

**Instrumental Jazz Ensemble Programs In
Alabama High Schools**

by

Lloyd Edward Jones, III

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
December 18, 2009

Keywords: music education, band, jazz,
Alabama

Copyright 2009 by Lloyd Edward Jones, III

Approved by

Kimberly C. Walls, Chair, Professor, Curriculum and Teaching
James Witte, Associate Professor, Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
Richard Good, Professor, Music
Jane Kuehne, Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Teaching

Abstract

The purpose of this cross-sectional study was to survey the instrumental jazz ensembles of Alabama's public high schools during the 2008-09 academic year. Since existing data on high school jazz ensemble programs in Alabama were limited, the objective of this study was to identify and describe developments and practices of current instrumental jazz ensemble programs. One hundred eighty three Alabama band directors responded to questionnaire items concerning the preparation of the director, school curriculum offerings for jazz instruction, rehearsal scheduling and performance opportunities, and funding sources and available equipment. Larger high schools in Alabama had a much higher occurrence of an organized high school jazz band. The majority of respondents stated that college jazz ensemble activity was most helpful in preparing directors to teach an instrumental jazz ensemble. Weekly practice time was positively correlated with the number of public relations performances, and the most common type of performances were for public relations. Drum sets, electric keyboards, sound equipment, and amplifiers were priority items for jazz band directors regardless of school size or level of funding.

Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank Dr. Kim Walls for her assistance and guidance during my studies at Auburn University. Sincere thanks to Dr. Kuehne, Dr. Good, and Dr. Witte for their meaningful contributions to this work. I very much appreciate the support of my mother and father who instilled in me an appreciation for lifelong learning and the pursuit of excellence. Most importantly, I give my thanks and love to my amazing wife, Amy, whose patience and perseverance have exceeded my own. And to our twins, Edward and Katherine, who came into this world as this journey began, and to our twins about to arrive, you have made this even more worthwhile.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
List of Tables	vi
Chapter 1 - Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Research Problem	5
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Research Questions.....	6
Definitions of Terms.....	7
Scope and Limitations.....	8
Assumptions.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	8
Chapter 2 - Literature Review.....	9
Purposes of School Jazz.....	9
Director Preparation.....	10
Rehearsal Planning and Scheduling.....	11
Finances and Equipment.....	13
Studies in Jazz Education and Jazz Educator Preparation	15
Summary.....	24
Chapter 3 - Methods and Procedures	26

Participants.....	27
Access and Permission.....	28
Instrument	28
Data Collection Procedures.....	28
Chapter 4 - Results.....	29
Chapter 5 - Discussion	79
Conclusions.....	80
Recommendations for Further Research.....	82
Recommendations for Curriculum Coordinators, Administrators, and Music Teacher Educators.....	83
Summary.....	84
References.....	85
Appendix A: Office of Human Subjects Approval and Information Letters.....	91
Appendix B: Questionnaire.....	95
Appendix C: School Groupings	100

List of Tables

1.	Highest Degree Earned by Directors	30
2.	Participation of Directors in Jazz Related Activities	32
3.	Jazz Band Directors' Preparation to Teach an Instrumental Jazz Ensemble	33
4.	Number of Jazz Related Professional Development Activities	34
5.	Preparation Needed to Teach a Jazz Ensemble.....	36
6.	Mean Numbers of Students in Each Grade-Level of the Band Program.....	38
7.	Instrumentation for Ensembles	40
8.	Academic Credit Received	43
9.	Percentage Teaching Jazz Related Courses During the School Day	44
10.	Jazz Instructional Program Additions.....	45
11.	Rehearsal Semesters.....	46
12.	Rehearsal Time Per Week by School Size.....	48
13.	Utilization of Sectional Rehearsals.....	49
14.	Performances.....	50
15.	Jazz Ensemble Annual Budget.....	51
16.	Funding Sources.....	52
17.	Percentages of Jazz Combo Compositions in Music Library	53
18.	Percentages of Jazz Band Compositions in Music Library	53
19.	Percentages of School Owned Equipment for the Jazz Ensemble.....	55

20.	Percentages of Needed Equipment for the Jazz Ensemble	56
21.	Highest Degree Earned by Years of Teaching a Jazz Ensemble	58
22.	Combined Groups: Highest Degree Earned by Years of Teaching a Jazz Ensemble	61
23.	Highest Degree Earned by Incidence of Jazz Bands	62
24.	Combined Groups: Three Levels of Degree Preparation.....	63
25.	Highest Degree Earned by School Size	64
26.	Cross-Classification of Directors' Jazz Participation Activities with Years of Jazz Teaching Experience	65
27.	Cross-Classification of Directors' Opinions of the Jazz Experiences that Most Prepared Them to Teach a Jazz Ensemble with Years of Teaching Experience ...	67
28.	Number of Years Teaching Instrumental Jazz Ensemble.....	68
29.	Prevalence of Jazz Band Instruction by School Size	69
30.	Years of Teaching Experience by School Size.....	71
31.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient: Amount of Weekly Practice with Number of Annual Performances by Type of Performance	73
32.	Annual Budget in Dollars by School Size	74
33.	Summary of Equipment Owned by Level of Funding.....	75

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

How does one begin to define jazz? It has been described as syncopation, improvisation, interpretation, elaboration, and interpolation. Originally, jazz was the blending of two musical cultures--African and western European--in New Orleans around the turn of the twentieth century. Since the early 1900s the word jazz has come to connote many genres of music--from blues and Dixieland, to boogie-woogie and swing, to bebop and fusion. The history of jazz has been a constant mixture of musical traditions derived from diverse cultural contributions (Kuzmich & Bash, 1984).

Traditionally, what has distinguished jazz development from other styles of music is its individualistic nature. In classical music the intent of the composer is more important than the actual performance or performer(s). Conversely, jazz music requires the performer(s) to include some part of self in the interpretation and presentation of the musical work. To perform jazz music any other way is to cheat the audience. Jazz is a performer's art--not a composer's art (Kuzmich & Bash, 1984). In 1987, in a tribute to jazz saxophonist John Coltrane on his birthday, the United States Senate in Washington, D.C., proclaimed jazz as a rare and valuable American treasure (Senate Judiciary, 1987). By making this proclamation, not only did the Senate honor Coltrane but, more importantly, it also gave tribute to the genre of jazz--a music native to America. American educators have long recognized the value of jazz to American culture and

began including the study of jazz in instrumental music programs as early as the 1920s. During the Swing Era of the 1930s, school jazz programs continued to grow. The primary function of the band at this time was to play for dancing. The terms dance band and swing band were used by educators. By the 1940s there was an increased interest in jazz band programs in the high school music curriculum (Ferriano, 1974).

After World War II, the G.I. Bill veterans, who had experienced jazz during the war, joined the teaching ranks at the high school level. This provided the forward motion for the dance band movement in high schools (Tolson, 2001). The movement experienced rapid growth throughout the 1950s. During this decade, musicians began to publish instruction books on jazz performance. Jazz was taught in college for credit, and some institutions, including North Texas State University (Henry, 1981), began to specialize in jazz instruction (Tirro, 1977). The popularity of jazz ensembles at the collegiate level led many institutions to start a degree program in jazz studies (Berry, 1985). North Texas State University, Westlake College of Music, and Berklee School of Music pioneered degree programs in jazz (Henry, 1981).

In 1960, about 5,000 U.S. high schools had at least one jazz band; most were not part of the formal music curriculum. Many of these jazz bands were entertainment oriented ensembles whose primary function was playing for school dances and community social events. They generally rehearsed outside of regular school hours (Baker, 1981). During this decade, music companies began publishing musical arrangements suitable for high school and collegiate jazz bands. Two major events occurred in the late 1960s which were important to the development of jazz education in the United States: the forming of the National Association for Jazz Education (NAJE)

and the Tanglewood Symposium. NAJE members presented a constitution and set of bylaws to the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) in March of 1968. The parent organization quickly accepted NAJE as a member, and since 1968, jazz has held an important position in the continual development of music education. NAJE was restructured and became the International Association for Jazz Education (IAJE) (Luty, 1982). In 2008 IAJE disbanded, and MENC decided to step forward and assist the jazz education community. To support education in jazz, MENC intended to work with leaders in jazz education to offer services and benefits to jazz educators (Lasko, 2008).

The Tanglewood Symposium was organized in 1967 to determine the status and future role of American music education in a society that was ever-changing (Andrews, 1970). According to Isbell (2007), an equally important purpose was to connect the musical experiences students had in school to those they experienced outside school. Based on the declaration presented at the symposium and recorded in a journal article by Andrews (1970), eight goals of high-priority were established in the Goals and Objectives Project of 1969. Five of the eight objectives have directly related to jazz education.

1. Lead in efforts to develop programs of music instruction challenging to all students, whatever their socio-cultural condition, and directed toward the needs of citizens in a pluralistic society.
2. Lead in the development of programs of study that correlate performing, creating, and listening to music and encompass a diversity of musical behaviors.
3. Assist teachers in the identification of musical behaviors relevant to the needs of their students.

4. Advance the teaching of music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures.
5. Lead in efforts to ensure that every school system allocates sufficient staff, time, and funds to support a comprehensive and excellent music program (Andrews, 1970, pp. 24-25).

According to Baker (2001), by the end of the 1970s, more than 70% of the 30,000 junior and senior high schools in the U.S. had at least one jazz ensemble. Over 500 colleges were offering at least one jazz ensemble or course for credit, with 15% of the 500 plus schools offering jazz related degrees. However, by the 1990s, a significant number of U.S. junior and senior high schools had jazz ensembles as did most colleges and universities. Many of the high schools also offered jazz courses. The colleges and universities developed jazz degree programs, and some initiated pedagogy programs in jazz for their music education majors.

In 1994, the next visionary tool in advancing music education was implemented with the National Standards for Arts Education. These standards further stressed the ideal of a multicultural, multimusical education (Kelly & Weelden, 2004). According to Hinckley (2000), five years after the implementation of the national music standards, the Housewright Declaration of 1999 enhanced the notions of a multicultural, multimusical education and helped to bring about more change for music education. Twelve agreements were made based on the future of music education. They were broad objectives--covering many topics, such as recruiting prospective music teachers, continuing research in music, and integrating other music that people experience besides just Western music (Madsen, 2000). MENC continued proactively by looking ahead to the twenty-first century with a plan entitled Vision 2020. Vision 2020 was a way to begin

creating a map for music education as MENC members felt it should be in the year 2020. The overriding mission was that music educators continue to “do the right things for the right reasons” (Hinckley, 2000, p. 24).

Jazz education has been recognized as one approach to incorporate multicultural, multimusical educational experiences for students. Over the past century, jazz education has become an important aspect of music education in the United States as well as in the music curriculum of Alabama. The Alabama Course of Study for Arts Education has recommended the jazz ensemble as one of the optional programs a music educator may employ (Morton, 2006). It is described as follows:

a means by which instrumental music students can express themselves through a different idiom and can enjoy the experience of participating in small group performance. The content and performance standards of the Jazz Ensemble should be at a minimum equivalent to those of other instrumental courses. Participation in Jazz Ensemble improves the playing ability of students due to the increased emphasis on major and minor scales, rhythms, and understanding of chords and chord structure. Creativity is enhanced through the development of improvisational skills. Jazz Ensemble can lead to the improvement of other school instrumental ensembles in which members participate due to the improvement of playing abilities (p. 104).

Statement of the Research Problem

Throughout the years as jazz has gained in popularity, the demand for its inclusion in high schools has increased. By 1979 there were 32,000 public school jazz ensembles, and in 1991 that number had increased to 45,000 (Hoffer, 1991). With this

increased demand, school administrators have wrestled with the details of how to provide this type of teaching in a student's overall music education, and band directors have been confronted with the issues of organization and administration of an instrumental jazz program in addition to their other responsibilities.

There are various necessary components that must exist for a jazz band program to function. Training prospective music educators in jazz pedagogy is essential. Ensemble opportunities must be provided for the students. Jazz bands must have an organized rehearsal and performance schedule to encourage the students to learn and perform jazz band charts. Funding and equipment must be available to meet the needs of the band. How are jazz bands in Alabama faring in each of these areas? Studies have been conducted in Alabama on jazz band pre-service teacher programs (Knox, 1996) and jazz personalities in the state (Berry, 1985). A review of the research and related literature revealed no study that surveyed the public high school jazz band directors in Alabama to gather information about current programs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to survey the status of existing high school jazz band programs in Alabama. The goal was to conduct a study that would be useful to instrumental music educators, school administrators, and curriculum coordinators for use in instructional planning for the arts and the continued development of jazz band programs in the public high schools of Alabama.

Research Questions

This study was a survey of the status of jazz ensemble programs in the public high schools of Alabama. A questionnaire was used to gather data to answer the following

questions relevant to jazz ensemble programs.

1. What is the relationship between director preparation and the number of current high school jazz bands?
2. What is the relationship between school size and the jazz instruction provided for students?
3. What is the relationship between amount of practice time and number of performances among high school jazz bands?
4. What is the relationship between funding and equipment for high school jazz bands?

Definitions of Terms

Instrumental jazz combo - a small group of three or more jazz musicians whose performance is highly improvisational

Instrumental jazz ensemble - any group of jazz musicians engaged in the rehearsing and performing of jazz music. Usually refers to traditional big band instrumentation (4-5 saxophones, 3-4 trombones, 3-4 trumpets, piano, guitar, bass, and drums)

Instrumental jazz program - consists of a jazz band, combo(s), and possible jazz education classes such as history, theory, and pedagogy

Studio laboratory band - the instrumentation of a standard jazz band or big band is augmented to include flutes, clarinets, French horns, tuba, and auxiliary percussionists. Common instrumentation is: 5 saxophones, 4 trombones, 4 trumpets, 4 flutes, 4 soprano clarinets, 1 bass clarinet, 4 French horns, a tuba, 2 auxiliary percussionists, piano, bass, guitar, and drum set

Scope and Limitations

The focus of this survey study was on the total population of public high school jazz band programs in Alabama. This study did not delve into the private, elementary, middle, or junior high school jazz band programs.

Assumptions of the Study

The writer assumed that the jazz band directors surveyed were truthful and accurate with survey responses and were concerned with (a) director's professional training, (b) the quality of a students' comprehensive music education, (c) availability of ensemble classes, (d) scheduling of rehearsals and performances, and (e) the availability of funding and resources for the high school jazz band.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study may be valuable to instrumental music educators, school administrators, and curriculum coordinators for use in instructional planning for the arts and the continued development of jazz band programs in the public high schools of Alabama.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The jazz band is frequently included in the high school curriculum because many educators advocate its value in the overall music program. When conducting this literature review, it was found that important jazz band studies have been conducted in jazz band educational settings and described in educational journals, textbooks, and articles and in educational research conducted by the use of a data gathering instrument and described in a formal dissertation.

Purposes of School Jazz

The purposes of school jazz are noted in instrumental music education textbooks. Bollinger (1979) noted that jazz bands have been accepted as a regular part of many public schools' music curriculum and listed the following as the foundational elements of the jazz band (a) educational value, (b) student interest, (c) functional advantages, (d) public relations value, and (e) additional music challenge and enrichment for talented students. Kowall (1966) stated that the jazz ensemble has been a very mobile unit that has been of great value to the school and community. Bessom, Tatarunis, and Forcucci (1974) stated that senior high school instrumental music programs should service the needs of all students who wish to perform, regardless of ability and area of interest and, whenever possible, offerings in the high school music curriculum should include stage

band among other instrumental ensembles. Although some schools offered jazz band as an extra-curricular class, some schools found it feasible to offer these additional classes as electives (Morgan, 1955).

Many educators believed that students are motivated by the social benefits offered by jazz bands. Adderly, Kennedy, and Berz (2003) investigated the world of the high school music classroom. It was found that students like ensemble teamwork where one is a part of something much greater than what one can produce alone. Goodrich (2007) reported in an educational journal that peer mentoring may attribute to the success of a high school jazz band. He suggested that music educators develop, support, and implement a peer mentoring program within their jazz band to aid directors and students in instruction and rehearsal efficiency. Berry (1971) recognized in an educational journal that the jazz band allows a student to gain immeasurably from being solely responsible for his personal part and noted that school jazz bands have helped high school musicians improve their playing skills.

Director Preparation

Luty (1982) noted in an educational journal that many lay people and some music educators have the opinion that the performance of jazz music requires little formal training. However, as much as all performers needed formal instruction, jazz educators needed formal training on the fundamentals of managing jazz ensembles of varying sizes and purposes (Luty, 1982). Roach (1998) reported in an educational journal an interview with Ellis Marsalis. Marsalis felt that when it comes to college teacher education programs, jazz is one skill that should be taught. Music educators needed these skills to prepare them for the marketplace. According to Bessom, Tatarunis, and Forcucci (1974),

the successful music educator's knowledge of music history and literature should include jazz and pop, and he should have the ability to organize a stage band. Tolson (2001) stated many teachers fear teaching jazz because they lack experiences in the idiom. He noted that teachers should realize that one does not have to be an accomplished jazz musician to teach it. A teacher should simply understand how the fundamental musical elements are applied in a jazz setting.

Rehearsal Planning and Scheduling

Rehearsal and performance practices were an important consideration for band directors and school administrators. The following education textbooks provided pertinent information. According to Henry (1981), the quality and success of any performing organization is influenced by what happens during rehearsals. Using a systematic approach to rehearsing brings about better outcomes than a haphazard approach. Planning by the director is often overlooked, but good planning will yield a more productive rehearsal with less wasted time. It was advised by Singleton and Anderson (1969) to avoid scheduling rehearsals after breakfast and lunch. The authors also advised avoiding the last hour of the school day. They suggested midmorning or mid-afternoon rehearsals during normal school hours. However, there were some advantages to after school rehearsals. Students who rehearsed before or after school felt there was something special about the group, and school administrators seemed impressed by a group that does not disrupt the school schedule. According to Hoffer (1991), it is sometimes difficult for a jazz band to meet during the regular school day since the majority of jazz band members are also members of a concert band. Few students have the opportunity of registering for two music courses during the course of a

school day. Since the jazz band is smaller and more selective, it was suggested that a successful jazz band should be able to function well with a couple of rehearsals each week--before or after school. Ferguson (1976) stated that the successful rehearsal is the key to a successful jazz band. This was found to be true more than any other consideration. All efforts of performance are potential disasters if proper preparation has not taken place within the regular practice period.

Seating arrangements for the jazz ensemble rehearsal are varied and were mostly dictated by the director's preference, available space, and other relevant factors. Rehearsal facilities have been known to have an effect on performance. Henry (1981) advised that the director consider rehearsing at different rooms or facilities to more ready the students for the performance.

Sectional rehearsals should be arranged when preparing for performances. A competent leader should be appointed to conduct the rehearsal, but the director should assume the responsibility at the majority of the sectional rehearsals (Singleton & Anderson, 1969). Sectional rehearsals have a positive effect on performances. During this time, the director places his focus on one particular section of the jazz ensemble. These rehearsals allow for the structured time spent practicing one section's part that will later be incorporated into the full jazz ensemble (Henry, 1981).

When preparing for performances, directors should select music that is not beyond the technical and physical capabilities of the group. Actual programming of a concert is considered as a large part of the concert preparation. For a jazz ensemble performance, a relaxed, informal atmosphere is best. The performance opportunities for the jazz ensemble are wide and varied (Henry, 1981). Proper preparation for performing

is essential. Community and school calendars should be consulted to ensure performance attendance is at a maximum. It was recommended that a performance schedule be set at the beginning of the school year or academic term to allow time for preparation and non-performance practice--sight-reading and study time (Henry, 1981). The public performance has grown out of rehearsals, and it should be a goal of rehearsals. The costs of performances should have been reasonable and stayed within music budget allocations. Concert band programs should not have made excessive demands on the students. Performances should align to the overall scope of a school's music curriculum (Bessom et al., 1974). If jazz is included as part of a school's music curriculum, then the performing group's rehearsals may be scheduled during curricular time. The jazz band considered important enough to receive curricular status should have been able to meet regularly with minimal conflicts from other subjects and activities (Singleton & Anderson, 1969).

Blocher (2000) stated in another educational journal that scheduling has been singled out as the major reason instrumental jazz ensembles have not been included in high school music programs. Various scheduling models have been used with limited success within music programs. The four-block schedule has not offered students or music educators continuity. Many times students have been forced out of music classes in order to enroll in required credit courses. Variations on the block schedule have had limited success and music educators felt that only 75% of a block rehearsal (90 minutes) is productive (Blocher, 2000).

Finances and Equipment

Finances and equipment for the instrumental jazz ensemble are important considerations for band directors and school administrators. Skinner (1986) stated in an

educational journal that financial problems exist in the most established jazz ensemble programs as well as the ones in developmental stages. Financial issues usually increase whenever new courses were introduced or existing ones were upgraded. Wheeler (1992) stated in another educational journal that budget problems have threatened the existence of many school music ensembles. Kuzmich and Bash (1984) reported in a music education textbook that in high school instrumental programs over fifty percent of monies have been provided through fundraising efforts. Grants were available to music groups through fundraising efforts. Grants were also available to music groups through various industries and arts endowments. Arts councils, which allocated state monies for specific performance activities, were functioning in some states, and private funding may have supplemented the instrumental jazz program for some schools.

According to music education textbooks, an instrumental music curriculum has required large amounts of equipment to effectively achieve its goals. Instruments, uniforms, risers, music folders, printed music, music stands, storage cabinets, sound equipment, and other necessities were needed by instrumental music programs that may not have been needed in other academic courses. Traditionally, 20-24 square feet per student is recommended to achieve ample working space and proper acoustics for an instrumental music program (Bessom et al., 1974), and Bollinger (1979) stated that a music library is of most importance to a successful music program.

Unusual instruments such as the soprano saxophone, flugelhorn, synthesizer, conga drums, and Latin percussion instruments are a necessity for the instrumental jazz program. Additionally, textbooks and etude books on improvisation, jazz history, jazz theory, and jazz arranging should be available to students. Quality recording equipment

should be used as a teaching tool in order to properly analyze performance quality (Kuzmich & Bash, 1984).

Studies in Jazz Education and Jazz Educator Preparation

Dissertations were reviewed which contained information about jazz education in high schools and teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities. Those studies which focused on director preparation, jazz curriculum offerings, rehearsal and performance practices, and funding and equipment resources were also reviewed.

Fisher (1981) conducted a study with 163 participants to determine a rationale for including jazz courses in college music education programs and to gather data to help meet the needs of public school music teachers. He surveyed jazz education specialists in the United States, heads of college music departments in Pennsylvania which offer degrees in music education, and high school band directors in Pennsylvania. The major intent of the study was to utilize the data collected through a questionnaire to identify and develop jazz courses which would be of greatest use to the public school music teacher. Respondents were generally in favor of including jazz courses in the undergraduate music curriculum. The respondents also felt that ideal preparation for a music teacher should include both required courses in jazz studies and time spent experiencing public performing in the jazz genre. Respondents generally felt that these courses should be taught by full-time faculty members who were jazz specialists. Respondents gave four courses the highest priority rating on the survey: jazz band methods, jazz improvisation, jazz band, and jazz history and literature.

Payne (1973) employed a descriptive survey technique by personally interviewing 50 randomly selected band directors (9.7% of the total population of 484 instrumental

music educators) employed in Louisiana's public and nonpublic schools and inquiring about their school's jazz program. His findings showed that 100% of interviewees felt that when developing the total high school music program jazz ensembles should be included, and 68% felt that the jazz ensemble provided musical experiences that are not available through the traditional ensembles. Payne inquired as to why directors who had no jazz ensemble chose not to include jazz as a part of their total music program. The responses he received were lack of time (39.3%), lack of student interest (10.7%), director's lack of interest in jazz study (7.1%), and insufficient budget (7.1%). Lack of proper instrumentation, lack of equipment, insufficient number of students, lack of musically advanced students, and lack of transportation for after-school rehearsals were also given as reasons no instrumental jazz ensemble was incorporated into existing music programs. Additionally, Payne asked those directors that had a jazz ensemble why they chose to include them in their music programs. The responses he received were numerous and varied: to provide meaningful musical opportunities not available in traditional ensembles (73%), to provide a balanced program (60%), to provide a mobile unit for public relation purposes (59%), to develop and improve the total band program (50%), and to provide opportunities for more advanced students (50%). The rewarding personal experience afforded the director, the contributions jazz has made to American music, and providing training for potential professional performers were also given as reasons directors chose to include the jazz ensemble in their instrumental music programs. Payne concluded that future research should be conducted focusing primarily on the organization and administration of high school jazz ensembles in other geographical areas.

In a two-volume study by Grimes (1988), conducting and rehearsal techniques of five jazz ensemble directors were analyzed. He collected data by videotaping each director during a normal rehearsal and by interviewing each director. The five high school directors chosen to be a part of the study were recommended by leading jazz educators and adjudicators. Analysis was made with a procedure devised to catalog gestures and verbal comments of each director. Rehearsal events were organized according to warm-up, count-offs, phrasing, articulation, balance/blend, time feel, and dynamics. Grimes noted, as limitations to the study, that while rehearsing and conducting techniques were an important part of jazz program development--demographics, funding, administrative support, cultural awareness, and other variables not within the immediate control of the director have a larger influence on the success of a school's jazz program. Grimes reported results for different aspects of the study. However, the data most relevant to the current study were the information Grimes reported on director preparation. It was found that a successful jazz band director must have the traditional instrumental music teacher training, but alone it is not enough for the director to teach jazz successfully. Grimes reported that directors should be able to play jazz on some level. He suggested that directors without jazz experience should still consider taking on the responsibility of a jazz program; however they should become involved in the music now, investigate improvisation, play in a band, listen to records, and prepare. The results of the study strongly suggested that the best jazz learning opportunities occur outside academia.

Scagnoli (1978) surveyed the status of high school band programs and related band activities found in the public senior high schools in New York. By means of

questionnaire, he surveyed 483 directors of which 471 directors responded. He found that the principal jazz ensembles in his sample population rehearsed 2.3 hours per week. Approximately one-fourth (25.4 %) met during the school day, approximately half (43.4 %) rehearsed after school, and one-fourth rehearsed at night. A few directors (3.6 %) rehearsed before school, and 2.2 % rehearsed during the lunch period. Approximately one-third of directors in Scagnoli's study indicated scheduling as the greatest problem in achieving the band program's overall goals. Scagnoli questioned directors as to why they did not have a jazz ensemble. Out of 95 directors in the study that did not have a jazz ensemble, 20% stated lack of time as the main reason for not running the ensemble. Some directors (17.9%) were just starting a new band and had not coordinated the jazz ensemble, and another 17.9% felt that their respective school population was too small to support a jazz ensemble. Scheduling was a problem for 16.8% of directors. Other reasons for not having a jazz program were no student desire for jazz activity, no budget, director's lack of interest, administrative indifference, and director's lack of jazz experience. The respondents to Scagnoli's survey averaged five performances each school year; however, 124 directors chose not to respond to this question on the survey. When questioned about jazz competitions, more than two-thirds (68.2%) of the respondents felt that jazz competitions help motivate students, and some (24.3%) believed they were invalid. Other benefits of competitions noted were (a) provides a forum for student evaluation, (b) provides a forum for student recognition, (c) provides a forum for director evaluation, and (d) helps build students' character. Scagnoli questioned the directors about funding sources and found that of the schools surveyed, 42.4% had booster organizations funding the expenditures for the jazz ensemble. He also

addressed jazz ensemble equipment and the results indicated that the equipment most often supplied by the school district was set drums (82.4%), microphone stand and extensions (55.2%), electric bass guitar (45.2%), electric piano (36.4%), and electric guitar (23.9%). Some other equipment the respondents mentioned receiving were jazz ensemble music, music cases, instrument stands, flugelhorn, soprano sax, conga drums, and mutes.

Mack (1993) included a detailed examination of successful jazz ensembles in 20 public high schools in Indiana. The schools selected for the study were more suburban and urban than rural, and school selection was based on a minimum of four superior ratings at state jazz ensemble festivals. His study divided the sample population into four groups, based on school enrollment. By means of a descriptive survey questionnaire, his findings showed the larger population areas produced the greater number of jazz ensembles per school. One hundred percent of surveyed schools had a feeder program, and of those feeder programs – eight had a jazz program. Mack found the greater the number of programs that fed into the high school and the more years that the director had taught at the high school, the greater the number of jazz ensembles at the high school. He also noted that 85% of the successful jazz directors surveyed played an instrument that is traditionally found in a jazz ensemble. Interestingly, 65% of the directors had not taken any undergraduate or graduate courses in the study of jazz apart from performance based ensemble classes. The jazz ensembles that met during the school day as a regular class consistently had more rehearsal time than the jazz ensembles that met on an extra-curricular basis. During rehearsals, the directors of a majority of these jazz programs had students sing their parts. All who had students sing parts were members of IAJE. A

willingness to perform for public relations seemed to be a significant factor in the success, and the surveyed directors stated that the most critical support groups were the band parents, the school board, and the school administration. Mack concluded that the long term investment of time in a program appeared to be very important to a program's success. Mack advised that future research should be conducted on the jazz programs at small schools that manage to succeed despite their size.

Jones (1986) constructed a questionnaire that was submitted to band directors in selected public high schools of Alabama. Jones's study was a follow up to Hinton's (1957) study--an examination of all components of the white public high school band programs in Alabama. Jones's intent was to identify practices of band programs in Alabama, and he divided the random population of 105 band directors into three equal groups based on school enrollment. Group one ($n = 35$) consisted of schools with 606 to 2,488 students; group two ($n = 35$) had 322 to 603 students; and group three ($n = 35$) had 114 to 315 students. Respondents surveyed in group one spent an average of 3.5 hours in jazz ensemble rehearsal weekly. Group two directors indicated spending 4.2 hours on average per week, and group three reported an average of 2.3 hours each week. Two jazz ensemble directors from group one rehearsed before school, 12 during, and 6 after. In group two, 30% rehearsed during the school day, and for group three no directors reported rehearsals during the school day. Jones reported that the jazz ensemble libraries of his participants contained fewer titles per student than the marching and concert band libraries. He found that his group one schools provided more jazz ensemble equipment than did groups two and three, and one school provided a uniform for its members.

Knox (1996) examined the implications for teacher education as it pertained to the director. Knox used four questionnaires developed to gather information from four different groups: collegiate music educators ($n = 19$), collegiate jazz educators ($n = 13$), Alabama high school band directors ($n = 175$), and Alabama high school choral directors ($n = 70$). His respondents felt deficient in the jazz field. Fifty-seven (80%) of all respondents believed their own jazz study was lacking sufficient undergraduate training. Fifty-four percent of those surveyed felt that the Alabama colleges and universities were not preparing future music educators to teach jazz adequately. Fourteen percent felt some institutions were preparing students well. Knox asked his respondents to list courses important to the undergraduate music curriculum. The five most frequently mentioned were jazz improvisation (27%), jazz ensemble (22%), jazz history (15%), jazz pedagogy (15%), and jazz theory (11%). He recommended that colleges and universities offer more jazz education opportunities at the undergraduate level for potential music educators. Ninety-two percent of band directors with jazz ensembles and 72% of band directors without jazz ensembles were convinced that jazz instruction should be as important in a high school music program as marching and concert band. Approximately one-fourth of those surveyed did not instruct a jazz ensemble.

Wiggins (1997) assessed the status of jazz music education in selected high schools throughout the eight educational regions of the North Carolina public school system. By means of a questionnaire for high schools and a check sheet for universities, he collected data to assess the status of jazz education in the public high schools of North Carolina and to evaluate curricular offerings and recommend possible revisions in the jazz music education curriculum in North Carolina universities. Wiggins specifically

researched (a) professional characteristics of selected band directors, (b) characteristics of jazz music study in the directors' high school music programs, and (c) characteristics of the band directors' undergraduate degree programs concerning the study of and preparation to teach jazz music. He surveyed 132 high school band directors (grades 9-12). The results provided by the study revealed that jazz is a major component in high school music programs in North Carolina. Over half of the directors surveyed offered jazz music courses and half felt unprepared to teach jazz music. It was found that the inclusion of jazz courses in North Carolina schools were affected by (a) administration, (b) community, (c) student support of jazz music education, (d) band directors' prior experiences as jazz performers, (e) scheduling, (f) directors' major and minor performing instrument, (g) undergraduate participation in jazz music courses, and (h) knowledge gained from formal and informal study of jazz music. Wiggins recommended his study be replicated by focusing on fewer regions in North Carolina.

Goodrich (2005) conducted an ethnographic study in which he observed a high school jazz band for an entire academic year. He set out to ascertain how this band achieved such a high level of performance consistently. The major components of success were found to be peer and adult mentoring, listening to jazz, advanced improvisation skills, and frequent performances. This study implied that there is a need for more teacher preparation in jazz education.

McCurdy (1983) set out to develop a detailed guide for organizing and maintaining a successful school jazz band. Ultimately, this study was an evaluation of the program he developed--McCurdy Jazz Ensemble Method. Seventeen music educators who lacked formal jazz education training were selected to participate in this

experimental study. He conducted a pretest, treatment, and posttest. After administering the posttest, McCurdy found that the participants' music theory in the jazz idiom had improved since being trained on the MJEM. Directors had a positive feeling toward jazz ensembles and a desire to implement some of the program's techniques. Overall, he found that the MJEM appeared to be a thorough instructional package for organizing and maintaining the jazz ensemble.

Jones (2005) investigated the role of jazz in music teacher education programs in Oklahoma colleges and universities. He conducted an online survey of music education program administrators in colleges and universities in Oklahoma. Over half the respondents reported their undergraduate in music education did not include a jazz performance experience, although jazz ensemble instruction is available in 91% of Oklahoma's music teacher education institutions. Jones also found that administrators strongly felt that pre-service teachers should be required to take at least one course in jazz studies. He further noted that the jazz ensemble was the most often reported jazz activity in Oklahoma's high schools.

Brittin (1997) investigated a sample of Texas music teachers' experiences, teaching situations, and attitudes in her formal dissertation. Fifty-four participants from middle schools, high schools, and universities across the state were surveyed. Brittin found there was a perceived decrease in support for high school jazz bands in Texas. Twenty-eight of the respondents had a jazz band teaching assignment. One-half of respondents had participated in a jazz ensemble themselves, and one-third played a jazz instrument as their primary instrument. It was also found that having more experience

performing and teaching jazz did not constitute a strong correlation with the perceptions concerning the benefits of jazz participation as defined in Brittin's survey.

Summary

Related jazz band studies have been conducted (a) informally in jazz band educational settings and described in educational journals, books, and articles and (b) formally in educational research conducted by the use of a data gathering instrument and described in a formal dissertation. All of the studies and other sources selected for this review were helpful in detailing the important components and specific challenges of high school instrumental jazz programs, and there were a number of instances where information overlapped. Studies by Scagnoli (1978), Payne (1973), Knox (1996), Mack (1993), and Jones (1986) were especially helpful in delineating a variety of topics related to the high school instrumental jazz ensemble. There was substantial evidence that jazz ensemble directors need more undergraduate preparation. A large percentage of band directors with jazz ensembles, as well as band directors without jazz ensembles, were convinced that jazz instruction should be as important in a high school music program as marching and concert bands. Rehearsal scheduling was singled out as the major reason the instrumental jazz ensemble was not included in high school music programs. Formal concerts, jazz festivals, and public relations events were the venues where jazz ensembles tended to perform. Financial issues were prevalent, and equipment needed for the jazz ensemble was--in most instances--available. However, the review of literature did not reveal a comprehensive study on the status of instrumental jazz bands in Alabama's public high schools. Knox (1996) examined the implications for teacher education in Alabama as it pertained to the director. Jones's (1986) intent was to identify practices of

public high school bands in Alabama; he gathered data concerning band programs in their entirety, including, but not limited to, marching band, concert band, and jazz band. The current study was conducted to survey the status of the existing high school jazz band programs in Alabama, and it differed in purpose, scope, and depth from Jones's (1986) previously conducted study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of the study was to survey the status of the existing public high school jazz band programs in Alabama. The goal was to conduct a study that would be useful to instrumental music educators, school administrators, and curriculum coordinators for use in instructional planning for the arts and the continued development of jazz ensemble programs in the public high schools of Alabama. This chapter provides an overview of the general methodology, data gathering procedures, and participants invited to participate in the study. A data gathering instrument was used to answer the following questions relevant to jazz band programs.

1. What is the relationship between director preparation and the number of current high school jazz bands?
2. What is the relationship between school size and the jazz instruction provided for students?
3. What is the relationship between the amount of practice time and the number of performances among high school jazz bands?
4. What is the relationship between funding and equipment for high school jazz bands?

The general methodology of the survey study was a quantitative, cross-sectional design. The design was selected to provide a numeric description of the trends found in

jazz programs by studying the population of Alabama band directors. The survey was an easily implemented instrument for a larger population; it provided quick turnaround in data collection; and valid inferences could be made due to the consistency of the instrument across participants (Creswell, 2003). Director preparation, school curriculum offerings for jazz instruction, rehearsal scheduling and performance opportunities, and funding sources and available equipment were found as important variables in the related literature and were investigated.

Participants

The population for this study was public high school instrumental music educators in Alabama. All directors were invited and encouraged to participate so the data related to current jazz ensemble programs would be valid and representative of the entire population. The 2008-09 Alabama Bandmasters Association Directory was consulted to identify high school bands currently operating in the state ($N = 313$). The major disadvantage associated with a questionnaire is the percentage of respondents. Often times, the response rate is low (Roberts, 2004). A return rate of 70% or 223 responses was desired for validation of the study.

The schools were grouped according to their average daily enrollment as provided by the Alabama State Department of Education Daily Average Attendance Report for the 2008-09 academic year. The researcher utilized the following groupings for organization of data and analysis: Group I ($n = 101$)--schools with an average daily attendance of 0-365 students, Group II ($n = 101$)--schools with an attendance rate of 366-699, and Group III ($n = 106$)--any school with an average daily attendance equal to or greater than 700 (see Appendix C).

Access and Permission

The researcher followed the policies and criteria of the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research to receive permission to conduct the study (see Appendix A).

Instrument

Director preparation, school curriculum offerings for jazz instruction, rehearsal scheduling and performance opportunities, and funding sources and available equipment were found as important variables in the related literature and were investigated with a questionnaire (see Appendix B). Questionnaire items were evaluated for content validity by a panel of education and music education faculty.

Data Collection Procedures

The initial mailing to directors included an introductory letter from the researcher to encourage participation and guarantee confidentiality (see Appendix A), the self-administered questionnaire (see Appendix B), an ink pen for completing the questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope. Five days after the initial mailing, a reminder post card was sent to encourage maximum participation. It was suggested that the questionnaire be returned to the researcher within two weeks. To those who did not respond after two weeks, another reminder letter and a replacement questionnaire with a return envelope were sent. A third, and final, reminder letter was sent to all who had not responded after four weeks from the date of the initial mailing (Roberts, 2004). Upon receipt, the data were entered into an Excel spreadsheet for organization and analysis. The Statistical Analysis System was also used to analyze the data.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to survey the status of the existing high school jazz band programs in Alabama. The data presented in this chapter were obtained from a questionnaire that was divided into four sections. The sections were (a) director preparation, (b) school curriculum offerings for jazz instruction, (c) rehearsal scheduling and performance opportunities, and (d) funding sources and available equipment. The information was analyzed for differences based on group according to school size. According to the Alabama Bandmasters Association Handbook there were 313 public secondary schools in Alabama which had band programs in the 2008-09 school year. One-hundred-eighty-three surveys were returned by the directors for an overall response rate of 59.4%. Responses were received from 54% of Group I schools, 61.3% of Group II schools, and 56.6% of Group III schools.

Director Preparation

Item one was answered by all respondents. Responses to questionnaire item one ($N = 183$)--concerning the highest degree earned by directors--revealed the master's degree was the most prevalent degree held in Groups II and III, while the bachelor's degree was most prevalent in Group I. In Group I, 52% of respondents held a bachelor's degree; in Group II, 59% of the respondents held a master's degree; and in Group III,

47% of respondents held a master’s degree. The doctoral degree was held by 5% of respondents in Group III.

Table 1

Highest Degree Earned by Directors

Degree Types Held	Group I	Group II	Group III	Total
Bachelor	51.7%	33.8%	36.7%	40.4%
Master	39.6%	58.5%	46.7%	48.6%
Master + 30	3.4%	4.6%	10.0%	6.0%
Specialist	3.4%	1.5%	1.7%	2.2%
Doctoral	1.7%	1.5%	5.0%	2.7%
Other	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%

Item two was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Eighty-one respondents provided an answer for item two. Responses to item two revealed the number of years the respondents had taught an instrumental jazz ensemble. The overall average number of years for respondents was 12. Group I respondents averaged approximately 12 years. Group II respondents averaged approximately 11 years, and Group III respondents averaged approximately 13 years.

Item three was answered by all respondents. Questionnaire item three responses ($N = 183$) indicated that the primary instrument for 63.4% of total respondents to be a brass instrument, 24.7% woodwind, and 11.7% percussion. Fifteen respondents indicated that they played a secondary instrument.

Item four was to be answered by all respondents. Item four delineated which ensembles, courses, and clinics or workshops in which directors had participated. Of 183 respondents 66.1% indicated they had participated in a high school jazz band, 78.7% in a college jazz band, and 51.4% in a local professional jazz group. Jazz theory/history course participation was reported by 23.5% of respondents, improvisation course participation by 20.8%, and workshop or clinic participation by 39.9%. (Four respondents did not provide an answer to item four.)

A variety of additional experiences were specified. Seven respondents specified studio work, performance with a military jazz ensemble, or local jazz band, blues band, and rock band experience. One person stated none of the provided criteria was applicable, and one noted only receiving jazz experience in a concert setting. Another respondent wrote jazz was performed in marching and concert band settings. One stated tubas were not afforded an opportunity to play in jazz bands, and one participated in a jazz camp for experience. Two directors noted no formal jazz training but enjoyed listening to the music. One attended jazz festivals and competitions for experience, and one had taken applied jazz lessons. One noted attendance at jazz majors' recitals, and one stated experience gained during student teaching.

Table 2

Participation of Directors in Jazz Related Activities

Group	Jazz Activity					
	High School Jazz Ens.	College Jazz Ens.	Local or Prof. Group	Jazz Theory/History	Improvisation Course	Jazz Workshops/Clinics
I	60.3%	69.0%	37.9%	24.1%	12.1%	13.8%
II	60.0%	80.0%	49.2%	23.1%	20.0%	43.1%
III	78.3%	86.6%	67.0%	23.3%	31.6%	61.6%

Item five was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. In answering item five, directors ($n = 87$) checked the activity they felt most prepared them to teach an instrumental jazz ensemble. Respondents most often chose participation in a college jazz band (58.6%), followed by participation in a high school jazz band (23.0%). One noted the best preparation was provided through private study with a jazz teacher. Three respondents felt listening was important for preparation. One viewed student need as the best preparation. Hands-on-experience, exposure to good groups, and college marching band were also listed as other methods of preparation. Two respondents felt the student internship provided preparation, and two marked instrumental lessons during their music coursework as valuable. One noted a great interest in jazz as preparation to teach an instrumental jazz ensemble.

Table 3

Jazz Band Directors' Preparation to Teach an Instrumental Jazz Ensemble

Categories	Group I (<i>n</i> = 14)	Group II (<i>n</i> = 23)	Group III (<i>n</i> = 50)	Total (<i>n</i> = 87)
High school jazz band	35.7%	17.4%	22.0%	23.0%
College jazz band	42.8%	56.5%	64.0%	58.6%
Local/professional group	28.5%	26.1%	16.0%	20.7%
Jazz theory/history	7.1%	0.0%	1.0%	6.9%
Improvisation courses	0.0%	4.3%	1.2%	8.0%
Jazz workshops/clinics	7.1%	8.7%	20.0%	14.9%
Other	7.1%	21.7%	20.0%	18.4%
None	7.1%	8.7%	0.0%	3.4%

Item six was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Item six was structured to identify the number of jazz related professional development activities in which the band director participated during the 2008-09 school year. The answers ranged from 0 to 7 activities across 83 respondents. Four people did not respond

to item six. One respondent had presented at two and participated in five professional development events for jazz. One stated that not many jazz professional development activities were offered.

Table 4

Number of Jazz Related Professional Development Activities

Number of Activities	Frequency of Respondents
0	51
1	10
2	12
3	6
4	2
5	1
6	0
7	1

Item seven was answered by all respondents. For item seven, 45.9% of 183 respondents cited improvisational skills as the professional development opportunity they

felt would best prepare them to teach a jazz ensemble at their school. Scheduling rehearsals for multiple ensembles (28.9%) and jazz pedagogy (28.3%) were the next most commonly listed choices. Four percent of all respondents noted other professional development needs. One stated the need for a workshop on the progression of the program. Other directors noted beginning a jazz program ($n = 2$), instrumentation ($n = 1$), jazz pedagogy ($n = 1$), techniques for motivating students ($n = 1$), scheduling for administrators ($n = 1$), and priority scheduling for music ($n = 1$) as needs for jazz professional development activities.

Table 5

Preparation Needed to Teach a Jazz Ensemble

Professional Development Opportunity	All Respondents (<i>N</i> = 183)	Group I (<i>n</i> = 59)	Group II (<i>n</i> = 64)	Group III (<i>n</i> = 60)
Jazz pedagogy	28.3%	22.0%	26.6%	38.3%
Jazz theory	16.9%	20.3%	10.9%	20.0%
Improvisation skills	45.9%	47.5%	40.6%	50.0%
Scheduling	28.9%	33.9%	35.9%	16.6%
Organization	21.3%	25.4%	25.0%	13.3%
Other	4.4%	6.8%	4.7%	1.6%
None	4.4%	5.1%	4.7%	3.0%

Item eight was to be answered by all respondents. Questionnaire item eight revealed 21.8% of those surveyed were past members of the International Association of Jazz Educators (IAJE). A small percentage (8.3%) of Group I respondents reported past

membership in IAJE. A larger percentage (13.8%) of Group II respondents reported past membership in IAJE. The largest percentage of past membership (43.3%) was found in Group III.

School Curriculum Offerings for Jazz Instruction

Survey item nine was to be answered by all respondents. For item nine the respondents indicated how many band students were enrolled in each grade level of the band programs. Twenty-nine respondents did not answer item nine according to the directions. Eight provided no response. The mean numbers of students in each grade level of band programs is provided in Table 6.

Item ten was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 10 concerned the types of ensembles offered by the school's music program. Overall, 14 respondents reported offering a jazz combo, 75 offered a jazz band, and 8 offered a studio laboratory band. In Group I ($n = 14$) respondents reported 35.7% offered a jazz combo while 71.4% offered a jazz band. No band program in this group offered a studio laboratory band or other types of ensembles. Group II ($n = 23$) respondents reported 13.0% of the schools offered a jazz combo, 78.3% offered a jazz band, and 17.4% offered a studio laboratory band. In Group III ($n = 50$) 12.0% offered a jazz combo, 94.0% offered a jazz band, 12.0% offered a studio laboratory band, and 4.0% marked other types of ensembles. However, of the two respondents that checked other types of ensembles, these notations were made: "variance on the studio concept w/ available musicians" and "depends on school schedule/it changes each semester." One provided no response.

Table 6

Mean Numbers of Students in Each Grade Level of Band Programs

Grade Level	Group I	Group II	Group III	Total
7	12.0 <i>n</i> = 48	18.7 <i>n</i> = 38	51.3 <i>n</i> = 3	16.2 <i>n</i> = 89
8	8.8 <i>n</i> = 47	14.9 <i>n</i> = 43	29.2 <i>n</i> = 5	12.9 <i>n</i> = 95
9	8.3 <i>n</i> = 53	13.6 <i>n</i> = 54	28.4 <i>n</i> = 40	15.7 <i>n</i> = 147
10	7.2 <i>n</i> = 53	13.0 <i>n</i> = 54	26.3 <i>n</i> = 42	14.7 <i>n</i> = 149
11	6.2 <i>n</i> = 53	11.6 <i>n</i> = 54	24.0 <i>n</i> = 42	13.2 <i>n</i> = 149
12	5.2 <i>n</i> = 53	8.0 <i>n</i> = 54	19.4 <i>n</i> = 42	10.2 <i>n</i> = 149

Item 11 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Responses to item 11 indicated how the students were selected for participation in the instrumental jazz organization(s) offered. In Group I (*n* = 14) 14.3% were by audition, 64.2% were placed by the director, 42.8% through interest, and 7.0% by other means. Group II (*n* = 23) reported 30.4% were selected through audition, 43.5% by placement, and 43.5% were selected through interest. Group III reported 46.0% were selected through audition, 28.0% through placement, 48.0% were selected through interest, and

2.0% by other means. One respondent selected members based on instrumentation needs. One provided no response.

Item 12 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. For survey item 12 the respondents indicated the instrumentation for each jazz ensemble offered in their music program. In Group II, 2 directors provided no response to item 12, and 4 wrote an auxiliary percussionist was included in a jazz ensemble. In Group III, 4 had auxiliary percussionists and 1 included a vocalist. Detailed instrumentation for ensembles provided by respondents is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Instrumentation for Ensembles

Group I

Instrument	Jazz	Standard jazz	Studio	Other
	combo(s) (<i>n</i> = 5)	band(s) (<i>n</i> = 10)	laboratory band (<i>n</i> = 0)	
Saxophone	1.6	4.5	0.0	0.0
Trumpet	1.8	4.3	0.0	0.0
Trombone	1.0	3.4	0.0	0.0
Piano	0.6	1.1	0.0	0.0
Bass	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.0
Guitar	0.4	1.1	0.0	0.0
Drums	1.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
Other	clar. 0.2 tuba 0.2	flute 0.2	0.0	0.0

Table 7 (continued)

Instrumentation for Ensembles

Group II

Instrument	Jazz	Standard jazz	Studio	Other
	combo(s) (<i>n</i> = 3)	band(s) (<i>n</i> = 19)	laboratory band (<i>n</i> = 3)	
Saxophone	2.3	4.5	4.0	0.0
Trumpet	0.7	4.3	4.7	0.0
Trombone	1.0	3.4	3.0	0.0
Piano	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.0
Bass	1.3	1.0	1.0	0.0
Guitar	1.3	0.7	2.0	0.0
Drums	1.0	1.4	1.7	0.0
Other	0.0		flute 1.0	
			euph 0.05	clar 2.0
		voice 0.05		FH 0.3
		flute 0.05		euph 0.3
			tuba 0.3	

Table 7 (continued)

Instrumentation for Ensembles

Group III

Instrument	Jazz	Standard jazz		Studio	
	combo(s)	band(s)		laboratory	Other
	(<i>n</i> = 6)	(<i>n</i> = 46)	(<i>n</i> = 3)	(<i>n</i> = 5)	(<i>n</i> = 0)
Saxophone	1.8	5.0	7.0	5.0	0.0
Trumpet	1.7	4.7	5.7	4.4	0.0
Trombone	1.7	4.2	4.7	4.0	0.0
Piano	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.0	0.0
Bass	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.2	0.0
Guitar	0.7	1.1	0.7	1.2	0.0
Drums	1.2	1.9	2.0	1.8	0.0
Other	0.0	flute 0.02	0.0	flute 0.2	0.0
		clar 0.02		clar 0.2	
		FH 0.02		euph 0.4	
		voice 0.02			

Item 13 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. For survey item 13 participants responded as to whether or not academic credit was offered for participation in any jazz ensemble. Credit was offered by 38.0% of all the schools. One respondent did not provide an answer for item 13.

Table 8

Academic Credit Received

	Group I (<i>n</i> = 14)	Group II (<i>n</i> = 23)	Group III (<i>n</i> = 50)
Yes	21.4%	34.7%	56.0%
No	78.5%	65.2%	44.0%

Item 14 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. For survey item 14 respondents were to indicate any jazz related courses taught during the regular school day (not during the jazz ensemble rehearsal time). Eighty-seven respondents provided information for item 14. Data indicated a minimal number of jazz related courses taught during the school day. Group I directors (*n* = 14) did not report teaching any jazz related courses during the regular school day. In Group II (*n* = 23) one director stated that jazz theory was taught during basic theory class. One Group II director provided no response. Fifty Group III respondents provided information for item 14. Two Group III schools noted teaching jazz theory during music theory class, and one

Group III director marked jazz history, theory, and improvisation as courses taught outside of the regularly scheduled jazz ensemble rehearsal time.

Table 9

Percentage Teaching Jazz Related Courses During the School Day

	Group I (n = 14)	Group II (n = 23)	Group III (n = 50)	Overall (n = 87)
Jazz History	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.1
Jazz Improvisation	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.3
Jazz Theory	0.0	4.3	4.0	3.4

Item 15 was to be answered by all respondents. For survey item 15 respondents indicated jazz courses or ensembles they would like to add to their present jazz instructional curriculum. In Groups I and II the jazz band was the most prevalent response, while in Group III jazz improvisation was the most prevalent response. Seven respondents did not provide an answer for item 15. Two respondents wrote “none” as additions to the current curriculum. One director noted no additional time was available to add to the current jazz instructional program. One director wanted jazz ensemble rehearsals included as a part of the regular school day. One director included instrumental techniques as a needed component for the jazz program. One director did not wish to add an additional ensemble to the school’s current program due to current class load, and one

respondent stated that there was a need to include rhythm players in the jazz instructional program. One director wished to have an inclusive course added for jazz history, theory, and improvisation for interested students.

Table 10

Jazz Instructional Program Additions

Categories	Group I (n = 62)	Group II (n = 65)	Group III (n = 60)
Jazz Band	48.3%	67.6%	30.0%
Jazz Combo	25.8%	10.5%	15.0%
Jazz History	9.6%	4.6%	5.0%
Jazz Theory	4.8%	4.6%	6.6%
Studio Lab Band	24.2%	20.0%	20.0%
Sectional Rehearsals	9.6%	10.5%	11.6%
Jazz Improvisation	6.4%	7.6%	31.6%
Private Lessons	20.9%	18.4%	16.6%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%

Rehearsal Scheduling and Performance Opportunities

Item 16 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 16 requested information concerning the semesters in which the jazz ensemble was rehearsing. While Group I ($n = 14$) and Group II ($n = 23$) had a variety of scheduling designs, the majority of Group III ($n = 50$) schools kept the jazz ensemble organized and rehearsing during both the fall and spring semesters (see Table 11). Overall, 50.6% of schools organized and rehearsed an instrumental jazz ensemble for the fall and spring semesters. One director noted having “a few summer rehearsals.” Three participants provided no response for item 16.

Table 11

Rehearsal Semesters

	Group I ($n = 14$)	Group II ($n = 23$)	Group III ($n = 50$)	Overall ($n = 87$)
Spring only	35.7%	30.4%	28.0%	29.9%
Fall Only	7.1%	0.0%	2.0%	2.3%
Fall and Spring	35.7%	39.1%	60.0%	50.6%
Partial semesters	14.2%	30.4%	12.0%	17.2%

Item 17 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 17 inquired if the jazz ensemble rehearsed in the normal band rehearsal

space. Eighty-four directors responded to item 17. Four directors provided no response. Seventy-five percent of schools did rehearse in the normal band rehearsal space. Group II ($n = 23$) had the highest percentage at 78.2%, and the lowest rate yielded was from Group I ($n = 14$) at 64.3%. Group III ($n = 50$) reported 72.0% of the jazz ensembles rehearsed in the normal band rehearsal space. One director in Group III noted having a separate rehearsal space for instrumental jazz ensemble.

Item 18 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 18 revealed the amount of time spent in rehearsals each week for each type of ensemble (jazz combo, jazz band, and studio laboratory band). Nine respondents provided weekly rehearsal times for jazz combo. The mean weekly rehearsal time was 201 minutes. Seventy-four respondents provided weekly rehearsal times for jazz band. The mean weekly rehearsal time was 200 minutes. Five respondents provided weekly rehearsal time for studio laboratory band. The mean weekly rehearsal time was 110 minutes.

Table 12

Rehearsal Time Per Week by School Size

Course	Group I		Group II		Group III	
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>
Jazz Combo	4	160	2	300	3	190
Jazz Band	9	141	19	161	46	227
Studio Laboratory Band	0	0	2	110	3	110

Item 19 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 19 concerned the utilization of sectional rehearsals within the instrumental jazz ensembles. No programs in Group I included sectionals, 27.3% of Group II and 27.1% of Group III schools held jazz sectional rehearsals. Six directors noted practicing in sectional rehearsals weekly, and 13 stated using them on occasion. Three participants did not respond to item 19.

Table 13

Utilization of Sectional Rehearsals

	Group I (<i>n</i> = 13)	Group II (<i>n</i> = 22)	Group III (<i>n</i> = 48)	Overall (<i>n</i> = 83)
Yes	0.0%	27.3%	27.1%	22.9%
No	100.0%	72.7%	75.0%	78.3%

Item 20 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 20 referred to the types and numbers of performances given by each of the high school jazz ensembles. Directors chose from a list including contest/festival, fundraiser, athletic events, formal concerts, public relations, and school functions. The most prevalent response by all three groups was the formal concert (90.2%), while athletic events yielded the lowest average (8.5%). One school did not provide any performances, and three participants did not respond to item 20.

Table 14

Performances

	Group I (n = 12)	Group II (n = 21)	Group III (n = 49)	Overall (n = 82)
Contest/Festival	33.3%	9.5%	42.9%	33.0%
Fundraisers	33.3%	4.8%	42.9%	31.7%
Athletic events	0.0%	9.5%	10.2%	8.5%
Formal Concert	100.0%	90.5%	87.8%	90.2%
Public relations	75.0%	62.0%	87.8%	79.2%
School Functions	50.0%	42.9%	57.1%	52.4%

Funding Sources and Available Equipment

Item 21 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. For survey item 21 directors listed the annual budget for the instrumental jazz ensemble. Group I averaged \$209. Group II averaged \$117, and Group III averaged \$518. The most frequent category for all three groups was \$0 - \$499.00. One school charged a \$40 fee for students who participated in a jazz ensemble, and of the respondents that stated having a budget for the jazz ensemble, it was noted that the jazz ensemble budget was a part of the overall band budget. Five directors provided no response.

Table 15

Jazz Ensemble Annual Budget

	Group I (n = 12)	Group II (n = 21)	Group III (n = 49)	Overall (n = 87)
\$0-\$499	66.6%	85.7%	59.2%	63.2%
\$500-\$999	33.3%	9.5%	18.4%	17.2%
\$1000+	0.0%	4.8%	22.4%	13.8%
Average Budget	\$208	\$117	\$518	\$349

Item 22 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 22 requested the participants check the funding sources for the school's instrumental jazz ensemble. Overall, the band booster organization's budget was the most prevalent response (79.8%). Student fees (34.5%) and donations (26.2%) were also frequently selected by all respondents. All groups received operational funding from a variety of sources. Four specifically wrote fundraising as a source of funds for the jazz program, and one stated the director as a source of funding. Three directors provided no response to this item.

Table 16

Funding Sources

	Group I (<i>n</i> = 13)	Group II (<i>n</i> = 22)	Group III (<i>n</i> = 49)	Overall (<i>n</i> = 84)
Booster Budget	69.2%	77.2%	83.7%	79.8%
Student Fees	30.8%	18.1%	42.9%	34.5%
State Funds	7.7%	4.5%	10.2%	8.3%
Local Funds	15.4%	9.0%	22.4%	17.9%
Donations	30.8%	36.3%	20.4%	26.2%
Other	7.7%	13.6%	2.0%	6.0%

Item 23 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. For survey item 23 respondents listed how many jazz ensemble and jazz combo music compositions and arrangements were in the school's music library. In reference to jazz combo compositions the mode category was 0-49 with all schools averaging fewer than 15 compositions. For jazz band compositions the responses were more varied. While Groups I and II still averaged less than 50 compositions, Group III averaged over 100 compositions.

Table 17

Percentage of Jazz Combo Compositions in Music Library

	Group I (<i>n</i> = 14)	Group II (<i>n</i> = 23)	Group III (<i>n</i> = 50)	Total (<i>n</i> = 87)
0-49	92.9	100.0	88.0	91.9
50-99	7.1	0.0	10.0	6.9
100+	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.1

Table 18

Percentage of Jazz Band Compositions in Music Library

	Group I (<i>n</i> = 14)	Group II (<i>n</i> = 23)	Group III (<i>n</i> = 50)	Total (<i>n</i> = 87)
0-49	71.4	82.6	28.0	49.4
50-99	7.1	4.3	24.0	16.1
100+	21.4	13.0	48.0	34.5

Item 24 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 24 inquired as to what related equipment is owned by the school music program. Participants checked each item which was owned by the school from a list containing: electric bass guitar, drum set, electric keyboard, jazz fronts (stands), risers, upright bass, electric guitar, sound equipment, amplifiers, and other. Four noted having auxiliary percussion instruments. Three stated having school owned horns such as a baritone saxophone, tenor saxophone, and trombone for use by the jazz ensemble. One director noted having an electric bass, and one stated having an acoustic piano. One respondent did not provide a response for item 24. (See Table 19 for responses to item 24.)

Item 25 was to be answered by directors who currently instruct a jazz ensemble. Survey item 25 asked the participants to list which piece(s) of equipment were needed for the jazz ensemble. Overall, sound equipment was the most needed. An electric bass, piano, pickups for an upright bass, trombones, more music, and more students were specifically noted as needs by six individual directors. Five provided no response. (See Table 20 for responses to item 25.)

Table 19

Percentages of School Owned Equipment for the Jazz Ensemble

	Group I (n = 14)	Group II (n = 22)	Group III (n = 50)	Overall (n = 86)
Electric Bass	28.5	50.0	48.0	45.3
Drum Set	92.9	91.0	94.0	93.0
Electric Keyboard	64.3	63.6	88.0	77.9
Jazz Fronts	7.1	9.0	32.0	22.1
Risers	0.0	18.2	24.0	18.6
Upright Bass	21.4	22.7	52.0	39.5
Electric Guitar	14.3	18.2	18.0	17.4
Sound Equipment	57.1	50.0	88.0	73.3
Amplifiers	64.3	59.0	92.0	79.1
Other	0.0	9.0	10.0	8.1

Table 20

Percentages of Needed Equipment for the Jazz Ensemble

	Group I (<i>n</i> = 13)	Group II (<i>n</i> = 20)	Group III (<i>n</i> = 44)	Overall (<i>n</i> = 77)
Electric Bass	15.4	30.0	9.1	15.6
Drum Set	23.1	15.0	18.2	18.2
Electric Keyboard	15.4	20.0	11.4	14.3
Jazz Fronts	38.5	20.0	22.7	24.7
Risers	15.4	15.0	20.5	18.2
Upright Bass	7.7	25.0	13.6	15.6
Electric Guitar	7.7	20.0	2.3	7.8
Sound Equipment	46.2	20.0	31.8	31.2
Amplifiers	23.1	15.0	15.9	16.9
Other	0.0	0.0	11.4	6.5

Question One

Research question one was stated as follows: “What is the relationship between director preparation and the number of current high school jazz bands?” Director preparation of those currently operating a jazz ensemble was compared with the preparation of directors not currently operating a jazz ensemble. The following tables provide a detailed view of degrees earned by years of teaching for each school size group.

Table 21

Highest Degree Earned by Years of Teaching a Jazz Ensemble

Group I

Years	Bachelors	Masters	Masters+30	Specialist	Doctorate	Totals
0	26	17	0	2	1	46
1-5	3	2	0	0	0	5
6-10	0	2	1	0	0	3
11-15	0	0	0	0	0	0
16-20	0	0	0	0	0	0
>20	1	2	1	0	0	4
Totals	30	23	2	2	1	58

Table 21 (continued)

Highest Degree Earned by Years of Teaching a Jazz Ensemble

Group II

Years	Bachelors	Masters	Masters+30	Specialist	Doctorate	Totals
0	19	21	3	1	1	45
1-5	1	7	0	0	0	8
6-10	1	1	0	0	0	2
11-15	0	4	0	0	0	4
16-20	0	3	0	0	0	3
>20	1	2	0	0	0	3
Totals	22	38	3	1	1	65

Table 21 (continued)

Highest Degree Earned by Years of Teaching a Jazz Ensemble

Group III

Years	Bachelors	Masters	Masters+30	Specialist	Doctorate	Totals
0	7	7	0	0	0	14
1-5	6	4	0	0	0	10
6-10	7	3	3	1	1	15
11-15	0	5	0	0	0	5
16-20	1	1	2	0	0	4
>20	2	7	1	0	2	12
Totals	23	27	6	1	3	60

Tables 21, 22, and 23 provide information on the relationship between highest degree earned, the number of years of experience teaching a jazz ensemble, and incidence of public school jazz bands for each school size (Groups I, II, and III). These tables suggest that incidence of jazz instruction may be more dependent on school size than director preparation. Among Group III schools, 76.7% of the directors were involved

with jazz instruction compared to 30.8% for Group II schools and 20.7% for Group I schools. This observation was explored in greater detail under research question 2.

Table 22

Combined Groups: Highest Degree Earned by Years of Teaching a Jazz Ensemble

Years	Bachelors	Masters	Masters+30	Specialist	Doctorate	Totals
0	52	45	3	3	2	105
1-5	10	13	0	0	0	23
6-10	8	6	4	1	1	20
11-15	0	9	0	0	0	9
16-20	1	4	2	0	0	7
>20	4	11	2	0	2	19
Totals	75	88	11	4	5	183

With regard to Table 22, it is of interest to note that 105 out of the 183 (57.4%) schools surveyed offered no jazz instruction. It is also interesting to note that among schools offering jazz instruction 19 of 78 (24.4%) have directors who have been teaching jazz ensembles for more than 20 years.

Table 23

Highest Degree Earned by Incidence of Jazz Bands

Jazz Band	Bachelors	Masters	Masters+30	Specialist	Doctorate	Totals
No	52	45	3	3	2	105
Yes	23	43	8	1	3	78
Totals	75	88	11	4	5	183

Table 23 features a comparison between director degree preparation and incidence of high school jazz bands. Since the frequencies observed for directors with training beyond the master’s level are low, these columns of Table 23 should be combined to facilitate testing the hypothesis that there is no relationship between highest degree earned and jazz instruction. Consequently, Table 24 has been reduced to three levels of degree preparation.

Table 24

Combined Groups: Three Levels of Degree Preparation

Jazz Band	Bachelors	Masters	Masters+30	Totals
No	52	45	8	105
Yes	23	43	12	78
Totals	75	88	20	183

The Chi-Square analysis of categorical data test procedure was used to analyze the data shown in Table 24. The resulting value of the Chi-Square statistic was 8.33 ($p = .0155$, $df = 2$). Using a .05 level of significance, it is reasonable to conclude that the highest degree earned is related to whether or not a school has a jazz band. More specifically, 30.7% of the directors holding a Bachelors degree were located in schools with a jazz band compared to 50.9% of the directors with earned degrees beyond the Bachelors level. It should be noted, however, that the percentage of Bachelors degree directors may be higher in the smaller schools that are less likely to have a jazz band. This possibility is explored in Table 25.

Table 25

Highest Degree Earned by School Size

Group	Bachelors	Bachelors+	Totals
I	30	28	58
II	22	43	65
III	23	37	60
Totals	75	108	183

A Chi-Square analysis of the categorical data presented in Table 25 resulted in a value of 4.26 ($p = .118$, $df = 2$). Consequently, it is not reasonable to conclude school size and incidence of Bachelors degrees among band directors is related.

Table 26

*Cross-Classification of Directors' Jazz Participation Activities with Years of Jazz**Teaching Experience (N = 186)*

Years Experience	Item 4 Categories					
	HSJE	CJE	L/PG	JT/HC	IC	W/C
None	52	68	38	18	12	31
< 1	9	10	8	2	2	4
1-5	21	16	11	10	8	13
6-10	13	20	13	6	6	12
11-15	6	8	6	1	1	4
16-20	5	5	4	1	2	4
> 20	15	17	14	5	7	15
Totals	121	144	94	43	38	83

Table 26 presents a display of band director participation in various jazz activities by years of teaching experience. It is interesting to note, for example, that of the 121 directors who participated in high school jazz ensemble activities, 69 (57.0%) are

currently teaching a jazz ensemble. Similar percentages for the other areas of participation include: college jazz ensemble (52.8%), local/professional group (59.6%), jazz theory/history coursework (58.1%), improvisation coursework (68.4%), and workshops/clinics (62.7%). It should also be noted, however, that the percentages of band directors associated with these categories of participation varied from 77.4% (144 out of 186) for college jazz ensemble to 20.4% (38 out of 186) for improvisation courses. Associated results for the other areas were as follows: high school jazz ensemble (65.1%), local and/or professional group (50.5%), jazz history and/or theory courses (23.1%), and workshops and/or clinics (44.6%). (Note: Since each respondent could check any of item four categories, statistical inference based on comparisons between categories would not be appropriate.) Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of this table is the relatively high percentage of respondents who had participated in high school jazz ensemble and college jazz ensemble type activities. Therefore, these data suggest that director preparation through participation in college jazz ensemble and high school jazz ensemble activities may indeed have a bearing on the presence and/or absence of high school jazz bands.

In item five of the survey, respondents were asked to check the one area that “most prepared you to teach an instrumental jazz ensemble.” These responses are summarized in Table 27. It is interesting to note that 51 of the 91 (56.0%) respondents felt that their college jazz ensemble activity was the most helpful for teaching a jazz ensemble. It should also be noted that even though each respondent was asked to check

just one area, several checked more than one area thereby resulting in a total 115 responses instead of 91.

Table 27

Cross-Tabulation of Directors' Opinions of the Jazz Experiences that Most Prepared Them to Teach a Jazz Ensemble with Years of Jazz Teaching Experience (n = 91)

Years Experience	Item 5 Categories					
	HSJE	CJE	L/PG	JT/HC	IC	W/C
< 1	0	6	0	0	0	0
1-5	8	10	4	2	3	4
6-10	3	13	4	2	1	3
11-15	3	6	1	0	1	0
16-20	2	4	1	0	0	0
> 20	4	12	8	2	2	6
Totals	20	51	18	6	7	13

Question Two

Research question two was as follows: “What is the relationship between school size and the jazz instruction provided for students?” Table 28 provides a summary of responses by group and years of experience. Since research question 2 is directed toward the presence/absence of jazz instruction in relation to school size, the results presented in Table 28 have been summarized in Table 29 for further statistical analysis.

Table 28

Number of Years Teaching an Instrumental Jazz Ensemble

Years Experience	Group			Totals
	I	II	III	
0	46	45	14	105
1-5	5	8	10	23
6-10	3	2	15	20
11-15	0	4	5	9
16-20	0	3	4	7
>20	4	3	12	19
Totals	58	65	60	183

As noted during the discussion of findings pertaining to research question one, Table 29 shows that 76.7% of the directors from Group III schools were involved with jazz instruction compared to 30.8% of the directors from Group II schools and 20.7% from Group I schools. Chi-Square analysis of these data yielded a value of 43.45 ($p < .0001$, $df = 2$). This finding provides compelling evidence, at the .0001 level of significance, that school size is related to provision for jazz instruction. Further Chi-Square analysis comparing Group I and Group II schools showed no evidence of a difference in the percentage of schools that offered jazz instruction ($\chi^2 = 1.63$, $p = .2006$, $df = 1$). Based on this evidence, it appears reasonable to conclude that Group III schools are more likely to offer jazz instruction.

Table 29

Prevalence of Jazz Band Instruction by School Size

Jazz Band	Group			Totals
	I	II	III	
No	46	45	14	105
Yes	12	20	46	78
Totals	58	65	60	183

Table 30 provides a breakdown of the type of jazz instruction offered among those schools that teach jazz. Jazz band is clearly the preferred ensemble with a combined percentage of 74.7%. Individual group percentages were 66.7, 72.0, and 78.0 for Group I, II, and III schools respectively. Since the Chi-Square analyses for Table 29 showed that Group III schools are more likely to offer jazz instruction, a similar analysis was conducted for Table 30 to compare the proportion of Group III schools offering jazz band instruction with the combined proportion of Group I and II schools that also offer jazz band instruction. Results were not significant ($\chi^2 = 0.80, p = .3734, df = 1$).

Table 30

Years of Teaching Experience by School Size

Jazz Instruction	Group			Totals
	I	II	III	
Jazz Combo	5	3	6	14
Jazz Band	10	18	46*	74
Studio Lab	0	4	6	10
Other	0	0	1	1
Totals	15	25	59	99

*One Group III school reported the existence of two jazz bands. This school was counted once in the jazz band category.

Question Three

Research question three was as follows: “What is the relationship between amount of practice time and number of performances among high school jazz bands?” Table 31 shows that there is very little relationship between weekly practice time and number of annual performances. The one exception is public relations performances. Weekly practice time is positively correlated with the number of public relations performances. Perhaps these data reflect the importance that band directors place on practice and preparation as opposed to the overall number of performances. Evidently directors value public relations performances for the high school jazz bands.

Table 31

*Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient: Amount of Weekly Practice with
Number of Annual Performances by Type of Performance*

Activity	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Contest/Festival (<i>n</i> = 28)	-0.081	.6826
Fundraisers (<i>n</i> = 26)	.046	.8240
Athletic Events (<i>n</i> = 9)	.328	.3887
Formal Concerts (<i>n</i> = 77)	.133	.2497
Public Relations* (<i>n</i> = 67)	.337	.0053
School Fundraisers (<i>n</i> = 43)	.251	.1040

* $p < .01$

Question Four

Research question four was as follows: “What is the relationship between funding and equipment for high school jazz bands?” Tables 32 and 33 provide information on this question.

Table 32

Annual Budget in Dollars by School Size

Budget	Group		
	I	II	III
0 – 499	10	20	31
500 - 1000	4	3	13
Over 1000	0	0	6

Table 33

Summary of Equipment Owned by Level of Funding

Group I

Equipment	Level of Funding		
	0 - 499	500 - 1000	Over 1000
Electric Bass Guitar	3	1	0
Drum Set	9	4	0
Electric Keyboard	6	3	0
Jazz Fronts	0	1	0
Risers	0	0	0
Upright Bass	2	1	0
Electric Guitar	1	1	0
Sound Equipment	6	2	0
Amplifiers	6	3	0
Other	2	0	0

Table 33 (continued)

Summary of Equipment Owned by Level of Funding

Group II

Equipment	Level of Funding		
	0 - 499	500 - 1000	Over 1000
Electric Bass Guitar	10	1	0
Drum Set	17	3	0
Electric Keyboard	11	3	0
Jazz Fronts	1	1	0
Risers	1	3	0
Upright Bass	4	1	0
Electric Guitar	4	0	0
Sound Equipment	8	3	0
Amplifiers	10	3	0
Other	1	1	0

Table 33 (continued)

Summary of Equipment Owned by Level of Funding

Group III

Equipment	Level of Funding		
	0 - 499	500 - 1000	Over 1000
Electric Bass Guitar	13	8	3
Drum Set	28	13	5
Electric Keyboard	28	11	5
Jazz Fronts	9	4	3
Risers	7	4	1
Upright Bass	16	6	4
Electric Guitar	7	1	1
Sound Equipment	28	10	6
Amplifiers	29	11	6
Other	3	0	2

Table 32 provides information on level of funding by school group, and Table 33 examines equipment owned by level of funding. (Note: Since each respondent could check any of the ten categories, statistical inference based on comparisons between categories would not be appropriate.) Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of this data are the relatively high percentage of respondents who report school owned drum sets, electric keyboards, sound equipment, and amplifiers regardless of school size or level of funding. When comparing across groups, directors at schools with a funding level of \$0-499 ($n = 61$) 70.5% reported owning a drum set, 73.8% reported owning an electric keyboard, 68.9% reported owning sound equipment, and 73.8% owned amplifiers. It is interesting to note that directors at schools reporting in the \$500-999 range ($n = 20$) 100% reported owning a drum set, 85% reported owning an electric keyboard, 75% reported owning sound equipment, and 85% owned an amplifier. Only a small portion (12%) of Group III school directors ($n = 50$) responded with budgets in excess of \$1000. Of those directors at schools in Group III, 83.3% reported owning a drum set and electric keyboard and 100% reported owning sound equipment and amplifiers. Evidently, drum sets, electric keyboards, sound equipment, and amplifiers are priority items for jazz band directors regardless of school size or level of funding.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to survey the instrumental jazz ensembles of Alabama's public high schools during the 2008-09 academic year. Specifically, the study included the preparation of the director, school curriculum offerings for jazz instruction, rehearsal scheduling and performance opportunities, and funding sources and available equipment. This study was considered useful to instrumental music educators, school administrators, and curriculum coordinators for use in instructional planning for the arts and the continued development of jazz band programs in the public high schools of Alabama.

This study surveyed the status of jazz ensemble programs in the public high schools of Alabama. A data gathering instrument was used to answer the following questions relevant to jazz ensemble programs.

1. What is the relationship between director preparation and the number of current high school jazz bands?
2. What is the relationship between school size and the jazz instruction provided for students?

3. What is the relationship between amount of practice time and number of performances among high school jazz bands?
4. What is the relationship between funding and equipment for high school jazz bands?

The general methodology of the study was a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design. This methodology was selected to provide a numeric description of the trends found in jazz programs by studying the population of Alabama band directors. The survey was an easily implemented instrument for a larger population; it provided quick turnaround in data collection; and valid inferences could be made due to the consistency of the instrument across participants (Creswell, 2003). Director preparation, school curriculum offerings for jazz instruction, rehearsal scheduling and performance opportunities, and funding sources and available equipment were found as important variables in the related literature and were investigated.

A response rate of 59.4% was achieved. The major disadvantage associated with a questionnaire was the percentage of respondents, which often have low response rates (Roberts, 2004). A return rate of 70%--or 233 responses--was desired for validation of the study.

Conclusions

The first research question was concerned with the relationship between director preparation and the number of current high school jazz bands. The data suggested that incidence of jazz instruction may have been more dependent on school size than director preparation. Among Group III schools, 76.7% of the directors were involved with jazz

instruction compared to 30.8% for Group II schools and 20.7% for Group I schools. Of the 183 schools surveyed, 105 schools (57.4%) offered no jazz instruction.

Among schools offering jazz instruction, 19 of 78 (24.4%) have directors who have been teaching jazz ensembles for more than 20 years. The college jazz ensemble activity was listed by 56% of respondents as the most helpful experience for teaching a high school jazz ensemble. The data suggested that director preparation through participation in college jazz ensemble and high school jazz ensemble activities may indeed have a bearing on the presence of a high school jazz band.

Research question two was concerned with the relationship between school size and the presence of the jazz band. The data provided compelling evidence, at the .0001 level of significance, that school size is related to provision for jazz instruction. Further Chi-Square analysis comparing Group I and Group II schools showed no evidence of a difference in the percentage of schools that offered jazz instruction ($\chi^2 = 1.63, p = .2006, df = 1$). Based on this evidence, it appears reasonable to conclude that Group III schools are more likely to offer jazz instruction.

The third research question concerned the relationship between the amount of practice time and the number of performances among high school jazz bands. There was very little relationship between weekly practice time and number of annual performances. The one exception was public relations performances. Weekly practice time was positively correlated with the number of public relations performances. Perhaps these

data reflect the importance that individual band directors have placed on public performances. The average amount of practice time was approximately 200 minutes each week for jazz bands and jazz combos.

The final research question concerned the relationship of level of funding and equipment provided for high school jazz bands. Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of this data were the relatively high percentage of respondents who reported school owned drum sets, electric keyboards, sound equipment, and amplifiers regardless of school size or level of funding.

Recommendations for Further Research

On the basis of the data gathered with this survey instrument, the writer recommends:

1. That a study be undertaken to thoroughly investigate the relationship between school size and its relation to provision for jazz instruction.
2. That a study be designed of the activities and practices of the Alabama Music Educators Association in order to determine what, if any, effect it has on the promotion and existence of high school jazz bands in Alabama.
3. That a study be conducted to determine to what degree a director's past participation in high school and college jazz bands effects the occurrence of the director implementing a high school jazz band.
4. That this study, or one of similar nature, be replicated in other states in order to ascertain a more comprehensive understanding of the high school jazz bands.

Recommendations for Curriculum Coordinators, Administrators,
and Music Teacher Educators

On the basis of the data gathered with this survey instrument, the writer recommends:

1. That the Alabama Department of Education develop standards that contain guidelines for future instrumental music educators that would provide a means to organize and maintain a high school jazz band.
2. That school administrators be provided an awareness of the importance of additional jazz curriculum offerings for students during the regular school day such as theory, history, and improvisation courses (not to be taught during the jazz ensemble rehearsal time).
3. That music teacher educators instill in undergraduate and graduate music education students the need for providing various instrumental opportunities for pupils so they might participate in high school and college jazz ensembles which may lead to the continuation and development of high school jazz ensemble programs.
4. That music teacher educators encourage those currently in music education programs to participate in the college jazz ensemble, since the research suggests that directors who have participated in a college jazz ensemble have a higher occurrence of a high school jazz ensemble.

Summary

Jazz is a uniquely American art form which has become part of the instrumental music curriculum at many high schools across the United States. This study suggests that in Alabama, school size - more than any other factor - influences the existence of the high school jazz band. Larger high schools in Alabama had a much higher occurrence of an organized high school jazz band. Surely band directors and school administrators at medium and small-sized high schools understand the value of teaching this uniquely American art form through the organization and cultivation of a high school jazz band.

Music students are individual in their talents and aptitudes within the musical art form. Traditionally, what has distinguished jazz development from other styles of music is its individualistic nature. Jazz music requires the performer(s) to include some part of self in the interpretation and presentation of the musical work. To perform jazz music any other way is to cheat the audience (Kuzmich & Bash, 1984).

The absence of a high school jazz band is the acceptance of an incomplete instrumental music program. This study reveals that less than half of the Alabama high schools in this study offer students the opportunity to participate in a jazz band. In those schools which do offer a jazz band experience to students, the vast majority of directors participated in high school and college jazz bands when they were in school. Possibly these directors were more likely to work at larger high schools which were able to fund the additional band activity, valued the jazz band's promotional potential for the high school, expected a jazz band to be a part of the curriculum, and valued the creative outlet which a high school jazz band uniquely offers to students.

REFERENCES

- Adderly, C., Kennedy, M., & Berz, W. (2003). A home away from home. The world of the high school music classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*(3), 190-206.
- Alabama Music Educators Association. (2006). *Alabama Bandmasters Association directory*. Florence, AL.
- Andrews, F.M. (1970). Goals and objectives for music education. *Music Educators Journal, 57*(4), 23-26.
- Baker, D. (1981). *Jazz pedagogy*. Bloomington, IN: Frangipani Press.
- Berry, J. (1971). High school jazz bands-the state of the art. *The Instrumentalist, 26*(4), 18-20.
- Berry, L. (1985). Historical analysis of the development of jazz and jazz education in the state of Alabama. (IAJE Jazz Research Papers, Vol. 4). Manhattan, KS: IAJE Publications.
- Bessom, M.E., Tatarunis, A.M., & Forcucci, S.L. (1974). *Teaching music in today's secondary schools: A creative approach to contemporary music education*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston, Inc.
- Blocher, L. (2000). The times are changing. *Teaching Music, 7*(4), 30-37.
- Bollinger, D.F. (1979). *Band director's complete handbook*. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.

- Brittin, R.V. (1997). The status of selected instrumental ensembles in Texas schools. (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1997).
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ferguson, T. (1976). *The jazz-rock ensemble*. Port Washington, New York: Alfred Publishing Co.
- Ferriano, F., Jr. (1974). A study of the school jazz ensemble in American music education. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1974).
- Fisher, L.F. (1981). The rationale for and development of jazz courses for the college music education curriculum, 1981-1982. (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1981).
- Goodrich, A.M. (2005). Inside a high school jazz band. (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 2005).
- Goodrich, A. (2007). Peer mentoring in a high school jazz ensemble. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 55(2), 94-114.
- Gravetter, F.J., & Wallnau, L.B. (2004). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning Inc.
- Grimes, W.F. (1988). Conducting and rehearsal techniques of selected secondary school jazz ensemble directors, Volumes I and II. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music, 1988).
- Henry, R.E. (1981). *The jazz ensemble: A guide to technique*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hinckley, J. (2000). Why vision 2020? *Music Educators Journal*, 86(5), 21-24, 66.

- Hinton, W.H. (1957). A study of bands in the white schools of Alabama. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1957).
- Hoffer, C.R. (1991). *Teaching music in the secondary schools* (4th ed). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Isbell, D. (2007). Popular music and the public school music curriculum. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 26, 53-63. DOI: 10.1177/87551233070260010106.
- Jones, H.E. (2005). Jazz in Oklahoma music teacher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 2005).
- Jones, L.E. (1986). The status of band programs in the public secondary schools of Alabama, 1984-1985. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1986).
- Kelly, S.N., & Weelden, K.V. (2004). Connecting meaningful music and experiences in a multicultural, multimusical classroom. *Music Educators Journal*, 90(3), 35-39.
- Knox, D.C. (1996). Status of jazz education in preparation of music educators in Alabama colleges and universities. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1996).
- Kowall, B.C. (1966). *Perspectives in music education: Source book III*. Washington D.C.: Music Educators National Conference.
- Kuzmich, J., & Bash, L. (1984). *Complete guide to instrumental jazz instruction: Techniques for developing a successful school jazz program*. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.

- Lasko, E. (2008). Serving jazz educators is the aim of new MENC initiative. Reston, VA: MENC. Retrieved from <http://www.menc.org/news/view/serving-jazz-educators-is-the-aim-of-new-menc-initiative>
- Luty, B. (1982). Jazz education's struggle for acceptance (part II). *Music Educators Journal*, 69(4), 49-50, 64.
- Mack, K.D. (1993). The status of jazz programs in selected secondary schools of Indiana, 1991-1992. (Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, AAT 9319884.
- Madsen, C.K. (2000). *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the future of music education*. Reston, Virginia: MENC.
- McCurdy, R.C. (1983). Development and evaluation of a comprehensive guide for the jazz educator. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1983).
- Morgan, H.N. (1955). *Music in American education: Music education source book number two*. Chicago, Illinois: Music Educators National Conference.
- Morton, J. (2006). Alabama State Department of Education. Alabama course of study: Arts education. Montgomery, AL.
- Payne, J.R., Sr. (1973). Jazz education in the secondary schools of Louisiana: Implications for teacher education. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern State University of Louisiana, 1973).
- Roach, R. (1998). Speaking on jazz education: Ellis Marsalis. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 14(24), 24-26.

- Roberts, C.M. (2004). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Scagnoli, J.R. (1978). The status of band programs in public senior high schools in the state of New York. (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1978).
- Senate Judiciary. (1987). Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 (S.CON.RES.23. December 4 1987). Retrieved June 18, 2007, from <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d100f:S.CON.RES.23>.
- Singleton, I.C. & Anderson, S.V. (1969). *Music in secondary schools* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Skinner, D. (1986). The little big band in the curriculum. *Jazz Educators Journal*, 18(4), 24-25.
- State of Alabama Department of Education. (2008). Enrollment by System, School, Sex, and Race Public Data Report. Retrieved November 3, 2008 from <http://www.alsde.edu/PublicDataReports/Default.aspx>
- Tirro, F. (1977). *Jazz: A history*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Tolson, J. (2001). Historical perspectives and a case for inclusion: Why teach jazz? *Bluegrass Music News*, December, 8-14.
- Wheeler, D.L. (1992). Jazz and academe: From hostility to harmony. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 38(27), A5.

Wiggins, I.T. (1997). An assessment of the status of jazz music education in the public high schools of North Carolina: A foundation for curriculum revision in higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1997). UMI 9818241.

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL AND INFORMATION LETTERS



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING

NOTE: DO NOT AGREE TO PARTICIPATE UNLESS AN IRB APPROVAL STAMP WITH CURRENT DATES HAS BEEN APPLIED TO THIS DOCUMENT.

INFORMATION LETTER
for a Research Study entitled
"Instrumental Jazz Ensemble Programs in Alabama High Schools"

You are invited to participate in a research study to collect information regarding the jazz ensemble programs found in the public high schools of Alabama. The study is being conducted by Lloyd Jones, doctoral candidate, under the direction of Dr. Kimberly Walls, Professor, in the Auburn University Department of Curriculum and Teaching. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a band director and are age 19 or older.

What will be involved if you participate? If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a short questionnaire. Your total time commitment will be approximately twenty minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? The risk associated with participating in this study is breach of confidentiality. To minimize these risks, we will use a number coding system in order to avoid identifying individuals or individual programs. Upon completion of the study, the code list will be destroyed.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you can expect to find this information useful to instrumental music educators, school administrators, and curriculum coordinators for use in instructional planning for the arts and the continued development of jazz ensemble programs in Alabama. I cannot promise you that you will receive any or all of the benefits described.

Will you receive compensation for participating? To thank you for your time you will be offered an ink pen to complete the questionnaire.

Are there any costs? If you decide to participate, you will incur no costs.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. I will protect your privacy and the data you provide by considering all data as highly confidential. Information collected through your participation may be used to fulfill an educational requirement, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Lloyd Jones at jonesll@auburn.edu or Dr. Kimberly Walls at kim.walls@auburn.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334) 844-5966 or email at hsubject@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO. THIS LETTER IS YOURS TO KEEP.

Investigator's signature

Date

Lloyd E. Jones, III

Print Name

The Auburn University
Institutional Review Board
has approved this document for use
from 2/10/03 to 2/19/10
Protocol # 01-035-EP-0703

5040 HEALY CENTER
AUBURN, AL 36849-5212

TELEPHONE:
334-844-4434

FAX:
334-844-6789



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING

NOTE: DO NOT AGREE TO PARTICIPATE UNLESS AN IRB APPROVAL STAMP WITH CURRENT DATES HAS BEEN APPLIED TO THIS DOCUMENT.

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
for a Research Study entitled

"Instrumental Jazz Ensemble Programs in Alabama High Schools"

This is your second invitation to participate in a research study to collect information regarding the jazz ensemble programs found in the public high schools of Alabama. The study is being conducted by Lloyd Jones, doctoral candidate, under the direction of Dr. Kimberly Walls, Professor, in the Auburn University Department of Curriculum and Teaching. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a band director and are age 19 or older.

What will be involved if you participate? If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a short questionnaire. Your total time commitment will be approximately twenty minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? The risk associated with participating in this study is breach of confidentiality. To minimize these risks, we will use a number coding system in order to avoid identifying individuals or individual programs. Upon completion of the study, the code list will be destroyed.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you can expect to find this information useful to instrumental music educators, school administrators, and curriculum coordinators for use in instructional planning for the arts and the continued development of jazz ensemble programs in Alabama. I cannot promise you that you will receive any or all of the benefits described.

Are there any costs? If you decide to participate, you will incur no costs.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. I will protect your privacy and the data you provide by considering all data as highly confidential. Information collected through your participation may be used to fulfill an educational requirement, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Lloyd Jones at jonesll@auburn.edu or Dr. Kimberly Walls at kim.walls@auburn.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334) 844-5966 or email at hsubjec@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO. THIS LETTER IS YOURS TO KEEP.

Investigator's signature

Date

Lloyd E. Jones, III

Print Name

The Auburn University
Institutional Review Board
has approved this document for use
from 3/10/09 to 3/31/10
Protocol # 08-035 EP-0903

5040 HALEY CENTER
AUBURN, AL 36849-5212

TELEPHONE:
334-844-4434

FAX:
334-844-6789

POSTCARD

REMINDER

For a research study entitled
“Instrumental Jazz Ensemble Programs in Alabama High Schools”

Please accept the recently received invitation to participate in the study regarding the jazz ensemble programs found in the public high schools of Alabama. You can expect to find the study’s information useful to instrumental music educators, school administrators, and curriculum coordinators for use in instructional planning for the arts and the continued development of jazz ensemble programs in Alabama.

Should you have any questions about this study, please contact Lloyd Jones at jonesll@auburn.edu or Dr. Kimberly Walls at kim.walls@auburn.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334) 844-5966 or email at hsubjec@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTINUED SUPPORT
OF MUSIC EDUCATION IN ALABAMA.**

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Instrumental Jazz Ensemble Programs in Alabama High Schools Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions. Some questions may ask for more than one answer. The term jazz ensemble will be used in the following questions to collectively represent all jazz oriented instrumental ensembles.

Does your high school have a jazz ensemble program at the senior high school level?

_____ YES - *If yes - please complete this questionnaire.*

_____ NO - *If no - please complete this questionnaire answering only the items in **bold print**.*

SECTION A. DIRECTOR PREPARATION

1. What is your highest degree earned? (check one)

_____ Bachelors

_____ Masters + 30 hours

_____ Doctorate

_____ Masters

_____ Specialist

_____ Other, please specify: _____

2. How many years have you taught an instrumental jazz ensemble?

3. What is your primary instrument? _____

4. In which of the following have you participated? (check all that apply)

_____ High school jazz ensemble

_____ Jazz theory/history courses

_____ College jazz ensemble

_____ Improvisation courses

_____ Local and/or professional group

_____ Jazz workshops/clinics

_____ Other, please specify: _____

5. In your opinion, which of the following most prepared you to teach an instrumental jazz ensemble? (check one)

_____ Participation in high school jazz ensemble

_____ Jazz theory/history courses

_____ Participation in college jazz ensemble

_____ College improvisation courses

_____ Participation in local and/or professional jazz groups

_____ Attended workshops/clinics

_____ Other, please specify: _____

_____ None of these

6. How many jazz oriented professional development activities did you attend during the 2007-2008 school year?

7. In your opinion, which of the following professional development opportunities would help you better teach a jazz ensemble at your school? (check one)

_____ Jazz pedagogy

_____ Scheduling rehearsals for multiple ensembles

_____ Jazz theory

_____ Organizational strategies for multiple ensembles

_____ Improvisational skills

_____ Other, please specify: _____

_____ None of these

8. Were you a member of the International Association for Jazz Education (IAJE)?

_____ Yes

_____ No

SECTION B. SCHOOL CURRICULUM OFFERINGS FOR JAZZ INSTRUCTION

9. What is the enrollment for your high school band membership?

7th grade 9th grade 11th grade
 8th grade 10th grade 12th grade

10. Please indicate the type(s) of jazz ensemble(s) your instrumental music program offers students.

Jazz combo (a jazz ensemble of nine or less musicians)
 Jazz band (any jazz ensemble of ten or more musicians)
 Studio lab band (a jazz band that is augmented to include flutes, clarinets, French horns, tuba, and auxiliary percussionists)
 Other, please specify: _____

11. How are students selected for membership in the jazz ensemble(s)?

Audition by director Interest
 Placement by director Other, please specify: _____

12. Please indicate the instrumentation for each ensemble your program offers.

<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Jazz Combo(s)</i>	<i>Standard jazz band(s)</i>	<i>Studio lab band</i>	<i>Other</i>
Saxophones				
Trumpets				
Trombones				
Piano				
Bass				
Guitar				
Drums				
Other, please list:				

13. Is academic credit received for participation in any jazz ensemble?

Yes No

14. Please check any jazz related courses offered during the regular school day (not including instruction given in these areas during jazz ensemble rehearsals).

Jazz History Jazz Improvisation
 Jazz Theory Other, please specify: _____

15. Which of the following jazz courses or ensembles would you like to add to your present music curriculum? (check one)

Jazz band Studio lab band (addition of French horns, flutes, clarinets, and tuba)
 Jazz combo Section rehearsals
 Jazz history Jazz improvisation
 Jazz theory Private lessons
 Other, please specify: _____

SECTION C. REHEARSAL SCHEDULING AND PERFORMANCE OPPORTUNITIES

16. During which portion(s) of the academic year do you rehearse the jazz ensemble(s)?

- Spring only Fall and spring semesters
 Fall only Partial, please clarify: _____

17. Are rehearsals organized in the normal band rehearsal space?

- Yes No

18. How often does/do your instrumental jazz ensemble(s) rehearse in a typical week? Please fill in the blanks below.

Jazz Ensemble Type	Days per week	Minutes per rehearsal	Before, During, or After School

19. Do you hold sectional rehearsals for the jazz ensemble?

- Yes – *If yes, how often are sectional rehearsals held?* _____
 No

20. Approximately how many performances of the following types did your jazz program give during the 2007-2008 school year?

Performance Type	Number during year	Performance Type	Number during year
Contest/Festival		Formal concerts	
Fundraisers		Public relations	
Athletic events		School functions	

SECTION D. FUNDING SOURCES AND AVAILABLE EQUIPMENT

21. What is the annual budget for the instrumental jazz ensemble? _____

22. What are the funding sources for your instrumental jazz ensemble(s) equipment and supplies? (check all that apply)

- Band booster budget Local funds
 Student fees Donations
 State funds Other, please specify: _____

23. Approximately how many jazz compositions are currently in your music library?

- Jazz Ensemble: _____
 Jazz Combo: _____

24. Which of the following pieces of jazz ensemble equipment are owned by the school music program?
(check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Bass Guitar | <input type="checkbox"/> Upright Bass |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Drum Set | <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Guitar |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Keyboard | <input type="checkbox"/> Sound Equipment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jazz Fronts (stands) | <input type="checkbox"/> Amplifiers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Risers | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please clarify: _____ |

25. In your opinion, which of the following pieces of equipment are you in need of most for your instrumental jazz ensemble program? (check one)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Bass Guitar | <input type="checkbox"/> Upright Bass |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Drum Set | <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Guitar |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric Keyboard | <input type="checkbox"/> Sound Equipment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jazz Fronts (stands) | <input type="checkbox"/> Amplifiers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Risers | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please clarify: _____ |

Thank you for completing this questionnaire! Your input on this topic is very valuable. If you would like to know the results of this survey, please feel free to contact me by mail, email, or phone using my contact information below.

Please return this questionnaire in the provided stamped envelope. Thank you again!

Lloyd E. Jones
7720 County Road 94
Killen, AL 35645

Jonesll@auburn.edu

(256) 272-8500

THANK YOU AGAIN!

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL GROUPINGS

Group I Schools

<i>School</i>	<i>9-12 Enrollment</i>	<i>District</i>
RA Hubbard HS	82	Lawrence County
Vina HS	106	Franklin County
Brilliant HS	120	Marion County
Autaugaville HS	123	Autauga County
Waterloo HS	124	Lauderdale County
Parrish HS	129	Walker County
Notasulga HS	136	Macon County
Hubbertville School	137	Fayette County
Marengo HS	138	Marengo County
Lynn HS	138	Winston County
Verbena HS	146	Chilton County
Hazlewood HS	147	Lawrence County
Meek HS	147	Winston County
Marion County HS	150	Marion County
Brantley HS	153	Crenshaw County
South Lamar School	157	Lamar County
Floral HS	163	Covington County
Sweet Water HS	166	Marengo County
Valley Head HS	169	Dekalb County
Hackleburg School	172	Marion County

Georgiana HS	174	Butler County
Ragland HS	180	St. Clair County
Berry HS	183	Fayette County
Gaston HS	189	Etowah County
Collinsville HS	195	Dekalb County
Addison HS	195	Winston County
Cherokee HS	202	Colbert County
Millry HS	202	Washington County
Loachapoka HS	211	Lee County
Greensboro Public Schools	212	Hale County
Asbury School	212	Marshall County
Keith School	218	Dallas County
Sulligent School	219	Lamar County
Isabella HS	220	Chilton County
Cottonwood HS	220	Houston County
Zion Chapel HS	221	Coffee County
Hatton HS	236	Lawrence County
Falkville HS	237	Morgan County
Red Level HS	240	Covington County
Flomaton HS	245	Escambia County
Red Bay HS	245	Franklin County

Pickens County HS	245	Pickens County
Horseshoe Bend HS	249	Tallapoosa County
Cold Springs HS	250	Cullman County
Houston County HS	252	Houston County
Woodland HS	253	Randolph County
Highland Home HS	254	Crenshaw County
Tanner HS	254	Limestone County
Thorsby HS	255	Chilton County
Oakman HS	257	Walker County
New Brockton HS	261	Coffee County
Phil Campbell HS	263	Franklin County
Lanett Senior HS	263	Lanett City
Ider School	264	Dekalb County
Vincent Middle HS	264	Shelby County
Lineville HS	265	Clay County
Lamar County HS	267	Lamar County
Reeltown HS	268	Tallapoosa County
South Choctaw HS	269	Choctaw County
Ohatchee HS	270	Calhoun County
Goshen HS	273	Pike County
Wicksburg HS	277	Houston County

Excel HS	278	Monroe County
West End HS	283	Etowah County
Ranburne HS	284	Cleburne County
Leroy HS	285	Washington County
Randolph County HS	286	Randolph County
Elba HS	287	Elba City
Lexington HS	287	Lauderdale County
Clements HS	289	Limestone County
Hale County HS	294	Hale County
Fyffe HS	295	Dekalb County
Clay County HS	303	Clay County
Winston County HS	304	Winston County
Fultondale HS	309	Jefferson County
Weaver HS	313	Calhoun County
Luverne HS	313	Crenshaw County
Calhoun HS	317	Lowndes County
Geraldine HS	318	Dekalb County
West Morgan HS	325	Morgan County
Barbour County HS	326	Barbour County
Pleasant Valley HS	327	Calhoun County
Piedmont HS	327	Piedmont City

Colbert Heights HS	328	Colbert County
Aliceville HS	330	Pickens County
Lafayette HS	334	Chambers County
JB Pennington HS	335	Blount County
Central HS	335	Lowndes County
Susan Moore HS	337	Blount County
White Plains HS	337	Calhoun County
Vinemont HS	340	Cullman County
Cordova HS	342	Walker County
Slocumb HS	343	Geneva County
Sheffield HS	343	Sheffield City
Sumter County HS	343	Sumter County
Glencoe HS	346	Etowah County
Montevallo HS	351	Shelby County
Carbon Hill HS	352	Walker County
Pike County HS	357	Pike County
Winfield HS	360	Winfield City
Marbury School	364	Autauga County

Group II Schools

<i>School</i>	<i>9-12 Enrollment</i>	<i>District</i>
Colbert County HS	366	Colbert County
Holly Pond HS	366	Cullman County
Geneva HS	366	Geneva City
Gordo HS	366	Pickens County
Elkmont HS	367	Limestone County
Abbeville HS	369	Henry County
New Hope HS	370	Madison County
Lauderdale County HS	373	Lauderdale County
Hanceville HS	379	Cullman County
Wellborn HS	380	Calhoun County
West Blocton HS	384	Bibb County
TR Miller HS	389	Brewton City
Daleville HS	389	Daleville City
Dale County HS	391	Dale County
Hamilton HS	392	Marion County
Oneonta HS	392	Oneonta City
Brindlee Mountain HS	393	Marshall County
Hokes Bluff HS	397	Etowah County
Dadeville HS	399	Tallapoosa County
Danville HS	401	Morgan County

Good Hope HS	402	Cullman County
Leeds HS	403	Leeds City
Northside HS	404	Tuscaloosa County
Ashville HS	405	St. Clair County
Crossville HS	407	Dekalb County
West Limestone HS	408	Limestone County
Handley HS	409	Roanoke City
Sardis HS	411	Etowah County
Headland HS	413	Henry County
Plainview School	415	Dekalb County
Tarrant HS	416	Tarrant City
Beulah HS	418	Lee County
Clarke County HS	422	Clarke County
Greene County HS	427	Greene County
Opp HS	427	Opp City
Livingston HS	430	Sumter County
Saks HS	431	Calhoun County
Central HS	431	Coosa County
Straughn HS	431	Covington County
Rogers HS	433	Lauderdale County
Munford HS	434	Talladega County

Calera HS	439	Shelby County
Andalusia HS	441	Andalusia City
Wilson HS	441	Lauderdale County
Booker T. Washington		
Magnet HS	443	Montgomery County
WS Neal HS	446	Escambia County
Priceville HS	447	Morgan County
Cherokee County HS	449	Cherokee County
Deshler HS	449	Tuscumbia City
Thomasville HS	454	Thomasville City
Hillcrest HS	455	Conecuh County
Midfield HS	456	Midfield City
Haleyville HS	457	Haleyville City
Fayette County HS	458	Fayette County
Corner HS	458	Jefferson County
Central HS	465	Lauderdale County
Oak Grove HS	470	Jefferson County
Holt HS	476	Tuscaloosa County
Brewbaker Tech. Magnet HS	483	Montgomery County
Jacksonville HS	491	Jacksonville City
Ardmore HS	493	Limestone County

Lincoln HS	499	Talladega County
North Jackson HS	500	Jackson County
Fairview HS	502	Cullman County
Holtville HS	506	Elmore County
Cleburne County HS	508	Cleburne County
Bullock County HS	509	Bullock County
Locust Fork HS	512	Blount County
Ashford HS	513	Houston County
East Lawrence HS	519	Lawrence County
Lawrence County HS	534	Lawrence County
Columbia HS	536	Huntsville City
Brooks HS	536	Lauderdale County
St. Clair County HS	539	St. Clair County
Dora HS	540	Walker County
Jemison HS	542	Chilton County
Ben C. Rain HS	548	Mobile County
Southside HS	554	Dallas County
Elmore County HS	554	Elmore County
Jackson HS	560	Clarke County
Childersburg HS	564	Talladega County
Alexandria HS	565	Calhoun County

Guntersville HS	568	Guntersville City
Ramsay HS	569	Birmingham City
West Point HS	582	Cullman County
Bibb County HS	585	Bibb County
Dallas County HS	587	Dallas County
East Limestone HS	594	Limestone County
Tallassee HS	612	Tallassee City
Anniston HS	613	Anniston City
Escambia County HS	619	Escambia County
Monroe County HS	619	Monroe County
Boaz HS	622	Boaz City
Shelby County HS	626	Shelby County
Springville HS	635	St. Clair County
Hayden HS	649	Blount County
West End HS	653	Birmingham City
Madison County HS	654	Madison County
Sylacauga HS	655	Sylacauga City
Moody HS	657	St. Clair County
Beauregard HS	665	Lee County
Curry HS	669	Walker County
Rehobeth HS	671	Houston County

Russellville HS	672	Russellville City
Charles Henderson HS	681	Troy City
Etowah HS	692	Attalla City

Group III Schools

<i>School</i>	<i>9-12 Enrollment</i>	<i>District</i>
Butler HS	700	Huntsville City
Hayes HS	702	Birmingham City
Pleasant Grove HS	703	Jefferson County
Wilcox Central HS	708	Wilcox County
Spanish Fort HS	712	Baldwin County
Woodlawn HS Magnet	713	Birmingham City
Central HS	718	Tuscaloosa City
Demopolis HS	721	Demopolis City
Talladega HS	725	Talladega City
Muscle Shoals HS	726	Muscle Shoals City
Gulf Shores HS	731	Baldwin County
Arab HS	736	Arab City
Southside HS	736	Etowah County
Mortimer Jordan HS	747	Jefferson County
Greenville HS	749	Butler County
Scottsboro HS	759	Scottsboro City
Chelsea HS	762	Shelby County
Citronelle HS	770	Mobile County
Walker HS	773	Jasper City
Fort Payne HS	774	Fort Payne City

Chilton County HS	797	Chilton County
Carroll HS	797	Ozark City
Johnson HS	799	Huntsville City
CF Vigor HS	807	Mobile County
Erwin HS	822	Jefferson County
Lee HS	828	Huntsville City
Eufaula HS	833	Eufaula City
Cullman HS	835	Cullman City
Brewer HS	840	Morgan County
Valley HS	845	Chambers County
Fairfield High Preparatory School	846	Fairfield City
Wenonah HS	863	Birmingham City
Booker T. Washington HS	863	Macon County
Parker HS	876	Birmingham City
Brookwood HS	878	Tuscaloosa County
McAdory HS	879	Jefferson County
Athens HS	891	Athens City
Hartselle HS	908	Hartselle City
Albertville HS	941	Albertville City
Mountain Brook HS	955	Mt. Brook City

Florence HS	959	Florence City
Gardendale HS	973	Jefferson County
Le Flore HS	975	Mobile County
Carver HS	979	Birmingham City
Hueytown HS	990	Jefferson County
Russell County HS	1,005	Russell County
Benjamin Russell HS	1,007	Alexander City
Selma HS	1020	Selma City
Pinson Valley HS	1,026	Jefferson County
Paul W. Bryant HS	1,043	Tuscaloosa City
Homewood HS	1,050	Homewood City
Jess Lanier HS	1,065	Bessemer City
Decatur HS	1,069	Decatur City
Buckhorn HS	1,076	Madison County
Northridge HS	1,080	Tuscaloosa City
Stanhope Elmore HS	1,113	Elmore County
Oxford HS	1,120	Oxford City
Carver Senior HS	1,125	Montgomery County
Wetumpka HS	1,136	Elmore County
Auburn HS	1,152	Auburn City
L.B. Williamson HS	1,168	Mobile County

Robertsdale HS	1,189	Baldwin County
Northview HS	1,196	Dothan City
Pell City HS	1,204	Pell City
Hazel Green HS	1,210	Madison County
Daphne HS	1,215	Baldwin County
Minor HS	1,219	Jefferson County
Hillcrest HS	1,231	Tuscaloosa County
Baldwin County HS	1,241	Baldwin County
Hewitt-Trussville HS	1,241	Trussville City
Shades Valley HS	1,267	Jefferson County
Sidney Lanier HS	1,268	Montgomery County
Fairhope HS	1,271	Baldwin County
Opelika HS	1,310	Opelika City
Satsuma HS	1,348	Mobile County
Huffman HS	1,371	Birmingham City
Enterprise HS	1,375	Enterprise City
Jackson-Olin HS	1,388	Birmingham City
Spain Park HS	1,404	Hoover City
Clay-Chalkville HS	1,410	Jefferson County
Robert E. Lee HS	1,417	Montgomery County
Dothan HS	1,440	Dothan City

Pelham HS	1,463	Shelby County
Jefferson Davis HS	1,485	Montgomery County
Foley HS	1,519	Baldwin County
Central HS	1,528	Phenix City
Blount HS	1,529	Mobile County
Gadsden City HS	1,531	Gadsden City
Davidson HS	1,550	Mobile County
Huntsville HS	1,575	Huntsville City
Austin HS	1,583	Decatur City
Alma Bryant HS	1,644	Mobile County
Thompson HS	1,650	Shelby County
Sparkman HS	1,679	Madison County
Theodore HS	1,690	Mobile County
Oak Mountain HS	1,710	Shelby County
Vestavia Hills HS	1,711	Vestavia Hills City
Mary G. Montgomery HS	1,757	Mobile County
Smiths Station HS	1,760	Lee County
Tuscaloosa County HS	1,773	Tuscaloosa County
Hoover HS	1,777	Hoover City
Baker HS	1,920	Mobile County
Grissom HS	1,971	Huntsville City

Bob Jones HS	2,056	Madison City
Prattville HS	2,238	Autauga County
Murphy HS	2,540	Mobile County
