private school seventh-through-tenth-grade band students of a city in Louisiana. Because implementing a curriculum with this larger group was unrealistic, convenience sampling was necessary. Convenience sampling involves recruiting participants that are “easiest to access and/or [are] within proximity of the researcher without any systematic attempt at creating a match between the sample’s characteristics and the characteristics of a particular general population.”

A rationale for the application of this sampling method was that it is commonly implemented in music education research. Another reason for this method was because this study constitutes applied research, meaning generalizing results to a larger population is not the central aim of the study. This made convenient sampling appropriate for obtaining participants.

The study participants were solicited from a private school where the current researcher is employed as the band director. Participants needed to meet three requirements to enter the study:
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1. The participant needed to be a student enrolled in this private school, Family Christian Academy, during the 2022-2023 school year.

2. The participant needed to take band as an elective during the 2022-2023 school year.

3. The participant could be no younger than a seventh-grader and no older than a tenth-grader.

This group of students was selected because they usually have at least two years of experience playing in a band. This experience was necessary because a certain level of technical and theoretical knowledge was required for students to succeed in the task of arranging.

This researcher introduced the study to the sample during classes in the fall semester of the 2022-2023 school year. Participants were instructed that the study sought to determine the effectiveness of an arranging curriculum implemented in the class during the spring semester. Participants reported understanding that the curriculum would require students to participate in various activities related to creating, performing, and evaluating two music arrangements of popular church music. Participants were informed that the time commitment for the study was expected to require four weeks for the curriculum implementation, with an additional week or two for one-on-one interviews.

Participants also understood that they would be asked to fill out pre- and post-surveys to measure their self-perception of skills and experience in arranging songs, rehearsing them, performing them, and evaluating them. Additionally, participants were made aware that recordings, written worksheets, teacher observations, and interviews would be included in data collection. Participants understood that data would be protected on the researcher's password-protected laptop or locked in a safe with a combination lock. These data would only be stored for
five years, after which they would be deleted or disposed.\textsuperscript{154} Finally, participants were informed that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time. This choice was also extended to the interviews at the end of the study. Additionally, parents were informed and given consent forms to grant permission for their child to participate in the study.

The number of students who were invited to be a part of the study was eight students ($N=8$), with seven males ($N=7$) and one female ($N=1$). Two students were in seventh-grade ($N=2$), one student in eighth-grade ($N=1$), four students in ninth-grade ($N=4$), and one student in tenth-grade ($N=1$). Regarding ethnicity, three students were African American ($N=3$), and five students were Caucasian ($N=5$). Because this was a small private school, students did not have individualized education plans, so this demographic was unknown. There were also no programs for free lunch, and teachers were not informed of socioeconomic status.

While this potential sample was considered too small to have any statistical power, its small size made it ideal for the informal, student-centered pedagogy used in popular music pedagogy. For instance, Rescsanzky taught rock band courses with class sizes of twelve and smaller.\textsuperscript{155} Still, the small sample of junior high and high school band students caused this researcher to realize the impossibility of determining significance. For this reason, qualitative data was also collected to supplement the data from this study's quantitative portion.


Instrumentation

As a “one-group pretest-posttest design,” participants were measured before and after implementing the arranging curriculum. For both the pre- and post-measurement, a modified form of Kokotsaki’s “self-assessment in music learning” survey was administered to students (See Appendix E). The purpose of this instrument was to measure students’ perception of their abilities in arranging, rehearsing, performing, and evaluating as aligned with the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. The original version of the survey was administered to students in northeast England at the end of Year 6 and Year 7 to determine students’ perceived abilities in “performing, composing, listening, reviewing and evaluating.” Survey questions addressed these four criteria at levels 3 and 4 of the pre-2013 National Curriculum for Music (the United Kingdom’s former national standards).

Kokotsaki did not report any findings of validity. However, she noted the assessment’s high overall reliability ($\alpha=0.98$). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were also high for the “Level 3 scale ($\alpha=0.94$), [and] the Level 4 scale ($\alpha=0.97$)” and for the subscales of “composing (Level 3 composing: $\alpha=0.83$; Level 4 composing: $\alpha=0.9$), performing (Level 3 performing: $\alpha=0.9$; Level 4 performing: $\alpha=0.94$), listening (Level 3 listening: $\alpha=0.84$; Level 4 listening: $\alpha=0.9$) and reviewing and evaluating (Level 3 reviewing and evaluating: $\alpha=0.82$; Level 4 reviewing and evaluating: $\alpha=0.9$).” The modified instrument used in the current study used a
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three-point Likert rating scale: 3: I can do this well, 2: I can do this some of the time, 1: I can’t do this yet (this number order was reverse of the format given in the original survey).

Kokotsaki’s version of the instrument contained fifty-four questions: twenty-four at Level 3 and thirty at Level 4. There were eighteen questions about composing, ten concerning reviewing and evaluating, seventeen concerning performing, and nine concerning listening. Five performance questions dealt with singing; these were omitted from the adapted form of the survey used for this study. The survey was administered one class day before the curriculum was implemented in the Family Christian Academy band program. It was also administered one class day after the final class of the curriculum. Thirty minutes were allotted for students to complete the survey each time.

**Intervention**

Conceptual Graphic
Scope and Sequence

To view the scope and sequence of the arranging curriculum, see Appendix D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Questions</th>
<th>S#1 – Imagine</th>
<th>S#1 – Improvise</th>
<th>S#1 – Notate &amp; Record</th>
<th>S#1 – Analyze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do musicians generate creative ideas?</td>
<td>How do musicians generate creative ideas?</td>
<td>How do musicians make creative decisions?</td>
<td>How does understanding the structure and context of musical works inform performance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content in terms of essential concepts and topics</td>
<td>Exploring the musical riffs, pads, and punctuations for student arrangement.</td>
<td>Improvising musical ideas through instruments and voices.</td>
<td>Notating Nashville Numbers and rhythms; Audio recording ideas.</td>
<td>Analyzing the elements of student arrangements; Explaining how elements affect performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards/Skills (process and skills emphasized in the National Core Arts Standards)</td>
<td>MU:Cr1.1.C.Ia</td>
<td>MU:Cr1.1.C.Ia</td>
<td>MU:Cr2.1.C.Ia</td>
<td>MU:Pr4.2.C.Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products/Assessments</td>
<td>Students fill out Imagination Sheet Theory/Composition MCA.</td>
<td>Teacher listens to student ideas and gives minimal feedback.</td>
<td>Students write down musical ideas with Nashville Numbers and Rhythms; Students record ideas.</td>
<td>Students fill out the Analysis Form Theory/Composition MCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Task instructions; Recording of rhythm/vocal tracks for Song #1;</td>
<td>Recording of rhythm tracks for Song #1; Copies of</td>
<td>Blank Paper; Pencil; Brass/Woodwind/</td>
<td>Copies of Analysis Form; Pencil;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Questions</th>
<th>Content in terms of essential concepts and topics</th>
<th>Standards/Skills (process and skills emphasized in the National Core Arts Standards)</th>
<th>Products/Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do musicians improve the quality of their performance?</td>
<td>Practicing and performing the first draft of the arrangement for other student groups.</td>
<td>MU:Pr5.1.C.Ia MU:Pr5.1.C.Ic</td>
<td>The students and the teacher will listen and evaluate performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do musicians improve the quality of their creative work?</td>
<td>Evaluating other student group arrangements.</td>
<td>MU:Cr3.1.C.Ia MU:Pr4.3.C.Ia</td>
<td>The students and the teacher will listen and evaluate performances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do musicians improve the quality of their creative work?</td>
<td>Interpreting comments from other student groups and discussing the aspects of the arrangement that can be changed.</td>
<td>MU:Cr3.1.C.Ia MU:Pr4.3.C.Ia</td>
<td>The teacher informally observes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do performers interpret musical works?</td>
<td>Refining and notating new drafts of arrangements.</td>
<td>MU:Cr3.1.C.Ia MU:Pr4.3.C.Ia</td>
<td>Students notate new drafts of arrangements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequent formative assessments will determine student skill development level during the “S#1 – Evaluate” portion of the lesson. Evaluate performances using the Peer Evaluation Form MCA. Student discussion of peer feedback.

### Resources
- Recording of rhythm/vocal tracks for Song #1; Nashville chart of Song #1; Recording device (iPhone); Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp
- Copies of the Peer Evaluation Form
- Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp
- Blank Paper; Pencil; Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp; Recording device (iPhone)

### Essential Questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#1 – Rehearse (With Plan)</th>
<th>S#1 - Self-Evaluate</th>
<th>S#1 – Perform/Present</th>
<th>S#1 – Evaluation (Self &amp; Peer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do musicians improve the quality of their performance? How do performers interpret musical works?</td>
<td>How do musicians improve the quality of their performance? How do performers interpret musical works?</td>
<td>When is creative work ready to share? When is a performance judged ready to present? How do context and the manner in which musical work is presented influence audience response?</td>
<td>How do performers select repertoire? How do individuals choose music to experience? How does understanding the structure and context of music inform a response? How do we discern musical creators’ and performers’ expressive intent?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**How do we judge the quality of musical work(s) and performance(s)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content in terms of essential concepts and topics</th>
<th>Creating a rehearsal plan and implementing it in student-led rehearsals</th>
<th>Self-Evaluation of student growth in rehearsals</th>
<th>Explaining arrangement organization and performing final draft arrangement for class.</th>
<th>Engaging in both self and peer evaluation;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Products/ Assessments</strong></td>
<td>Students will fill out the Rehearsal Plan Sheet MCA. The teacher will observe student rehearsals and give feedback when necessary.</td>
<td>Students document growth on the Rehearsal Plan Sheet MCA.</td>
<td>The teacher grades performance with the Arrangement Presentation Scoring Device MCA.</td>
<td>The students fill out the Arrangement Presentation Scoring, Arrangement Responding Form, and Arrangement Select Form MCAs; Teacher grades these forms with the Process Scoring Device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Recording of rhythm/vocal tracks for Song #1; Nashville chart of Song #1;</td>
<td>Rehearsal Plan Sheet;</td>
<td>Brass/Woodwind/ Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp;</td>
<td>Composer Self-Evaluation Forms; Arrangement Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Questions</td>
<td>S#2 - Imagine</td>
<td>S#2 - Improvise</td>
<td>S#2 – Notate &amp; Record</td>
<td>S#2 - Analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do musicians generate creative ideas?</td>
<td>Exploring the musical riffs, pads, and punctuations for student arrangement</td>
<td>Improvising musical ideas through instruments and voices.</td>
<td>Notating Nashville Numbers and rhythms; Audio recording ideas</td>
<td>How does understanding the structure and context of musical works inform performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content in terms of essential concepts and topics</td>
<td>Improvising musical ideas through instruments and voices.</td>
<td>Notating Nashville Numbers and rhythms; Audio recording ideas</td>
<td>Analyzing the elements of student arrangements; Explaining how elements affect performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards/ Skills (process and skills emphasized in the National Core Arts Standards)</td>
<td>MU:Cr1.1.C.Ia</td>
<td>MU:Cr1.1.C.Ia</td>
<td>MU:Cr2.1.C.Ia MU:Cr2.1.C.Ib</td>
<td>MU:Pr4.2.C.Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products/ Assessments</td>
<td>Students fill out Imagination Sheet Theory/Composition MCA.</td>
<td>Teacher listens to student ideas and gives</td>
<td>Students write down musical ideas with</td>
<td>Students fill out the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Questions</td>
<td>Content in terms of essential concepts and topics</td>
<td>S#2 – Rehearse/Perform</td>
<td>S#2 - Evaluate</td>
<td>S#2 – Interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequent formative assessments will determine student skill development level</strong></td>
<td>Practicing and performing the first draft of the arrangement for other student groups.</td>
<td>How do musicians improve the quality of their performance?</td>
<td>Evaluating other student group arrangements.</td>
<td>Interpreting comments from other student groups and discussing the aspects of the arrangement that can be changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimal feedback.</td>
<td>Recording of rhythm tracks for Song #2; Nashville chart of Song #2; Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp; Blank paper for writing down ideas.</td>
<td>Blank Paper; Pencil; Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp; Recording device (iPhone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Task instructions; Recording of rhythm/vocal tracks for Song #2; Nashville chart of Song #2; Imagination Sheet; Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp;</td>
<td>Recording of rhythm tracks for Song #2; Nashville chart of Song #2; Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp; Blank paper for writing down ideas.</td>
<td>Blank Paper; Pencil; Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp; Recording device (iPhone)</td>
<td>Copies of Analysis Form; Pencil;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards/Skills (process and skills emphasized in the National Core Arts Standards)</td>
<td>MU:Pr5.1.C.Ia MU:Pr5.1.C.Ic</td>
<td>MU:Cr3.1.C.Ia MU:Pr4.3.C.Ia</td>
<td>MU:Cr3.1.C.Ia MU:Pr4.3.C.Ia</td>
<td>MU:Cr3.1.C.Ia MU:Pr4.3.C.Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products/Assessments</td>
<td>The students and the teacher will listen and evaluate performances during the “S#2 – Evaluate” portion of the lesson.</td>
<td>The students and the teacher will listen and evaluate performances using the Peer Evaluation Form MCA.</td>
<td>The teacher informally observes student discussion of peer feedback.</td>
<td>Students notate new drafts of arrangements; Teacher records using iPhone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Recording of rhythm/vocal tracks for Song #2; Nashville chart of Song #2; Recording device (iPhone); Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp</td>
<td>Copies of the Peer Evaluation Form</td>
<td>Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp</td>
<td>Blank Paper; Pencil; Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp; Recording device (iPhone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#2 – Rehearse (With Plan)</th>
<th>S#2 - Self-Evaluate</th>
<th>S#2 – Perform/Present</th>
<th>S#2 – Evaluation (Self &amp; Peer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential Questions</td>
<td>How do musicians improve the quality of their performance? How do performers interpret musical works?</td>
<td>How do musicians improve the quality of their performance? How do performers interpret musical works?</td>
<td>When is creative work ready to share? When is a performance judged ready to present? How do context and the manner in which a work is interpreted influence the audience's perception?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content in terms of essential concepts and topics</strong></td>
<td>Creating a rehearsal plan and implementing it in student-led rehearsals</td>
<td>Self-Evaluation of student growth in rehearsals</td>
<td>Explaining arrangement organization and performing final draft arrangement for class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Products/Assessments</strong></td>
<td>Students will fill out the Rehearsal Plan Sheet MCA. The teacher will observe student rehearsals and give feedback when necessary.</td>
<td>Students document growth on the Rehearsal Plan Sheet MCA.</td>
<td>The teacher grades performance with the Arrangement Presentation Scoring Device MCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Rehearsal Plan Sheet;</td>
<td>Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp</td>
<td>Composer Self-Evaluation Forms; Arrangement Responding Forms; Arrangement Select Forms;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording of rhythm/vocal tracks for Song #2; Nashville chart of the Song #2; Copies of second draft of arrangements. Rehearsal Plan Sheet; Brass/Woodwind/Percussion Instruments; Bass Guitar and Amp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedures**

Prior to soliciting participants and implementing the curriculum, the researcher obtained approval from the Liberty Institutional Review Board (IRB). (See Appendix A for IRB approval.) Upon approval, the researcher presented the study to the seventh-through-tenth-grade band students at the researcher’s workplace. The researcher informed the students of the purpose of the study, the study’s time commitments, and its benefits. In addition, students were informed in how data would remain anonymous and be stored on the researcher’s password-protected laptop or in a safe with a combination lock. Furthermore, the researcher ensured that the students understood the voluntary nature of the study and that, even after joining, they were allowed to
discontinue participation at any time. Students were given the Parent of Participant and Student Consent Form and were required to sign it to participate in the study (see Appendix B). Student parents were also contacted regarding the details of the study via a written letter and pass-a-note (the school’s communication system). Parents were also required to give consent by signing the Parent of Participant and Student Consent Form (see Appendix B).

After the necessary permissions were acquired, the teacher administered the pre-test survey on Friday, January 6, 2023, one class period before the curriculum was administered. The curriculum began on Monday, January 9, 2023 and concluded on Monday, February 6, 2023. The post-test survey was administered on Tuesday, February 7, 2023, the class after the curriculum concluded. One-on-one interviews were conducted beginning Thursday, February 9, 2023 and did not extend past Friday, February 10, 2023. After interview data was coded, willing students who were interviewed were asked to participate in member checking, which involved “[determining] the accuracy of the qualitative findings by taking the final report or specific descriptions or themes back to participants and determining whether these participants feel that they are accurate.”

All data collected was stored on the researcher's password-protected computer or in a safe with a combination lock. All data will be discarded after five years of storage.

Class One – “Song #1 – Imagine”

The first and second songs arranged in the curriculum were chosen by students prior to the study, in alignment with the informal learning of popular musicians. The first song was “Glorious Day” by Passion. The first class of the curriculum was called “Song #1 (S#1) –

\[163\] Creswell and Creswell, Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, 200.

Imagine.” As part of the first half of the curriculum, the class dealt with the first song students were to arrange. The class began with three minutes of unstructured individual warm-up. Students were given the choice to warm-up as they saw fit. Following the warm-up period, the teacher clapped his hands three times to signal the class to stop practicing momentarily to hear a designated classmate read the Bible verse of the day. The verse of the day for this class was Genesis 1:1, presented in the King James Version to align with the views of the school. The teacher spoke for two minutes on God’s creative power and how mankind was created in His image. As such, God has granted a level of creative abilities to humanity. By arranging the brass, woodwind, and percussion parts of praise and worship music, people engage in this creative process.

Following the opening verse, the teacher explained that musical creativity involves imagination. Following this, the teacher gave students the task scenario sheet that guided the activities of the curriculum and read the task sheet out loud. The task sheet contained a hypothetical letter from a nearby church. The church, as a part of their upcoming Easter services, asked for student musicians to create brass, woodwind, percussion, and/or bass guitar parts that complemented songs the church planned on performing for their Sunday morning Easter service. The letter asked that students add orchestral sweetening to pre-existing arrangements. The letter defined orchestral sweetening as adding riffs, pads (sustained chords), and/or punctuations (emphases of chord changes or text) to songs in order to communicate their themes and lyrics. Students were supplied rhythm audio tracks of the songs that featured acoustic guitar, keyboard, drums, and a lead vocal carrying the arrangement. Additionally, students were supplied a lyric chart and a Nashville Number chart for each song that contained the words, the timing of the chord changes, and the form of the songs. Students were asked to create and record orchestral
sweetening arrangements for the church and “submit” the recordings to the teacher, who hypothetically would “send” the recording to the church.

Following the reading of the task sheet, the teacher answered any questions students had about the directions. The teacher handed students the adapted Imagination MCA sheet (see Appendix F). He asked the students to consider and write how they might use dynamics, timbres, riffs, pads, and punctuation ideas to express the lyrics and themes of the first song. The teacher informed students of their group assignments. Groups contained one member each, though one group began the study with an additional participant before the participant dropped out. The students were asked to work individually for the remainder of the first class. During this time, students were provided QNGEE S5 Music Players, which they used to listen to the recording of the first song. As they listened, they were instructed to think and write down their ideas on the Imagination Sheet MCA. Students were encouraged to listen to the song as many times as they desired. Additionally, to make it easy to navigate between each section of the song, the recording was divided into separate smaller recordings that were labeled with the section name, such as Verse 1 or Chorus 1. At the end of class, the teacher collected the Imagination Sheets and reviewed initial ideas for each group’s arrangement. The teacher also filled out an Observation Protocol Form after the class concluded. The participants’ work was scored using the Imagine Scoring Device.

Class Two – “Song #1 – Improvise”

The second class began with the same warm-up format. Following the teacher’s three claps, a designated student read Genesis 1:2. The teacher discussed that even God’s creation had a moment where it was “without form, and void” (Gen. 1:2, King James Version). Therefore, the students were encouraged to be patient as they worked through different ideas and revisions of
their arrangements. The teacher said, “If God allowed Himself time to create, His people should allow themselves time to create.”

The teacher then handed back the Imagination Sheets completed in the previous class. Following this, the teacher reminded students of their group assignments. The teacher instructed the students to share the ideas they wrote on their imagination sheets and explain their rationale for these ideas to their group members. The groups met in two separate places: at the back door of the room (with the door open to help lower sound levels), and right outside the front door in the buffer area between the band room and the rest of the school. Each group was provided a QNGEE S5 Music Player (an .mp3 player) and a pair of headphones for each student in the group. A headphone splitter was initially provided for the one group that had two students. This allowed each group to work separately and listen to the song while they improvised and discussed ideas for the arrangement. Students were directed to improvise and create riffs, pads, or punctuations together in their groups. Individuals within each group wrote down any scale degrees and rhythms used for their part on a blank piece of printer paper. The teacher gave minimal help to students, acting in a facilitating role common in the non-formal and creative pedagogy of PME.\(^{165}\) While students were working, the teacher observed student behavior and engagement that he later recorded using the Observation Protocol Form. The class concluded with the submission of student notation drafts and Imagination Sheets for the teacher to review and for safekeeping.

\(^{165}\) Kladder, “Songwriting in Modern Band?”, 10.
Class Three – “Song #1 – Notate, Record, and Analyze”

As with the other classes, the students began Class Three with an informal warm-up. Then, the teacher designated a student to read Genesis 1:3-4. The teacher discussed how God began organizing creation, “[dividing] the light from the darkness” (v. 4). In the same way, students were to begin organizing their ideas for their arrangements. After two minutes of discussing the verse of the day, the teacher gave the students back their Imagination Sheets with the Imagine Scoring Device as well as their notation drafts with the initial ideas for their arrangements. In a similar fashion to the previous class, students worked in groups on their arrangements, practicing and notating their first draft on their sheets of paper. This continued for fifteen minutes. After this, the teacher recorded the first draft of each group’s recording using the Voice Memos app on the researcher’s iPhone. This took no more than twelve minutes.

After recording, the teacher passed out the adapted Analysis Form MCA to the students (see Appendix F for the form). For the remaining class time (approximately fifteen minutes), students were asked to analyze how they used the elements of music to connect with and convey the message of “Glorious Day.” The elements of music they were asked to discuss were dynamics, timbres, riffs (melodies), pads (sustained harmonies), and punctuations (rhythm and articulation emphasis). Students turned in these forms, and the teacher reviewed student answers and gave written feedback using the Plan, Make, and Analyze Scoring Device. The teacher filled out an Observation Protocol Form to record what he observed for that class.

Class Four – “Song #1 – Rehearse and Organize”

This class followed the pattern of the three-minute warm-up and two-minute verse discussion. The verse was Philippians 1:6, which discussed Christ's role in performing sanctification in the life of the believer. Even as Christ continues to work on His creation,
musicians should work to develop and organize their arrangements. The teacher communicated that, with His power and guidance, believers can create music arrangements that glorify and honor God.

The students received their Analysis Form MCA and the Plan, Make, and Analyze Scoring Device with feedback from the teacher. The students reviewed the feedback and considered how they might better use the elements of the music to express the message of the song. The students, then, had the remainder of the hour to discuss ideas, organize and notate them, and rehearse them in their groups. The teacher collected student notation drafts and reviewed them. The teacher also observed student behavior and engagement and filled out an Observation Protocol Form after class.

Class Five – “Song #1 –Evaluate”

Class Five began with three minutes of informal warm-up and continued with two minutes of discussing the verse of the day. The verse for the class was Proverbs 27:17. The teacher explained that, while God’s creation does not need to be critiqued by mankind, musicians’ creations benefit from feedback. This “sharpens” or strengthens the product by allowing the arranger to adjust ideas that do not communicate as effectively as initially thought. The teacher communicated that the students would rehearse and perform their arrangements again for the class, but would evaluate other group arrangements rather than their own.

The students were given eighteen minutes to rehearse their arrangement for the performance. After rehearsal, the teacher handed out the Peer Evaluation Form MCA to the students (see Appendix F). The teacher assigned each individual a group arrangement to evaluate. Performances took place over a span of fifteen minutes, with three-minute intervals between each group to allow for student response. Each performance was recorded using the
Voice Memo app on the researcher’s iPhone. The forms were collected by the teacher and reviewed. The teacher observed student behavior and engagement and filled out an Observation Protocol Form after class.

Class Six – “Song #1 – Interpret, Refine, and Notate”

After the initial warm-up, the designated student read Proverbs 12:15. The teacher stressed the importance of listening to advice and taking correction in all things, whether spiritual, practical, or academic. The teacher explained that, in arranging, it is important to be able to receive and interpret ideas from others in order to develop a better musical product. Following this, the teacher handed out the Peer Evaluation Forms to the groups that were evaluated. Students were instructed to read these comments, complete the bottom section of the peer evaluation form, and discuss ways in which they could refine their arrangements. Students were asked to rehearse their new ideas and notate them with Nashville numbers and rhythmic values. The teacher collected the Peer Evaluation Forms and the sheets with the newly annotated ideas for review at the end of class. The teacher also observed student behavior and engagement using the Observation Protocol Form.

Classes Seven through Nine – “Song #1 – Rehearse and Evaluate”

Classes Seven through Nine followed nearly identical procedures. Each began with the same three-minute warm-up and featured a two-minute devotion of a Bible verse. Class Seven discussed Proverbs 29:18 and the need for direction in spiritual, practical, and musical matters. As student-led groups, the teacher informed students to take direction in how they would rehearse their arrangements. The teacher gave students the Rehearsal Plan Sheet MCA (see
Appendix F), had them analyze and interpret their arrangement, and create a rehearsal plan for it. The teacher completed an Observation Protocol Form based on what he witnessed during class.

The verse of the day for Class Eight was 2 Corinthians 13:5, which discusses the importance of evaluating one’s faith. The teacher correlated this examination to student evaluation of their progress in performing their arrangements. In Class Nine, the teacher talked about the importance of evaluating one’s heart and actions, as seen in Lamentations 3:40. In like manner, students were exhorted to assess their musical progress throughout these rehearsals.

Class Eight allotted thirty minutes to student-led rehearsal and refinement of arrangements. The final five minutes of class Eight were allotted for student evaluation of progress. This evaluation was written under question 4 of the Rehearsal Plan Sheet MCA. Class Nine included twenty minutes of rehearsal and concluded with fifteen minutes spent filling out the Presentation Preparation Worksheet MCA (see Appendix F). Students in each group decided how to divide the responsibilities for the oral presentation in Class Ten. The teacher completed an Observation Protocol Form for both of these classes.

Class Ten – “Song #1 – Perform, Present, and Evaluate”

The verse for Class Ten was Romans 12:1. The teacher expressed the importance of presenting one’s life before God as worship. In the same way, the arrangement created in the curriculum and its performance should be considered a presentation of worship. As part of the presentation, students were to convey how they used musical elements to express the theme and lyrics of the song they arranged. Group performance and presentations occurred in a span of twenty minutes and were recorded using a Shure SM7B Cardioid Dynamic Vocal Microphone, a Cloud Microphones Cloudlifter CL-1 1-channel Mic Activator, an M-Audio two-channel preamp, a MacBook Pro, and Logic Pro. During this time, participants filled out the Arranger Self-
Evaluation Form, the Arrangement Responding Form, and the Arrangement Selection Sheet MCAs (see Appendix F). The remainder of class was spent completing these forms. The teacher recorded student behavior and engagement by filling out an Observation Protocol Form after class.

Classes Eleven through Twenty – “Song #2”

The format for the second set of ten classes was identical except that the scripture verses used for each class were different and the song arranged was “1,000 Names” by Phil Wickham. Chart 3.1 presents the ten verses and their themes discussed in these classes:

Chart 3.1
Scriptures and Themes for Classes 11-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Number</th>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 Corinthians 5:17</td>
<td>The New Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 Corinthians 3:18</td>
<td>The Process of Becoming the New Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Luke 24:44</td>
<td>Christ, the Key to Understanding Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Philippians 2:12</td>
<td>Working out Salvation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>John 15:12</td>
<td>Love Others as Christ Loved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Matthew 7:19-20</td>
<td>Evaluate Fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Psalm 26:2</td>
<td>Examine the Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 Peter 3:18</td>
<td>Spiritual Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jude 24</td>
<td>Presented Holy in Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Psalm 139:23-24</td>
<td>Spiritual Self-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Scorer

The researcher scored student work throughout the duration of the curriculum project. However, to help protect against potential bias, an independent music educator also scored student work following the project’s completion. This music educator followed the same grading procedures, which are outlined in the chart below. The chart delineates the grading process for the first song of the curriculum into five large steps which are further elucidated in the Description column. Within the Description column, scoring devices are indicated in red with bold and italics. Student documents, teacher feedback, and recordings are indicated in green with bold and italics.

To complete Step 4 each time, the independent scorer received digital scans of teacher feedback given to students throughout the first half of the project. This feedback originated from the “Additional Teacher Feedback” sections found on both the “Imagine Scoring Device” and “Plan, Make, and Analyze Scoring Device,” as these devices were given to students with scores and comments to help improve their work. However, the researcher’s scores were removed from the documents in order to avoid undesirable influence on the scores of the independent scorer. Finally, the grading procedures for Song #2 (1,000 Names) were identical except for the fact that the Nashville Number chart, the student work, and the recordings feature the second song rather than the first.

Chart 3.2
Grading Procedures for Song #1 (Glorious Day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Using the <em>Imagine Scoring Device</em>, grade the <em>Arrangement Imagination Sheets</em> that were filled out by each participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Listen to the first recording of each group and examine each student's notation of their ideas. Using the <em>Plan, Make, and Analyze Scoring Device</em>, read and grade the <em>Arrangement Analysis Form</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Step 3 | For this step, score student work using the *Final Composition Presentation Scoring Device*. Read through the transcript of each student's presentation provided in the .pdf titled *Song #1 Verbal Presentation*. Then, do these three things simultaneously:  
1. Listen to the final recording of the arrangement (labeled Grp # Song 1 Arrangement)  
2. Follow along with the *Student Notation from Class 10* for each participant  
3. Follow along with the Nashville chart for *Glorious Day*.  
4. When these steps have been accomplished, score each participant using the rubric. |
| Step 4 | For this step, score student work using the *Process Scoring Device*. To score the category "Feedback for Refinement," follow these steps:  
1. Read the documents for each participant called *Feedback #1 from Teacher, Feedback #2 from Teacher*, and *Peer Evaluation Form*. Consider how students might have used the feedback to refine their arrangements.  
2. Compare the earlier group recordings to the final recording.  
3. Then, score this category.  
To score the category "Interpretation," follow these steps:  
1. Read the *Analyze and Interpret* sections of each participant's *Arrangement Rehearsal Plan Sheets*.  
2. Compare these student reflections with the performance heard in the final recording.  
3. Then, score this category.  
To score the category "Strategies for Improvement," follow these steps:  
1. Read the *Rehearsal Plan* and *Evaluate and Refine* sections of each participant's *Arrangement Rehearsal Plan Sheets*.  
2. Then, score this category. |
| Step 5 | For this step, you will score student work using the *Responding Scoring Device*. |
To score the category "Selection," read each participant's *Arrangement Selection Sheet*. Then, score this category.

To score the category "Analysis," read the first question of each participant's *Arrangement Responding Form*. Then, score this category.

To score the category "Evaluation of Technical and Expressive Aspects," read the second question of each participant's *Arrangement Responding Form*. Then, score this category.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this applied research study was to determine the effectiveness of a curriculum that utilized Composition/Theory Model Cornerstone Assessments (MCAs) that were adapted for church music arranging that utilized popular music pedagogy and Nashville Numbers for notating brass, woodwind, percussion, and/or bass guitar orchestral sweetening. One research question guided this study:

**RQ1:** How can Composition/Theory MCAs be effectively applied to a church music arranging curriculum that utilizes popular music pedagogy and uses Nashville Numbers as the primary notational device and communicative medium?

The curriculum given in Chapter 3 of this curriculum project represents this researcher’s efforts to answer this question. The focus of the present chapter is to report the results of the implementation of this curriculum. As a review, the following statement serves as the hypothesis for this study:

**H1:** Implementing the MCA-based arranging curriculum in the seventh-through-tenth-grade FCA band will result in improved student perception of student arranging, performance, rehearsing, and evaluating/responding.

Additionally, statistical analyses were performed using the following null hypothesis:

**H₀:** Implementing the MCA-based arranging curriculum in the seventh-through-tenth-grade FCA band will result in no difference in student perception of student arranging, performance, rehearsing, and evaluating/responding.
Description of Site and Participants

The researcher conducted this applied research study at Family Christian Academy, a small Christian private school in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Enrollment for the middle school and high school was less than a hundred students \((n < 100)\). The number enrolled in the band class was eight students \((n=8)\) when the researcher recruited students for the study. Three participants \((n=3)\) turned in signed consent forms agreeing to partake in the study, but one of the participants dropped out halfway through the project. The two participants \((n=2)\) who remained were both in high school, one in ninth-grade \((n=1)\) and one in tenth-grade \((n=1)\). One was male \((n=1)\) and the other was female \((n=1)\). Both students were Caucasian \((n=2)\). One student was in their first year of band and the other was in their second year of band. Both students had taken a few years of piano lessons prior to their enrollment in band at Family Christian Academy. Finally, both students played percussion in the band.

The Outline for the Chapter

The analysis phase of this study involved both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The first portion of the report focuses on the quantitative data, relaying the descriptive statistics for the pre- and post-test surveys that were completed by students. The results for the paired t-test follow, along with a brief discussion about the data. The next section reports the qualitative analysis, beginning with the themes found in the students’ documents and recordings. A comparison of the researcher and independent scores on the MCA rubrics follows. After, the themes that emerged from this researcher’s Observation Protocol Forms and the interviews conducted with the participants is reported. Finally, the data from both types of analysis are integrated and discussed in relation to the effectiveness of the curriculum project on the participants’ perception of student arranging, performance, rehearsing, and evaluating.
Quantitative Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

The adapted form of the pre- and post-surveys contained forty-eight questions that covered creating, responding, evaluating, rehearsing, and performing. Sixteen questions dealt with creating activities like arranging or composing, twenty questions corresponded to responding and evaluating, four questions discussed rehearsing, and eight questions related to performing. After administering the surveys, this researcher performed quantitative analyses using the software SPSS Statistics. Table 4.1 gives the mean, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean for each question on the pre- and post-test surveys. The sample was two (n=2) for every question. Questions 3, 4, 5, 6, 25, and 32 are not included in the table because participants did not answer a question on either the pre- or the post-test survey, resulting in insufficient data to calculate the mean, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean.

Table 4.1
Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paired T-Test

Table 4.2 represents the results of the paired t-test performed on the pre- and post-test data. The mean, standard deviation, standard error of the mean, confidence interval, t-value, degrees of freedom (df), and the two-sided p-value are given in the table below. Questions 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 18, 28, 29, 33, 34, 44, 45, and 46 are omitted from the chart as the t-value could not be computed because the standard error of the difference was 0.

Table 4.2
Paired Samples Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Two-Sided p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>-1.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-7.85310 - 4.85310</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-13.70620 - 11.70620</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-12.70620 - 12.70620</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-13.70620 - 11.70620</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>-.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-6.85310 - 5.85310</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-13.70620 - 11.70620</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-5.85310 - 6.85310</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>-.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-6.85310 - 5.85310</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-5.85310 - 6.85310</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-13.70620 - 11.70620</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>-1.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-7.85310 - 4.85310</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-13.70620 - 11.70620</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>-.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-6.85310 - 5.85310</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>-.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-6.85310 - 5.85310</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.41421</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-11.70620 - 13.70620</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>-.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-6.85310 - 5.85310</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>-.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-6.85310 - 5.85310</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>-.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-6.85310 - 5.85310</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>-.50000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.50000</td>
<td>-6.85310 - 5.85310</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Analysis of the differences between the means of the pre- and post-test surveys revealed no statistical significance. For this reason, this researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis stated for the quantitative portion of this study. However, the lack of significance is likely a result of the low sample size (n=2) involved in the study. Additionally, while there is no significance found in the paired t-test, questions from the surveys that had a difference of means of -1.5 are included below so that they can be revisited during the qualitative analysis phase of this study.

Only four questions had a difference in mean of -1.5, which was the greatest difference reported from the t-test. These questions were 1, 21, 37, and 39. Question 1 stated, “When creating rhythmic punctuation or emphasis for song arrangements, I use a limited range of rhythms.” Question 21 stated, “When creating riffs for a musical arrangement, I use a suitable set of pitches/notes.” Question 37 stated, “When performing, I make sense of rhythmic notation and play the correct notes when given Nashville Numbers.” Question 39 stated, “When playing an individual part, I maintain a reliable sense of pulse.” These questions will be examined again after considering the qualitative data.
Qualitative Analysis

This researcher used the qualitative software Delve to help code the data found in the student documents, recordings, observation protocol forms, and student interviews that resulted from the implementation of this curriculum. This qualitative analysis is divided into four sections to aid in organization of the data. The first section deals with the themes discovered from the student documents and recordings. The second section reports and compares the scores given by this researcher and the independent scorer on the MCA rubrics. The third section describes the themes found in the Observation Protocol Forms that were filled out by the researcher for each day of the curriculum. The fourth section of the analysis details the themes found in the student interviews. A discussion integrating the quantitative and qualitative data follows.

Analysis of Student Documents and Recordings

The following themes emerged from an examination of the student documents and recordings taken from the curriculum project. The themes have been separated according to their relationship to three artistic processes of the NCCAS: Create, Perform, and Respond.

Create

Improvement of Arranging Abilities

Participant reflections on the Arrangement Self-Evaluation Forms indicated that students perceived themselves as growing in their arranging abilities. In response to a question that asked students to describe their growth in theoretical and arranging techniques, Participant 1 wrote “It’s easier to pick notes now” after arranging the project’s first song, “Glorious Day.” In response to the same question, Participant 2 stated that the experience of arranging “Glorious Day” taught them to “look for areas that are oddly quiet” when deciding where to add orchestral sweetening.
Students answered the same question similarly after the presentation of the curriculum’s second song “1,000 Names,” though their answers indicated less positive views of the difficulty of arranging. Participant 1 stated “I found that I can do more than I think [I can] if I want to. I also found that it is harder than it looks.” Participant 2 answered, “Don’t rely on melody. Come up with something on your own.”

Abandonment of Early Musical Ideas

Both participants demonstrated a tendency to abandon their initial ideas during the process of arranging each song. For instance, Participant 1 described an idea to place a riff “at the end of Verse 2/Chorus” on the Imagination Sheet for “Glorious Day.” However, after only one class, the student composed a riff and labeled it “Intro” to indicate that it belonged to the introduction. The student also never added a riff at the end of Verse 2 or during any of the Choruses, retaining only the riff for the introduction. Additionally, during the arranging of “1,000 Names,” Participant 1 expressed a desire to “put a pad in the 1st chorus” and also “put a riff on the line ‘My soul was made… to be free,’” which was found in Verse 2. However, the final recording indicated that the student chose instead to place the pad in the bridge and create a riff for the intro rather than for Verse 2.

Participant 2 also followed a similar pattern, starting with musical ideas at the beginning of each song period only to reject them in favor of more suitable ideas. The student intended to write a riff for the end of Verse 1 of “Glorious Day,” which was indicated with the time stamp “0:32.” However, the final recording did not contain a riff in this area, though the participant’s other ideas to create a riff for the end of the Bridge and the last Chorus were present in the final draft of the arrangement. A notation draft from Class 2 revealed an early idea for a “syncopated riff based on a Bb major chord arpeggio.” By Class 4, however, the student decided not to
complete this idea and instead created a new riff that remained for the final recording of the song.

Rhythmic Approximation

Comparison of student recordings and notation drafts revealed the practice of rhythmic approximation. In this practice, rhythms written out as notation were simplified versions of the rhythms students performed for their recordings. Sometimes these rhythms were written as quarter notes and eighth notes, while at other times the Nashville Numbers were grouped in phrases through the use of bar lines. Thus, the notation acted less as a precise account of the rhythm and more as a mnemonic device. Example 4.1 represents the notation of Participant 1 while Example 4.2 represents a transcription of what the student played for the final recording of “Glorious Day.” Note also that the student notation does not indicate the contour of the musical line even though students were asked to do so on the Church Arranging Task Scenario Sheet.

Example 4.1 – Participant 1’s Notation of Riff for “Glorious Day”

Example 4.2 – Transcription of Participant 1’s Riff for “Glorious Day”
Example 4.3 shows the riff that Participant 2 notated for “Glorious Day.” However, the student omitted the time signature and rhythm, leaving only the Nashville Numbers that were grouped in four measures. Example 4.4 represents a transcription of the riff as performed for the final presentation. Comparison of each of the four examples revealed a tendency toward rhythmic approximation.

Example 4.3 – Participant 2’s Notation of Riff for “Glorious Day”

Example 4.4 – Transcription of Participant 2’s Riff for “Glorious Day”

Limited Dynamic and Articulation Markings

While students notated numbers and approximated rhythms, students rarely notated dynamic and articulation markings. Most of the dynamic markings were limited to the Imagination Sheets for both songs of the curriculum. For instance, Participant 1 drew a crescendo and a decrescendo on their Imagination Sheet for “Glorious Day” and wrote “Gets louder through the intro and then soft as you enter Verse 2.” However, the student did not write any dynamics for any of their drafts. Participant 2 also notated dynamics on their imagination sheet, drawing a line that went up and down to indicate dynamics at the different time stamps of “0:38, 1:00, 1:31, 1:40, 1:50, and 2:10.” Later, the final notation draft included a forte in the first measure of the riff, followed by crescendo in the same measure. The second measure of the riff
also indicated forte, and a crescendo was added at the end the third measure. The Imagination Sheets for “1,000 Names” followed a similar pattern, though no dynamics were indicated in any of the students’ notations. Finally, articulation markings were never addressed in any of the Imagination Sheets, though Participant 2 did add three accents to their riff of “Glorious Day.” Participants did not add any articulation markings for any worksheet or notation during their arrangement of “1,000 Names.”

Differing Treatment of Punctuation

Participants interpreted the term punctuation in unique ways. While Participant 2 created traditional punctuations based on chords, Participant 1 often created punctuations that utilized arpeggios. For instance, the student chose to punctuate the lyrics “It was my tomb, ‘Til I met you” at end of Verse 1 by arpeggiating a 4 chord (notice the Arabic number “4” was chosen instead of the Roman Numeral “IV” to represent the Subdominant harmony, as this is the standard practice in the Nashville Number System). This type of punctuation existed also in the Chorus with only slight variations. The student did, however, include one punctuation as a chord on the lyrics “Now your mercy,” found at the beginning of Verse 3.

Participants also approached emphasizing lyrics by doubling the vocal melody. For example, Participant 2 attempted to perform the vocal melody and its harmony during the first verse of “Glorious Day.” The idea was later dropped and replaced with a more traditional punctuation, though it is possible that this emphasis was initially intended as a punctuation. This idea is further supported by Participant 1’s doubling of the vocal melody in Verse 1 of “1,000 Names.” Whether the students considered these ideas as punctuations or not, it appeared that the ideas were best understood as “emphases of lyrics,” part of the definition for the term punctuation given to students at the beginning of the project.
Rhythmically, each punctuation was either given approximate rhythms or was written as sets of Nashville Numbers written over the lyrics that students wanted to emphasize. In order to represent the simultaneous sounding of the notes in their notation, then, the students wrote the Nashville numbers as fractions or as one number written above another number, in a manner similar to a musical time signature. Participant 1, for example, wrote out the words “Into your glorious day” and placed Nashville Numbers under each syllable.

Differing Treatment of Pads

While students most frequently chose to write pads as whole notes in less harmonically active sections of music, Participant 1 chose to perform a pad that began on unpredictable beats in each measure of the Bridge of “Glorious Day,” even though their notation indicated simple whole notes that always began on beat 1. This unpredictability only continued for the first half of the bridge. The pad’s rhythm became predictable during the second half of the bridge, regularly rearticulating beat two of each measure. Interestingly, this interpretation of the pad resembles a punctuation in that it emphasizes the accented chords in the rhythm audio track. Lastly, because both participants were percussionists, students performed two notes of the pad simultaneously on either xylophone or glockenspiel. In like manner to the punctuations, the students wrote the Nashville numbers for the pads as fractions or musical time signatures.

Perform

Basic Rehearsal Strategies

The participants’ Arrangement Rehearsal Plan Sheets revealed students demonstrated basic knowledge of rehearsal strategies. For instance, Participant 1 stated that their practice goal for “Glorious Day” was “to be able to play through the song from beginning to end.”
next with rehearsal strategies, the participant wrote “To do this, I would start by clapping and counting until you are able to do it without messing up the rhythm. After that, I would finger the music and think in your head what the notes sound like. Then, I would actually play the song till I have it from beginning to end.” Participant 2, however, gave a less detailed approach to practicing for the same song, saying that they would “Do it over and over (for real, it is 4 measures repeated).” While this response gives a simplistic strategy, it is to be noted that the participant had missed two days of class prior to filling out this sheet. Thus, the student was behind and only had one portion of the arrangement ready for practice preparation. Participant responses to the Arrangement Rehearsal Plan Sheet for “1,000 Names” were similar. In addition to clapping and counting and simple repetition, Participant 1 included “hover[ing]… and sing[ing]” as a practice strategy. Both Participants 1 and 2 also described playing one measure at a time as a strategy for their practice.

Improvement of Student Performance

Participants recorded that their performance improved after practicing for their final presentations. For instance, Participant 1, during the preparation of “Glorious Day,” stated, “When we first started this project, I kept messing up the notes and I was unable to play with ‘emotion.’ As we kept going in this song, I was able to not get frustrated and play the song all the way through and make adjustments.” The participant latter added, “After today’s practice, I’m feeling good about how I can perform. I have improved in the way that I can play all the way through the song without messing up and I can improvise notes off the top of my head. While playing the song, I wasn’t able to do that before.” Participant 2 more briefly noted “I have gotten better at the tune as [a] whole, with a few occasional parts I wish I had polished.” Both participants also reported improvement during their practice of “1,000 Names.” Participant 1
said, “I have improved the way I play and I could play it more consistently.” Likewise, Participant 2 noted, “I can play it more consistently. Still working on making it accurate to the song.”

Respond

Unclear/Vague Student Responses

Participant responses to the Arrangement Selection Sheets and Arrangement Responding Forms indicated unclear or vague answers to questions posed on these MCAs. On the Arrangement Selection Sheet, students were asked to select their preferred student arrangement and give the “most important reason this arrangement reflects and supports the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song.” For the song “Glorious Day,” Participant 1 stated that the arranger “made sure to let the lyrics do stuff and did not play too much.” Participant 2 wrote that the arrangement had “great note usage” and that they liked “the glockenspiel.” Again, responses were vague or unclear for the same question after the presentation of “1,000 Names.” Participant 1 stated “It was better” while Participant 2 said “I feel like the arrangement would be perfect if we combined both arrangements into one song, but I mainly chose [the arrangement for group] 2 solely because of the instrument. It is better for the song.” Neither gave evidence of how the selected song arrangement supported the “lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song.”

Another question on the Arrangement Selection Sheet asked the students to “describe how the selected arrangement can serve as a model for your future arranging.” Participant 1 did not address the arrangement itself. Instead, the participant said, “Don’t get sick. You need to be here to get as much done as possible.” Participant 2 was closer to answering the question, saying that the arrangement did well because it “fill[ed] up the whole song.” Student responses for the same question at the end of the project were equally imprecise. Participant 1 offered advice for
arrangers in general rather than identifying how the arrangement they selected was a good model. The participant stated, “Don’t give up. (I know [Participant 2] almost did).” Participant 2’s response stated that arrangers should “[try] to fill all the song and not do just the beginning/ending.” While Participant 2 answered the question, the lack of a subject in the sentence initially made it difficult to comprehend.

Student responses to the Arrangement Responding Forms revealed a similar tendency in answering questions. The first question on the worksheet asked the student to “describe how the elements of music are used to support the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song.” Neither student gave any evidence of musical elements in their support of their responses for the first song of project. Participant 1 stated, “It helped the chorus and the lyrics,” while Participant 2 wrote, “Very well placed. Fills silence well.” Responses for the second song were a little less obscure. Participant 1 said “[Participant 2] used pads in the bridge and I think it works really well. [Participant 2] used punctuation really well and made it exciting.” Participant 2 stated “Emphasizing what He does. Showing that He is omnipotent and omniscient.” While Participant 2’s answer addresses the themes of the song, it does not deal with the musical elements of the arrangement.

Students were also asked to “evaluate the arrangement citing specific examples of how the arrangement is or isn’t appropriate in style, mood, and/or performance quality for the Easter church service.” In response to Group 2’s “Glorious Day” arrangement, Participant 1 wrote that “It’s very Eastery.” In response to Group 1’s arrangement, Participant 2 said the arrangement was “Very upbeat, just how it should be on Easter Sunday.” Participant 1, after the presentation of “1,000 Names,” answered the same question, saying the arrangement “is appropriate because it is exciting and Easter is exciting.” Participant 2 began answering the question but did not
Comparison of MCA Rubric Scores

The original Composition/Theory MCAs included five different rubrics. Each of these rubrics were utilized for this curriculum project, though with minor modifications to fit the arranging context. Using these modified rubrics, this researcher and an independent music education colleague each scored student work. Table 4.3 reports the scores for the student work dealing with “Glorious Day,” while Table 4.4 reports scores for “1,000 Names.” The scoring devices are contained in one column, followed by the different scoring categories found within each rubric in the second column. The researcher score (RS) for Participants 1 and 2 are reported in the next two columns, followed by the independent score (IS) for Participants 1 and 2 in the last two columns. For every scoring category (with one exception), Level 1 scores were labeled “Emerging,” Level 2 “Approaches Criterion,” Level 3 “Meets Criterion,” and Level 4 “Exceeds Criterion.” The one exception is Feedback for Refinement, which only had Level 1 and Level 3 achievement categories which were labeled as “Emerging” and “Meets Criterion” respectively.

Regarding Participant 1, both scorers showed agreement for the following scoring categories: Analysis (Plan, Make, and Analyze), Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation, Verbal Presentation, Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent, Feedback for Refinement, and Evaluation of Technical and Expressive Aspects. Scores were different in the categories of Imagine, Organization, Interpretation, Strategies for Improvement, Selection, and Analysis (Responding). Besides the Imagine Scoring category, the independent scorer consistently assigned higher achievement scores than this researcher.
For Participant 2, both scorers gave identical scores for the categories of Analysis (Plan, Make, and Analyze), Verbal Presentation, Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent, Feedback for Refinement, Interpretation, Strategies for Improvement, Analysis (Responding), and Evaluation of Technical and Expressive Aspects. Differences in scores existed for the categories of Imagine, Organization, Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation, and Selection. For each of these of these categories, the independent scorer consistently gave lower scores than this researcher.

Table 4.3 – Rubric Scores for “Glorious Day”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Device</th>
<th>Scoring Category</th>
<th>RS P#1</th>
<th>RS P#2</th>
<th>IS P#1</th>
<th>IS P#2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine</td>
<td>Imagine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Make, and Analyze</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Composition Presentation</td>
<td>Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Feedback for Refinement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies for Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Technical and Expressive Aspects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the second song of the project, there was less agreement on the scores. For Participant 1, both scorers showed agreement for only three scoring categories: Organization, Analysis (Plan, Make, and Analyze), and Analysis (Responding). Scores differed in the categories of Imagine, Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation, Verbal Presentation, Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent, Feedback for Refinement, Interpretation, Strategies for Improvement, Selection, and Evaluation of Technical and Expressive Aspects.
This researcher gave higher scores in the Imagine, Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation, Verbal Presentation, Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent, and Feedback for Refinement categories. The independent scorer gave higher scores in the process and responding categories of Interpretation, Strategies for Improvement, Selection, and Evaluation of Technical and Expressive Aspects.

Table 4.4 – Rubric Scores for “1,000”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Device</th>
<th>Scoring Category</th>
<th>RS P#1</th>
<th>RS P#2</th>
<th>IS P#1</th>
<th>IS P#2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine</td>
<td>Imagine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Make, and Analyze</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Composition Presentation</td>
<td>Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal Presentation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Feedback for Refinement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies for Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Technical and Expressive Aspects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For participant 2, the scorers were in agreement for three categories: Imagine, Analysis (Plan, Make, and Analyze), and Evaluation of Technical and Expressive Aspects. The scorers disagreed in the following categories: Organization, Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation, Verbal Presentation, Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent, Feedback for Refinement, Interpretation, Strategies for Improvement, Selection, and Analysis (Responding). This researcher gave higher scores in the categories of Organization (Plan, Make, Analyze), Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation, Verbal Presentation, Craftsmanship of
Expressive Intent, Feedback for Refinement, and Strategies for Improvement. The independent scorer gave higher scores in Interpretation, Selection, and Analysis (Responding).

For the majority of the scores in both songs, scores differed only by one point. Reasons for these differences may have resulted from a difference in interpretation of the rubric. For instance, this researcher scored Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation as a 3 for both participants and for each song arrangement. However, the independent scorer only gave a 3 to Participant 1 during “Glorious Day.” For every other instance, the scorer gave a 2. The scorer included the following comment on Participant 2’s score sheet for “1,000 Names” to explain his reasoning: “Notation doesn’t match performance, though by itself I would’ve considered it ‘readable.’” The independent scorer, then, included accuracy in his interpretation of the word “readable.” This researcher, however, interpreted “readable” as something that was neat and easy to distinguish. Accuracy, in this researcher’s interpretation, was dealt with in the Level 4 Achievement Category with the statement “Notation was…accurately laid out.”

Another potential reason the scores differed is because this researcher did not want to penalize one participant score for the vague feedback of another participant. For example, this researcher gave 3’s to both participants during “1,000 Names” while the independent scorer gave them 1’s for the scoring category Feedback for Refinement on the Process Scoring Device. In his comments for Participant 1, the independent scorer noted that the student had made a “subtle but different intro.” However, he also quoted the student’s Peer Feedback reflection that stated they “learned absolutely nothing” as his reasoning for giving the student a 1 rather than a 3. In contrast, this researcher thought that the feedback given to Participant 1 from Participant 2 was unclear. Participant 2’s feedback stated that Participant 1 should include “More notes,” adding that “it needs to be longer, as in [sic] into the next few sections.” Participant 1, in response,
wrote, “I learned absolutely nothing except that I need to add more notes which I knew that already.” Additionally, this researcher considered that the student responded to teacher feedback throughout the process of developing the arrangement. For this reason, this researcher gave the participant a 3.

Analysis of Observation Protocol Forms

This researcher completed twenty different Observation Protocol Forms throughout the course of the curriculum project. The forms recorded general behaviors through a checklist of different statements. The number of times each behavior was recorded is relayed in Table 4.5 below. The specific observations for each form were notated under the section “Additional Comments from Observer.” These comments were coded using Delve, and four themes emerged from the analysis. The themes are discussed below.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Behavior</th>
<th># of Times Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Practicing and rehearsing arrangements.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communicating and discussing ways to improve arrangements.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvising and creating new pads, punctuations, or riffs.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Filling out assessments.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Notating and/or refining previous notations of arrangements.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Asking frequent questions about the wording of the assessments.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Staying in assigned areas.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discussing material irrelevant to the assigned task or to music in general.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Disrupting other groups and distracting from the assigned task.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Frequently looking around the room.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Having difficulty communicating because of noise levels.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Verbally praising the challenge and excitement of the assigned task.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Verbally complaining about the difficulty of the assigned task.  3
14. Asking for additional help from the teacher.  10
15. Talking and/or playing out of turn.  1

**Initial Frustration**

Observations revealed that students initially found the task of arranging frustrating. The additional comments from Class 1 state that the Imagination Sheet “task might have seemed overwhelming, particularly for one student.” This participant also demonstrated confusion about the task. Participant 2 demonstrated similar frustration during Class 2 in response to teacher feedback on the Imagination MCA. This occurred because the student misunderstood some of the criteria for the assignment. When the student was observed later, however, they “appeared to be less frustrated.” Furthermore, frustration appears to have subsided by Class 12. The comments from that class note, “Students appear to have a better disposition for the second round of the project. They appear to be less overwhelmed.”

**Pacing Problems**

For the first half of the project, this researcher showed concern for a few issues in the pacing of the project. A note from Class 1 echoes this sentiment, stating, “There may not have been enough time for this first activity.” Comments from Class 3 support this idea, saying, “It appears that the pacing is too quick for this project. Students were not able to accomplish much during the first 15 minutes of this class.” However, there were no observations of pacing problems after this class, so it is possible that the pacing improved as the students and the teacher grew comfortable with the nature of the curriculum activities.
Need for Clarification

Students occasionally needed clarification on the meaning of the terms pad, punctuation, and riff. The first recorded incident occurred during Class 4. This researcher recorded, “I had to give more explanation about the pads, punctuations, and riffs. I gave some examples of good potential places to place each. I told them riffs were best placed in spaces where there was a lot of rest.” Again, this researcher recorded a similar situation in Class 8, writing, “Participant 2 needed additional clarification on the meaning of the terms pad and punctuation. I recommended that a pad covers at least four measures.” Participant 1 asked for clarification about the term pad during Class 18. After explaining it to the student, the student “revealed that there was confusion on how to sustain a chord on the xylophone.” This researcher informed the student that they “should allow the instrument to ring out as long as it can, knowing the sustain is short.”

There were also two different classes where students asked for clarification about an assessment. In Class 7, this researcher had to “clarify what each question was asking” on the Arrangement Rehearsal Plan Sheet. In Class 9, this researcher recorded that “both Participants 1 and 2 asked a question to clarify what the presentation preparation worksheet was asking them to write.” There were no other requests for clarification for the rest of the project.

Student Complaints

While students generally did not express dislike toward the project, there were a few moments throughout the project where students stated their perspective of an activity. For instance, Participant 1 “complained about having to speak in front of the class” during the final presentation in Class 10. During Class 15, both participants “complained about the difficulty of Song #2.” They also “felt like the project was dragging on.” Comments in Class 16 noted that “students complained about the boring nature of the task.” Participant 2 explained that the
activity was fun the first time through, but now it was repetitive. The participant also described it as ‘watching a movie right after you finish watching it for the first time.’”

Analysis of Interviews

Both participants agreed to be interviewed and answered five questions regarding the curriculum project. The questions were as follows:

1. How has this study affected your understanding of arranging?
2. How do you feel about the arrangements you and your classmates made during the study?
3. How has this study affected your understanding of rehearsal and performance?
4. How do you feel about the activities you participated in during this study?
5. How would you change this curriculum to make it more effective?

The data from interviews were coded using Delve. Five themes emerged from the analysis. The themes and data are reported in the sections below. Some of the extra words, such as “like,” have been removed from the student quotes to help with readability. Both participants have reviewed each of the sections and have agreed to this researcher’s interpretation of their words.

Improved Perception of Arranging Abilities

As data from the Observation Protocol Forms noted, participants were initially frustrated with the process of arranging. Participant 1 stated “I was very frustrated with it. I couldn’t seem to do it.” However, the participant stated that they grew more comfortable with the task of creating ideas for their arrangements: “Towards the second week [of the project] and then through ‘1,000 Names,’ I felt like I could more easily put notes together that worked out well
with the lyrics.” While Participant 2 did not use the word frustration in their interview, they did reflect on the difficulty of arranging. The participant said:

I feel like whenever you feel like arranging, you would think it's easy. It's easy. All you got to do is put the notes in the places and then hope it works and then try again. It's hard because you gotta use both your ears—one for your instrument, one for the song. You've got to be listening and then playing, making sure it all fits in. It's a lot of tedious work. It's helped me to understand how difficult it is, which is why I no longer get as angry and mad.

The participant also mentioned they had attempted previous arranging projects using notation software on their own personal time and struggled with completing an arrangement. Their participation in the curriculum project, however, helped them “understand how tedious the process is.”

**Recognized Practicing Strategies and Challenges**

Both participants discussed practice strategies during their interviews, though their views toward the usage of practice strategies differed. Participant 1 stated that, prior to the study, the main practice strategy that they were familiar with was “play [it] over and over again.” According to the participant, this practice approach was utilized when they took piano lessons. After the project, however, the participant stated “I realized there’s more than one way to practice, like, clap and count and stuff like that.” Participant 2 also recognized the various practice strategies available, but they found that they did not use them as often. The participant stated:

I've never been good with practice strategies. I don't know if you looked at any of my papers where I'd write down the practice strategy. They were both sad. Because I don't really use those practice strategies that much. Yeah, it probably might just be me, but I feel like instead of clapping and counting, sometimes I'll snap it in my head a little bit [subdivide]. But then once I figure it out, then I just sort of throw that one out the window. And most of the time I just refer to just playing it and figuring out as I go. So, I don't really strategize how I practice that much.
Participant 2 also reflected on the challenges of practicing during the project. The participant explained that waiting to practice the arrangement until the last minute for a difficult song might result in a poor performance. However, rehearsing early has its disadvantages, too. The participant stated, “Obviously, it's better than rehearsing late, but it can get boring. Once you get it. And then you stop. Then you get to the end and you're rusty. So, it's definitely a trial-and-error kind of a topic.” Participant 1 did not discuss anything about the practicing challenges they encountered.

**Worksheets Were Helpful**

Both participants reported that the worksheets for the project were useful and beneficial for their learning. Participant 1 stated that “it was really helpful to have the different sheets like the Imagination Sheet and the Performance Sheet [Presentation Preparation Worksheet].” The participant added that the sheets allowed them to “write everything down during ‘1,000 Names.’” Participant 2 initially reported disliking the Imagination Sheets, saying, “I did not like it whenever we would sit over there [in the chairs] and just listen to [the songs], and then write down the ideas. And I think the reason I didn't like that one is because about three days later, I would throw all my ideas out the window.” However, as the participant spoke, they noticed that the sheet would allow students to get their “ bearings on the song.” Upon this statement, the student changed their mind and said, “I feel like it could be pretty good.”

**Repetitious and Predictable**

Both participants agreed that the last two weeks of the project were repetitious and predictable. Participant 1, while describing their work ethic for the song “1,000 Names,” said, “I was just doing the bare minimum because I felt like there was really lots of repetition for weeks,
which was a long time.” The participant later stated, “the first song was fun. I put a lot of work into it and this song [“1,000 Names”], I did not do as much because I was bored.” Again, the participant related that they did not write as much on the worksheets for the second half of the project because they were “honestly bored of the project at this point.” Participant 2 agreed that the project “got repetitive after we did it the second time.” The participant further explained this thought with an analogy, stating, “Whenever you're at a waterpark for the first time and you're having fun, you're going to be doing everything. You'll be running around. [However], whenever you've gone there 80 times and then you come back, you know everything. It's less fun. You're sort of walking around like, ‘What do I do now?’”

**Suggestions for Improvement**

**Change Curriculum Length**

As was stated in the last section, student experience of the curriculum was repetitious and boredom for the second song of the curriculum. Because of this, both participants recommended changing the duration of the curriculum. Participant 1 suggested doing “one song over one period of two weeks instead of two songs over two periods for two weeks.” Similarly, Participant 2 thought the curriculum could be more interesting. Regarding the repetition of the curriculum, the participant said, “It's like watching a movie and [saying], ‘Okay, that was pretty good movie’ and then immediately going back and watching the exact same movie again. You know everything that's gonna happen. You know the entire plot. You know what's going to happen.” When asked about the recommended length for the project, the participant agreed that two weeks would be an acceptable length. However, the participant also added, “You could maybe extend [Song #1]. Have more things a little bit longer, maybe like three or four weeks if you really want to. If you really wanted them to be good.” When this researcher asked for further clarification,
the participant said that the teacher could “extend how long it takes. Maybe add a couple more assignments to help some of the less-advanced people understand or add more advanced assignments to help them advance more and if they obviously started to get bored of it, you could… maybe shorten it down a little bit.” The participant, in summary, suggested cutting the second song of the project and modifying the activities of the first song to challenge or aid student learning.

Modify Project Requirements

Participant 2 suggested some ideas to modify the project for students of different experience levels. The participant stated, “I would say maybe require less or more from certain people, like a tax that sometimes the government does. I don't remember what it's called. But they take more from people who make more. I would have maybe lowered the requirements for a student that doesn't have as much experience.” The participant suggested requiring only one of the three orchestral sweetening requirements for students who were less experienced. For advanced students, the participant proposed requiring the students to arrange for “multiple instruments,” or using notation software and printing out a “professional arrangement for it.”

Include More People

Participants agreed that the curriculum would benefit from having more students participate. Participant 1 suggested having the full class of eleven students participate. Participant 2 agreed, recommending that “everybody… do it to help them on arranging.” Participant 1 expressed difficulty in selecting the arrangement they thought was best for the Arrangement Selection Sheet activity. The participant said, “We only had one group or two groups to choose from, and [it] made you feel sort of guilty to pick yourself.” The participant
added that the small number made it “hard to think of ideas by yourself” and made them feel “lonely.” The participant continued, “If there's one person, you have one brain to think of ideas, but if you have four people, you have four brains to come up with different ideas. So, you have more ideas to make one big idea.” According to this participant, including more people would result in a better product.

Incorporate More Technology

Participant 1 recommended that technology be integrated into the assessment process of the curriculum. The participant recognized that Participant 2, “didn't write very much on their sheets” and suggested that the participant would do better working on a computer: “If you could put it on a laptop for them to type, I know [Participant 2] does so much more when they are typing.” The suggestion requires that digital versions of the MCAs be provided to the students via laptops. Additionally, student responses to the answers would have to be shared with the teacher for scoring and review via email or some type of file-sharing service.

Create Opportunities for Peer Feedback

Participant 2 recommended that the curriculum include more opportunities for students to interact and give feedback to one another. The participant said, “If you had four groups… you can get two of the groups to get together and sort of throw their ideas across from each other and give the other group recommendations, like peer-to-peer review.” When this researcher asked the participant what they thought of the Peer Review Form, the participant responded saying, “Just gonna say it. I didn't really like that. Because that was written. And if it's written, you can't really ask for clarification if you don't understand.” The participant explained that the increased
interaction between the groups would allow them to “recommend stuff to each other, play each other's arrangements, [and] steal ideas from each other.”

Discussion

While the quantitative analysis resulted in no instances of significance likely because of the small sample size, four questions had a difference in mean of -1.5, which was the greatest difference reported from the t-test. The first question stated “When creating rhythmic punctuation or emphasis for song arrangements, I use a limited range of rhythms.” The qualitative analysis revealed that students either approximated rhythms or wrote out lyrics to indicate the timing of punctuations. While students used a “limited range of rhythms” in their notation (such as quarter notes and half notes), this notation was rarely a reflection of the rhythms in their performance. Typically, their performances included more syncopation. The punctuations, therefore, extended beyond a limited range of rhythms but these rhythms were not represented with accurate music notation.

The next question stated “When creating riffs for a musical arrangement, I use a suitable set of pitches/notes.” The qualitative analysis revealed that there was a general improvement in arranging abilities. For instance, Participant 1 wrote “It’s easier to pick notes now,” for the Arranger Self-Evaluation Form, which supports the idea that the student perceived themselves as being able to pick a “suitable set of pitches/notes.” During the one-on-one interviews, the same participant stated, “I felt like I could more easily put notes together that worked out well with the lyrics.” Participant 2 stated, “All you got to do is put the notes in the places and then hope it works and then try again. It's hard because you gotta use both your ears—one for your instrument, one for the song. You've got to be listening and then playing, making sure it all fits in.” The participant’s reflection reveals that they at least understood the difficulty of arranging notes for
orchestral sweetening. The students’ riffs reported in Example 4.2 and Example 4.4 support the idea that the students were capable in choosing appropriate notes to fit the harmonic context of “Glorious Day.”

The third question stated, “When performing, I make sense of rhythmic notation and play the correct notes when given Nashville Numbers.” In the qualitative analysis, comparison of student notation and performances revealed a tendency towards rhythmic approximation. Participant 1, in particular, wrote a simplified version of their riffs’ rhythms. For this participant, the statement “I make sense of rhythmic notation” appears to be false, as their performance was not accurate to their notation. Additionally, the participant’s performance of pads in “Glorious Day” reveals that they did not perform the whole notes they notated during the Bridge of the song. Participant 2 did not have any rhythmic notation written for their riffs, though they did include whole notes for their pads. Their performance of these pads suggests that they made accurate sense of the rhythmic notation.

Regarding the second half of the question that states “I… play the correct notes when given Nashville Numbers,” students were never given Nashville Numbers from another student to perform. This is because there were not enough students in groups to attempt reading the Nashville Numbers of another student. However, Examples 4.1-4.4 reveal that many of the Nashville Numbers notated by students were represented during their final performances. Nevertheless, it is impossible to determine whether this accuracy resulted from memorization, reading the Nashville Numbers students notated, or both.

The final question of the quantitative analysis stated, “When playing an individual part, I maintain a reliable sense of pulse.” No section of the qualitative analysis dealt with the term pulse. However, this does not mean that students failed to perform with good tempo. For
instance, the existence of the transcriptions in Examples 4.2 and 4.4 suggests that the students performed with enough consistency in pulse for the researcher to transcribe music notation. However, this evidence is not concrete, as students did not perform rhythms as they were notated. For this reason, there is insufficient data to support the validity of the statement.

Beyond these questions, the qualitative analysis revealed that students were able to create instances of each type of orchestral sweetening. While rhythms were often approximations and issues of dynamics and articulations were rarely considered, it appears that students could successfully create their own pads, punctuations, and riffs. During the process, students faced frustration as they wrestled with their understanding of the teacher criteria. This frustration, however, subsided as students experimented with their musical ideas, abandoning and altering them to fit with their musical vision. Additionally, students interpreted terms differently, resulting in orchestral sweetening that did not fit neatly within the prescribed definitions given to students at the outset of the project. Subsequently, students grew more comfortable with the process of arranging, gaining perspective of its difficulty but confronting the challenge with success.

The curriculum project also revealed that students were able to choose simple goals and practice strategies for their rehearsal plans. However, the rehearsal plans did not address issues of music interpretation, such as dynamics, articulation, and phrasing. The absence of these elements corresponds with the absence of dynamics and articulations written in student notation. For this reason, it appears that students did not consider issues of musicality in their practice because these elements were not included in their arrangements. Additionally, students perceived that their performances improved throughout the project as a result of their practice.
Student responses on the Arrangement Responding Form for both curriculum songs demonstrated limited analysis and evaluation of musical elements in connection to the themes, lyrics, and the overall meaning of each song. Additionally, students wrote vague answers on the Arrangement Selection Sheet for both songs, giving little to no evidence from student arrangements to support their responses. Part of the reason for the unclear answers may lie in the lack of direct instruction from the teacher during the curriculum. Activities were primarily student-led, which did not allow for much explicit instruction in concepts like lyric interpretation and word painting. Furthermore, the response forms required that students have a command of musical vocabulary, much of which is not addressed in this curriculum. For these reasons, it appeared the curriculum was weak in addressing the issue of student evaluation of others’ musical arrangements. Applying the curriculum to an older group of students that have a better command of musical terminology might have helped to alleviate this issue. Otherwise, students could have been introduced to more theoretical ideas prior to implementation of the curriculum in the future.

Students unanimously agreed that the second half of the curriculum was repetitious and grew uninteresting. Students recommended changing the curriculum length, agreeing that one song was preferable to two. Two weeks was a preferred length, though Participant 2 suggested three or four weeks if activities were added to help or challenge students in ways not currently addressed in the project.

Students also encouraged the involvement of more people. The preferred amount was a small classroom, such as the eleven students enrolled in the class from which students were recruited. Students also recommended four groups for one classroom, with three or four students per group. The increased class size would be more ideal for the social nature of the curriculum
activities, aligning with the constructivist learning theory adopted for this study. The greater number of students would also aid students in creation of their ideas. As well, Participant 1 suggested implementing laptops into the assessment process. Additionally, Participant 2 recommended addressing issues of differentiation by modifying requirements to meet students’ achievement levels. The same participant also desired that the curriculum include more opportunities for peer review, preferring face to face dialogue over written responses.

Conclusion

The paired t-test from the quantitative analysis revealed no significant results. However, the qualitative analysis suggests that students’ abilities in arranging improved, as students were able to create all three types of orchestral sweetening in their arrangements, with limitations in rhythmic accuracy, dynamics, and articulation. The analysis also revealed that students at least recognized if not improved in issues relating to performance and rehearsing, though their strategies for practicing were limited to concerns of right notes and rhythms. Analysis of the Arrangement Responding Forms and Arrangement Selection Sheets demonstrated limited analysis and evaluation of musical elements found in other student arrangements. Finally, students recommended that the curriculum length be changed, the number of students increased, the MCAs be offered digitally through laptops, issues of differentiation be addressed, and activities be expanded for socially-driven peer review.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Overview

This study explored how Composition/Theory Model Cornerstone Assessments could be adapted for an arranging curriculum that utilized NNS and the learning practices of popular musicians. This researcher sought to determine the effectiveness of this curriculum on Family Christian Academy junior high and high school band students’ perception of their skills in arranging, rehearsing, performing, and evaluating their own arrangements as well as their peers’ arrangements. This chapter first summarizes the study, its purpose, and its procedures. Then, findings are reviewed and discussed in relation to existing literature. Next, the significance and implications for practice are considered. Finally, limitations and recommendations for future research are given.

Summary of Study

This study examined the effectiveness of a curriculum that utilized adapted Composition/Theory MCAs, NNS, and popular music pedagogy for arranging church music. The study implemented an applied research design, as it was intended for a specific research site and not for generalization of results. Because it constituted applied research, a mixed methods design was utilized. The quantitative portion of the study utilized a one-group pretest-post design. An adapted form of Kokotsaki’s self-assessment survey was administered to students before and after the curriculum, and a t-test was performed to determine if the difference between the means of each survey was significant. The qualitative portion of the study examined student documents, recordings, teacher observations, and one-on-one interviews, organizing and coding the data with themes that emerged during analysis. Prior to the implementation of the study, this researcher performed a literature review dealing with PME and music education assessment relevant to this
study. The review revealed that little to no studies existed that dealt with assessment practices in arranging, particularly one centered on church music, NNS, and popular music pedagogy. Additionally, there were no studies or curriculums that dealt with adapting Composition/Theory MCAs for an arranging context. As such, this curriculum is unique and adds to that body of literature.

**Summary of Purpose**

The purpose of this applied research study was to determine how Composition/Theory MCAs could be effectively applied to a curriculum for arranging church music in the junior high and high school band program at Family Christian Academy. The study aimed to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum for developing student skills in arranging, rehearsing, performing, and evaluating their own arrangements as well as their peers’ arrangements. The form of the curriculum project presented in Chapter 3 resulted from a review of the literature on popular music pedagogy and assessment and an adaptation of the MCAs posted on the National Association for Music Education’s website.166

**Summary of Procedures**

This researcher first obtained approval from the Liberty Institutional Review Board (IRB). Then, this researcher recruited students from the junior high and high school band class at Family Christian Academy. The researcher received three signed consent forms, but only two participants remained in the study for its entire duration.

---

The study began with the administration of the pre-test survey on Friday, January 6, 2023. The curriculum that followed was twenty class periods in length, beginning on Monday, January 9, 2023 and concluding on Monday, February 6, 2023. This researcher administered the post-test survey on Tuesday, February 7, 2023. Participants were interviewed on Thursday, February 9, 2023 and Friday, February 10, 2023. Upon conclusion of the study, quantitative data from the surveys was recorded with the SPSS Statistics software and this researcher conducted a t-test. Following this, student documents and recordings, Observation Protocol Forms, and one-on-one student interviews were analyzed using the qualitative software, Delve. After the data was coded, themes and quotes were reported to students who were interviewed, where they participated in member checking to determine the accuracy of this researcher’s interpretation. Student work was also scanned and sent to an independent scorer, who scored student work and sent back scanned forms to the researcher’s email. The files that were shared have been deleted from this researcher’s emails and Google Drive to help protect raw student data. All data collected for the study have been stored on the researcher's password-protected computer or in a safe with a combination lock. All data will be discarded after five years of storage.

**Summary of Findings and Prior Research**

The following research question guided this study:

**RQ1:** How can Composition/Theory MCAs be effectively applied to a church music arranging curriculum that utilizes popular music pedagogy and uses Nashville Numbers as the primary notational device and communicative medium?

The following sections discuss the findings of the study in connection with pre-existing literature. Because of the small sample size for this study, all data and conclusions should be taken as preliminary.
Improvement in Creating Orchestral Sweetening

While the t-test from quantitative portion of this study did not reveal any significance in the results from the pre- and post-test surveys, the qualitative data suggested that the curriculum helped improve the participants’ abilities in creating orchestral sweetening. Participants reported feeling more comfortable with the process of arranging, and each participant was able to create pads, punctuations, and riffs that fit the harmonic context of each song. Even though students were only supplied with a recording, a Nashville Number chart, and limited teacher feedback, they were able to improvise their own ideas. While at first frustrated with the lack of restrictions, students were eventually able to create unique musical products. Thus, the curriculum created an environment that fostered improvisation and creativity. The success of this approach supports van der Schyff’s suggestion that music educators foster a “improvisational disposition”\textsuperscript{167} in students rather than the more common trend towards “standardized and technically driven music improvisation pedagogy.”\textsuperscript{168} The application of van der Schyff’s ideas within this curriculum supply evidence towards his claims.

The analysis also revealed a tendency towards rhythmic approximation in music notation. The notation appeared to serve as a mnemonic device rather than as an exact representation. This approach to reading notation is authentic to many popular musicians. For instance, this researcher recalls his personal experience playing in a group of popular church musicians that use Nashville Number charts. Often, this researcher has encountered notated riffs that were approximated, requiring that the musicians of the group rely on reference recordings for the exact rhythm. Thus, the Nashville Number notation was used in addition to the musicians’ ears.

\textsuperscript{167} Van der Schyff, “Improvisation, Enaction, and Self-Assessment,” 326.

\textsuperscript{168} Ibid., 324.
Other popular musicians also utilize notation in similar manner. Green noted that for six of the fourteen popular musicians she interviewed, “copying by ear was mixed in to varying degrees with using notation, but notation was very much secondary to learning by listening.”\textsuperscript{169} The participants of this study also appear to have used their notation as a “secondary” aid, relying primarily on their ears and their memory of their ideas.

Demonstration of Basic Rehearsal Strategies and Performance Ability

The data analysis revealed that students demonstrated basic rehearsal strategies centered around playing correct notes and rhythms. However, students did not address issues of musicality, such as dynamics, articulation, and phrasing. It is also difficult to determine whether students indeed grew in their understanding of practicing or if they were merely reporting the knowledge they had already required prior to curriculum. The lack of significance makes it difficult to make any conclusions in this area. Additionally, students reported that their performances improved throughout the curriculum. However, like practice strategies, student performances did not demonstrate any recorded improvement in issues of musicality.

Because students were alone in each group, students were not able to discuss how they would address the rehearsal and performance issues of other students in their group. Also, because the number of students was limited, it was difficult to substantiate Green’s report that the “performance… abilities [of popular musicians] are acquired, not only individually, but crucially, as members of a group, through informal peer-directed learning and group learning, both conscious and unconscious.”\textsuperscript{170} While students certainly grew individually, they did not

\textsuperscript{169} Green, \textit{How Popular Musicians Learn}, 68.

\textsuperscript{170} Green, \textit{Music, Informal Learning}, 7.
have the opportunity to interact in a group. Therefore, it is not possible to confirm Green’s statements within the context of this project.

Lacking Development of Evaluative Abilities

The study revealed that the students gave superficial answers to questions that asked them to evaluate and analyze their peers’ arrangements. Students rarely cited musical elements in their answers, and they had difficulty describing how musical elements connected to the themes, lyrics, and overall meaning of both songs. However, it is possible that this issue demonstrates an authentic characteristic found in the learning of popular musicians. For example, Green asserts that popular musicians learn music theory “haphazardly according to whatever music is enjoyed and played.” 171 She argues that these musicians have “‘tacit knowledge’… of technicalities” [Green’s term for music theory], in so far as they were able to use musical elements in stylistically appropriate ways, but without being able to apply names to them, or to discuss them in any but vague or metaphorical terms.” 172 For this reason, it is conceivable that the participants of this study had this kind of “tacit knowledge.” The vague nature of their responses corresponds to this idea.

Perhaps this thought also suggests some conflict between the formal sphere of the MCAs and the informal sphere of popular music pedagogy utilized in this curriculum. In order for students to successfully answer the MCAs that focus on responding, it is necessary that they be supplied with a greater understanding of the theoretical concepts used in arranging. Thus, the curriculum would have to be “formalized” with additional instruction in these ideas.


172 Ibid., 93.
Alternatively, these theoretical concepts could be taught in more detail prior to the implementation of the curriculum in order to preserve the current format.

**Alter Curriculum Duration**

Participants agreed that the second half of the project became repetitious and uninteresting. Subsequently, they suggested altering the length of the curriculum. Both participants suggested removing the second song of the curriculum. Suggestions for length varied from two to four weeks, although it appears that two weeks was the preferred duration. In review of the literature, it was discovered that the creators of the Composition/Theory MCAs did not recommend any length for the Proficient, Accomplished, and Advanced tasks included on the National Association for Music Education website. Green, however, reported that “each stage [of her curriculum project] usually lasted from four to six lessons of 50 to 90 minutes once a week,” including the informal stages upon which this curriculum was based.\(^{173}\) By contrast, this study’s curriculum project lasted twenty 48-minute periods. If limited to ten classes, it is likely that students would not grow as uninterested with curriculum activities.

**Increase Number of Students**

The small number of students involved in this study resulted in a lack of arrangements to select from during the Arrangement Selection Sheet activities of the curriculum. Additionally, the low quantity of students meant that little social interaction was present in the curriculum, resulting in feelings of loneliness as well as challenges in creating all parts of the arrangement without the aid of group members. Therefore, participants asked that more students be included in future iterations of the project. The tenets of constructivism, the theoretical framework

adapted for this study, agree with these participants’ views, as proponents of the theory hold that learning is a “social activity” in which learning results from interactions with other people.\(^\text{174}\) Additionally, similar informal activities utilized in Rescsanszky’s classes involved classroom sizes that averaged twelve students, close to the recommendation of eleven students that participants of this study proposed.\(^\text{175}\) Therefore, the study requires more participants to determine whether constructivism is a suitable framework for the informal arranging activities of this curriculum.

**Adjust Project Requirements and Technology for Students**

The participants thought that the curriculum could be adjusted to better meet the experience levels and strengths of the students. Future students who encounter the curriculum would benefit from differentiation strategies that require more or less from students based on their skill level and aptitude. This idea agrees with the differentiation strategies given in the Proficient level Composition/Theory MCAs, which recommend “tier tasks to address levels of abilities and support students within each tier.”\(^\text{176}\) Participant suggestions to include technology like laptops and music software in the curriculum also align with the differentiation strategies suggested in the MCAs.

**Summary of Significance**

This study provided a practical example of a church music arranging curriculum that utilized popular music pedagogy and NNS. The informal strategies used for the curriculum

\(^{174}\) Kladder, “Songwriting in Modern band?”, 5.

\(^{175}\) Rescsanszky, “Mixing Formal and Informal,” 29.

encouraged students to take responsibility for their learning through student-led exploration. In context of the current educational climate, this curriculum addressed much of desideratum for twenty-first century skills such as “critical thinking, problem-solving, creativity, [and] innovation.” As a curriculum based on the theoretical framework of constructivism, the curriculum adds to that body of literature. Finally, the curriculum tested the flexibility of the Composition/Theory MCAs for an arranging context, demonstrating that the MCAs adapt well to the new context.

**Implications for Practice**

This study suggests that informal strategies of learning should be more regularly included in arranging curricula. The format encourages students to be creative and innovative, as the student is required to synthesize musical ideas with little influence from the musical ideas of the teacher. As well, the study implies that music educators incorporate more informal approaches for improvisation activities that allow students to freely explore musical ideas. The study also indicates that students can create musical ideas with limited understanding of music theory. For this reason, teaching practice should include more opportunities to experience musical composition and arranging apart from theory. After students have experienced the process of creating, it is appropriate to follow up experiences with an investigation of undergirding theoretical concepts.

**Limitations**

The main limitation of this study was the small sample size. The low number of participants resulted in the inability to determine significance in the t-test. Additionally, student

---

groups ended up being too small to test the social elements of the curriculum. The small sample also only included percussionists. Accordingly, no brass, woodwind, or bass guitar instrumentalists were involved in the study. Thus, it was not possible to test the effectiveness of the curriculum with instrumentals who play those instruments.

Another limitation was that the study did not include any seventh- or eighth-grade students. Additionally, all participants of this study were Caucasian, resulting in an improper representation of students of other ethnicities. As well, pre- and post-test surveys utilized for this study were not tested prior to being administered in the study. With this, the researcher also did not determine reliability and validity of the survey. Finally, the fact that this researcher also served as the teacher for study might have resulted in more positive responses in interviews from the students throughout the project. Consequently, participants may have stated what the teacher wanted to hear rather than what they thought.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

Because the study sample was too small, recommendations for future research include replicating the study with a larger sample size to address the lack of representation of different grade levels, instruments, and ethnicities in this study. The increased sample size would also help test the social elements of the curriculum. It would also help increase statistical power. Additionally, further research can focus on determining the validity and reliability of the survey utilized for the quantitative portion of this study. The curriculum could also be tested with a version that only includes one song over two weeks, rather the current two-song four-week iteration. As well, this curriculum only tested the creation of orchestral sweetening with the key of Bb major. Future iterations could test other major and minor keys. Future studies could also consider songs that include time signatures other than 4/4, such as 2/4, 3/4, 6/8, etc. Finally, the
student could be performed in multiple geographical locations to determine its effectiveness with different types of students.

**Summary**

This applied research study sought to determine the effectiveness of a church arranging curriculum that utilized adapted Composition/Theory MCAs as well as NNS and popular music pedagogy. The similarities between the creative processes of composing and arranging suggested that Composition/Theory MCAs could be adapted for such a curriculum. As well, the desire to promote authentic practices of popular church musicians resulted in a curriculum that utilized informal learning and pedagogy. The results of the study revealed that students grew in their ability to create orchestral sweetening for the songs of the project. The participants’ use of rhythmic approximation suggested that the curriculum promoted authentic practices of popular musicians. Students also demonstrated rehearsal and performance improvement focused on correct notes and rhythms, though it is uncertain whether this resulted from the intervention of the curriculum or not. Issues of musicality were not usually considered in student arranging, rehearsing, or performing. The study also revealed little development of participants’ evaluative abilities, which suggests that the curriculum did not grant students adequate instruction in theoretical concepts, though the students may have had “tacit” theoretical knowledge which they struggled to express in anything but vague ways.

In addition to this, the study participants recommended altering the curriculum duration, increasing the number of participants, and applying differentiation strategies to help improve the curriculum for future students. The study limitations revolved around a small sample size, improper representation of the student population for the study, untested survey instruments, and the potential skewing of data caused by the dual role of this researcher as the teacher and
researcher in the study. Additional research is required to alleviate these limitations and determine the effectiveness of this curriculum project.
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Appendix B:

Parent of Participant and Student Consent Form

Title of the Research Study: Implementing Composition/Theory Model Cornerstone Assessments in the Family Christian Academy Band Program

This research study is being conducted by Matthew Woolsey, a Master's Student at Liberty University. Your child was selected as a possible participant because he/she is no younger than a seventh-grader and no older than a tenth-grader, is enrolled in Family Christian Academy, and is taking band as an elective for the 2022-2023 school year. Please read this entire form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to allow him or her to be in the study.

Why is this study being done?
The purpose of the study is to determine if a four-week curriculum focused on arranging church music will improve your child’s ability to arrange brass, woodwind, percussion, and/or bass guitar parts for a church service. The study also seeks to determine if this curriculum will improve your child’s ability to rehearse his or her own group arrangements and evaluate other group arrangements. Through this study, the researcher hopes to discover more effective ways to teach your child and future students to arrange music for church contexts.

What will my child/student be asked to do?
If you agree to allow your child to be in this study, he/she will be asked to do the following things:

1. Fill out a survey two different times that measures what your child thinks he/she is able to do regarding arranging, performing, rehearsing, and evaluating music. This will take 30-40 minutes on the band class day before the curriculum starts (on Friday, January 6, 2023) and 30-40 minutes on the band class day after the curriculum is completed (on Tuesday, February 7, 2023).

2. Participate in the curriculum assignments and activities which will include creating two different praise and worship song arrangements, editing and revising the arrangements, evaluating both his/her own and other group arrangements, rehearsing these arrangements, and recording audio of his or her group performing the arrangements at various stages of the curriculum. (Many aspects of this curriculum will require your child to fill out various documents and paperwork intended to measure his/her learning throughout the study. These documents are called Model Cornerstone Assessments.) This portion of the study should take approximately four weeks of our scheduled class time, or 20 class periods (from January 9 through February 6, 2023).

3. Participate in one-on-one interviews that ask your child what he/she thought about the curriculum, his/her understanding of arranging, rehearsing, and evaluation, as well as what he/she feels could be done to improve the curriculum for future students. (These interviews are entirely voluntary. If asked to do an interview, your children are not required to do so, even if they participated in other parts of this study.) This will likely take 15 minutes of your student’s time in band class and will be done over two weeks of our class time (from Thursday, February 8 through Friday, February 17, 2023).
4. Review and check to make sure that I understand the meaning of what your child said in his/her interviews after I have transcribed them and looked closely at them. (This is to ensure that my conclusions about your child’s words properly reflect what he/she intended them to mean). This will likely take 5 to 10 minutes of your student’s time during a band class in the month of February or March.

### What are the risks and benefits of this study?

**Risks:** The risks involved in this study are minimal, which means they are equal to the risks your child would encounter in everyday life.

**Benefits:** The direct benefits your child might receive from taking part in this study are an increased understanding of church music arranging, rehearsing, and evaluation of personal arrangements and others’ arrangements. Your child will have experienced recording two church arrangements that he or she helped to create. In addition, future students can benefit from the study as the results will help this researcher determine more effective ways to implement similar curriculums in the future.

### Will my child be compensated for participating?

Besides the grades that your child would normally receive from typical classwork, your child will not be compensated for participating in this study.

### How will my child’s personal information be protected?

Research records will be stored securely on the researcher's password-protected laptop or locked in a safe with a combination lock. Only the researcher will have access to the records. Participant responses will be kept confidential through the use of numbers that will be assigned to each participant. Interviews will be conducted in a location where others will not easily overhear the conversation. Any documents, recordings, and data collected will be stored for five years, after which they will be deleted or disposed. All data collected from the study will be used for the purpose of this curriculum project and to improve future students’ learning experiences in church music arranging.

### Does the researcher have any conflicts of interest?

The researcher serves as the band director at Family Christian Academy, the school where the study participants will be obtained. This disclosure is made so that you can decide if this relationship will affect your willingness for your child to participate in this study. No action will be taken against an individual based on his or her decision to participate or not participate in this study.

### Is study participation voluntary?

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University. Even if you decide to grant your child permission to participate, you or your child can withdraw from the study at any time if you or your child chooses to do so. Additionally, if you or your child chooses not to participate, your child will be provided an alternative class assignment during the study and will not be penalized in any way for your choice or his/her choice not to participate.
What should I or my child do if I decide to withdraw him or her or if he or she decides to withdraw from the study?

If you choose to withdraw your child or if your child chooses to withdraw from the study, please talk to the researcher or contact him at the email address/phone number included in the next paragraph. Should you or your child choose to withdraw, data collected from your child will be destroyed immediately and will not be included in this study.

Whom do I contact if my child or I have questions or concerns about the study?

The researcher conducting this study is Matthew Woolsey. If you have questions at any time, you are encouraged to contact him at [redacted] or at [redacted]. You may also contact the researcher’s faculty sponsor, Dr. Karen Kuehmann, at [redacted].

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, 1971 University Blvd., Green Hall Ste. 2845, Lynchburg, VA 24515 or email at irb@liberty.edu.

Disclaimer: The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is tasked with ensuring that human subjects research will be conducted in an ethical manner as defined and required by federal regulations. The topics covered and viewpoints expressed or alluded to by student and faculty researchers are those of the researchers and do not necessarily reflect the official policies or positions of Liberty University.

Your Consent

By signing this document, you are agreeing to allow your child to be in this study. Make sure you understand what the study is about before you sign. If you have any questions about the study after you sign this document, you can contact the study team using the information provided above.

Please notify the researcher if you would like a copy of this information for your records

I have read and understood the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to allow my child to participate in the study.

☐ The researcher has my permission to audio-record my child as part of his or her participation in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Parent</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Student Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Investigator</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Observation Protocol Form

**Title of Class and Number:** ____________________________________________

**Date:** __________

Check the following categories if observed during the class period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are students doing?</th>
<th>Check if Yes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Communicating and discussing ways to improve arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Improvising and creating new pads, punctuations, or riffs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Filling out assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Notating and/or refining previous notations of arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Asking frequent questions about the wording of the assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Staying in assigned areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Discussing material irrelevant to the assigned task or to music in general.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Disrupting other groups and distracting from the assigned task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Frequently looking around the room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Having difficulty communicating because of noise levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Verbally praising the challenge and excitement of the assigned task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Verbally complaining about the difficulty of the assigned task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Asking for additional help from the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Talking and/or playing out of turn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments from Observer:
Appendix D: Scope and Sequence

Creating Musical Arrangements with “Orchestral Sweetening”
*Students will generate, analyze, evaluate, and organize original musical ideas for two different arranging projects.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #1 – (Song #1)</th>
<th>Class #2</th>
<th>Class #3</th>
<th>Class #4</th>
<th>Class #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine musical ideas</td>
<td>Improvising musical ideas</td>
<td>Improvising musical ideas</td>
<td>Organizing and refining first draft of arrangement</td>
<td>Evaluate musical ideas of other arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemble and notate musical ideas</td>
<td>Assemble and notate musical ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyze how musical elements contribute to the arrangement and its purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #6</th>
<th>Class #7</th>
<th>Class #8</th>
<th>Class #9</th>
<th>Class #10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refine and notate arrangements based on feedback from students</td>
<td>Refine organization and expressive elements of arrangement</td>
<td>Refine organization and expressive elements of arrangement</td>
<td>Refine organization and expressive elements of arrangement</td>
<td>Share arrangements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #11 – (Song #2)</th>
<th>Class #12</th>
<th>Class #13</th>
<th>Class #14</th>
<th>Class #15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine musical ideas</td>
<td>Improvising musical ideas</td>
<td>Improvising musical ideas</td>
<td>Organizing and refining first draft of arrangement</td>
<td>Evaluate musical ideas of other arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemble and notate musical ideas</td>
<td>Assemble and notate musical ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyze how musical elements contribute to the arrangement and its purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class #16</td>
<td>Class #17</td>
<td>Class #18</td>
<td>Class #19</td>
<td>Class #20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine and notate arrangements based on feedback from students</td>
<td>Refine organization and expressive elements of arrangement</td>
<td>Refine organization and expressive elements of arrangement</td>
<td>Refine organization and expressive elements of arrangement</td>
<td>Share arrangements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performing Original Arrangements

*Students will analyze, interpret, rehearse, and perform original arrangements of two different songs.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #1 – (Song #1)</th>
<th>Class #2</th>
<th>Class #3</th>
<th>Class #4</th>
<th>Class #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perform ideas created through the Imagination Sheet.</td>
<td>Improvising and perform musical ideas in small groups; Rehearse initial ideas</td>
<td>Improvising and perform musical ideas in small groups; Rehearse initial ideas</td>
<td>Rehearsing the first draft of the arrangement</td>
<td>Analyze how the performance of musical elements in arrangement aid the central message of the song.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #6</th>
<th>Class #7</th>
<th>Class #8</th>
<th>Class #9</th>
<th>Class #10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Perform arrangements</td>
<td>Evaluate performances (self and peer evaluations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearse groups, identifying appropriate goals and strategies for improvement of performance</td>
<td>Rehearse groups, identifying appropriate goals and strategies for improvement of performance</td>
<td>Rehearse groups, identifying appropriate goals and strategies for improvement of performance</td>
<td>Verbally explain interpretation of music based on elements of music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class #11 – (Song #2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Class #12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Class #13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Class #14</strong></td>
<td><strong>Class #15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform ideas imagined through the Imagination sheet.</td>
<td>Improvising and perform musical ideas in small groups; Rehearse initial ideas</td>
<td>Improvising and perform musical ideas in small groups; Rehearse initial ideas</td>
<td>Rehearsing the first draft of the arrangement</td>
<td>Analyze how the performance of musical elements in arrangement aid the central message of the song.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Class #16</strong></th>
<th><strong>Class #17</strong></th>
<th><strong>Class #18</strong></th>
<th><strong>Class #19</strong></th>
<th><strong>Class #20</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Perform arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #16</th>
<th>Class #17</th>
<th>Class #18</th>
<th>Class #19</th>
<th>Class #20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehearse groups, identifying appropriate goals and strategies for improvement of performance</td>
<td>Rehearse groups, identifying appropriate goals and strategies for improvement of performance</td>
<td>Rehearse groups, identifying appropriate goals and strategies for improvement of performance</td>
<td>Evaluate performances (self and peer evaluations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #16</th>
<th>Class #17</th>
<th>Class #18</th>
<th>Class #19</th>
<th>Class #20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate student performance and growth in rehearsals</td>
<td>Evaluate student performance and growth in rehearsals</td>
<td>Evaluate student performance and growth in rehearsals</td>
<td>Verbally explain interpretation of music based on elements of music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #16</th>
<th>Class #17</th>
<th>Class #18</th>
<th>Class #19</th>
<th>Class #20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Interpret how the elements of music will aid in expressing the central message of the song</td>
<td>Perform arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluating and Responding to Original Arrangements**

Students will analyze and interpret student arrangements, choosing the arrangements they feel best fit prescribed criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Class #1 – (Song #1)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Class #2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Class #3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Class #4</strong></th>
<th><strong>Class #5</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider and evaluate musical ideas for the arrangement</td>
<td>Consider and evaluate musical ideas for the arrangement</td>
<td>Analyze how musical elements contribute to the arrangement and its purpose.</td>
<td>Analyze how musical elements contribute to the arrangement and its purpose.</td>
<td>Analyze musical ideas of other arrangements and offer suggestions for improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class #6</td>
<td>Class #7</td>
<td>Class #8</td>
<td>Class #9</td>
<td>Class #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret peer feedback and evaluate current draft of arrangement</td>
<td>Evaluate the current draft of the arrangement and its performance in rehearsals</td>
<td>Evaluate the current draft of the arrangement and its performance in rehearsals</td>
<td>Evaluate the current draft of the arrangement and its performance in rehearsals</td>
<td>Interpret performance of arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-evaluate final draft of the arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate the quality of other arrangements, citing specific musical elements heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose the arrangement that best fits criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class #11 – (Song #2)</td>
<td>Class #12</td>
<td>Class #13</td>
<td>Class #14</td>
<td>Class #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider and evaluate musical ideas for the arrangement</td>
<td>Consider and evaluate musical ideas for the arrangement</td>
<td>Analyze how musical elements contribute to the arrangement and its purpose.</td>
<td>Analyze how musical elements contribute to the arrangement and its purpose.</td>
<td>Analyze musical ideas of other arrangements and offer suggestions for improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class #16</td>
<td>Class #17</td>
<td>Class #18</td>
<td>Class #19</td>
<td>Class #20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret peer feedback and evaluate current draft of arrangement</td>
<td>Evaluate the current draft of the arrangement and its performance in rehearsals</td>
<td>Evaluate the current draft of the arrangement and its performance in rehearsals</td>
<td>Evaluate the current draft of the arrangement and its performance in rehearsals</td>
<td>Interpret performance of arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-evaluate final draft of the arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate the quality of other arrangements, citing specific musical elements heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose the arrangement that best fits criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Pre- and Post-Test Survey

**Directions:** This survey is designed to measure what you think regarding your ability to rehearse, perform, create, arrange, listen to, and evaluate music. Respond to the following statements by circling 3 (I can do this well), 2 (I can do this some of the time) or 1 (I can’t do this yet).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When creating <em>rhythmic punctuation</em> or emphasis for song arrangements, I use a limited range of rhythms.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When creating <em>riffs</em>, I use repeated melodic and rhythmic patterns.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When creating <em>pads</em> or sustained chords, I can assign different notes of the chord to other musicians in my group using Nashville Numbers.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When changing and extending my musical ideas, I use big contrasts of pitch and dynamics.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When changing and extending my musical ideas, I combine more than one musical idea.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When combining sounds to create music, I select from several layers of sound, such as rhythms, melody, and different instruments.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When combining sounds to create music, I choose different sounds that fit well with each other.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When looking back at our compositions/arrangements, I can decide how my own work does what I was asked.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When looking back at our compositions/arrangements, I can comment on the different musical elements used.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When looking back at our compositions/arrangements, I can describe the musical effect that was intended and how my own and other people’s work reflects this.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When reviewing compositions and arrangements, I can recognize and describe how musical elements have been combined.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When reviewing compositions and arrangements, I can describe what the composer or arranger intended.</td>
<td>3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When rehearsing for a performance, I set goals that are attainable within the timeframe that I have to practice.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When rehearsing for a performance, I choose strategies that help me attain my practice goals.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When performing, I read simple rhythms and riffs from Nashville Number System notation.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When listening to musical arrangements, I use suitable musical words to describe how elements such as rhythm, pitch, dynamics, and instrumentation are used and combined.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When listening to musical arrangements, I compare the various ways in which the music creates a feeling.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When listening to musical arrangements, I can explain what I like and dislike about the music I hear.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When thinking about musical arrangements I have heard, I can recognize how different musical elements like rhythm, pitch, and dynamics are combined and used to create different moods and feelings.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. When thinking about musical arrangements I have heard, I can recognize how different musical elements like rhythm, pitch, and dynamics are combined and used to help support the lyrics and themes of each song.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. When creating <em>riffs</em> for a musical arrangement, I use a suitable set of pitches/notes.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. When creating <em>riffs</em> for a musical arrangement, I use steps and leaps to show a sense of melodic shape.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. When creating <em>rhythmic punctuation</em> for a musical arrangement, I choose and develop a set of rhythmic patterns.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. When creating <em>pads</em> or sustained chords for a musical arrangement, I choose notes for each chord that are in a range that is easy to hear and is not too difficult for me to play (not too high or too low).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. When changing and extending my musical ideas, I use repeated patterns.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. When changing and extending my musical ideas, I use simple variation techniques.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. When changing and extending my musical ideas, I use contrasts of one or more musical element (ex. Pitch, dynamics, rhythm, etc).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. When combining sounds, I create melodies and chords.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. When combining sounds, I am aware of the combined effect of all the parts playing together.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Thinking about our performances, arrangements, and compositions, I can describe how my own and other people’s work matches what we were asked to do.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Thinking about our performances, arrangements, and compositions, I can compare my own work with that of others, describing differences and similarities.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Thinking about our performances, arrangements, and compositions, I can give constructive suggestions for next steps and improvements, using appropriate musical terms.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. When reviewing performances, arrangements, and compositions, I can describe what the performer, arranger, or composer intended.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. When reviewing performances, arrangements, and compositions, I can use appropriate musical terms to explain how well the performer, arranger, or composer met his or her intentions.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. When rehearsing for a performance, I reflect upon my progress and adjust my practice to meet my goals.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. When rehearsing for a performance with other musicians, I discuss my progress with the other student musicians and adjust my practice based on their suggestions.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. When performing, I make sense of rhythmic notation and play the correct notes when given Nashville Numbers.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. When playing an individual part, I can maintain my part in performance with confidence and accuracy.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. When playing an individual part, I maintain a reliable sense of pulse.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. When performing, I use phrasing, articulation, and dynamics to express my musical intent.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. When performing, I pay attention to the style and/or the genre of the song and adjust my playing to fit accordingly.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. When performing with others, I fit my part with other different parts, aware of how the different parts fit together.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. When performing with others, I perform with mostly accurate timing and pulse.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. When describing the musical arrangements I hear, I use suitable musical terms to describe rhythm, dynamics, pitch, and structure.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. When describing the musical arrangements I hear, I can identify and explain musical devices such as pads, punctuations, and riffs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. When describing the musical arrangements I hear, I can make comparisons between different arrangements of the same song.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. When describing the musical arrangements I hear, I can give my opinion and justify my preference.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. When thinking about the music I have heard, I can use appropriate musical terms to explain how different musical elements and devices are used to create expressive effects.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Adapted MCAs

Student Name ___________________________________  Date _______________________

Song Title: ________________________________  Group Number ______________________

Imagine Scoring Device

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Category</th>
<th>Level 1 Emerging</th>
<th>Level 2 Approaches Criterion</th>
<th>Level 3 Meets Criterion</th>
<th>Level 4 Exceeds Criterion</th>
<th>Performance Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imagine</strong>: Generate and conceptualize artistic ideas and work.</td>
<td>Description was unclear how the musical ideas related to the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>Description provided some guidance as to how the musical ideas related to the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>Description clearly related musical ideas to the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>Description creatively integrated the lyrical and thematic concepts of the song into the musical ideas that relate to the overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>MU:Cr1.1.C.Ia Describe how sounds and short musical ideas can be used to represent personal experiences, moods, visual images, and/or storylines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Teacher Feedback:

### Plan, Make, and Analyze Scoring Device

**Plan and Make:** Select and develop musical ideas for defined purposes and contexts.

**Analyze:** Analyze how the structure and context of varied musical works inform the response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Category</th>
<th>Level 1 Emerging</th>
<th>Level 2 Approaches Criterion</th>
<th>Level 3 Meets Criterion</th>
<th>Level 4 Exceeds Criterion</th>
<th>Performance Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Musical ideas were disorganized.</td>
<td>Organization of musical ideas (recorded and notated) were sequenced but lacked coherency.</td>
<td>Organization of musical ideas (recorded and notated) demonstrated a coherent arrangement.</td>
<td>Organization of musical ideas (recorded and notated) demonstrated a coherent arrangement including variety and expression.</td>
<td><strong>MU:Cr2.1.C.Ia</strong> Assemble and organize sounds or short musical ideas to create initial expressions of selected experiences, moods, images, or storylines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Description of how the pads, punctuations, riffs, and elements of music (pitch, rhythm, dynamics, instrumentation/timbre, form/structure, and/or style/articulation) relate to the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song was inadequate.</td>
<td>Adequately identified and described how most, but not all, of the pads, punctuations, riffs, and elements of music (pitch, rhythm, dynamics, instrumentation/timbre, form/structure, and/or style/articulation) relate to the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>Adequately identified and described how the pads, punctuations, and riffs incorporating elements of music (pitch, rhythm, dynamics, instrumentation/timbre, form/structure, and/or style/articulation) relate to the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>Thoroughly identified and described how the musical idea incorporating elements of music (pitch, rhythm, dynamics, instrumentation/timbre, form/structure, and/or style/articulation) relate to the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td><strong>MU:Cr2.1.C.Ib</strong> Identify and describe the development of sounds or short musical ideas in drafts of music within simple forms (such as one-part, cyclical, or binary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MU:Pr4.2.C.Ia</strong> Analyze how the elements of music (including form) of selected works relate to style and mood, and explain the implications for rehearsal or performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Teacher Feedback:**
Student Name ______________________ Date ______________________

Song Title: ________________________ Group Number _______________________

**Final Composition Presentation Scoring Device**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Category</th>
<th>Level 1 Emerging</th>
<th>Level 2 Approaches Criterion</th>
<th>Level 3 Meets Criterion</th>
<th>Level 4 Exceeds Criterion</th>
<th>Performance Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perform: <strong>Perform</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present: <strong>Present</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perform:** Perform expressively, with appropriate interpretation and technical accuracy, and in a manner appropriate to the audience and context.

**Present:** Share creative musical work that demonstrates craftsmanship and exhibits originality.

**Verbal Presentation**

- **Inadequately explained how he/she employed the elements of music through pads, punctuations, and riffs to realize the expressive intent for the song arrangement designed for the Easter Service.**
- **Somewhat explained how he/she employed the elements of music through pads, punctuations, and riffs to realize the expressive intent for the song arrangement designed for the Easter Service.**
- **Adequately explained how he/she employed the elements of music through pads, punctuations, and riffs to realize the expressive intent for the song arrangement designed for the Easter Service.**
- **Thoroughly explained how he/she employed the elements of music through pads, punctuations, and riffs to realize the expressive intent for the song arrangement designed for the Easter Service.**

- **MU:Cr3.2.C.Ia** Share music through the use of notation, **performance**, or technology, and demonstrate how the **elements of music** have been employed to realize **expressive intent**.

- **MU:Cr3.2.C.Ib** Describe the given **context** and performance medium for presenting personal works, and how they impact the final **composition** and presentation.

- **MU:Pr6.1.C.Ia** Share live or recorded **performances** of works (both personal and others’), and explain how the **elements of music** are used to convey **intent**.

- **MU:Pr6.1.C.Ib** Identify how **compositions** are appropriate for an audience or **context**, and how this will shape future compositions.

**Recognizability of Nashville Number System Notation**

- **Notation was not readable.**
- **Notation was readable in some, but not all places.**
- **Notation was readable.**
- **Notation was readable and accurately laid out.**

**Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent**

- The arrangement conveys limited expressive intent.
- The arrangement somewhat conveyed the expressive intent.
- The arrangement conveyed the expressive intent.
- The arrangement conveyed a clear and compelling expressive intent.
**Process Scoring Device**

**Achievement Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Performance Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Approaches Criterion</td>
<td>Meets Criterion</td>
<td>Exceeds Criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluate and Refine**: Evaluate and refine selected musical ideas to create musical work(s) that meet appropriate criteria, and develop and refine artistic techniques, and work for presentation.

**Analyze and Interpret**: Analyze, and interpret artistic work for presentation.

**Feedback for Refinement**

- Evidence indicated little to no feedback was used to refine the technical aspects of the arrangement.

**Interpretation**

- Arrangement or reflection demonstrated little to no interpretive choices based on effective use of elements of music.

**Strategies for Improvement**

- Rehearsal Plan identified limited or no strategies for improvement of technical and/or expressive aspects for the arrangement’s performance.

**Evidence**

- Evidence indicated that feedback was used to refine the technical and musical aspects of the arrangement.

**Interpretation**

- Arrangement demonstrated very few interpretive choices based on effective use of elements of music.

**Strategies for Improvement**

- Rehearsal Plan clearly identified strategies to thoroughly address technical and expressive aspects for the arrangement’s performance.

**MU:Cr3.1.C.1a** Identify, describe, and apply teacher-provided criteria to assess and refine the technical and expressive aspects of evolving drafts leading to final versions.

**MU:Pr4.3.C.1a** Develop interpretations of works based on an understanding of the use of elements of music, style, and mood, explaining how the interpretive choices reflect the creators’ intent.

**MU:Pr5.1.C.1a** Create rehearsal plans for works, identifying repetition and variation within the form.

**MU:Pr5.1.C.1c** Identify and implement strategies for improving the technical and expressive aspects of multiple works.
**Responding Scoring Device**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Category</th>
<th>Level 1 Emerging</th>
<th>Level 2 Approaches Criterion</th>
<th>Level 3 Meets Criterion</th>
<th>Level 4 Meets Criterion</th>
<th>Performance Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select:</strong> Choose music appropriate for a specific purpose or context.</td>
<td>Provided unclear rationale supporting the selection of the arrangement as designated by the teacher-provided criteria.</td>
<td>Provided minimal rationale supporting the selection of the arrangement as designated by the teacher-provided criteria.</td>
<td>Provided clear rationale supporting the selection of the arrangement as designated by the teacher-provided criteria.</td>
<td>Provided clear and insightful rationale supporting the selection of the arrangement as designated by the teacher-provided criteria.</td>
<td><strong>MU:Pr4.1.C.Ia</strong> Identify and select specific excerpts, passages, or sections in musical works that express a personal experience, mood, visual image, or storyline in simple forms (such as one-part, cyclical, binary). <strong>MU:Re7.1.C.Ia</strong> Apply teacher-provided criteria to select music that expresses a personal experience, mood, visual image, or storyline in simple forms (such as one-part, cyclical, binary), and describe the choices as models for composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyze:</strong> Analyze how the structure and context of varied musical works inform the response.</td>
<td>Inadequately analyzed the elements of music (pitch, rhythm, harmony, dynamics, timbre/instrumentation, texture, form, and/or style/articulation) of the arrangement in relation to lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>Minimally analyzed the elements of music (pitch, rhythm, harmony, dynamics, timbre/instrumentation, texture, form, and/or style/articulation) of the arrangement in relation to lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>Adequately analyzed the elements of music (pitch, rhythm, harmony, dynamics, timbre/instrumentation, texture, form, and/or style/articulation) of the arrangement in relation to lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td>Thoroughly analyzed the elements of music (pitch, rhythm, harmony, dynamics, timbre/instrumentation, texture, form, and/or style/articulation) of the arrangement in relation to lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song.</td>
<td><strong>MU:Re7.2.C.Ia</strong> Analyze aurally the elements of music (including form) of musical works, relating them to style, mood, and context, and describe how the analysis provides models for personal growth as composer, performer, and/or listener. <strong>MU:Re8.1.C.Ia</strong> Develop and explain interpretations of varied works, demonstrating an understanding of the composers' intent by citing technical and expressive aspects as well as the style/genre of each work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate:</strong> Support interpretations of musical works that reflect creator’s/performer’s expressive intent.</td>
<td>Evaluation did not cite specific excerpts relating to style, mood, and/or context; and/or there was no clear supportive rationale.</td>
<td>Evaluation cited specific excerpts relating to style, mood, and/or context with clear, but minimal supportive rationale.</td>
<td>Evaluation cited specific excerpts relating to style, mood, and/or context with clear and thorough supportive rationale.</td>
<td>Evaluation cited specific excerpts relating to style, mood, and/or context with clear, thorough, and insightful supportive rationale.</td>
<td><strong>MU:Re9.1.C.Ia</strong> Describe the effectiveness of the technical and expressive aspects of selected music and performances, demonstrating understanding of fundamentals of music theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Young Musician,

For this year’s Easter service at Christ Cross Fellowship, we want to involve some local student musicians in playing for the main service on Sunday morning, April 9th, 2023. We are looking specifically for students who can play brass, woodwind, or percussion instruments. We also invite any bass guitar players to participate. However, we do not use traditional sheet music for our musicians. We only use lyric sheets, Nashville Number charts, and recordings in preparation for services. Because of this, students will need to arrange their own parts in a way that aligns with the music selection for that Sunday.

To test whether or not students will be able to fulfill this function for the service, we ask that students create *pads*, *punctuations*, and *riffs* for two different praise and worship songs we plan on doing for that Sunday. To clarify, *pads* are sustained slow-moving harmonies or chords that support the melodic line of the lead singer; *punctuations* are rhythmic and harmonic emphases of lyrics or chord changes; and *riffs* are short repeated musical figures or ideas and are usually melodic in nature. These three elements of the arrangement are called *orchestral sweetening*.

Students should arrange this *orchestral sweetening* for the following songs: “Glorious Day” by Passion and “1,000 Names” by Phil Wickham. We have included the lyric sheets, Nashville Number charts, and recordings of rhythm tracks and lead vocals with this letter to guide the process of arranging. We want students to write out their parts using Nashville Numbers and also record their group playing over the provided recordings. Finally, we would like each student to describe how they used timbre (instrumentation), dynamics, pads, punctuations, riffs, or any other musical elements in their group arrangements to convey the lyrics, themes, and overall purposes of each song. The expectations of the arrangement project are given on the “Directives for Arrangements” sheet included with this letter. We look forward to hearing the student arrangements. We pray you enjoy this creative process as we work to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ this Easter.

In Christ,
Raymond Hudson
Worship Pastor of Christ Cross Fellowship
Directives for Arrangements

You must meet the following task requirements with your arrangements:

- Create at least one example of a pad, a punch, and a riff in both songs.
- Focus on the elements of music (timbre/instrumentation, dynamics, pads, punctuations, riffs, style/articulation, etc).
- Notate the individual parts of each of your groups using Nashville Numbers, rhythms, and bar lines so that it is readable and performable by you and others. These parts must include the *name of the instrument* used for the part and *the time signature* of the music. Also, be sure to designate whether pitches go *up or down* by writing noteheads higher or lower than each other. **Do not draw staff lines.** Below is an example of what the notation should look like:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Trumpet} & \{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{8}\} & \{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{8}\}
\end{array}
\]

- The arrangements must demonstrate craftsmanship and originality, and relate to the lyrics, themes, and overall purposes of each song.

Project Expectations

The arrangements must portray the lyrics, themes, and overall purposes of each song and be at an appropriate level of performance challenge for you and or your classmates’ performance skill. In order to accomplish this, it is expected that you:

- Identify and address the technical, stylistic, and musical challenges of your arrangements as they relate to you and your classmates’ performance skill.
- Apply your understanding of theoretical principles to create two arrangements to perform that are at the appropriate level of performance challenge for the skill of each performer.
- Develop and submit a rehearsal plan that provides strategies for improvement of technical and expressive aspects of each arrangement's performance.
- Rehearse, evaluate, and refine the performance of each arrangement, addressing and improving on the identified performance challenges.
- The arrangements will be recorded using brass, woodwind, and/or percussion instruments.
- The presentation must include the following:
  - Introduce your group number.
  - Persuasively explain how the arrangements are appropriate for the Easter Service and the lyrics, themes, and purposes of the songs and explain how the elements of music (pads, punctuations, riffs, etc.) are used in the arrangements to convey intent (**each group member must participate in giving part of the verbal presentation**).
  - Perform and record your arrangements in front of the class with the rhythm and vocal recordings provided.
- You will respond to your classmates’ arrangements identifying how they used each of the elements of music and how those elements portray the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the songs.
VERSE ONE:
I was buried beneath my shame
Who could carry that kind of weight?
It was my tomb
'Til I met You

VERSE TWO:
I was breathing, but not alive
All my failures I tried to hide
It was my tomb
'Til I met You

CHORUS 1:
You called my name
Then I ran out of that grave
Out of the darkness
Into Your glorious day
You called my name
And I ran out of that grave
Out of the darkness
Into Your glorious day

INSTRUMENTAL TURNAROUND:

VERSE THREE:
Now Your mercy has saved my soul
Now Your freedom is all that I know
The old made new
Jesus, when I met You, whoa, what a day

CHORUS 2: (Lyrics are the same as Chorus 1)

BRIDGE: (1x lead solo, 2x unison, 3x all parts)
I needed rescue, My sin was heavy
But chains break at the weight of Your glory
I needed shelter, I was an orphan
But You call me a citizen of Heaven
When I was broken, You were my healing
Now Your love is the air that I'm breathing
I have a future, My eyes are open
‘Cause when you called my name’
I ran out of that grave

CHORUS 3: (Lyrics are the same as Chorus 1)

OUTRO:
Glorious Day
Passion ft. Kristian Stanfill

INTRO:
1 1 1 1

VERSE 1:
1 1sus 1 1sus • 6– 6– 6– 6–
4 4 1 1sus

VERSE 2:
1 1sus 1 1sus • 6– 6– 6– 6–
4 4 1 1

CHORUS 1:
◇~ ~ ~
4 4 1 1 • 4 4 1 1
4 4 6– 6– • 4 4

INSTRUMENTAL TURNAROUND 1: (Same as Intro; 4 measures long)

VERSE 3: (Same as Verse 2; 12 measures long)

CHORUS 2: (Same as Chorus 1; 14 measures long)

INSTRUMENTAL TURNAROUND 2: (Same as Intro; 4 measures long)

BRIDGE:
1 1sus 1 1sus • 1 1sus 1 1sus
1 1sus 1 1sus • 6– 5 5 4
✧ Building!
4 1 1

CHORUS 3:
◇~ ~ ~
4 4 1 1 • 4 4 1 1
4 4 6– 6– • 4 4 4 4

OUTRO: (Same as Intro; 4 measures long)
VERSE 1:
I call you Maker
You give life an eternal spark
I call you Healer
You can mend any broken heart
I call you Faithful Father
You finish everything You start
My soul was made to respond

CHORUS 1:
I know You by a thousand names
And You deserve every single one
You've given me a million ways
To be amazed at what You've done
And I am lost in wonder at all You do
I know You by a thousand names
And I'll sing them back to You, yeah
Sing them back, sing them back to You

VERSE 2:
Your love is boundless
Beyond what I could dream
Your grace is patient
You're never giving up on me
I call You Bondage Breaker
'Cause You're handing out the prison keys
My soul was made to be free

CHORUS 2: (The lyrics are the same)

BRIDGE: (1x lead solo, 2x unison, 3x all parts)
You are Rock of Ages, You're the Great I Am
You are King forever, The beginning and the end
You are Lord and servant, You're the Son of Man
You're the Lion of Judah, You're the risen Lamb
You're the second Adam, Here to lead us home
You are Yahweh's glory, Now revealed in flesh and bone
You are Ocean Parter, You will make a way
You are Death Defeater, You have risen from the grave
You are full of mercy, You are rich in love
You are Jesus, Messiah, The one true God

CHORUS 3: (The lyrics are the same)
1,000 Names
Phil Wickham

INTRO:
> > > >
$\frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ \frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4}$

VERSE 1:
> > > > > > > >
$\frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ \frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ \frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4}$

CHORUS 1:
> > > > > > > >
$\frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ \frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ 1 \ - \ \frac{1}{2} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ \frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4}$

INSTRUMENTAL TURNAROUND 1: (Same as Intro; 4 measures long)

VERSE 2: (Same as Verse 1; 8 measures long)

CHORUS 2: (Same as Chorus 1; 8 measures long)

INSTRUMENTAL TURNAROUND 2: (Same as Intro; 4 measures long)

BRIDGE:
1 2- 6- 4 • 1 2- 6- 4
Build!
1 2- 6- 4 • 1 2- 6- 4
Bigger!
1 2- 6- 4

CHORUS 3: Diamonds for the first 4 measures
> > > > > > > >
$\frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ \frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ 1 \ - \ 2 \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ \frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4}$

Diamonds for the first 4 measures
$\frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4} \ - \ \frac{4}{6} \ - \ \frac{1}{5} \ - \ \frac{1}{3} \ - \ \frac{1}{4}$

(Ring out until it fades)

Arrangement Imagination Sheet

Directions: Use this sheet to brainstorm and describe (with words, pictures, and/or Nashville Numbers) your ideas: e.g., timbres/instrumentation, dynamic shapes, pads (sustained chords), punctuations (rhythmic emphasis of lyric or chord changes), and riff ideas that could be used for your song arrangement. These ideas should relate to the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose and meaning of the song. These ideas will be used in the planning and making of your arrangement. In your arrangement, the elements of music (pitch, rhythm, dynamics, timbre/instrumentation, texture, form, and/or style/articulation) are to be used to portray the meaning of the song and should combine to create memorable music to convey the theological and biblical meaning of the song to the congregation on Easter Sunday. Make sure you use the Nashville chart, lyric chart, and recording provided as a guide for the overall structure of the song. Remember: You must include at least one instance of a pad, one instance of a punctuation, and one instance of a riff for your arrangement.

Timbres/Instrumentation

Dynamic Shapes

Ideas for Pads

Ideas for Punctuations

Ideas for Riffs
Arrangement Analysis Form

**Directions:** Identify and describe the various ways you might create pads, punctuations, and riffs using the elements of music to serve as memorable music to convey and aid the lyrics, themes, and overall purpose of the song:

*Elements of music (pitch, rhythm, dynamics, instrumentation/timbre, texture, form/structure, and/or style/articulation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhythm, Articulation, Style:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitch, Melody, Riffs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamics, Instrumentation/Timbre:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form, Structure:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teacher Feedback:*
**Peer Evaluation Form**

*This section to be completed by the listener.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What works well? (pitch, rhythm, harmony, dynamics, timbre, texture, form, and/or style/articulation)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What could improve the composition?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What did you learn from the peer and teacher feedback that will help you make the arrangement more effective?**

*This section to be completed by the arranger.* **Name of Arranger** ____________________________
# Arrangement Rehearsal Plan Sheet

1. **Analyze**
   - *Does the music sound as I had planned?* (e.g., pads, punctuations, riffs, dynamics, timbre/instrumentation...)
   - *What parts of the music are difficult for me to perform?* (e.g., rhythm, notes, breathing, phrasing, dynamics...)

2. **Interpret**
   - *How can I expressively use elements of music to portray the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning and purpose of the song?* (e.g., dynamic contrast, phrasing/text painting, articulation...)

3. **Rehearsal Plan**
   - *How will I learn the music and address musical problems to achieve an accurate and expressive performance?* (e.g., rhythmic accuracy, learn the meaning of the lyrics, technical and expressive skills, goals, strategies...)

4. **Evaluate & Refine**
   - *Do I perform this selection more accurately/expressively than I did when I began? Can I make more improvements?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyze:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpret:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehearsal Plan: goals/strategies/processes for improvement across rehearsals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluate and Refine: Checking results – How have I improved and what can I do better?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation Preparation Worksheet

For the class presentation of your arrangement, you will present the arrangement to the class as follows:

- Persuasively describe to the audience how you and your group used pads, punctuations, riffs, dynamics, and timbre/instrumentation in the arrangement to create memorable music to convey the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song. (Each member of the group needs to speak about the arrangement. Plan on dividing up the presentation evenly among group members).
- Perform and record the arrangement with the rhythm track provided at the beginning of the arrangement process.
- You will then complete a self-evaluation while the class members complete their Responding Form.
- Finally, fill out the Arrangement Selection Sheet.
- At the end of class, you will submit to the teacher this Presentation Preparation Worksheet; Rehearsal Plan Sheet; Peer Evaluation Form; your Self-Evaluation form; and your Arrangement Selection Sheet.

Description of how you used Elements of Music in your arrangement to create memorable music that conveys the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning and purpose of the song.
Arranger Self-Evaluation Form

Circle the quality that matches your composition and performance. Then, answer the three questions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Interpretation</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Approaching Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance had limited instances that reflected authentic interpretation of style and/or genre.</td>
<td>Performance had some noticeable instances that reflected authentic interpretation of style and/or genre.</td>
<td>Performance consistently reflected appropriate and/or believable interpretation of style and/or genre.</td>
<td>Performance reflected exceptional interpretation of style and/or genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmanship of Expressive Intent</td>
<td>The arrangement conveyed limited expressive content that will support the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song.</td>
<td>The arrangement somewhat conveyed the expressive content that will support the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song.</td>
<td>The arrangement conveyed the expressive content that will support the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song.</td>
<td>The arrangement conveyed clear and undeniable expressive content that will support the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Describe what you discovered about arranging for a church service using elements of music (pads, punctuations, riffs, dynamics, timbre/instrumentation, texture, form/structure, and/or style/articulation) to convey the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of a song.

b. Describe if and how you grew as an arranger in understanding theoretical and arranging techniques.

c. Explain how your understanding of music theory helped you achieve your musical goals in this arrangement.
Describe how the elements of music (pads, punctuations, riffs, dynamics, timbre/instrumentation, texture, form/structure, and/or style/articulation) are used to support the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song:

Evaluate the arrangement citing specific examples of how the arrangement is or isn’t appropriate in style, mood, and/or performance quality for the Easter church service.
Arrangement Selection Sheet

Select the arrangement you feel is most appropriate for use in the Easter church service.

What group’s arrangement did you select? (Write the Group number):

___________________

List the specific reasons why you believe the selected group arrangement is appropriate for the Easter church service:

The most important reason this arrangement reflects and supports the lyrics, themes, and overall meaning of the song:

Describe how the selected arrangement can serve as a model for your future arranging: