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ABSTRACT

The purposes of the study were to investigate factors that motivate students in grades 6-12 to study instrumental music and to identify motivation techniques employed by middle and high school band directors. Three main research questions guided the study: (1) What do students consider to be their motivations in pursuing instrumental music study? (2) Are these motivations intrinsic or extrinsic? (3) What techniques do directors use to motivate students, and with what results? Nineteen schools participated in the survey, yielding 891 student surveys and 19 director surveys. Student participants indicated that learning new music is the single greatest motivating factor. No single motivation technique was found to significantly impact student motivation, but student motivation levels tend to rise with the number of motivation techniques employed by the director.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The development of musical performance skills is a complex process. Why some students succeed and some do not is a question that has puzzled music educators for many years. Success has been attributed to many factors, including talent, quality and quantity of instruction, parental support, and motivation to practice, among others.

Statement of the Problem

The purposes of the study were to investigate factors that motivate students in grades 6-12 to study instrumental music, to identify motivation techniques employed by middle and high school band directors, and to suggest potential implications for teaching.

Significance of the Problem

This study is significant because it will identify specific student motivations for music education and suggest solutions to improve student motivation for practicing. The research questions are designed to gain an understanding of the nature of student motivation and what potential solutions might exist when intrinsic motivation is lacking.

Research Questions

1. What do students consider to be their motivations in pursuing instrumental music study?
2. Are these motivations intrinsic or extrinsic?
3. What techniques do directors use to motivate students, and with what results?
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In an effort to help band students improve their skills, music educators seek to encourage the development of good practice strategies. A large body of research has been devoted to the role of motivation in musical practice.

Defining Motivation

Motivation can be indicated by three types of behavior—choices that a person makes, persistence, and level of activity (Maehr, 1983; Maehr, Pintrich, & Linnenbrink, 2002). Marsh and his colleagues studied academic motivation orientation in terms of the following constructs: ego, competition, mastery, intrinsic, cooperation, individual, approach success, and avoid failure (Marsh, Craven, Hinkley, & Debus, 2003). This combination of constructs has also been studied in the specific context of instrumental music (Schmidt, 2005). Motivating factors in music have included effort, family background, classroom environment, musical ability, and affect for music (Asmus & Harrison, 1990). Affect and cognition—how students feel and think—is also important in inferring the level and depth of motivation (Maehr et al., 2002).

Early motivation research focused on internal factors as motivating behavior. During the behavioral revolution, the focus turned to external forces (Maehr et al., 2002). Behavioral psychologist B. F. Skinner distinguished among “real,” “natural,” and “functional” reinforcements (analogous to what some would call intrinsic motivation) and “educational” reinforcements, for example, grades or extrinsic motivation (Skinner, 1953). Skinner defines “progressive education” as that which introduces “real” reinforcements as often and as soon as
possible. After the launching of Sputnik I in 1957, the cognitive revolution led researches to again consider internal cognitions as determining behavior (Maehr et al., 2002). Cognitive psychologist Jerome Bruner defined an intrinsic motive as one that does not depend upon reward that lies outside the activity that it impels. Instead, the reward lies in the successful termination of that activity or in the activity itself. Intrinsic motives for learning identified by Bruner include curiosity, drive to achieve competence, identification, and reciprocity (Bruner, 1966).

One factor that has been used as an indicator of musical motivation is whether a student persists in music or drops out. Motivation has been found to play a more important role in this decision than do external factors such as demographics or abilities (Costa-Giomi, 2004), although socioeconomic level has been shown to predict students’ intentions to continue participation in instrumental instruction (Corenblum & Marshall, 1998; Kinney, 2010; Klinedinst, 1991; McCarthy, 1980). Students’ own attitudes have been found to be a more important predictor than the influence of family or friends (Hallam, 1998). Achievement has been found not to be the best predictor of a decision to drop out (Costa-Giomi, Flowers, & Sasaki, 2005).

Students who dropped out of music instruction experienced more shame as a result of failure when they practiced and still did not succeed, while students who persisted experienced more shame as a result of failure when they did not practice (Covington, 1983). Criticism has arisen of the suggestion that whether one approaches or avoids a goal is dependent on the affective anticipation of pride and shame because this conception does not acknowledge the role of any other emotions (Weiner, 1984).

Elliott and Dweck defined motivations in terms of reaction to failure (Elliott & Dweck, 1988). Their definitions have also been applied to musical tests (O'Neill & Sloboda, 1997).
Whether or not students attribute success and failure to factors within their control can influence motivation (Austin & Vispoel, 1998).

**Factors Affecting Motivation**

Even if the perfect combination of practice strategies were known, this knowledge would be useless if students did not practice, or if they practiced with only mild extrinsic interest (Pintrich & de Groot, 1990). Attitude is therefore one of the most studied measures in the field of music education, and hence it is a construct that educators desire to understand more fully (Cutietta, 1992). One of the earliest attempts to measure attitude was outlined by Thurstone (1928), who conceded that the solution for measuring attitude is restrictive and applies only under certain conditions. For example, an attitude scale can be used only in situations in which it is reasonable to assume that the subject is telling the truth; an attitude variable must be specified with the measurement restricted to that variable; and the scale used to measure attitudes must be independent of the attitudes that it measures.

It is possible for a student to be highly motivated to practice but not necessarily exhibit a high degree of practice regulation. Conversely, some individuals may regulate their practice to a fair degree, but not necessarily derive motivational benefits from practice (Austin & Berg, 2006). Stambaugh (2011) measured students’ attitude toward practice through the use of a questionnaire which addressed three topics: if the student thought that the practice schedule was effective, if the student would use that practice schedule in future practice, and if the student found the practice satisfying. Findings revealed no significant differences in attitude toward practice when comparing blocked and random practice schedules, but participants in both groups responded positively to their practice conditions. The latter finding could be due to the variance from
normal routine and may imply that students would enjoy using alternative learning strategies and situations (Hewitt, 2001).

Students who displayed short-term commitment to learning their instrument scored lowest on a performance achievement test irrespective of their levels of musical practice, while students who expressed medium-term commitment achieved higher average scores which increased with practice time, and the highest achieving students were those who displayed long-term commitment coupled with high levels of practice (McPherson, 2001). This finding is not transferable to university students, among whom differences in motivation by immediate and long-term career goals were non-significant (Schmidt, Zdzinski, & Ballard, 2006).

In an effort to understand motivation, researchers have sought to understand to what factors (such as effort or ability) students attribute their success or failure (Weiner, 1979, 1984). In a study of student beliefs about the causes of success in music, 80% of the reasons cited for success were internal, such as natural talent (Asmus, 1986). The converse is also true—findings indicate that most students attribute failure to a lack of ability (Austin & Vispoel, 1998). Students who adopt such a belief are less likely to practice unless they view themselves as individuals with the requisite talent. The belief that reasons for success in music are external, such as effort, is congruent with the idea that practicing will make a student a better musician and is more likely to result in students who practice. Gender, school level, and school system have been found to have a significant influence on student attribution in music (Legette, 1998).

What factors contribute to motivation in the realm of musical practice? What are the characteristics of musically motivated students? Amount of practice (Austin & Berg, 2006) and length of involvement predicted by students before learning begins have been suggested as indicators of motivation and commitment, and students who maintain motivation have been
found to be more self-critical, reflective, and conscientious in their practice (Pitts, Davidson, & McPherson, 2000).

Self efficacy, group efficacy, and entity-incremental theory (whether traits and abilities are stable or can be modified) have all been suggested as factors contributing to motivation (Schmidt, 2007). Self efficacy in particular has been examined (McCormick & McPherson, 2003; McPherson & McCormick, 2006; Myers, 1990; Nielson, 2004). Self efficacy is defined as judgment of personal capability, as opposed to self esteem, which is defined as judgment of self worth (Bandura, 1997). In general education, perceived efficacy to achieve has been found to motivate academic achievement by influencing personal goal setting, and self efficacy and goals in combination may contribute to subsequent academic attainment (Zimmerman, Bandura, & Martinez-Pons, 1992). Findings specific to the field of music education indicate a correlation between musical self efficacy and intrinsic interest in music (Austin, 1991). The process of learning specific skills may result in a closer association between student attitudes toward the skills and their perceived ability of the same skills (Kostka, 1997). Students’ self-efficacy for jazz improvisation has been found to increase significantly following exposure to improvisation instruction (Watson, 2010).

The assumption that students with musical aptitude would tend to be motivated to achieve in music has not always been supported (Asmus & Harrison, 1990). Academic achievement has been found to be a predictor of musical achievement (Klinedinst, 1991; McCarthy, 1980), while the addition of a music attitude or self-concept in music measure provided a moderate increase in predictive power (Hedden, 1982). Among professional musicians, family environment and intrinsic motivation for musical activity have been found to be the factors most influencing musical development (Manturzewska, 1990).
Cultural influences can have an effect on the nature of motivation. For example, American music students were found to show a greater reliance on extrinsic motivation than were Chinese music students (Brand, 2001). In The Gambia music is largely self-taught, facilitated by a rich musical environment, expectation to be musical, and motivation to learn. The children in The Gambia are motivated to learn music because they want to participate in the group musical activities (Koops, 2010).

Age and gender can also have an effect on motivation. Younger children’s perceptions of competence and subjective task values in instrumental music are more positive than the beliefs of older children, and girls have more positive competence beliefs and values in instrumental music than do boys (Eccles & Wigfield, 1993). Students who have been playing their instrument for a greater length of time tend to express less motivation for practice (Austin & Berg, 2006). Nolin (1973) also observed a steady and generally significant decline in attitude toward musical study from third grade to sixth grade. The trend was reversed, however, for performance activities, in which attitudes tended to improve. Nolin also suggests the possibility that less frequent class meetings might result in less positive attitudes.

**Intrinsic versus Extrinsic Motivation**

Students are said to be intrinsically motivated when they engage in an activity in the absence of other people or rewards (Maehr et al., 2002). The dichotomy of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has been described in many ways. Nicholls refers to “task-involvement” versus “ego-involvement,” the competitive form of motivation (Nicholls, 1984) and cautions educators against promoting ego involvement instead of creating an environment in which the goal is to create music for the sake of its beauty (Nicholls, 1983). Task-involvement has been found to correlate positively to perceived value and use of study strategies requiring deep processing of
information and, to a lesser degree, value and use of strategies requiring only surface-level processing. Ego-involvement was found to correlate positively to the value and use of surface-level strategies only (Nolen, 1988).

Self-Determination Theory consists of a continuum of motivational levels, rather than a dichotomy (Ryan & Deci, 2000). These levels include amotivation (the state of lacking an intention to act), external regulation (the least autonomous form of extrinsic motivation, performed to satisfy an external demand or obtain an externally imposed reward contingency), introjected regulation (extrinsic, performed with the feeling of pressure in order to avoid guilt or anxiety or to attain ego-enhancements or pride), identification (extrinsic, the person has identified with the personal importance of a behavior and accepted its regulation as his own), integrated regulation (extrinsic, occurs when identified regulations have been fully assimilated to the self), and intrinsic motivation (the prototype of self-determined activity).

The question of intrinsic motivation is not new. Even Plato addressed the subject in his Republic (Plato, trans. 2004). Rousseau made the determination of what a child finds useful and interesting the foundation of his method (Rousseau, 1966). More recently, Piaget asserted that intrinsic motivation is more effective than extrinsic motivation (Piaget, 1977), and Freud theorized about what motivates children to engage in certain behavior (Freud & Strachery, 1975). One purpose of the Woods Hole Conference, according to Piaget, was the consideration of developing intrinsic motivation in students (Piaget, 1977). After Woods Hole, cognitive psychologists such as Jerome Bruner began to consider the nature of intrinsic motivation. Bruner determined that we are intrinsically drawn to that which is unclear, unfinished, or uncertain until the matter becomes clear, finished, or certain (Bruner, 1966). Hence, we find an intrinsic interest
in that which Dewey called “an experience,” whose close is a consummation rather than a cessation (Dewey, 2005).

Some authors assert that extrinsic motivation destroys intrinsic motivation (Montessori, 1964), while others have refuted this assertion (Reiss & Sushinsky, 1975) or even argued that extrinsic motivation can enhance intrinsic motivation (Raynor, 1983). An oft-cited study found no differences that could be ascribed to added incentives (verbal exhortation and cash incentive) as compared to learning without added incentives (Rubin-Rabson, 1941). Conversely, deCharms (1984) predicted that an extrinsic reinforcer would cause an action to disappear or diminish when the reinforcer is removed because the reinforcer would cause the actor to lose the feeling of freedom, ownership, and choice. Indeed, subjects who expect and receive an extrinsic reward have shown less subsequent intrinsic interest in an activity than subjects who did not (Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973). Skinner, an advocate for progressive education, conceded that extrinsic reinforcement is sometimes necessary (Skinner, 1953).

In the field of music education, extrinsic rewards include awards, chair placement, rankings, trips, and trophies (Lautzenheiser, 1997). Descriptive inquiry specific to music practice has revealed the results of extrinsic motivation to be inconsistent, and students who persist in music instruction tend to be more intrinsically motivated (Pitts et al., 2000).

What are the conditions of intrinsically interesting activities? Suggestions include challenge, clear goals and feedback, and greater degree of control than ordinary life (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Malone (1981) examined the elements that children find intrinsically motivating in games and applied his findings to a theoretical framework of intrinsically motivating instruction. Malone included challenge, fantasy, and curiosity as elements of intrinsic environments.
To what degree are the conditions of intrinsic motivation present when students are practicing an instrument? Why are some students motivated to practice while others are not? Exceptional young pianist Ji-Yong describes practicing as an activity which he loves and “can’t live without,” but even he has struggled with periods in which he did not feel motivated to practice (O’Riley, 2009). This observation is consistent with the finding that motivation fluctuates among children of all ability and interest levels (Pitts et al., 2000) and implies the existence of deterrents to practicing. Bernstein suggests that loneliness is perhaps the major deterrent to practicing (Bernstein, 1981).

Techniques to Influence Motivation

Because the external pressure to study music is less than in other areas, the degree to which musical motivation is intrinsic rather than extrinsic is especially crucial (McPherson & Zimmerman, 2002; Thomas, 1992). If directors do not lead students to discover the intrinsic benefits of participation, students may quit when extrinsic rewards are not satisfying (Lautzenheiser, 1997). Band directors concede that only a small percentage of students participate in band for the love of music (Rudaitis & Lovell, 1996). Ericsson, Krampe, and Tesch-Römer assert that deliberate practice is not inherently enjoyable and that individuals are motivated to engage in it by its more extrinsic value in improving performance (Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Romer, 1993). Social motivation has been found to have the highest effect on attraction to participation in band. Musical motivation has been found to predict attraction to participation, but not as strongly as does social motivation (Warnock, 2005). This finding is troubling in that high school students have rated music activities among the least socially prestigious school activities (Holland & Andre, 1995). The finding is not transferrable to college
choir members, among whom the value of music was found to be the strongest direct predictor of the intention to persist in music (Sichivitsa, 2003).

Finding strategies to develop intrinsic motivation has been called the most important task for beginning instrumentalists and their teachers (Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010; Pitts et al., 2000; Teachout, 1997). Assuming that all people possess some degree of motivation, the question becomes not how to motivate students but how to direct behavior (Maehr, 1983). Behavioral psychologists identify the desire to control behavior as the reason for studying motivation (Skinner, 1953). Nolin recommends that teachers modify their approaches to result in more positive student attitudes toward music study (Nolin, 1973). The Asmus (1986) study also indicated that teachers can influence student beliefs, because the school attended significantly indicated how students responded.

If teachers are able to determine what motivates students, instruction can be designed to capitalize on those characteristics. For example, a study indicating that undergraduate non-music majors are motivated by affect for music includes the recommendation that instruction should emphasize the affective aspects of music (Asmus & Harrison, 1990).

In a survey of 542 elementary music students, most respondents indicated a positive attitude toward singing (Mizener, 1993). Parsons (1983) asserts that most people get intrinsic value from some aspect of music, and to the extent that teachers can identify the source of intrinsic interest and incorporate it into instruction, the teacher can increase intrinsic motivation. Toward that end, Parsons suggests allowing the students some choice over the pieces that they learn. Findings also indicate that using student-selected repertoire resulted in an increase in practice time (Greco, 1997; Renwick & McPherson, 2002). In a study of twenty-eight instrumental students, over half reported increased enjoyment of practice when provided with
variety and choice of practice techniques (Da Costa, 1999). Other researchers have echoed the need to allow students a voice in instructional design (Brändström, 1996; Espuny i Pujol, 2004; Mackworth-Young, 1990; Power, 2008). Such an approach might require a restatement of learning objectives as a disparity of preferences for instructional objectives has been found between students and teachers (Murphy & Brown, 1986).

Teachers can also have a positive influence on students’ motivation by avoiding certain conditions. An excessive emphasis on aural skills and conventional music notation at the expense of other musical contexts has been offered as an explanation of decreased motivation (Mota, 1999).

The use of competition to promote motivation is a common debate among music educators. Thomas (1992) suggests that research should explore whether competition is beneficial or harmful and points to performance anxiety as a potentially harmful companion to competition. Early research indicated that competition might not have a positive effect on motivation (Austin, 1991), but the effects of contribution are less detrimental among pre-adolescent students (Austin, 1988). More recent research has indicated that even very young musicians experience the detrimental effects of performance anxiety (Boucher & Ryan, 2011). Researchers disagree as to whether emotions occur after behavior or if affect may motivate behavior. If affect motivates behavior, then fear or anxiety may reduce engagement (Maehr et al., 2002). Findings have also suggested that competition is not an effective strategy to promote intrinsic motivation because the link between these two elements (competition and intrinsic motivation) is not viable (Smith, 2005).

Enlisting the help of parents can be an important action for teachers to take (McPherson, 2009; McPherson & Zimmerman, 2002). Students who report having a quiet and comfortable
place to practice at home demonstrate significantly higher practice motivation than students who lack such an environment (Austin & Berg, 2006). Statistically significant relationships have been found between home musical environments and musical achievement (Brand, 1986).

In a study of private piano teachers, the two most often-mentioned strategies for motivating students to practice were repertoire assignment and examinations (Jorgensen, 1986). Teaching specific practice techniques to students is also recommended as students who are more cognitively engaged during their practicing tend to express more intrinsic interest in learning their instrument (McPherson & McCormick, 1999). This finding is consistent with research in non-musical learning (Pintrich & de Groot, 1990).

**Measuring Motivation**

Having defined motivation, motivation must be measured. Many relevant thoughts and feelings are conscious and known by the subjects, so the best way to gain information about an individual is to directly ask the subject (Weiner, 1984). Confidence that data provided in self-report methods are accurate is justified when student responses are anonymous and free of evaluative consequences; students reflect on context-specific behaviors or events in which they are presently engaged; efforts are made to minimize response bias through item/scale development and refinement; and evidence of psychometric quality is provided (Austin & Berg, 2006). Self-report measurements of motivation have been criticized as inaccurate in a study that found no significant effect of motivation for music on aural skills performance in college students (Harrison, Asmus, & Serpe, 1994).

Because true-false formats can be problematic because of susceptibility to socially desirable responses, a preferable format is one in which the child is asked to identify which kind
of kid is most like him or her (given choices) and then asked whether this is only sort of true or really true for him or her (Harter, 1981).

In a study measuring the magnitude of musical motivation, students were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement on four-point Likert-type scales. The three areas assessed (with a representative item statement) were: Personal Commitment (“Music is a very important part of my life”), School Music (“Music class is my favorite class of the day”), and Music Compared to Other Activities (“Attending a musical activity is more important to me than attending a sports activity”) (Asmus & Harrison, 1990).

Another study tested the motivation of band members by asking students if they had ever challenged for chair placements and how frequently. A positive correlation was observed between practice time and frequency of challenging (Chandler, Chiarella, & Auria, 1987).
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants

The target population for this study was middle and high school band students and band directors in Georgia during the 2009-2010 or 2010-2011 school year. To ensure proportional representation from across the state, a stratified random sampling technique was employed. Before any band directors were contacted or any survey packages were mailed, school system policies were investigated to ensure that the surveying of students and/or teachers would not be a violation of board policy. If authorization for research could not be confirmed, the school was not included in the sample. Survey packages were delivered to 26 schools. 19 survey packages were returned, resulting in a response rate of 73%. Nine out of the 13 districts in the Georgia Music Educators Association was represented in the responding sample.

Student respondents \((n = 891)\) were male \((n = 442)\) and female \((n = 440)\) middle school \((n = 416)\) and high school \((n = 453)\) students who were enrolled in a band class at their school. Nine respondents declined to indicate their gender; 22 respondents declined to indicate their grade level. Band class sizes of participating schools ranged from 18 to 93 \((M = 44)\). Director respondents \((n = 19)\) were middle school \((n = 7)\), high school \((n = 10)\), and combined middle/high school \((n = 2)\) band directors. Directors’ years of teaching experience ranged from 2 to 40 \((M = 19)\).
Instruments

The Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale (Appendix A), adapted from a measure previously developed by Sandene (1997), was administered to all student participants. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability for Sandene’s original scale was .95. For the current study, items from Sandene’s scale were modified in an attempt to emphasize motivation specifically for practicing. The modified scale was pilot tested to ensure reliability and clarity of the scale items and directions. Pilot participants \((n = 84)\) were middle and high school band students at a single school. Cronbach’s alpha reliability was found to be .97. Following the pilot study, several items were reworded to relate to band specifically instead of to music in general, and the directions were reworded to increase clarity.

The Director Survey (Appendix B) was developed by the researcher and administered to all director participants. Twelve motivation techniques were included on the instrument and were drawn from a review of research literature related to motivation techniques. Directors were also given the option to include additional techniques and were asked to indicate which technique they have found to be the most effective.

Procedures

After approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the researcher’s university, band directors in the random sample (selected using a table of random numbers) were contacted and invited to participate in the study. Directors were asked to indicate the number of students in their highest level band class so that the appropriate number of student surveys (Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale) could be supplied. Packages were then mailed to all participating schools. Each package contained the appropriate number of student surveys, a Director Survey, and a self-addressed stamped return envelope. Included with each survey
(students and director) was a cover letter that detailed the study purpose and value of participation. Participants were informed that completing the anonymous survey was voluntary and any information that may identify any participant would remain confidential.

Participating band directors were asked to administer the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale to their students. Each student survey was supplied in an individual envelope. Students were instructed to place their completed survey in the envelope and seal it to ensure that only the researcher would see their responses. After band directors returned the package to the researcher, the surveys were scored and the data were entered into PASW Statistics 18 for analysis.

Survey packages were returned from 19 schools. All 19 packages contained a completed Director Survey. Student surveys were discarded if one or more of the 48 items was left unanswered. Student surveys were not discarded if the student neglected to respond to the demographic questions (grade and gender). A total of 891 student surveys were included in the analysis.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale was administered to all participating students between February and September of 2010. Prior to analysis, negatively-worded items were re-coded in order to reflect appropriate mean values. Individual items in the scale were scored on a 4-point scale, resulting in a range of possible mean values from 1.0 (low) to 4.0 (high). Table I presents descriptive statistic results for all variables in the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale.

Table I

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Variables, Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale (n = 891)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Band is a very important part of my life.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I work hard to do well in band.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would practice my band instrument even if my teacher or parents didn’t tell me to.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I like myself best when I am playing my band instrument.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My parents and teachers don’t need to remind me to practice.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Playing my band instrument is more important to me than watching television.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I don’t look at the clock very much when I practice.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I enjoy band class more than any other classes I take.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I practice hard at home.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I want to be involved in musical activities more than other activities.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sometimes I practice extra music at home that isn’t assigned.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would rather play an instrument than read a book.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I like to go back and play music which I’ve already learned.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Band is one of my favorite classes of the day.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Attending a musical activity is more important to me than attending a sports activity.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I don’t like learning new music.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If I could, I would spend more time playing my band instrument.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sometimes I play music on my band instrument for fun which isn’t an assignment.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am willing to put more time into my music than most of my other interests.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I don’t put any more time into my practicing than I need to.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. If I can, I will be involved in music all my life.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sometimes I completely forget about the time when I’m practicing.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Time goes very slow for me when I’m practicing.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I can do without other things, but I have to have music.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Sometimes I think about quitting band.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The only time I practice at home is if someone tells me to.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am willing to work harder on my music than everything else.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. If some music is too hard for me, I sometimes give up trying on it.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Band is one of my favorite activities.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. I don’t practice my instrument very much at home.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. If I had my way, I would spend more time in band class.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. When I practice I keep working until I get things right.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I would like to pursue a career in music.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I like to spend time outside of class working with other students on my band instrument.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The main reason I am in band is so that I can be with my friends.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. If my friends quit band, I might quit also.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I would be in band even if none of my friends were in it.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. If there were other classes I could take instead of band, I would take them instead.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. If there were things I could learn other than playing my instrument, I would choose them instead.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I work harder in other classes than I do in band.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I practice my band instrument mainly because it makes me feel good inside.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The main reason I practice is to learn new things.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I would practice for band class even if we didn’t get graded on it.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I like music that makes me work hard to learn it.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I often choose music that I will learn something from even if it will require more practice.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I try harder in band if we are getting graded on things.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I would be in band even if I knew I wouldn’t get an “A” in it.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. It doesn’t matter if we get grades in band or not, I will still try the same.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lowest item mean (2.21) was found for the statement, “I try harder in band if we are getting graded on things,” whereas the highest item mean (3.42) was found for the statement, “I don’t like learning new music.” Both of these statements were reverse-scored items, meaning that a response of “Strongly Agree” indicated the lowest level of motivation and a response of “Strongly Disagree” indicated the highest level of motivation.

Table II presents descriptive statistics for the overall administration of the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale. Analysis of the data indicated that the mean scores were, for the most part, normally distributed with a slight negative skew. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the scale was .96.

Table II

*Descriptive Statistics, Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale (n = 891)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>136.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>25.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III presents mean values and standard deviations for the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale scores for each of the schools participating in the study. Mean scores of 48 to 84 were considered low; scores of 85 to 120 were considered moderately low; mean scores of 121 to 157 were considered moderately high, and mean scores of 158 to 192 were considered high.

Table III

Descriptive Statistics for Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale Scores for Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>130.89</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>150.30</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>146.65</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>126.69</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>128.80</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>127.32</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>119.34</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>144.68</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>127.26</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 11</td>
<td>133.35</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 12</td>
<td>127.56</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 13</td>
<td>140.53</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 14</td>
<td>145.97</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 15</td>
<td>147.45</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 16</td>
<td>139.42</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lowest mean score (115.00) was found for School 3, whereas the highest mean score (149.31) was found for School 17. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of Motivation in Instrumental Music scores among schools indicated an overall statistically significant difference among schools ($F = 7.10, p < .001$). Scheffé comparisons between mean scores of each of the schools indicated significantly different mean scores between School 2 and School 3 ($p < .05$), between School 3 and School 14 ($p < .05$), between School 3 and School 15 ($p < .05$), between School 3 and School 17 ($p < .001$), and between School 5 and School 17 ($p < .05$).

An independent samples $t$ test revealed no significant difference ($t = 1.31, p > .05$) in Motivation in Instrumental Music scores by gender, and a Levene’s test confirmed equality of variances ($F = 0.01, p > .05$). The same procedure indicated significantly higher Motivation in Instrumental Music scores for high school students than middle school students ($t = 5.07, p < .05$). Similarly, a significant positive correlation was found between grade level and Motivation in Instrumental Music scores ($r = .12, p < .001$). Among middle school students only, a significant negative correlation was found between grade level and Motivation in Instrumental Music scores ($r = -.19, p < .001$). No significant correlation was found between grade level and Motivation in Instrumental Music scores among high school students only ($r = .05, p > .05$).

The Director Survey was administered to the band directors of all participating schools. Each of the 19 directors was asked to indicate which motivational techniques they employed,
resulting in a frequency of 0 (low) to 19 (high) for each item. Table IV presents the results of the Directors Survey.

Table IV

*Director Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency of Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching students that effort is more important than ability in musical achievement.</td>
<td>15 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emphasizing the affective aspects of music.</td>
<td>11 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Determining students’ musical interests and incorporating those interests into instruction.</td>
<td>11 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Allowing students a choice in repertoire selection.</td>
<td>15 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Allowing students a choice in instructional design.</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avoiding instructional elements to which students respond negatively.</td>
<td>7 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The use of competition within the classroom.</td>
<td>10 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The use of competition outside the classroom.</td>
<td>8 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enlisting the help of parents.</td>
<td>15 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grading students on the amount of practice time they complete.</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Grading students on the execution of specific skills or assigned repertoire.</td>
<td>17 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teaching students about specific practice techniques.</td>
<td>15 (79%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest frequency (17) was found for the statement, “Grading students on the execution of specific skills or assigned repertoire,” whereas the lowest frequency (2) was found for the statement, “Allowing students a choice in instructional design.” No significant correlation
was found between the number of motivation techniques employed by the director and the mean Motivation in Instrumental Music Scores. However, School 3 and School 8 directors employed the lowest number of motivation techniques (2 and 3, respectively). These schools also ranked the lowest in Motivation in Instrumental Music Scores ($M = 115.00$ and $M = 119.34$, respectively). The director of School 2 was the only director who reported to employ all 12 motivation techniques, and School 2 also ranked the highest in Motivation in Instrumental Music Scores ($M = 150.30$).

While independent samples $t$ tests revealed no significant differences between the use of specific motivation techniques and school motivation scores, the greatest mean difference was found for the statement, “Teaching students that effort is more important than ability in musical achievement.” Schools with directors who employed this technique scored higher on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale ($M = 138.02$, $SD = 9.11$) than schools with directors who did not ($M = 127.82$, $SD = 13.11$). The least mean difference was found for the statement, “Grading students on the amount of practice time they complete.” Schools with directors who employed this technique scored lower on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale ($M = 134.77$, $SD = 13.45$) than schools with directors who did not ($M = 136.08$, $SD = 10.45$).

No significant correlations were found between directors’ years of experience and school motivation scores, class size and school motivation scores, directors’ years of experience and number of techniques employed, or class size and number of techniques employed.

Two open-ended questions appeared on the Director Survey. One asked directors to list additional motivation techniques that they employed, while the other asked directors to indicate which motivation technique they believed to be the most effective. Other techniques listed by directors include: possible loss of chair placement; cutting students from parts for incorrect
playing; encouraging students for what they can do as opposed to focusing on what they cannot; the use of a pass-off system that helps students focus on their strengths; teamwork and collaboration; interdisciplinary emphasis; testing on fundamentals; and teaching students ownership of the band program.

In response to the second open-ended question, some directors indicated one of the survey items as the most effective motivation technique, while other directors indicated other techniques. Of the survey items, only one was identified as the most effective by more than one director. Item 3, “Determining students’ musical interests and incorporating those interests into instruction,” was identified as the most effective by two directors. Other items identified as most effective include items 2, 7, 8, 9, and 12. Non-survey items identified as the most effective include: appealing to students’ desire to perform well; use of positive encouragement; requiring students to play tests in front of the class or as chair placement tests; making students successful; teaching students ownership of the band program; teaching students that they are personally responsible for their success; availability of the director after school hours; and making sure that the students know the director cares about them as individuals.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Findings related to the first research question (What do students consider to be their motivations in pursuing instrumental music study?) suggest that the most common motivating factor for students is repertoire. The highest item mean (3.42) on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale was found for the statement, “I don’t like learning new music” (reverse-scored). A comparatively high item mean was found for the statements, “I like to go back and play music which I’ve already learned” ($M = 3.14$) and “Sometimes I play music on my band instrument for fun which isn’t an assignment ($M = 2.97$).

Ninety-two percent of student respondents indicated that they like learning new music. Even among students who scored below 121 on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale ($N = 216$), 79% of respondents indicated that they like learning new music. This finding suggests that even students who are otherwise less motivated in band enjoy exposure to new and varied repertoire. Similarly, 84% of student respondents indicated that they like to go back and play music that they have already learned and 76% of student respondents indicated that they like to play music for fun which is not an assignment. These findings suggest that it is not only new music that motivates students, but that most students (even those who are otherwise less motivated in band) enjoy interacting with the repertoire.

Results of the Director Survey indicate that schools with directors who allow students a choice in repertoire selection scored higher on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale ($M = 137.54$, $SD = 9.16$) than schools with directors who do not ($M = 129.62$, $SD = 14.54$). Although
not statistically significant, this finding corroborates the interest in repertoire indicated by students on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale.

The comparatively high item mean (2.98) for the statement, “If some music is too hard for me, I sometimes give up trying on it” (reverse-scored) may suggest that the repertoire motivates some students to persist even when challenged. Alternatively, when coupled with the relatively high item mean (3.02) for the statement, “When I practice I keep working until I get things right,” this finding may suggest that the desire to improve is the motivating factor. Above-average means for the statements, “I like music that makes me work hard to learn it” ($M = 2.95$) and “I often choose music that I will learn something from even if it will require more practice” ($M = 2.91$) may lend support to the latter possibility but still demonstrate a positive student response to interaction with repertoire. Future research should include survey items with distinctions made between the motivational effects of practicing repertoire versus practicing skills.

In light of the findings related to the first research question, band directors should critically consider their selection of repertoire. Their selection should be, in part, a response to students’ musical interests. Directors should also consider increasing the amount of repertoire to which they expose their students. Motivation techniques such as these may assist directors in recruiting and retaining students who might otherwise lose interest. Such techniques may also reduce the gap that some researchers have perceived between students’ musical culture outside of school and the musical culture within a school (Snead, 2010).

The second research question focused on the intrinsic or extrinsic nature of motivations. Although some researchers employ a strict definition of intrinsic motivation (Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Römer, 1993; Ryan & Deci, 2000), the present study relies on Bruner’s (1966)
definition. Bruner defined intrinsic motivation as motivation “that does not depend upon reward that lies outside the activity it impels” (p. 114). Bruner also specified that the drive to achieve competence is an intrinsic motive (p. 117). By this definition, the two most common motivating factors in the present study (interaction with the repertoire and the desire to improve) are considered intrinsic in nature.

Ryan and Deci’s (2000) levels of motivation can also be applied to the present findings. At the amotivation level, students do not practice. Fifty-six percent of student respondents indicated that they do not practice their instrument very much at home. Fifty-seven percent of student respondents indicated that they practice hard at home. The slight inconsistency suggested by these findings could be due to differing interpretations of qualifiers such as “very much” or “hard.” Future research should include survey items that are more precise, such as “I never practice my instrument at home.”

At the external regulation level, students practice to avoid punishment. Only 29% of student respondents indicated that they only practice at home if someone tells them to. Sixty-three percent of student respondents indicated that their parents and teachers do not need to remind them to practice. These findings suggest a relative consistency among responses.

At the identification level, students practice to get good grades. Seventy-three percent of student respondents indicated that they would practice for band class even if they did not get graded on it. Similarly, 80% of student respondents indicated that they would be in band even if they knew they would not receive an “A,” and 82% of student respondents indicated that they would put forth the same amount of effort irrespective of grades. In a seeming contradiction, 63% of student respondents indicated that they put forth greater effort if they are getting graded. A possible explanation for this contradiction is that all items related to grades appeared on the
back page of the survey. Many students, possibly bored or rushed by the end of the survey, selected the same response to all six items on the back page of the survey. As a result, only 30% of student respondents gave consistent responses between the statements, “I try harder in band if we are getting graded on things” (reverse-scored) and “It doesn’t matter if we get grades in band or not, I will still try the same.” Future research should utilize shorter student surveys, or spread related items throughout the survey. For the purposes of the present study, the last six items of the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale should be interpreted with caution.

Despite these limitations, the results of the Director Survey corroborate the finding that grades are not a strong motivational force. Two items on the Director Survey were related to grades: grading students on the amount of practice time they complete and grading students on the execution of specific skills or assigned repertoire. Schools with directors who reported grading students based on practice time scored lower on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale ($M = 134.77, SD = 13.45$) than schools with directors who did not ($M = 136.08, SD = 10.45$). Likewise, schools with directors who reported grading students based on the execution of skills or repertoire also scored lower on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale ($M = 135.15, SD = 10.83$) than schools with directors who did not ($M = 142.04, SD = 6.53$). These findings lend support to Montessori’s belief that extrinsic techniques decrease motivation.

At the integrated regulation level, students practice to become better musicians. While Ryan and Deci (2000) would consider this motive to be extrinsic, this researcher (relying on Bruner’s definition) considers this motive to be intrinsic. As demonstrated previously, students participating in the present study considered the desire to improve to be a strong motive for pursuing instrumental study.
The only motive that Ryan and Deci would consider to be intrinsic is the joy of playing an instrument. Items on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale suggesting this level of motivation include “I like myself best when I am playing my instrument” and “I practice my band instrument mainly because it makes me feel good inside.” The comparatively low item means for these statements (2.71 and 2.59, respectively) suggest that few students have obtained this level of motivation.

In light of these findings, band directors should consider reducing emphasis on extrinsic techniques such as grades, which may prove difficult given the current emphasis on assessment in education. Social motivations may also have been overstated by some authors (for example, Rudaitis & Lovell). Relatively high item means for the statements, “The main reason I am in band is so that I can be with my friends” (reverse-scored, $M = 2.87$), “If my friends quit band, I might quit also” (reverse-scored, $M = 3.13$), and “I would be in band even if none of my friends were in it” ($M = 3.05$) suggest that participants in the present study did not consider social attraction to be a strong motive for pursuing instrumental music study. This finding is contradictory to that of Warnock (2005), who found social motivation to have the highest effect on attraction to participation in band. Warnock, however, considered social attraction to be a musical (as opposed to extra-musical) motivation.

The third research question pertained to the techniques that band directors use to motivate their students. The task of motivating students may be particularly important for middle school directors as the middle school students participating in the study scored significantly lower on the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale than did the high school students. Further, motivation scores tended to significantly decrease during the middle school years, but slightly increase during the high school years. A possible explanation for this trend reversal is that as
beginners, middle school students view band as new and exciting. The students may begin to lose interest in band as they get older and discover new interests. Since only band students were surveyed in this study (and not students who had dropped out of band), motivation scores were found to be higher among high school students because only those students who were motivated in band in middle school are likely to persist in high school. Further research is needed to confirm whether high school band students are naturally more motivated than middle school band students, or if high school directors are more effectively motivating their students than are middle school directors.

While the findings of the Director Survey were not statistically significant, the data suggest that the number of techniques employed may be more important than which techniques are employed. Directors who employ a broad approach (using many motivation techniques) may be more likely to have more motivated students than directors who employ a focused approach (using fewer motivation techniques).

Teaching students that effort is more important than ability in musical achievement may be the single most effective motivation technique. Since most students attribute success or failure to ability (Asmus, 1986; Austin & Vispoel, 1998), it is understandable that teaching students otherwise yields higher motivation levels. Students are more likely to practice if they believe they are capable of improving. Band directors should consistently remind students of the importance of effort, and should introduce students to relevant examples of musicians who have overcome ability challenges through effort.

Grading students on the amount of practice time they complete may be the single least effective motivation technique. Further research is needed to determine if this finding is due to students’ negative reaction to grades or if it is due to the ineffectiveness of measuring practice
time as determined by Wagner (1975). Since the amount of time spent practicing is less
important than the specific practice techniques used (Miksza, 2006), directors might want to
consider assessing students on how they practice, rather than how long they practice. Johnson
(2009) has suggested a practice chart that helps students focus on specific techniques rather than
the amount of time that they practice. In the current study, schools with directors who teach
students about specific practice techniques scored higher on the Motivation in Instrumental
Music Scale ($M = 137.80$, $SD = 9.61$) than schools with directors who do not ($M = 128.63$, $SD =
12.20$).

The most common technique among directors in the sample was grading students on the
execution of specific skills or assigned repertoire. Ninety percent of the directors in the sample
reported using this technique, possibly as an alternative to grading students on the amount of
practice time they complete, a technique used by only 16% of directors in the sample. However,
grading students on the execution of specific skills or assigned repertoire was not found to be an
effective motivation technique, possibly due once again to students’ negative reaction to grades.
This finding lends further support to the importance that directors should place on repertoire
selection. Since repertoire plays a large role in student motivation, carefully chosen repertoire
might motivate students to practice more effectively than do grades, while also addressing the
skills and concepts that might otherwise be addressed through graded assignments.

The least common technique among directors in the sample was allowing students a
choice in instructional design. Only 11% of the directors in the sample reported using this
technique. Some directors may have avoided this item on the survey because they found it to be
vague. Perhaps directors do not use this technique because they feel that it is their job, and not
the students’, to make decisions about instructional design. Pressure to adhere to national and
state standards, as well as local system policies, may not allow directors the flexibility to give students a choice in instructional design. Analysis of the Director Survey results revealed a very slight increase in Motivation in Instrumental Music scores for schools with directors who use this technique ($M = 138.50, SD = 16.69$) over schools with directors who do not ($M = 135.56, SD = 10.34$).

This study was designed with the intent of suggesting potential implications for motivating students. In addition to the implications previously discussed, some additional suggestions can be offered. The predominantly intrinsic nature of student motivation should encourage directors to base their programs on musical, as opposed to extra-musical, foundations. For example, participation in band for social reasons or to get “an easy grade” may have been previously overestimated. Most students may be more attracted to meaningful interactions with repertoire and to the opportunity for musical growth. These aesthetic attractions to music and the practice of justifying music programs by such are consistent with the beliefs of the early music education philosophers (Leonhard & House, 1972; Reimer, 1970).

Because no significant evidence can be given as to the relative effectiveness of different motivation techniques, it is critically important that band directors share, discuss, and evaluate motivation strategies with their colleagues. Such discussion and evaluation should focus on observed effectiveness and should be viewed in light of the research implications. There is a continued need for training to help directors understand the relationship between their actions and student motivation, specifically as it relates to continued student achievement. This training may come in the form of dissemination of motivation research through music education publications as well as through sustained professional development for music teachers in the field.
Further research should be conducted to determine the test-retest reliability of the Motivation in Instrumental Music Scale as well as the reliability of motivation techniques actually employed by band directors. Research studies employing different methodologies (for example, interviews, case studies) may prove useful in identifying sources of student motivation and effectiveness of motivation techniques. As additional motivation research is completed in the field of music education, practitioners and researchers can become better informed of various factors that may influence students’ motivation in instrumental music.
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APPENDIX A

MOTIVATION IN INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC SCALE

The items in this survey ask your opinion about various aspects of music and musical activities. Each item consists of a statement to which you are to respond by circling either “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” Disagree,” or “Strongly Disagree.” Please choose only one answer for each question.

Please be sure to complete the front and back of each page.

Upon completion of the survey, please fold your survey, place it in the attached envelope, and seal the envelope. This will ensure that only the researcher will see your responses. Do not put your name on this survey.

1. Band is a very important part of my life.
   Strongly Agree          Agree          Disagree          Strongly Disagree

2. I work hard to do well in band.
   Strongly Agree          Agree          Disagree          Strongly Disagree

3. I would practice my band instrument even if my teacher or parents didn’t tell me to.
   Strongly Agree          Agree          Disagree          Strongly Disagree

4. I like myself best when I am playing my band instrument.
   Strongly Agree          Agree          Disagree          Strongly Disagree

5. My parents and teachers don’t need to remind me to practice.
   Strongly Agree          Agree          Disagree          Strongly Disagree
6. Playing my band instrument is more important to me than watching television.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

7. I don’t look at the clock very much when I practice.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

8. I enjoy band class more than any other classes I take.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

9. I practice hard at home.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

10. I want to be involved in musical activities more than other activities.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

11. Sometimes I practice extra music at home that isn’t assigned.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

12. I would rather play an instrument than read a book.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

13. I like to go back and play music which I’ve already learned.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

14. Band is one of my favorite classes of the day.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree
15. Attending a musical activity is more important to me than attending a sports activity.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

16. I don’t like learning new music.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

17. If I could, I would spend more time playing my band instrument.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

18. Sometimes I play music on my band instrument for fun which isn’t an assignment.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

19. I am willing to put more time into my music than most of my other interests.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

20. I don’t put any more time into my practicing than I need to.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

21. If I can, I will be involved in music all my life.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

22. Sometimes I completely forget about the time when I’m practicing.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

23. Time goes very slow for me when I’m practicing.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
24. I can do without other things, but I have to have music.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

25. Sometimes I think about quitting band.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

26. The only time I practice at home is if someone tells me to.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

27. I am willing to work harder on my music than everything else.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

28. If some music is too hard for me, I sometimes give up trying on it.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

29. Band is one of my favorite activities.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

30. I don’t practice my instrument very much at home.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

31. If I had my way, I would spend more time in band class.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree

32. When I practice I keep working until I get things right.

Strongly Agree    Agree    Disagree    Strongly Disagree
33. I would like to pursue a career in music.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

34. I like to spend time outside of class working with other students on my band instrument.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

35. The main reason I am in band is so that I can be with my friends.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

36. If my friends quit band, I might quit also.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

37. I would be in band even if none of my friends were in it.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

38. If there were other classes I could take instead of band, I would take them instead.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

39. If there were things I could learn other than playing my instrument, I would choose them instead.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

40. I work harder in other classes than I do in band.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

41. I practice my band instrument mainly because it makes me feel good inside.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
42. The main reason I practice is to learn new things.

Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

43. I would practice for band class even if we didn’t get graded on it.

Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

44. I like music that makes me work hard to learn it.

Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

45. I often choose music that I will learn something from even if it will require more practice.

Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

46. I try harder in band if we are getting graded on things.

Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

47. I would be in band even if I knew I wouldn’t get an “A” in it.

Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

48. It doesn’t matter if we get grades in band or not, I will still try the same.

Strongly Agree       Agree       Disagree       Strongly Disagree

Please provide the following information about yourself:

Gender:       Male       Female

Grade:       6 7 8 9 10 11 12
Which of the following techniques do you use to motivate your students to practice? Circle all that apply.

1. Teaching students that effort is more important than ability in musical achievement.
2. Emphasizing the affective aspects of music.
3. Determining students’ musical interests and incorporating those interests into instruction.
4. Allowing students a choice in repertoire selection.
5. Allowing students a choice in instructional design.
6. Avoiding instructional elements to which students respond negatively.
7. The use of competition within the classroom.
8. The use of competition outside the classroom.
10. Grading students on the amount of practice time they complete.
11. Grading students on the execution of specific skills or assigned repertoire.
12. Teaching students about specific practice techniques.
13. Other (please specify)
14. Other (please specify)
15. Other (please specify)

Which one motivation technique have you found to be most effective?

What grade levels do you teach?
How many years have you been teaching?

Please indicate the number of students in your highest grade-level band class. ______