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This paper examines part of role that music analysis holds in the music curriculum at the University of Delaware and in the minds of students. Chapter 1 begins with a review of literature on the relationship between performance and analysis, presenting two starkly different philosophies on the purpose of music analysis. An experiment which compared the effects that different types of analyses had on musicians’ performance will be explained and discussed in Chapter 2; through this experiment it was found that incorporating metaphorical concepts into analysis may benefit performers. Chapter 3 outlines an additional study which considered students’ conceptualizations of music and reviewed the methods by which analysis is taught in an undergraduate music theory course. Results from the studies in Chapters 2 and 3 are synthesized in Chapter 4 and suggestions are made as to how further studies and research may present ways in which music curriculums can be enhanced through the incorporation of metaphorical understanding.
Chapter 1

THE ROLE OF ANALYSIS IN PERFORMANCE: LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Introduction

The relationship between analysis and performance is a much-debated topic among music theorists and has been extensively explored in recent years. A lot of recent research can be characterized as falling into one of two different philosophies. Theorists Wallace Berry\(^1\) and Eugene Narmour\(^2\) advocate for directive analysis and are considered to be quite controversial in their “authoritative” approach to music, asserting that performers must understand a theorist’s total analysis of a piece in order to learn it properly. However, other theorists such as Patrick McCreless\(^3\) and Cynthia Folio\(^4\) give more analytic value to a performer’s intuitive interpretation, suggesting the possibility of a piece-driven analysis. They believe that performing music should not only be about conveying the composer’s intent but that musicians may have unique, personal contributions to a performance as well.


1.2 Approaches to Music Analysis

This section will begin by exploring theorists’ perspectives on directive analysis and will then consider the performer’s approach. It will conclude by considering how musical interpretation may, in reverse, influence analysis.

1.2.1 Directive Analysis

Berry and Narmour view music analysis as directive, meaning that the primary role of analysis, for performers, is to direct them towards a correct interpretation. In his introduction to *Musical Structure and Performance*, Berry states, “if the performer does anything beyond mere execution, the doing must not be merely intuitive or mimetic; it must result from informed discretion and deliberate control.”\(^5\) Even if a performer is using their musical intuitions to bring their rendition past “mere execution,” that may not be enough to prepare a satisfactory performance. He claims that musical realization is frequently ruined by “the performer’s failure… to explore in probing analysis those problems of interpretive choice,” suggesting that he may doubt musical intuition as something valuable.\(^6\) He later asserts that performance is only at its best when musical elements have been scrutinized in analysis.\(^7\)

Narmour feels similarly, writing that analysis “increas[es] the likelihood of [musicians] producing an informed and aesthetically satisfying interpretation.”\(^8\) To both of these theorists, analysis is meant to result in a “correct” performance. If a

\(^5\) Berry, 2.

\(^6\) Ibid., 2.

\(^7\) Ibid., 6.

\(^8\) Narmour, 317.
musician fails to critically analyze their music, then it is unlikely that they will produce a convincing interpretation or make the right “expressive” decisions. These criticisms move past assessing technical accuracies and, for both theorists, a performance not conforming with analytic realization might not be simply undesirable, but incorrect.

Directive analysis is a fairly simple concept: If music is analyzed, then a musician will be able to correctly perform it based on the implications of that analysis. However, the application of directive analysis is by no means simple. Rather than deciding how to express musical elements based on theoretical findings, Berry and Narmour think that through careful analysis, a musician may clearly see what interpretive choices they should not make, lowering their chances of an “incorrect” performance. Utilizing analysis in this way reduces music to something much more discernable by performers and theorists alike, categorizing interpretive decisions as being objectively correct or incorrect.

Berry and Narmour may be considered structuralist music theorists, believing that musical expression can be found purely within a work’s compositional design. Musicologist and theorist Nicholas Cook explains that the implication of viewing music through a structuralist lens “is that a performance should function as a transparent medium, ‘expressing,’ ‘projecting,’ or ‘bringing out’ only what is already ‘in’ the work.”9 He believes that directive analysis is narrow-minded. Cook criticizes Narmour, saying that he “eliminate[s] the musician as an individual,” and then

continues to fault him, along with “all” music theorists, for “explain[ing] music without musicians.” Structuralist systems of music interpretation essentially discard the personal, expressive capabilities of musicians and diminish musicianship to following an instruction manual provided by composers and then translated by theorists.

1.2.2 A Counterargument: The Performer’s Approach

Other theorists challenge the directive view of music analysis. Some, including Cynthia Folio, George Fisher, and Judy Lochhead argue that it is possible to develop a “piece-driven” analysis by examining the entirety of a work’s meaning. Through a performance, musicians are able to express emotional or metaphorical concepts that may not be understood the same way through written analysis. An audible presentation of music is to a performer what an analysis is to a theorist; a method of demonstrating musical comprehension and understanding. Neither a theory-driven nor a piece-driven analysis is invalid, but each has its weaknesses.

The task of a piece-driven analysis, defined by Lochhead and Fisher, “is the exploring of contextual relations in a single work.” This analytic approach is more concerned with expressing music than explaining music, and so historical context, programmatic material, or expressive intention may be considered. Patrick McCreless

10 Cook, 242.

11 Folio, 1.


13 Ibid., 7.
says that “performers tend to think and talk about their work more in terms of shape, motion, intensification and relaxation, gesture, climax, and goal, than they do in terms of music-theoretical concepts.” He also believes that performers “think in terms of, and…give constant and loving attention to” these aspects, whereas an analyst takes them for granted or ignores them altogether. He calls the language used by performers through the process of shaping their musicality “studio language,” which is inexact and abstract. This can be seen as contrasting to the analytic language used alongside theoretical analysis; although varied methods of analysis certainly exist, theoretical analysis may also be hyper-focused on very specific elements within musical structure.

An example of this can be seen in Narmour’s essay, where he considers how five performers interpret an excerpt from Richard Strauss’s Der Rosenkavalier differently. Although he recognizes that “there can never be any such thing as the definitive performance,” he does think that “we can say more or less objectively that… certain performances are subtly though demonstrably better than others.” He views the issue very mathematically, first providing ratios for the “correct” performance based on the written music. He then compares the five interpretations in note length, dynamic range, dynamic shift, and articulation, explaining his evaluation of each. Despite his evaluation being subjective and partially dependent upon the

14 McCreless, 6.
15 Ibid., 6-7.
16 Ibid., 7.
17 Narmour, 334-335.
recordings, Narmour uses this table to identify which performance is most “correct”, singling it out as the best rendition. What he does not consider, however, is the entirety of each performance and how this short excerpt may fit in differently for each performer’s broader interpretation of Der Rosenkavalier.

The studio language used by performers may be limited by a lack of absoluteness, but the analytic language used by theorists is also limited in its pursuit of being exact. Cook describes music theory as “rang[ing] from the scientific to the fantastic,” recognizing that representing music is “fundamentally metaphorical.”\(^\text{18}\) He brings up “the general principal that the more ‘scientific’ an analytic approach is… the less well adapted it is for the complex, and often ill-defined, circumstances under which we use analysis to interrogate music and our experience of it.”\(^\text{19}\) For this reason, musicians must utilize their personal musical intuition while attempting to understand abstract, musical concepts. Some musicians approach this by means of a piece-driven analysis, focused on the relationships of ideas across a whole piece.

### 1.2.3 Piece-Driven Analysis

A piece-driven analysis is “fundamentally different” than a theory-driven analysis, and Cynthia Folio clearly states that “the analysis that is truly relevant to performers is often different from the general theoretical analysis.”\(^\text{20}\) Unlike Berry, she believes that every individual performer brings their own unique personality to the

\(^{18}\) Cook, 357.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 357.

\(^{20}\) Folio, 1.
music and that the “interpersonal quality of music is intensified when the piece requires multiple performers.”  

Her approach considers the performer’s ability to give music life by expressing their own emotions, illustrated through a composer’s framework, whereas structuralist music theory explains expression away as part of the musical structure.

Patrick McCreless also finds merit in a performer’s musical intuitions, arguing that in his own personal musical experiences, performance itself has played a role in guiding his analyses.  

His experiences cause him to question the use of analysis as a purely directive tool. In *Analysis and Performance: A Counterexample*, McCreless describes his wife’s “unorthodox” performance of César Franck’s Chorale No. 1, which influenced his understanding of the piece. He considered it unorthodox because it did not conform to the standard analysis and its performance implications, especially in terms of tempo and points of emphasis. However, McCreless found the performance to be compelling due to how it was performed convincingly and with musicality.  

Although his wife may not have been able to verbally articulate every expressive decision that she made and she had no experience with advanced analytic methods, “she had solid musical instincts.”  

By making her own expressive decisions, the piece became a tool with which she demonstrated emotions. Her analysis did not need the backing of theoretical evidence because she was able to demonstrate

21 Folio, 3.

22 McCreless, 1-2.

23 Ibid., 6.

24 Ibid., 16.
interpretative decisions clearly through an artistic performance. Even without advanced training in theory, as a performer, she could make sense of the music intuitively.

Janet Schmalfeldt attempts to examine the “elusive and problematic” relationship between performer and analyst in her essay On the Relation of Analysis to Performance: Beethoven’s Bagatelles Op. 126, Nos. 2 and 5 by taking on both personae herself and staging a discussion between them. 25 Although somewhat artificial, Schmalfeldt examines two different perspectives on the same music. As the analyst, she focuses on the thematic structure and use of motivic ideas in Bagatelle No. 2. Her analyst does not explicitly say how the performer should be playing music based on analysis, but she explains ways in which a listener may cognitively process the material based on its structure. In order to appeal to the performer, the analyst suggests the representation of a dramatic story; a rivalry between two different characters, represented by the two primary contrasting ideas. The performer recognizes the analyst’s effort of adding dramatic interpretation to the music as a way of connecting the music to their interests. The performer stresses the significance of analysis, saying that “to have an analytic view of a work is to have a basis for the preparation of a performance.” She continues by explaining specific ways in which the analysis affected her expressive decisions, and how the analytic understanding of a difficult passage made her practicing more efficient. 26


26 Ibid., 18.
Schmalfeldt considers collaboration between analyst and performer to be something of great value. Between these two approaches to understanding music, she believes that the most important difference is that a performer’s take on music “must never be taken as final within a live performance,” whereas an analyst’s medium “requires a final commitment to a presently held view.”

It is important to take into consideration that while music exists in both a written, static form as well as an audible, active form, it is experienced as a time art. By viewing a work in its entirety, examining the salient features and structural elements on a large scale, analysis may assist a performer. Through analysis it can be better understood how the music was composed or why compositional decisions were made, but it is in the performance that musicians demonstrate what music means. However, analysis is not the ultimate deciding factor in musical expression, and “there is no single, one-and-only performance decision that can be dictated by an analytic observation.”

1.2.4 Musical Narrative

Some theorists, including William Rothstein and John Rink argue that musical understanding may be best expressed through the creation of a musical narrative.

27 Schmalfeldt, 28.

28 Ibid., 28, emphasis in original.


narrative. Rothstein says that “musical performance is, by its very nature, a species of acting. It is the performer who controls the way in which virtually every aspect of the work in conveyed to the listener.”\(^{31}\) When enacting a play, actors are concerned with the portrayal of both plotline and character concurrently, without describing these aspects to the audience. He believes that the same must be done in a musical performance. While performers may choose to convey whatever aspects of a piece that they wish, one cannot deny that some performances are more favorable than others. Rothstein is clear that “most listeners… do not go to concerts or listen to recordings to hear an analytical demonstration,” and that they instead ask for performers to demonstrate the “magic” in music.\(^{32}\)

If one can accept that creating a musical narrative might assist a performer in conveying the “magic” of music to an audience, the method by which a performer actively uses this narrative is still in question. Rink critically approaches the use of musical narrative by examining Liszt’s *Vallée d’Obermann* and two independent analyses of the work by Márta Grabócz and William Hughes. Both Grabócz and Hughes claimed to have given attention to an “evolutionary form” in the construction of their analyses, but Rink says that “the performer would be hard pressed to make much practical use of their analyses, as all the activation of the music in time remains to be done.”\(^{33}\) He believes that their analytic attempts lack “a broader interpretative

\(^{31}\) Rothstein, 237.

\(^{32}\) Ibid., 218.

\(^{33}\) Rink, 225.
vision or *grande ligne* to guide the narrative.”\(^{34}\) In order to remedy this shortcoming, he traces what he refers to as an intensity curve: “a graphic representation of the music’s ebb and flow, its ‘contour’ in time, determined by all active elements (harmony, melody, rhythm, dynamics, etc.).”\(^{35}\) By providing a graphic notation based in time, Rink believes that he has provided something much more applicable to performance.

He continually refers to the *grande ligne* of a piece, which may be literally interpreted as the line on his intensity curve, or as a visual depiction of the musical narrative.\(^{36}\) While debatable whether or not Rink’s exact method is best, he has clearly argued that performers require some sort of “guide” or explanation of musical narrative, if not created by themselves. While Rothstein does not believe the musical narrative must always be verbalized, Rink understands that the sharing of interpretation from analyst to performer requires greater explanation. He prefers to achieve this with a graph; others may find it easier to explain through words.

### 1.2.5 Understanding Musical Interpretation

The role of a performer is to demonstrate a work of art. Through hours of practice and rehearsal, performers work towards a final product: the performance. A piece in its written form frequently symbolizes music clearly enough that performers may conceptualize it, but it is impossible to obtain the final product by only examining

---

34 Rink, 225.

35 Ibid., 236.

36 Ibid., 236-237.
A score. Every performance is unique to the performer and that instance, and while it may be difficult to describe the qualitative aspects of particular occurrences, disregarding those aspects is detrimental to musical understanding. However, the process through which a performer reaches their final understanding of a piece varies greatly from person to person.

When discussing the interpretation of analysis for expressive decisions, theorists frequently examine either their own performances or the performances of well-established soloists, conductors, or ensembles. Examining one’s own performance, as Schmalfeldt does, allows the theorist to explain every conscious thought process that led them to make specific decisions and is extremely useful in the critical analysis of that individual’s musical understanding. However, by actively considering the way in which an analysis affects a theorist’s expressivity, it is possible that their expressive decisions are biased towards an end goal. Schmalfeldt recognized this issue and attempts to eliminate the conflict through her presentation of two personalities, although one must still consider that she is a theorist and has obviously developed a theoretical analysis of these pieces. It may not be possible for her to fully remove the theoretical understandings that she has developed. Frequently, music theorists separate the roles of theorist and performer, suggesting that they approach music analysis differently. While understanding the expressive interpretations of a theorist through their own performance may be important, it might not provide the same insight into the mind of a performer whose expressivity is driven by drama and emotion. Recognizing this, theorists may examine professional musicians who lack advanced theoretical background.

37 Schmalfeldt, 2.
Instances of famous performers interpreting music in unique, non-standard ways are interesting and provide grounds for a great discussion of comparison and analysis. Unfortunately, studying these instances provides more insight on an individual musician’s interpretive decisions rather than the “average” musician because established musicians, whose interpretations can be backed by experience, may have more expressive liberty to make atypical choices in performance. Studying these artists may be limiting if the goal is to understand how the average musician is utilizing and conceptualizing analysis. Instead, student musicians early in their stages of musical comprehensions should be studied.

1.3 Conclusion

If analysis is to be used by a performer, then the analyst must consider the performer’s perspective. While perspectives on music vary, performers tend to think of music in more abstract ways than analysts, and it may be that performers are best assisted through the articulation of a musical narrative. To understand the actual impact that analysis may have on performance, musicians themselves must be studied. All professional musicians, as well as theorists, analysts, composers, etc., were once students, and so in order to obtain information pertaining to the “average” musician, it should be understood how student musicians are interpreting music. The experiment to follow in Chapter 2 is designed to determine how analysis may impact performance differently if it is based either entirely in theoretical facts or if it blends the performer’s perspective into analytic findings through the inclusion of abstract concepts.
Chapter 2

FINDING METAPHOR IN MUSIC

The research study presented in this chapter was approved by the Institutional Review Board; the approval form can be found in the Appendix, Section A.2.

2.1 Introduction

Students majoring in music performance are required to take music theory courses, suggesting that the course material must have an impact on the processes by which they learn music; if it did not, then music theory skills would hold significantly less value for students who aim to perform professionally. If music theory coursework is supplemental material to a performer’s degree, then these courses should be constructive towards that student’s professional goals. While these courses cover a wide range of topics under the broad term of “music theory,” this study focuses specifically on analysis and exploring its use by performers. It is important for music educators to understand the complex relationship between performance and analysis so that they may promote useful learning for all music students. This study aims to evaluate how analysis influences the way in which musicians understand and perform music. In a two-month experiment with a quintet of musicians, different types of analysis were presented and used to see how they impacted the musicians’ learning

38 All music students are required to perform to some degree, and this is true even for those with a concentration in music education, business, history, etc.
processes. This chapter will begin by explaining the types of analyses used within the experiment and will then continue by detailing the hypotheses that guided it, reviewing the methods used and discussing the results produced.

2.1.1 Theoretical and Metaphorical Analyses

For this study, a clear separation is made between “theoretical” analysis and “metaphorical” analysis. A theoretical analysis is one based on structural elements such as harmonic progression, voice-leading, and form. This is not to be confused with theoretical skills that are necessary for all musicians for basic music reading purposes. Instead, theoretical analysis involves looking critically and specifically at the musical material in order to determine how the music is functioning, what the composer intended, or what the relationships are between structural elements. It is the result of asking how a piece of music functions and it is easily identifiable in a physical, written form. According to McCreless, performers do not think “in terms of music-theoretical concepts such as hypermeter, motive, linear-contrapuntal framework (as in Schenkerian analysis), harmonic progression, and formal classifications” as much as a theorist would. Although a theoretical analysis may be approached by different methods and may vary for each analyst, it can generally be seen as something factual about a piece of music.

A metaphorical analysis is the melding of a theoretical analysis with metaphorical understanding. Metaphorical understanding may come from programmatic, emotional, and/or thematic material that is already present in a piece of

---

39 Narmour, 317.

40 McCreless, 6.
music, or it may be material that is added. It examines what a piece of music is meant to represent or convey rather than how it is structured. However, having a metaphorical understanding of a piece of music is still vastly different from creating a metaphorical analysis. Many performers may understand works metaphorically through emotional or pictorial comprehension, but a metaphorical analysis requires that these abstract concepts are tied to music in its static form. Verbalizing how musical elements specifically represent metaphorical concepts necessitates the melding of theoretical analysis with a deep metaphorical understanding.

2.2 Hypotheses

Four hypotheses were used during this study that stemmed from both personal experience and the research presented in Chapter 1. The experiment was structured in two halves, each half examining a different piece of music and type of analysis. Hypotheses 1 and 2 correlate closely to the first half while Hypotheses 3 and 4 relate to the second half.

Hypothesis 1: If a performer is provided no analysis prior to learning a piece of music, then the performer will create an analysis of the work themselves.

This does not necessarily mean that a performer will create a theoretical analysis based on harmonies or formal structure. Folio described a performer’s “piece-driven analysis”\(^1\) as their explanation of music through actual audible performance and McCreless would argue that it is less likely for a performer to create a theoretical analysis.\(^2\) In order to measure this hypothesis it would be necessary for the

\(^{1}\) Folio, 1.

\(^{2}\) McCreless, 6.
participating musicians to provide written or verbal evidence of a metaphorical or theoretical analysis, or that they explain the reasoning behind any interpretive decisions they make.

Hypothesis 2: If a performer is given an analysis after learning a piece of music, then it will affect the performer’s conviction about the music.

With either type of analysis, the addition of new information may affect how the musician performs or conceptualizes the music. If the musician has already created some sort of analysis themselves, then they may be affected differently depending on whether or not it “matches” their personal analysis. Schmalfeldt’s performer argued that analysis is not always necessary to learn music, but that if it matches a musician’s intuition, then it will promote greater confidence, resulting in a more convincing performance. On the contrary, it is possible that a musician would feel less confident if the analysis provided does not match their intuitions.

Hypothesis 3: If a performer is given an analysis prior to learning a piece of music, then the performer will be assisted in their learning process.

It is hypothesized that both metaphorical analyses and theoretical analyses will assist a musician in their learning process. An analysis may assist a musician in different ways: it may increase the speed at which the music is learned, it may help to direct their expressive decisions towards a specific goal, and it may increase the efficiency of rehearsals.

Hypothesis 4: If a performer is given an analysis prior to learning a piece of music, then the performer’s own musical intuition may be suppressed.

__________________________

43 Schmalfeldt, 19.
While providing a musician with an analysis may increase their efficiency, providing analysis upfront has the potential to hinder their personal musical intuitions. If a musician were left to make expressive decisions themselves, then perhaps they would be forced to critically examine the music, forming a closer connection to it. Narmour argues that “analytical theory is crucial in the planning, execution, and evaluation of musical performances,” but he does not specifically say that a performer must create this analysis.\textsuperscript{44} It is hypothesized that if a performer were to simply take an existing analysis and apply it to their performance without utilizing their musical intuitions, then a level of musical expressivity could be lost. Although this is hypothesized, the ideal result is for Hypothesis 3 to be supported by the data while Hypothesis 4 is not. Instead, it is desirable that musicians would be able to combine the possible benefits of both analysis and musical intuition.

2.3 Methodology

This study focuses predominantly on the musicians’ learning processes as they approach music completely unknown to them. Pieces of contextual and analytical information are treated as independent variables in the experiment so that their impact can be examined. Throughout the process of learning music, musicians may experiment with various expressive choices and their interpretations of the music may evolve. If just the final performance were to be examined, then the process through which they interpreted the music would be lost. Contextual and analytical information may impact the learning process in different ways, which may be determined through varied experimental structures.

\textsuperscript{44} Narmour, 340.
2.3.1 Participants

The ideal participant for this study is a student musician majoring in music with high proficiency on their instrument, who has also completed their standard music theory and aural skills coursework. The pieces used in the study are Quintet in Bb Major (1876) by Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov and Piano Quintet in Eb Major, Op. 136 (1918) by Hans Huber, which both require a pianist, flutist, clarinetist, bassoonist, and hornist. Student proficiency on their instrument is extremely subjective; it is assumed that anybody performing in a higher-level ensemble at the University of Delaware would also have the skills necessary to perform these two pieces. It is assumed that students who have completed their music theory and aural skills sequences are more likely to understand theoretical information presented to them and that they have the skills necessary to analyze the music themselves, if they choose to. However, finding the correct instrumentalists to perform the selected pieces is of highest importance, so compromises may have to be made in other criteria.

2.3.2 Rimsky-Korsakov Quintet in Bb Major

The first half of the experiment uses the second movement of Rimsky-Korsakov’s Quintet in Bb Major. Musicians are provided edited parts in which cues for other instruments and any expressive element that could imply a timbral change, such as “dolce,” “Andante,” “espress.,” and “a piacere” are removed. The beginning tempo marking is replaced with a bpm marking of $\dot{J}=74$ and other expressive elements such as dynamic markings and original articulations remain in the edited parts. None of the musicians, including the pianist, have access to a full score of the piece and are not permitted to listen to a professional recording. They do not know the composer, year of composition, title of the piece, or even that they will be playing the second
movement within a three-movement work. Information is withheld from the musicians so that it can be seen whether or not they will make expressive decisions based solely on the musical material.

Throughout the study, musicians answer questions through online reflection forms. Musicians are asked to complete “practice reflection forms” between rehearsals, which have varied questions. Before, during, and/or after rehearsals, musicians complete “rehearsal reflection forms” that ask about their musical comprehension, expectations for rehearsals, and personal opinions about the process and music. The musicians are unaware of the specific goals of the study and reflection forms are designed to avoid answers biased to a particular outcome; they simply know that they are being studied while they learn new music. A full list of the questions is available in the Appendix, Section A.1.

The first interaction with musicians is in private sight-reading sessions, during which their initial interpretations are observed. The musicians begin learning this piece with no context, guidance, or expressive purpose, but over the course of three rehearsals, information about the music is presented to them. Between each rehearsal the musicians are expected to individually practice at least once. New knowledge of the piece may affect their learning process and, eventually, their performance.

Musicians are able to hear the other parts in context during the first rehearsal and they are asked whether or not that has affected their perception of the piece. Following the first rehearsal, a theoretical analysis of the piece is presented to the musicians. The presentation first outlines the formal structure of the piece, breaking each larger section into different themes. Measure numbers are provided throughout so that the musicians can follow along and make markings if they desire. The tonality of
each section and theme is explained; since the Phrygian mode is used substantially throughout this piece, some basic information is provided about Phrygian harmonies. Tonal relationships across the piece are explained and a few excerpts of reoccurring harmonic function are presented.

Musicians are each given a new, annotated copy of their part that has all non-chord tones (NCT) labelled, as well as some structurally significant pitches, such as in a cadential figure. An example from the flute part can be seen in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1:  Rimsky-Korsakov, *Quintet in Bb Major*, mvt. II, mm. 1-28. Annotated flute part.

The pianist’s part (Figure 2.2) includes a full harmonic analysis and labelled cadences.
The musicians are not given directive performance implication for any of the information provided so that their own interpretations may be studied. The practice reflection form between the first and second rehearsals specifically asks how having a theoretical analysis of the piece may affect their playing.

Following the second rehearsal, the musicians are provided contextual information about the piece. They are told the composer’s name, year of composition, and that the piece was written for a competition by the Russian Musical Society. Some background information is then provided about Rimsky-Korsakov, including that he is considered one of the primary composers to establish the “Russian” style and that he is most well-known for his opera and symphonic works.  

The presentation includes a quote from an article within *The Lotus Magazine* (1917) which speaks on his subtly expressive style:

He is not lacking in warmth of feeling, which kindles to passion in some of his songs but his moods of exaggerated emotion are very rare. His prevailing tones are bright and serene, and occasionally flushed with flowing colour. If he rarely shocks our hearts, as Mussorgsky does, into a poignant realization of darkness and despair, neither has he any of the hysterical tendency which sometimes detracts from the impressiveness of Tchaikovsky’s _cris de coeur_.

The quintet is then told that they are performing the second movement of a larger work, which was written during Rimsky-Korsakov’s “fallow” period while he was studying counterpoint. Some program notes from various sources are mentioned. The rehearsal reflection form following this rehearsal includes questions directly related to the contextual information presented.

In the third rehearsal, the musicians have a chance to discuss any aspect of the music that they want to and are specifically asked to consider what the music may mean. The piece is rehearsed until it is “performance ready” and one final recording is taken. Finally, the musicians have the opportunity to listen to a professional recording while following along in their part. They make note of any significant differences that they hear, and then submit those through a rehearsal reflection form. With the conclusion of this rehearsal reflection form, the first half of the experiment is complete.

---


47 Staff, Rovi, “Quintet, for Flute, Clarinet, Horn, Bassoon & Piano in B Flat Major. Description.” _AllMusic_.

2.3.3 Huber *Piano Quintet in Eb Major, Op. 136*

The second half of the experiment uses the first movement of Hans Huber’s *Piano Quintet in Eb Major, Op. 136*. The basic structure is the same as the first half, but this time musicians are provided more information before receiving parts. The quintet is told that the movement represents a fairy tale story, although no programmatic material is original to this piece. A short presentation is given about Hans Huber and the formal structure of this movement, which outlines the story’s plot. Three themes are identified within the movement, which are said to correlate with the story’s primary characters: the parents (Figure 2.3), the witch (Figure 2.4), and the child (Figure 2.5).

![Figure 2.3: Hans Huber, Piano Quintet in Eb Major, Op. 136, mvt. I, mm. 1-4, clarinet part. The “parents’” theme.](image-url)
Although Hans Huber did not create this programmatic material, it is presented to the quintet as if fact, without ever actually stating that it was made by Huber.
Musicians are provided the original parts and are asked to do no outside research on Huber or the piece and they are not permitted to listen to recordings.

Sight-reading sessions occur between the initial presentation and the quintet’s first rehearsal. At the conclusion of the first rehearsal, a metaphorical analysis of the piece is presented. Again, the musicians follow along and measure numbers are provided throughout. During the presentation, information is provided about the piece’s harmonic patterns: chord qualities are used for coloration and frequent harmonic sequences, applied chords, and fully diminished seventh chords are used to shift tonal centers quickly. Each theme is presented in the order that they are heard, emphasizing stylistic elements that already exist in the music, such as the Parents’ theme being marked “dolce” and the Witch’s theme “animato.” Musical timelines are provided for various sections, indicating where themes appear alone or simultaneously, and alterations in instrumentation or texture are described. Instances of significant dynamic changes, rhythmic unisons, and metric variations are tied to elements of the fairy tale; for instance, the fortissimo $A^7$ in m. 107 is described as the Witch’s death, followed by an ascending line that may represent the lifting of her curse on the family, as shown in Figure 2.6.
Throughout the presentation, the musicians are told what the music may represent, but they are never told how to perform the music. Through the rest of the rehearsals and reflection forms the musicians continue to provide data.

Since all the of the information about the piece has been provided, the rest of the experiment follows a simple structure. No more presentations are given, and the quintet has two rehearsals to prepare the piece. After a final “performance” is recorded...
at the conclusion of the last rehearsal, it is revealed to the musicians that the programmatic material was created specifically for this experiment. A professional recording of the piece is played for the musicians as they follow along in their parts, marking significant differences between the two interpretations.

2.4 Results

Following the conclusion of the experiment, all data collected through reflection forms was used to either support or refute the four hypotheses. The first half of the experiment correlated directly with Hypotheses 1 and 2 and the second half related more specifically to Hypotheses 3 and 4.

2.4.1 Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 proposed that if musicians were not given an analysis prior to learning a piece of music, then they would create one themselves, theoretical or metaphorical. During the sight-reading sessions, only the hornist spoke on theoretical concepts, saying that they wanted to understand the “aural landscape of the piece in terms of the notes, key areas, and different sections.” The hornist recognized repetitive patterns and motivic ideas during the sight-reading, which they regarded as a helpful tool, and made a specific remark about giving notes with accidentals more emphasis to stress harmonic change. The clarinetist and flutist were also able to recognize some repeated patterns and motivic ideas while sight-reading, but otherwise, only the hornist considered large scale theoretical concepts.

Prior to and after receiving a theoretical analysis, no musicians indicated the consideration of metaphorical understanding. After receiving theoretical information, all of the musicians commented on what they aspects of the music they wanted “bring
but none provided direct thoughts indicating any metaphorical concepts that may have been in mind. While it is possible that musicians had a basic metaphorical understanding of the music, they did not verbalize those thoughts and so it is likely that no metaphorical analysis was created. The musicians did not clearly indicate metaphorical understanding until they received contextual information about the piece and composer. Hypothesis 1 is not supported by the data collected through this experiment.

2.4.2 Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that if musicians were provided an analysis after learning a piece of music, then their conviction about the music would be affected. After the musicians were provided a theoretical analysis and received annotated parts, each of them spoke on how they could more easily “bring out” musical ideas. The pianist explained, “now that there is a concrete analysis, I can better control what I am doing to make the piece flow more coherently.” There was a general assumption that any NCT marked in their annotated parts should be played with a louder dynamic and as the musicians were aware of this information, some found a difference in their practicing and rehearsal. Only the hornist expressed a change in individual practice after receiving contextual information, saying, “it gave me an intention in my practicing.” None of the musicians found it significant that the piece was originally composed for a competition and during individual practice, most focused their time on technical aspects of the piece, such as rhythms and intonation.

However, most seemed to notice a difference in rehearsals after receiving contextual information. All musicians commented, to some extent, on the emotional aspects of the piece. The clarinetist described Russian music as “dark, strong,
emotional,” and the pianist described Russian music as passionate, saying it “is supposed to sound bold and strong, with a mix of melancholy.” The flutist and bassoonist both felt that the piece evoked more emotion from them after its Russian origin was revealed, and the bassoonist mentioned listening differently in order to “think about what story we are trying to tell.” This hypothesis is generally supported by the data collected as both theoretical and contextual information altered the musicians’ interpretation of the music.

2.4.3 Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 proposed that if musicians were provided analytic information prior to learning a piece of music, then their learning process would be assisted. Directly before the first rehearsal, all of the musicians commented on the Huber being more technically difficult than the Rimsky-Korsakov and expressed concern about the rehearsal running smoothly. Although they found it more difficult, the bassoonist, flutist, and hornist all thought, by the second rehearsal, that this piece was coming together more quickly because it has a “defined story” with association between characters and musical material. Once the musicians were provided annotated parts and had been presented all of the information about the piece, each expressed a change in their practicing. The bassoonist said that they could “focus on what character [they were] playing in each section,” and the hornist said that “knowing the metaphorical interpretation gave me many visual images,” which then assisted their playing. The musicians seemed convinced that the program was created by Hans Huber and some spoke about paying careful attention to details in order to correctly convey the composer’s intentions. In general, the musicians found it easier to play expressively when they could match the music with characters. Although technically more
challenging, all of the musicians expressed enjoyment, possibly because there was programmatic meaning. Since the programmatic material and metaphorical analysis gave the musicians more interest in learning the piece, Hypothesis 3 is strongly supported by the collected data.

2.4.4 Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 suggested that if musicians were given an analysis prior to learning a piece, then their musical intuitions and expressivity would be hindered, even if the analysis had assisted their learning process. At the conclusion of the final rehearsal, the hornist said, “I felt so much more connected to the music,” comparing the Huber to the Rimsky-Korsakov. Similarly, the clarinetist described the Rimsky-Korsakov as “dull” compared to the Huber. The bassoonist and flutist both felt that being provided programmatic material for the piece helped them shape musical ideas and focus their attention. The flutist liked having a “foundation to rely on” because once that was established, the musicians had freedom to create the rest. None of the musicians expressed any sense of hindrance in their own musical expression, and most actually believed that being provided an analysis encouraged greater expressivity. This hypothesis is not supported by the data collected.

2.5 Discussion

The section will begin by discussing the constraints which may have affected the results of this experiment and will then continue by examining the musicians’ reception of both the music itself and the processes through which they learned the music.
2.5.1 Participants

This experiment took place during a summer term, and so the pool of students from which participants were taken was small, making it difficult to find the perfect participants. Ideally, the students would have had the same experiences and proficiency on their instruments. The hornist, pianist, and flutist were all “ideal” participants: senior music majors and all highly proficient instrumentalists. The bassoonist and clarinetist, while both proficient on their instruments, were younger. At the time of the experiment, the bassoonist was a rising junior and the clarinetist a rising sophomore. Additionally, the clarinetist was not a music major, so their only music theory experience came from a high-school AP Music Theory course. It is also important to note that many of these musicians are close friends of the author, and that they had agreed to participate in the study without payment or any academic benefit. While these factors could have affected results of the study slightly, care was taken to minimize biases as much as possible.

2.5.2 Time Constraints

The timeline of the experiment was very restricted; perhaps with more time, the experiment could have revealed more about how a theoretical or metaphorical analysis affects a musician’s learning process. Due to the constraints of the summer research program for which the study occurred, the need to have full approval by the Institutional Review Board, and the personal schedules of the participants, the entire experiment had to take place over an approximately five-week period. The largest issue coming from these constraints is the data related to Hypothesis 1, which states that if a musician is not provided an analysis, then they will create one themselves. While the data did not support this hypothesis, it is possible that the musicians simply
did not have enough time with the piece to formulate their own critical thoughts before a theoretical analysis was provided. It still holds true that none of the musicians indicated any metaphorical understanding prior to the presentation of contextual information. It was expected that the musicians would consider at least some metaphorical concepts before the first rehearsal, but there was no evidence of metaphorical understanding or analysis throughout the experiment’s first half.

It is possible that some of the musicians had analytic thoughts during the early stages of learning the Rimsky-Korsakov. Questions on the reflection forms were nonspecific so that the musicians would not know what exactly was being studied, avoiding biased responses. However, the questions may not have been direct enough to extract analytic thoughts. But although this may be a minor issue, if the musicians had not been examined while using their natural learning processes, then the study would be futile in an attempt to examine the impact of theoretical and metaphorical information on their musical interpretation.

With more time available for the experiment, the musicians might have been able to truly bring both of these pieces to a “performance ready” state with established, deliberate expressive ideas. At the conclusion of each piece, the musicians listened to a professional recording and were asked whether either performance was more or less “correct.” The musicians generally believed that, besides technical accuracies, their performances were no less correct than the professionals’. The flutist stated, “the ‘correct’ version is the version that you create to the best of your abilities,” and, in relation to the Rimsky-Korsakov quintet, the bassoonist said, “we just interpreted things differently.” Based on the musicians’ responses, it is possible that the musicians
would have received the theoretical analysis differently, perhaps negatively, if it had been presented with directive performance implications.

2.5.3 Difficulty of the Pieces

One key aspect of the experiment is that musicians expressed much more enjoyment while learning the Huber. Prior to the first rehearsal, all musicians had concerns about the piece’s overall difficulty. For both pieces, the musicians were asked to rate the difficulty of the music and the difficulty of learning the music. Ratings were on a scale of one to ten, with ten being the most difficult; results can be seen in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Musicians’ ratings of how difficult the pieces were (D) and how difficult they were to learn (L) from Practice Reflection Forms (PRF) 2 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Piano</th>
<th>Flute</th>
<th>Clarinet</th>
<th>Bassoon</th>
<th>Horn</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RK, D (PRF2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK, L (PRF2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK, D (PRF4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK, L (PRF4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH, D (PRF4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH, L (PRF4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectively, the musicians considered the Huber to be much more difficult, but on the whole, they favored it over the Rimsky-Korsakov. Reasons for the musicians’ preferences may vary, but the most striking difference between the experimental designs was the presence or absence of programmatic material. The clarinetist said that “the quintet was more fun to learn because of the storyline behind the music,” and the flutist believes that “it is much easier when there is a story already there.” This is not to say that programmatic material is the only aspect of music that can strengthen a
performer’s enjoyment; by having a common understanding and expressive goal, the entire learning process may be more cohesive. Programmatic material seemed to help this specific group of musicians and it is possible that it could also benefit other student musicians.

2.5.4 Reception of Metaphorical Analysis

The second half of the project resulted in much more interesting and enthusiastic responses from the musicians. In part, this may have been due to the pairing with programmatic material, which made the experience more enjoyable. However, it is important to consider that by the second half, the musicians had already been playing together for three weeks and were much more familiar with each other. A greater sense of comfort could have resulted in more willingness to share thoughts through the reflection forms or to openly discuss musical concepts in rehearsal. This issue was unavoidable with the already existing constraints on time and personnel choice; perhaps the results would have been different if the study examined a pre-existing student chamber ensemble. Swapping the roles of the pieces by providing programmatic material to the Rimsky-Korsakov may have also had some different outcomes, but it is believed that the hypotheses would still be supported since it was chiefly the analytic design which altered the musicians’ perceptions.

It was hypothesized that if the musicians were provided analysis prior to learning the Huber quintet, then their musical intuitions would be inhibited and their expressivity diminished. Data from the experiment did not support this hypothesis, but it might have been the method of presenting a metaphorical analysis that resulted in a favorable outcome, rather than the analysis itself. This hypothesis became a focus of the experiment as a response to the “authoritarian” approach taken by Berry and
Narmour. However, the approach taken in this experiment was less focused on how the musicians should portray something, but rather telling the musicians what they were meant to express. Perhaps if a directive approach was taken, then their expressivity would have been hindered. By providing a metaphorical framework in which the musicians directed their own expressive decisions, it was seen how they utilized available resources in the preparation of music.

2.5.5 Perception of the Metaphorical Analysis

The programmatic material for the Huber quintet was created specifically for this experiment and was presented to the musicians before they received individual parts. Although artificial and not historically accurate to the piece, all decisions made in “writing” this fairy tale story were directly related to the musical content. By the time the pieces had been learned, all five musicians were convinced that the story was Huber’s original concept. If they had been explicitly told that Huber did create the program, then they may have received the work differently. The musicians placed high value on “the composer’s intentions” when making musical and expressive decisions. After hearing the truth, the bassoonist said, “every single time I played the piece, I had this story in mind.” The flutist felt similarly and said, “I really put in more attention, expression, and emotion to this piece because of my belief that I had to convey a story.” The musicians thought that telling a story was part of their musical responsibility, not just a suggestion. The pianist felt “more obliged to bring out certain qualities and characters within the textures,” due to how the story was presented with a “sense of authority.”

A metaphorical framework assisted all of the musicians through their preparation of the Huber. The hornist, bassoonist, and flutist mentioned how having a
storyline in place helped them in individual practice and all musicians felt that having a similar goal in mind made rehearsal more efficient. The flutist noted in their final reflection form that through this process they learned “that it is just as easy to put emotion and expression into absolute music.” The flutist also mentioned the possibility of approaching absolute works by creating short stories that provide expressive direction. Other musicians felt similarly; the bassoonist and hornist both said that they would consider analyzing their music more closely in the future to give it more emotional value.

2.6 Conclusions

This experiment has given insight into how five college-level musicians utilized information about two different pieces of music in order to prepare the pieces for performance. Their learning processes were affected differently when provided with either a strictly theoretical analysis or a metaphorical analysis. Although the group of musicians studied was of minimal size, many results were consistent across the group and findings from this study could be applicable to a larger population of music students. Of course, these musicians are all individuals and cannot represent the entire community in absoluteness, so no factual statements may be made about the average musician. Instead, suggestions can be made as to how a student’s understanding of analysis may influence their performing capabilities.

Theoretical information about a piece of music increased the speed at which the quintet learned new music, but it was not as useful in providing expressive direction. Multiple musicians found it helpful to know the NCT within their individual parts, but none of them could explain specifically how this information gave them expressive direction, except that it helped them “bring out” musical elements. As far
as the reflection forms reveal, there was no instance that theoretical information directly assisted the musicians in considering aspects of musical expression.

   Once paired with metaphorical meaning, however, theoretical information gave way to a metaphorical analysis, which influenced the musicians’ perspectives. Metaphorical understanding of a piece may provide some assistance in shaping music, but it was tying those elements to specific musical structures that allowed the musicians to practice more efficiently and find greater expressive capabilities. Assigning the three primary themes in the Huber quintet to different characters invited the musicians to explore entirely different styles for each. Clear direction and a unified expressive goal were incredibly useful for these musicians and may be likewise for other student musicians.

   In order to have a cohesive approach to a piece across an entire ensemble, there does not necessarily need to be programmatic material. Programmatic works have that as their foundation and it is possible for musicians to follow a learn music similarly by creating programs themselves for absolute music. If five musicians were to approach the Huber quintet in a normal setting, though, then they would not be provided any of the information given during this study. They would then have to build expressive cohesion through discussing music, but in order to discuss the music effectively one must to be able to verbalize their personal understanding of a piece. If a piece’s meaning is based in metaphorical concepts, then they must be able to articulate that by connecting those ideas to musical elements, which is the backbone of a metaphorical analysis.

   Analyzing a piece of music metaphorically may seem like a daunting task, but it does not necessarily mean that a musician has discerned every individual detail of a
piece. Analytic information presented to the musicians during the second half of the study was primarily focused around the reoccurrence of themes and motives, the manipulation of those elements, the general tonal areas of the sections within the piece, and significant changes in timbre, tessitura, and range. Teaching music students how to identify these different musical elements may allow them to find more useful applications of analysis to performance. If the methods of music analysis incorporated into standard music theory courses are limited to technical skills, such as Roman numeral (RN) analysis, lead sheet symbols (LSS), or Classical era formal structures, then a student may not be learning as many applicable skills as possible.

This study will continue by examining the role of analysis in the undergraduate music curriculum through the examination of a sophomore music theory course. The methods used to teach analysis in the course will be observed first-hand and, through private interview sessions, the students will answer questions relating to analysis. It would be beneficial to understand how music students are conceptualizing the role of analysis and what methods of instruction they find understandable. Students will also be interviewed as they analyze music from their own solo repertoire; through this, it may be investigated whether or not the process of analyzing music has an impact on their musical understanding or performance decisions.
Chapter 3

THE INSTRUCTION AND CONCEPTUALIZATION OF ANALYSIS

The research study presented in this chapter was approved by the Institutional Review Board; the approval letter can be found in the Appendix, Section B.5.

3.1 Introduction

This study involves the observation of a sophomore music theory course at the University of Delaware with the primary goal of understanding how students are being taught music analysis within their standard curriculum. Students enrolled in the course were also interviewed so that it could be understood how they were conceptualizing the purpose of music analysis and if they were viewing analysis as useful for performers. It was found that, in general, students had vastly different conceptualizations of what “analysis” and “musical understanding” are; this is likely due to the course having a strong foundation in teaching students how to label musical elements in order to complete analyses. However, as the class progressed, analysis projects were increasingly geared towards encouraging students to understand music, rather than simply label it, and they were given more opportunities to explore musical contexts which they could then connect to their theoretical analyses.

The review of this study will start by outlining the methodologies designed to gather data and will then explain what occurred through the semester. Afterwards, the results of the study will be discussed, and conclusions will made about how the course’s design may be influencing students’ conceptualizations of music analysis.
3.2 Methodology

This study is exploratory in nature and no hypotheses have been created as part of its structure. Rather, the selected course will be observed on multiple levels so that overarching trends may be discovered relating to the course’s structure or students’ responses. Throughout the semester, analysis-focused classes will be observed, analysis-related homework assignments will be reviewed, and students will be interviewed individually.

3.2.1 Course Selection

This study focuses on the students in and the instruction of the second written music theory course at the University of Delaware, a standard course for sophomore music majors in their fall semester. The course is the second of four written music theory courses for students at UD and covers topics through diatonic and chromatic harmony, chord structures, functional relationships, and basic melodic and contrapuntal compositional techniques. The course’s prerequisites include one semester of written music theory and two semesters of aural skills, and the course has a corequisite of an advanced aural skills course.

3.2.2 Participants

Students enrolled in this course are ideal participants for the study because while they have experience with music theoretical skills and basic methods of analysis, they are within the core of the music theory curriculum. All forty students enrolled in this course have the option to actively participate in the study through interview sessions and/or tutoring sessions on their final repertoire projects. Students also have the option to allow their homework assignments and journal entries relating to analysis to be reviewed for this study. No preference is given to students dependent
upon their gender, age, instrument, or skill level and these factors are not considered when reviewing their responses.

3.2.3 Content Journal Entries and Homework

Throughout the semester, students complete content journals (approximately every week) to develop their writing skills regarding music topics. Students are presented multiple prompts each week but only prompts related to analysis are viewed as part of this study; a list of analysis-related prompts is located in Appendix B, section B.1. Although guided by prompts, content journals are open-ended. It may be useful to see what topics or concepts students frequently mention in their writing to determine what ideas stand out to students. These journals may also indicate if the students are interpreting the prompts similarly or differently. Analysis assignments given to students will also be examined. These assignments are inspected to understand their functional purpose within the course, and review of students’ submissions may reveal how well they are comprehending topics in music analysis.

3.2.4 Interview Sessions

Throughout the semester, students will have the option to take part in interview sessions, about twenty minutes in length. Students will be asked a range of questions relating to their conceptualization of music analysis, musical understanding, and performance, as well as their comprehension of topics in the MUSC196 course. There are four categories of questions: analysis, understanding, performance, and the course itself. Some of the most significant questions that will be asked include:

- What does the term “analysis” mean to you?
- Is analysis useful for a performer? Why or why not?
• Do you use analysis in your private study?
• What does the term “performance” mean to you?
• Is analysis necessary for a “correct” performance?
• How well are you comprehending the analysis skills taught in MUSC196?
• Are analysis skills being taught effectively in MUSC196?
• Do you think that this course material is assisting you in your professional goals?
• What does it mean to understand a piece of music?
• Is it possible to understand music without analyzing it?

A full list of interview questions is included in Appendix B, section B.2. Interview questions are designed to be open-ended so that answers will not be skewed to a prescribed outcome. Interviews with students will be scheduled on an individual basis and will occur during weeks directly following specific lessons focused on music analysis. Students will have the option to schedule interviews during any number of the rounds, but only once per round, and the students are not obligated to take part in any interviews during the semester.

3.2.5 Tutoring Sessions

During the last weeks of the semester, students will be working on their final analysis projects in which they analyze a piece from their solo repertoire. All students will be required to prepare a short presentation of their analysis for the professor; they will have the option to schedule a tutoring session with the principal investigator beforehand where they will practice their presentation, review their analytic findings, and answer several interview questions:
• Does your analysis specifically impact your performance at all?

• Did you find it easier to analyze a piece of music that you are familiar with, rather than an example in class?

• How do non-chord tones play a role in your analysis? In your performance?

• Does knowing the harmonic material underneath the melody affect how you perform it?

• Does analyzing a piece of music affect how you hear (not perform) it?

If students participated in tutoring sessions, but had not previously scheduled an interview, then questions may also be extracted from the interview question list. Students who take part in tutoring sessions will receive a small boost to their final grade as compensation and students not taking part in tutoring sessions will have a separate opportunity for extra credit.

3.3 Examining the Course

The following section will provide details about what occurred during the study, without exploring results. Specific lesson plans could not be incorporated into the study’s original plan and the course structure was not changed to specifically benefit the results of this study, so analysis lessons were simply observed. It was also previously unknown exactly how many students would take part in interview or tutoring sessions, or how many students would allow their homework assignments and content journals to be examined.

3.3.1 Interview Sessions

Interviews with students were scheduled on an individual basis and occurred during weeks directly following lessons based in music analysis; these lessons will be
outlined in 3.3.3. There were three rounds of interviews total, the first in late September, the second in late October, and the third in mid-November. A total of nineteen regular interview sessions occurred during the semester, collecting responses from fourteen different students. Select interview questions were also asked during final project tutoring sessions and so in total, twenty-one different students gave responses to a variety of interview questions. Due to time constraints and the natural variation in length of students’ responses, not all questions were able to be used for every interview. All students gave permission for their interview sessions to be audio-recorded so that their responses could be reviewed accurately.

Twelve of the interview questions allowed for simple Yes/No responses, which are indicated in Appendix B, section B.3. Although students were asked to elaborate on their answers, qualitative data can be easily taken from an overview of the responses to these questions. During the review process, answers were condensed to one response per student; in cases where a student participated in multiple interviews and answered differently between them, the student’s last response was used. In several cases where a student did not give a clear Yes/No answer to a question, their response was assigned to the category that most fit the content of their answer. In a few instances, students responded “maybe” or gave mixed responses to questions, which is reflected in the data charts found in the appendix.

All interview sessions were transcribed by listening to the audio recordings. By transcribing the students’ answers, responses could then be easily compiled into text documents that were analyzed with Unix bash scripting. When analyzing the text, all punctuation and identifying information, such as names, were removed from the transcriptions. Multiple-word phrases such as “music history” and “sheet music” were
edited with hyphens, “music-history” and “sheet-music,” so that the text analyzer would not count them as separate terms. Other terms, such as “roman numerals” and “non-chord tones” were also reduced to abbreviations, like “RN” and “NCT.”

Collections of responses to individual questions across one round or multiple rounds of interviews were compiled into plaintext documents which were then analyzed to count the frequency of each word. This process is extremely useful for examining students’ responses objectively. Interview questions were fairly short and open-ended, so text analysis can help to determine what words, phrases, or concepts students associate with various topics without them being prompted to use specific words.

3.3.2 Content Journals and Homework Assignment

Content journal responses to seven different prompts relating to analysis were collected from students during the study. Responses were analyzed similarly to the transcribed interview sessions to count the frequency that different words were used. Only one of the prompts received responses from more than half of the class; the others received either sixteen or less responses, as shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Quantity of responses to content journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit #, Journal #, Prompt #</th>
<th>U1J4P1</th>
<th>U2J3P1</th>
<th>U2J3P2</th>
<th>U3J1P1</th>
<th>U3J1P2</th>
<th>U3J2P1</th>
<th>U3J3P1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses (out of 40)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homework submissions were collected on three separate occasions during the semester. Only two students asked that their homework assignments not be viewed, and a few students did not submit these assignments. The assignment collected on
October 8th involved the analysis of a Bach chorale which included vii6 chords. The assignment collected on October 15th involved the analysis of a four-part chord progression that included multiple applied chords. The assignment collected on October 17th was a written reflection about two pieces of music that the students listened to prior to Lesson 3.

3.3.3 Lesson Timeline

Three lessons in the sophomore course relating to music analysis were examined during the semester, as well as three class sessions in which students worked on group analysis projects. All of these lessons involved relating music theoretical skills to actual repertoire, rather than four-part chordal examples. Various approaches of analysis were demonstrated across the first three lessons so that the students would be more prepared to analyze ensemble and solo repertoire in later projects. Obviously, not all methods of analysis could be covered in one semester of the course and the professor was careful to only include ensemble repertoire or allow the selection of solo repertoire that they believed students would be capable of analyzing.

Lesson 1 took place on September 19th and involved an example analysis of mm. 1-18 of Sonata in Major, K. 331 by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. The professor first opened up a discussion about students’ preferred methods of analysis. Although student’s answers varied, it was stressed that whatever approach a student takes, they should begin with a process and direction to guide them. Before walking through an analysis, the professor first performed the beginning of the sonata. The score was projected onto a screen and the professor annotated the document as the analysis was explained. She engaged students by asking them simple questions throughout the
process, such as identifying chords and their function, and students followed along with a paper copy of the score, labelling musical elements themselves.

Lesson 2 occurred on September 21st; this time, students were asked to complete analyses of *Four Impromptus, D. 935 Op. 90, No. 3 mm. 1-18* by Franz Schubert in small groups. The students were required to label LSS, RN, figured bass (FB), NCT, cadences, and a few formal structures. Students had not yet learned about applied chords, so the professor bracketed off any beats or measures that included them. In these instances, students were asked to only label the LSS and NCT. The professor and teaching assistants helped students with their analyses and answered questions on an individual basis throughout the class period. At the conclusion of the class, groups were asked to write responses to one of two discussion topics and submit them online.

Lesson 3 occurred on October 17th. Prior to the lesson, students were asked to listen to both *Five Movements, Op. 5, No. 4* by Anton Webern and *The Shire* by Howard Shore and “write notes about the salient musical characteristics” of each piece without viewing a score. Students’ answers were guided with some additional questions: Where are there points of closure? How is closure created? What motives are present? What texture(s) are used? How is timbre used? Students were unaware of the name of either piece or the composers. Their responses were collected at the beginning of class and are also used in the data analysis for this study.

Before discussing the pieces in class, the professor played an entertaining YouTube video that was sure to evoke a response from the students. Although seemingly disconnected from the topic at hand, the professor used this video as a way of demonstrating juxtaposition. In the video, two characters acted in vastly different
ways and it elicited a response and reaction from the students. She explained that music works similarly; by creating contrast and challenging a person’s expectations, music can cause people to react in different ways. This led into a larger discussion of why music students are required to learn the “rules” of music theory, pointing out that it’s important to know when these “rules” are being broken or stretched for creative purposes.

Students were then given scores to both pieces and the professor played recordings. A discussion began about how music may be perceived differently with and without a score. Harmonic, melodic, and phrase structures in *The Shire* functioned similarly to other music that the students have already worked with, so less time was spent discussing it. The professor walked through a short analysis of *String Quartet* and split the class into three groups. Each group labelled intervallic motion in one of the piece’s three sections before coming back together as a class. The professor explained that although some pieces do not follow traditional harmonies and standard methods of labelling musical function cannot be used, there may be other ways to analyze the music, such as by intervallic patterns and motives.

### 3.3.4 Ensemble Repertoire Analysis Project

Class sessions on October 19<sup>th</sup>, November 2<sup>nd</sup>, November 9<sup>th</sup>, November 16<sup>th</sup>, and December 5<sup>th</sup> involved an ensemble repertoire analysis project. Only the classes on October 19<sup>th</sup>, November 9<sup>th</sup>, and November 16<sup>th</sup> were viewed. Students were given the opportunity to rank their top three choices of ensemble pieces that were presently being performed in one of the department’s large ensembles. The professor split students into groups of four or five students and assigned each group one piece. While most students majoring in voice analyzed music from a choral ensemble and most
instrumentalists analyzed a music from either a band or orchestra, pieces were assigned based on students’ interest. Many students were analyzing music from ensembles that they were personally involved in, but this was not always the case.

Learning outcomes for this project, as written by the professor, were:

1. Students will analyze music that they care about.
2. Students will be able to make articulate and coherent observations about their selected piece(s) of music.
3. Students will be able to ask stimulating and interesting questions about their selected piece(s) of music.
4. Students will work effectively in groups, capitalizing on the diversity of knowledge and skills within the group to form a cohesive unit.

Students analyzed one of the following:

- “Dance of the Snowmen” from Howard Blake’s *The Snowman*
- “Dance of the Reed Flutes” from Pytor Tchaikovsky’s *Nutcracker Suite*
- *Der Schwanendreher*, Mvt. 1 by Paul Hindemith
- *Symphonic Metamorphosis*, Mvt 4: March, arranged for wind ensemble by Paul Hindemith
- *Agnus Dei* from Luigi Cherubini’s *Requiem in C Minor*
- *Offertorium* from Luigi Cherubini’s *Requiem in C Minor*
- *We Are The Voices* by Jim Papoulis
- *Warrior* by Kim Baryluk

During these classes, students worked in groups to analyze their assigned ensemble piece. In the first class session, students were asked to listen to the pieces, identify elements that they found interesting, and to formulate questions that could be
explored in later classes. Few strict guidelines were given as to how they should analyze the music, except that students were asked to identify the larger form of the piece. During the second class each group was required to come up with a plan and strategy for approaching their assigned piece. Examples of a plan included either analyzing the form of their piece or focusing on one particular musical aspect, such as motives, text-music relationship, harmonic analysis, or timbre/tone. Once each group had a plan, the students spent the rest of the class sessions analyzing the music in groups. As the students analyzed the music, they continuously wrote observations and new questions in a shared document, which was then uploaded online for the professor to view after each class as a way of checking in on each group. Students also submitted individual reflection forms after each class session to discuss their group’s work and their personal contributions.

There was no specific presentation or product that students were expected to create following their analyses; instead, groups were asked to continue analyzing the music until they felt their analysis was “complete,” and at that time, they would have been assigned another piece. However, over the five-week project, no group felt that they had “completed” their ensemble analysis, and so no groups were assigned a second piece. During the final class session dedicated to this project, students worked in their groups to summarize their findings in a write up that was submitted to the professor.

### 3.3.5 Solo Repertoire Analysis Project

The students’ final project for the class involved selecting a piece of music from their own solo repertoire and completing an analysis to present to the professor in a 5-minute meeting. The goal for the project, as written in the guidelines were:
The ability to assign RN analysis to a piece is not the end goal of this class—rather, we are seeking to truly understand the music at a much deeper level, and as a first step we will analyze music using the various labels and terms that we have learned. This allows us to eventually move fluently between a small-scale, atomistic view and a large-scale comprehension of a piece of music.

The full guidelines for this project are included in the Appendix. Students were asked to analyze about 2-3 pages of music, depending on the piece they selected, and all selections were approved by the professor before students began. Students were asked to label RNs, LSSs, FB, and NCTs, identify cadences, complete functional-level (FL) analyses where applicable, identify phrase structures, identify the large-scale form, and label modulations, tonicizations, and applied chords. Students were not expected to learn additional methods of analysis from outside sources.

Students had the option to gain extra credit by taking part in 20-minute tutoring sessions with the principal investigator before meeting with the professor. A total of fourteen tutoring sessions occurred, all of which were audio-recorded for later review. Most students were asked several questions about their analyses, although due to time constraints, a few students were not. If time allowed and the student had not scheduled an interview session earlier in the semester, they were also asked a few questions that had been used in the interview sessions.

3.4 Results and Discussion

Utilizing data and notes from interviews, tutoring sessions, collected homework, and class observations, the students’ conceptualizations of music topics will be explored in this section. Of the forty students enrolled in the course, interviews and tutoring sessions collected responses from twenty-one. Although data from these sessions does not cover the entirety of the course, considering homework and journal
submissions expands the participant range. In total, thirty-eight students contributed data towards this study through at least one method. To begin, general trends found through interview sessions will be identified. Afterwards, methods in which students are learning music analysis skills will be discussed, followed by a discussion of how students are understanding music, and concluding with a brief examination of how students are relating music analysis to performance.

3.4.1 Student Responses and General Trends

At the conclusion of all interviews, students’ responses were categorized and evaluated. It was important to understand the students’ conceptualization of various terms before continuing with related questions so that their later responses could be correlated with what they originally said; it was also useful to have the students first consider what these topics mean to them. By reviewing the students’ explanations of music analysis and musical understanding, significant trends were found in these two topics.

When analyzing responses to “what does the term ‘analysis’ mean to you?”, words were categorized as belonging to one of two groups: structural/functional and contextual/emotional. Of course, not all words could be assigned to a group; some words, such as articles, were simply discarded, whereas other words would require greater context and explanation to categorize them. Although certainly different, words relating to contextual and emotional topics were paired together because they represent thinking beyond theoretical skills and the physical score. Words belonging to the structural/functional category were:

- approach, break-down, breaking-down, cadence, cadences, chord, chords, chord-tones, elements, FB, FL1, FL2, form, function, functioning, functions, harmonic, harmonies, harmony, identify,
identifying, LSS, motifs, motives, music-theory, NCT, notes, patterns, phrasing, picking-apart, piece-by-piece, process, progression, rhythmic, rhythms, RN, science, scientifically, sequences, structure, theoretical.

Words belonging to the contextual/emotional category were:

characteristics, composer, composers, context, contextual, contextually, creative, critically, emotional, explanation, expressive, feeling, listening, music-history, stylistic, understand, understanding.

It was found that many students tend to consider analysis as a more “scientific” and factual approach to viewing a piece of music, as shown in the results displayed in Table 3.2. Words in the structural/functional category were used more than twice as frequently as words in the contextual/emotional category:

Table 3.2:  Word frequency from responses to the question “what does the term ‘analysis’ mean to you?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What does the term “analysis’ mean to you?</th>
<th>Interview Count: 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural/Functional Word Count</td>
<td>Contextual/Emotional Word Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every student used at least one word relating to a structural or functional concept and students rarely used words relating to the composer or historical setting of music. Collectively, the students seem to view analysis as relating more closely to the physical material on sheet music, prioritizing the labelling of musical elements rather than the contextualization of them. By labelling different elements and levels of the written music without considering their performance implications, historical context, or interpretive flexibility, students may be conceptualizing analysis as a procedure that is eventually complete, rather than something that takes multiple forms.
On the contrary, when asked what it means to “understand” a piece of music, students commonly mentioned the importance of the composer, historical factors, and context of the music. Student responses to the question “what does it mean to ‘understand’ a piece of music?” were analyzed similarly to the previous question.

Words belonging to the structural/functional category were:

- analysis, analytical, analyze, arpeggios, cadence, chord, chords, elements, form, harmonically, harmonics, harmonies, harmonizes, harmony, key, key-wise, mechanics, notation, notes, period, phrase, progression, progressions, repeated, rhythms, sections, structural, structurally, structure, technical, technique, themes, theoretically, theory.

Words belonging to the contextual/emotional category were:

- aspect, audience, background, beauty, bright, chaos, color, composer, composers, context, contexts, convey, conveyed, dark, death, dramatic, emotion, emotional, entertaining, fashion, gloomy, happy, historical, historically, intended, intent, interpretation, interpretations, listen, listener, listening, lyrical, manic, mood, performance, performer, performers, picturing, portray, possibilities, purpose, reflects, style, stylistic, tessitura, texture, time-period, venue, vibe, words.

While the students still mentioned theoretical concepts and elements of label analysis, on the whole, more consideration was given to contextual information, as demonstrated in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“What does it mean to ‘understand’ music?”</th>
<th>Interview Count: 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural/Functional Word Count</td>
<td>Contextual/Emotional Word Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Words in the contextual/emotional category were used almost twice as much as words in the functional/structural category. There is less divide between the categories when examining this question as compared to students’ descriptions of “analysis,” but there is still a clear split. Although this question was asked in fewer interviews, there was significantly more text to analyze in total, as shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: Comparison of the text analyzed from student responses to questions asking students about analysis and understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th># of interviews</th>
<th># of words analyzed</th>
<th># of S/F words</th>
<th># of E/C words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may indicate that students found it more difficult to describe musical understanding but were more easily able to state their conceptions of analysis. The average frequency of structural/functional terms per student response is fairly close (3.33 to 3.95) when comparing descriptions of musical understanding to definitions of music analysis. However, emotional/contextual words were used 409% more frequently (6.47 to 1.58) when students described what it means to “understand” music as compared to when they defined analysis.

Table 3.5 shows the responses of fifteen students who were asked about the relationship between analysis and musical understanding.
Responses to questions “is it possible to understand music without analyzing it?” and “does analysis assist in the understanding of music?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Is it possible to understand music without analyzing it?</th>
<th>Does analysis assist in understanding a piece of music?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (of 15)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students seem to value analysis as a method of gaining more information about a piece of music, but most do not consider it necessary. However, if the majority of students are viewing analysis as an objective, factual view of music based in labelling musical elements, it may be more accurate to say that students do not consider label analysis as necessary for understanding music, whereas gathering contextual information is. To the students, contextual information and analytic findings seem to be entirely different concepts.

### 3.4.2 Content Journals and Homework Submissions

The data collected from the text analysis of content journal submissions did not provide much insight into how students were conceptualizing topics. Unlike the interview questions, the content journal prompts were very specific and the most frequently used words were typically found within the prompt itself; because of this, it would be wrong to assert that students are bringing in these ideas themselves. More valuable and applicable data has been gained from reviewing responses to interview question that did not guide students’ answers, and so content journals will not be used to make conclusions about the course or students.

Thirteen different homework assignments were viewed to evaluate which topics were reinforced throughout the course, which will be expanded upon in section 3.4.3. Students submissions from three different homework assignments were
collected, but only one is being used to view students’ conceptualizations of music. The assignment collected directly before Lesson 3 will be explored in section 3.4.4; the other two assignments were originally collected to help determine the students’ level of comprehension. It was decided later in the process that instead of evaluating the students’ course performance itself, it would be more insightful to see whether or not students are identifying themselves as comprehending the material, which will be examined in section 3.4.3.

3.4.3  Music Analysis Skills

Why are students typically viewing music analysis as something objective and factual? Through observing analysis-focused classes and reviewing class handouts and assignments, it has been found that the course is heavily focused in teaching students how to analyze music through the labelling of musical elements. Lessons 1 and 2 involved significant amounts of label analysis, so they will be discussed in further detail.

During Lesson 1, the professor opened up a discussion about how students approach analysis. It was stressed that every student has some sort of process and plan when examining a new piece of music, beginning by listening to the music. Some elements may be easier for students to identify by listening, such as cadences or sentence and period structures. After listening, the professor suggested that students begin by identifying the LSS. LSS are useful in analysis because, unlike RN, they have no direct relationship to function and, typically, can be identified by simply looking at the notes present. Once LSS are labelled, students can more easily identify other elements of the music that require musical context.
For the most part, the process suggested to the students is one that works from the smallest level of music, the notes themselves, to larger ideas such as phrases and periods. The exception to this is that the students’ ability to aurally identify elements immediately is prioritized, generally including cadences and phrasing. Students are not expected to identify every element of a piece aurally, but as they become more experienced with analysis, it is important for the students also develop aural skills. At this point in the curriculum, students were not yet labelling large formal structures, but eventually this multi-leveled method of analysis could be used to achieve that goal.

During Lesson 2, students split into groups in order to complete analyses of Schubert’s *Four Impromptus, D. 935 Op. 90, No. 3*. Just two days after Lesson 1, students now had the opportunity to utilize an analytic process as suggested by their professor. Students were asked to begin their analyses by aurally identifying formal cadences, periods, and sentences. Most groups identified cadences easily by listening and many groups were also able to recognize sentence and period structures. Once the students had listened to the piece all the way through and wrote down their initial findings, they began with the smallest elements and worked their way up to a FL analysis. Measures with applied chords were bracketed off, as the students had not yet learned the topic, and students rarely had difficulty labelling musical elements. *Impromptu No. 3* was a useful example for this class session because it allowed every student to practice their analytic skills, while also giving more advanced students the opportunity to examine applied chords before they formally learned the topic.

Across the semester, students had thirteen different homework assignments, separate from their projects and journal entries, which helped to reinforce analysis skills. Table 3.6 shows the frequency with which the topics of LSS, RN, FB, FL, NCT,
Phrases, and Cadences were included in the homework assignments. Topics were only marked if the students were asked to actively write those topics and were not counted if the labels had already been provided. It is significant to mention that all thirteen required students to complete LSS analyses, ten involved RN analysis, and ten asked students to label FB, suggesting that these three topics are foundational in the structure of the course. Although only six of the assignments asked students to complete FL analyses, that topic was not introduced until a few weeks into the semester. Every time students were asked to complete FL it is also assumed that they were labelling cadences.

Table 3.6: Frequency of topics presented across thirteen homework assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homework #</th>
<th>LSS</th>
<th>RN</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NCT</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
<th>Cadences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (of 13)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout the course students were also frequently given handouts in class. The purposes of these handouts varied: Some were to be filled out by students in-class so that they could use them later as a reference; a few handouts were guidelines for group activities that began in class and were completed within a single class or across multiple days; other handouts included scores for analysis examples or simple examples that were used when introducing new topics. Many of the handouts included fill-in-the-blank sentences or problems so that students would follow along and stay engaged throughout their review. The twenty-two handouts from the semester were reviewed similar to the homework assignments, examining how frequently different theoretical concepts were incorporated (Table 3.7). It is significant again how frequently LSS, RN, and FB analysis is included in the handouts. It can be seen that the topics of phrase structure and cadence identification were more commonly used as an in-class exercise, although these topics were still emphasized slightly less than labelling chordal elements.
Table 3.7: Frequency of topics presented across twenty-two class handouts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handout Name</th>
<th>LSS</th>
<th>RN</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NCT</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
<th>Cadences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Syntax</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embellishing Tones</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4 Chords</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Writing Practice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Detection</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1 Composition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence/Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Writing Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Practice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Schubert</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Mozart</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Tone Chord (LTC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2 Composition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Chords 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Chords 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2 Review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Chords 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (of 22)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8 shows the responses of fourteen students who were asked during interview sessions about the analysis skills being taught in their course:
Table 3.8: Responses to questions “are analysis skills being taught effectively in MUSC196?” and “how well are you comprehending the analysis skills taught in MUSC196?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Are analysis skills being taught effectively in MUSC196?</th>
<th>How well are you comprehending the analysis skills taught in MUSC196?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (of 14)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No students responded “no” to either question and although these fourteen students cannot represent all forty in the course, this shows a very positive reception of the professor’s teaching methods. It appears that the course is providing students with the skills to analyze physical elements of music and that the students are comprehending the material as well.

Observing the results given in this section, it makes sense that students’ first thoughts about analysis generally include different forms of labelling. Analytic labelling is a significant part of the course’s structure and in the vast majority of homework assignments and class handouts, students are being asked to write LSS, RN, and FB. In-class analysis exercises during Lessons 1 and 2 promoted a step-by-step process of analyzing music from smaller pieces to larger ideas.

3.4.4 Musical Understanding

This course does not emphasize or teach the emotional and contextual topics that students typically associate with musical understanding, but throughout the semester students increasingly had more opportunities to view music in ways other than with label analysis. Subjective observations about music were considered to be analytically valuable when students discussed their impressions of the Webern string quartet and Howard Shore piece in Lesson 3. The ensemble and solo repertoire
analysis projects that followed were geared towards comprehending music in a more holistic sense, through formulating and answering questions, and they encouraged students to consider musical context. This approach was unlike previous analysis assignments, although label analysis was still a significant part of both.

Before Lesson 3, students listened to the pieces without a score and were guided to explain their initial reactions. Alongside points of closure and the musical texture, students were prompted to consider how timbre was used in the pieces, a rather subjective element. Many students interpreted this as identifying how different sounds made them feel, rather than just identifying what instruments were used. This was a very significant turning point in the students’ course; by including this guiding question, the professor validated the students’ opinions about the music as acceptable responses, even without direct theoretical backing. The written reactions to hearing the music before class were collected from twenty-four of the students; whether with an emotional quality such as “cheerful” or a descriptive word such as “mysterious” or “eerie,” all twenty-four students mentioned something abstract about their musical experience relating to the quality of how the music sounded. Many students made one or two comments about the timbre, primarily labelling it as “warm” or “dark,” but eight students stood out by mentioning four or more abstract terms. One student described the Webern quartet as “ambient” and having a sense of “eeriness,” while the Shore piece was “folky, triumphant, and bouncy.” Another student described the Webern quartet as sounding like a “deep, dark forest,” but the Shore piece as “brighter” and “hopeful.”

The class period opened up a discussion about how to approach the analysis of “non-standard” repertoire for which RN and FL analyses cannot be used. A major
concept of the class was musical contrast and juxtaposition; the professor explained that contrasting ideas may be represented in music in many different ways. The two pieces they had listened to were starkly different in tonality and form, but also in their timbral qualities. As a whole, this lesson was heavily discussion-based and gave value to students’ emotional and abstract reactions to the music. When later faced with music that was difficult to analyze and outside the realm of traditional music theory, in either their ensemble or solo repertoire projects, students were asked to think critically and creatively about the music.

Later classes related to music analysis were focused on the group repertoire analysis project. There are both issues and benefits to open-ended design of the project; by taking away the students’ guide, they may not yet be able to figure out what is significant in a piece of music and they may struggle to label some elements within a piece. However, they may be able to more easily use their instincts and intuitions to decide what about the music is actually significant to them and they have the freedom to explore topics that they find interesting. Without a specific end to their project, it was uncertain where the students would end up.

The students’ solo repertoire projects were also left fairly open-ended, although there were some more specific goals about what the students should be achieving through their analysis and study. The students were provided with four topics and were asked to focus on two or three in their meetings with the professor. The topics were:

- modulations, tonicizations, and applied chords
- dissonance as an expressive device, such as non-chord tones
- periods and sentences, leading to large-scale forms; and motives.
Depending on their selected piece, many of these topics were well manageable for the students and stay within the boundaries of theoretical concepts they have already learned. For any element of a student’s piece that they had not learned how to analyze, they were asked to use creative thinking and relate what is happening in the music to the analysis techniques that they do know.

The professor clearly stated in the project guidelines that the project was designed to encourage deeper musical understanding and comprehension. While “musical understanding” can be interpreted in many ways, based on the rest of the project guidelines, the professor was, in part, implying an understanding of how analysis can influence performance by “connecting knowledge gained to real-world applications.” Additionally, the professor wrote that students should have a “sense of [the piece’s] most interesting or unique characteristics,” which may have encouraged students to incorporate the contextual and emotional concepts that they generally link to musical understanding.

If students are being at all prompted to incorporate contextual or emotional topics into their analyses, but those topics are not taught in the course, then the professor might be assuming that the students are learning this style of thinking elsewhere or that the students are intuitively thinking in this manner. This study does not indicate why students are conceptualizing musical understanding with contextual and emotional concepts; perhaps the students are learning contextual thinking through their music history courses and emotional thinking through their private study. Further research would be needed to answer this question.
3.4.5 Analysis related to performance

During interview sessions, students were also asked a few questions relating to musical performance. Although less directly connected to the music theory course examined for this study, it may be useful to see if students are connecting the concepts of analysis and performance. When asked in interviews what the term “performance” means, students generally had fairly straightforward answers. One student described performance as “any sort of presentation for an audience of any size,” and another explained it as “when you're playing something and you intend for other people to hear it.” Only a few students mentioned topics relating to personal interpretation, musicality, or expression.

Sixteen students were asked whether or not analysis is necessary for performance, as shown in Table 3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Is analysis necessary for a “correct” performance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (of 16)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students who provided mixed responses explained that it would depend on the music’s genre and time period. Remembering that 14/15 students said music can be understood without analysis, it is interesting that 6/16 students think that analysis is necessary for performance, at least in some contexts. This might suggest that some students may view analysis as a tool utilized by performers in the preparation of music, but that it is less significant to them when listening to or trying to understand
music. Table 3.10 shows that, in total, 21/21 students agreed that analysis is useful for a performer.

Table 3.10: Responses to the question “is analysis useful for a performer?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Is analysis useful for a performer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (of 21)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of their final solo repertoire analysis projects, students were instructed to indicate how their analysis of one the four provided topics would help them to make musically informed decisions as a performer. While some students may have been able to apply analytic findings from their ensemble repertoire projects to their performance within those ensembles, solo repertoire naturally allows for greater expressive control, allowing students to more easily identify ways in which their analysis could impact performance of melodic material.

During interview sessions, fourteen students were asked if they think that analysis impacts performance; ten students were asked a similar question during tutoring sessions. Responses are shown in Table 3.11 and Table 3.12.

Table 3.11: Responses to the question “do you think that analysis impacts the way in which you perform music?” from interview sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Do you think that analysis impacts the way in which you perform music?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (of 14)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.12: Responses to the question “does your analysis specifically impact your performance at all?” from tutoring sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Does your analysis specifically impact your performance at all?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (of 10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, eighteen different students were asked one or both of these questions. Only one student answered “yes” to the first question in an interview session and then responded “no” during their tutoring session. However, of these eighteen students, all eighteen said at some point in the study that they believe analysis impacts performance. It can be seen that students see a relation between analysis and performance, but it is unclear what exactly this connection is. It may be that students view analysis as a useful tool but cannot yet articulate how exactly they would use those skills themselves, trusting that eventually their studies will assist them in performance.

3.5 Conclusion

Through this study it was found that sophomore music students are primarily pairing topics related to function and structure with their conception of “analysis,” while they more frequently match emotional and contextual ideas with their definitions of “musical understanding.” The students likely relate structural/functional topics with music analysis because the course had a strong foundation in teaching students how to correctly label musical elements. However, along with the incorporation of repertoire that students were actively performing, the professor began to introduce topics that led some students to consider concepts beyond the physical score, such as mood, timbre, and context. Students were increasingly guided towards
understanding their music, rather than just labelling features. Additionally, students were prompted to consider the performance implications of their analyses as part of their final analysis projects, a significant step towards actively using analytic skills.
Chapter 4

CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This paper has explored multiple topics: the implications of music analysis, the effect that analysis has on performance, musical understanding, methods by which analysis is taught within a selected music theory course, and how students in that course are conceptualizing analysis. Topics in Chapter 1 influenced the experiment that took place in Chapter 2, and the results of that experiment ultimately led to the study in Chapter 3. This final chapter will primarily synthesize how the results of Chapter 3 can be used to further support the conclusions in Chapter 2 and will suggest methods by which further research may be conducted.

The results of Chapter 2 suggest that a metaphorical analysis may be an efficient and effective method of applying theoretical concepts to performance, whether created by an analyst or performer. A metaphorical analysis involves both the critical observation of musical structure through analytic and theoretical methods, as well as the incorporation of metaphorical and abstract concepts which are commonly prioritized by performers. While theorists may possess the ability to analyze music on intensely deep levels and to extreme extents, performers might find their strength in musical interpretation and expression. Instead of prioritizing one over the other, both “sides” of the argument would benefit by coming together with the understanding that excellent music comes as a result of complex relationships. Performers would benefit from a strong foundation in technical analytic skills and, likewise, theorists may gain a
lot by giving attention to abstract concepts if they truly wish to impact another’s performance. At the heart of musical presentation, it can be understood that musical works hold innately emotional qualities and are designed to evoke responses from audiences. Composers rarely create works of art without considering the impact that it may have on those experiencing it.

4.2 Creating a Metaphorical Analysis

Through the study in Chapter 2, it was found that a musician may benefit more from a theoretical analysis if it is tied to abstract concepts through the creation of a metaphorical analysis. Two pieces of music were approached with different methods of analysis; the first, by Rimsky-Korsakov, was paired with a theoretical analysis focused on labelling musical elements, whereas the second piece, by Hans Huber, was matched with programmatic material that had been tied to theoretical findings. By connecting abstract qualities to theoretical information, performers both enjoyed the music more and found it easier to prepare a convincing performance.

An example of a metaphorical analysis is demonstrated in Chapter 2 with Hans Huber’s quintet in which a fairytale story was correlated with the structure of the first movement of this work. Although a metaphorical analysis does not necessarily require a story or sequence of events to exist, this study is only able to support a metaphorical analysis based in programmatic material. At this point, the benefit of other kinds of metaphorical analyses can only be hypothesized. It would be wrong to suggest that every piece in the Western repertoire may benefit from the association with a storyline; some works might be deliberately composed to lack programmatic purpose. If that is the case, these pieces may gain from the metaphorical conceptualizing of the emotions or ideas presented across that work, whether they are simple or dynamic.
Creating a metaphorical analysis of any kind is not a straightforward task and connecting abstract thought to notation requires specific skills.

Three distinct areas of skill are necessary to create such an analysis. First, one must have a solid grounding in theoretical concepts and basic methods of theoretical analysis. Next, one must be able to both imagine and *articulate* abstract and metaphorical qualities of music; the articulation of abstract ideas would most commonly be through writing or speech, although a pictorial demonstration similar to Rink’s intensity graph is possible. Finally, one must have the ability to connect these abstract concepts to the theoretical analyses that they have created in order to effectively present this information to others, while also strengthening their own interpretations. This chapter will continue by examining how the current music curriculum at the University of Delaware may be providing students with the skills necessary to create their own metaphorical analyses.

4.2.1 Theoretical Analysis Skills

As far as the study detailed in Chapter 3 can demonstrate, students are learning the theoretical analysis skills necessary to create a metaphorical analysis. In the beginning stages of this study, it was never expected that students would be lacking these skills or that the course would not be teaching them effectively; however, this could not be assumed and it was important to determine how exactly the course may be influencing students’ conceptualizations of analysis. The theory course explored in Chapter 3 was only a sophomore fall course, the second of four written theory courses in the University of Delaware curriculum, yet the students were still learning sufficient analytic skills to influence their own performance of significant pieces within their repertoire.
While it might be assumed that later written theory courses provide students with greater analytic skills, even the skills presented in this semester alone could be sufficient for the theoretical aspect of some metaphorical analyses. If the students were to attempt an analysis of either piece utilized in Chapter 2, they would likely feel as though they have enough analytic skills. They may not be able to analyze the pieces entirely or by various approaches, but enough so that it can impact performance. Even within the students’ repertoire analysis projects, they were presented with material beyond their threshold for analytic comprehension. The professor encouraged students to use “creative thinking” to overcome these challenges and students were still able to define elements of the music that they found significant. Every student who was asked if music analysis impacts performance responded positively and it is important to consider that their conceptualizations of music analysis were, at the time, limited only to analytic methods they had learned.

The study performed in Chapter 3 explored only one segment of one piece of the entire music curriculum. In order to have a more comprehensive view of what students at the University of Delaware are learning through their studies, further research may be performed later in the music theory curriculum. Certainly, advanced topics of music analysis such as Schenkerian voice-leading and the intensity graph demonstrated by Rink may be beneficial in the creation of metaphorical analyses, and so advanced study in music analysis could very well provide students with additional skills. This study does not aim to suggest that basic music theoretical skills are an end point for musical comprehension, but rather that performers may begin to experience benefits from even early connections across theoretical and metaphorical concepts.
4.2.2 Formulation of Metaphorical Ideas

This paper has provided no evidence to suggest that students are directly learning how to formulate metaphorical and abstract ideas about the music that they are performing. The topic itself is not incorporated into the course that was observed. It was never expected that the professor would be teaching this topic in class, but to focus this study, other areas of the curriculum were not examined. Determining whether or not students are learning these skills elsewhere would be the appropriate next step to further this study. As discussed before, performers tend to think about their music through a more abstract lens than an analyst may, suggesting that the next area of study might be students’ performance-related curriculum, such as private lessons and ensemble participation.

It is expected that students are learning to think abstractly about music, at least indirectly, through their professional mentors. During the second half of the study in Chapter 2 with Hans Huber’s piece, the students did not express any difficulty in incorporating emotional and pictorial elements into their learning process. Although they had not articulated the concepts themselves, it was clear that they had an understanding of what characteristics of their playing may change when asked to represent the characters and scene of a fairytale. It is likely that students are able to interpret the subjective concepts of tone, color, and mood, at least to some extent, even though such qualities cannot actually be seen within a score. Instead, musicians hear and experience these qualities, either in person or through a recording. Private lessons give students the opportunity to consistently hear a professional musician’s interpretations, which a student may then transfer to their own playing. Similarly, ensemble participation places students in atmospheres where their musical expression is constantly being shaped by a director’s artistic view.
Through interviews and surveys with studio instructors and ensemble directors, one may discover if students are learning how to not just formulate abstract ideas, but how to articulate them. Of course, private instruction on voice or instrument is incredibly unique to each studio and is heavily dependent upon the faculty member. For example, it may be found that faculty in the instrumental department focus less of their time on expressivity and favor technical skill, while the vocal department might encourage dramatic interpretations in order to match music to text; or, the opposite may be found. It may also turn out that students are picking up on metaphorical concepts in their playing but lack the ability to articulate those thoughts. Hypotheses may be made about this hypothetical study, but this paper alone cannot give answers as to whether or not students in this curriculum are learning this particular skill.

4.2.3 Connecting Metaphor to Music

While there is no evidence that students are being taught how to formulate and articulate their own metaphorical ideas, the sophomore music theory class observed in Chapter 3 did, at a basic level, introduce the skill of matching deeper musical understanding to theoretical analysis. Beginning in Lesson 3, which explored the students’ perceptions of music with and without a score, subjective elements of music began to hold a role in students’ analyses. In their initial reactions, students expressed a variety of emotions and described timbral qualities, two topics which were rather non-existent in previous attempts to analyze music. As they worked through their ensemble and solo repertoire analysis projects, students used critical listening to formulate questions about and to define significant aspects of their chosen pieces. By incorporating subjective elements into their plan to analyze music, the students began
to understand how analysis is actually the synthesis of many different components, not just the labelling of chords and phrases.

Additionally, in their final solo analysis projects, the professor required that students consider how their analyses may impact a well-informed performance of their selected piece. Due to the confines of the study, exact results of how that requirement played a role in students’ final presentations for the professor are unknown, but the simple fact that this project asked students to apply analysis to performance is significant. Allowing students to see the applicable use of analysis in a personal setting with a piece of music they are already familiar with may show them the role that music theory could play in their performance. Although students are seeing how deeper musical understanding can be tied to the theoretical analyses, there is much more to be learned if they are to actually create metaphorical analyses.

As explained in the previous section, students are not yet learning how to articulate metaphorical ideas. They must have this skill before being able to tie those ideas to theoretical knowledge; however, this course is helping to establish the significance of music theory and critical musical examination in the preparation of performance. Further research in the music theory courses may indicate if applicable uses of analysis continue through the students’ curriculum and if students are learning effective ways to utilize analysis. If the articulation and formulation of metaphorical ideas are being taught elsewhere in the curriculum, then it may also be possible to see whether or not students are encouraged to connect abstract ideas to their analytic findings.
4.3 Final Conclusions

This study was not designed to find conclusive answers to particular questions; instead, this paper may act as the inception of future studies. It is my own view that students would greatly benefit from the use of metaphorical analyses, which has been supported through the study in Chapter 2. Additional studies similar to that experiment that cover a wider range of students and compare control to experimental groups may better strengthen my argument. Before fully considering whether or not the skills necessary to create metaphorical analyses should be a significant aspect of the curriculum, more research should be conducted that consider how various types of analysis influence a student’s learning process and musical interpretation. The structure of the experiment in Chapter 2 is unfamiliar in the field of music theory research and may be used as a base model for future experiments.

Extensive study focused in the University of Delaware’s music curriculum would give a comprehensive view of how that curriculum is preparing students to create and use analyses, which may be then reviewed to direct students’ education toward desired outcomes. If additional research indicates that metaphorical analysis is indeed a useful tool for students, then it would be reasonable that it becomes part of a school’s curriculum. The incorporation of metaphorical analysis into multiple areas of a single school’s curriculum alongside a longitudinal study to examine how the topic influences students’ performance and conceptualizations of music would certainly be difficult but would indicate whether or not transitioning curriculums in this direction may be worthwhile for music schools in general.
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Appendix A

CHAPTER 2 APPENDIX

A.1 Practice Reflection Form and Rehearsal Reflection Form Questions

A.1.1 PRF 1 (Rimsky-Korsakov)

1. Now that you have a better theoretical understanding of the piece, do you find any difference in any aspect of your practicing?

2. Now that you have heard your part along with others in a rehearsal setting, do you find any difference in any aspect of your individual practicing?

3. What challenges are you facing in the music?

4. What strategies are you using to overcome the challenges?

5. Other comments about your practicing?

A.1.2 PRF 2 (Rimsky-Korsakov)

1. Now that you have a better contextual understanding of the piece, do you find any difference in any aspect of your practicing?

2. Knowing that the piece was composed for a competition, do you find any difference in any aspect of your practicing?

3. What challenges are you facing (new or continuous) in the music?

4. What strategies are you using to overcome the challenges?

5. How difficult would you rate this quintet piece? On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the most difficult.

6. How difficult has this piece been to learn?
7. Other comments about your practicing?

A.1.3 PRF 3 (Huber)

1. Knowing the meaning of the piece and having a theoretical understanding from the start, do you find any difference in any aspect of your practicing?

2. How does knowing a metaphorical interpretation of the piece affect the way in which you practice?

3. What challenges are you facing with the music?

4. What strategies are you using to overcome the challenges?

5. Other comments about your practicing?

A.1.4 PRF 4 (Huber)

1. What challenges are you facing (new or continuous) in the music?

2. What strategies are you using to overcome the challenges?

3. How difficult would you rate this piece? On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the most difficult.

4. How difficult would you rate the Rimsky-Korsakov quintet? Also on a scale of 1-10.

5. How difficult has this piece been to learn?

6. How difficult was the Rimsky-Korsakov to learn?

7. Other comments about your practicing?

A.1.5 RRF 1 (Rimsky-Korsakov)

1. Before the rehearsal begins, do you have any expectations? It is okay if you have none. Be specific if possible.

2. Now that you have heard the other members' parts along with your own, how has it affected your understanding of the music?
3. Do you now anticipate that there will be any changes in your rehearsal/practice techniques? If so, what?

4. Now that you have been provided a theoretical analysis of the piece, do you anticipate that there will be any changes in your rehearsal/practice techniques?

5. Other Comments?

A.1.6 RRF 2 (Rimsky-Korsakov)

1. Before the rehearsal begins, do you anticipate any changes for this second rehearsal?

2. Does it mean anything to you that this piece was written by Rimsky-Korsakov? If yes, what?

3. Does it mean anything to you that this is the second movement of a three movement piece? If yes, what?

4. Does it mean anything to you that this piece was composed for a competition? If yes, what?

5. Does it mean anything to you that the piece is meant to sound "Russian?" If yes, what?

6. Other Comments?

A.1.7 RRF 3 (Rimsky-Korsakov)

1. Now that the entire quintet has a fuller understanding of the piece, did you notice any differences in the rehearsal? If yes, what?

2. Are there any differences (other than note accuracy) between your performance and the professional recording?

3. Is either performance more or less "correct" than the other? Explain.

4. What are your final thoughts about this piece and your learning process?
A.1.8 RRF 4 (Huber)

1. Before the rehearsal begins, do you have any expectations? It is okay if you have none. Be specific if possible.

2. Now that you have heard the other members' parts along with your own, has it affected your understanding of the music? If yes, how?

3. Now that you have been provided a theoretical analysis of the piece, do you anticipate that there will be any changes in your rehearsal/practice techniques?

4. Having discussed the piece with the rest of the quintet, has your understanding of the music changed at all? If yes, how?

5. Other thoughts?

A.1.9 RRF 5 (Huber)

1. What are your personal opinions about the music? Explain.

2. What, if anything, has been different about learning this piece as compared to the Rimsky-Korsakov?

3. Other thoughts?

A.1.10 RRF 6 (Huber)

1. After hearing the composer's intended meaning of the piece, does that change anything? If yes, what?

2. Do you feel as though being given an alternate interpretation of the piece has guided your practice/rehearsal/performance in any way? If yes, how?

3. Do you notice any differences (other than accuracy) between the professional recording and your own performance? If yes, what?

4. Is either performance more or less "correct" than the other? Explain.

5. What are your final thoughts about this piece and your learning process?
A.2 Institutional Review Board Approval

Figure A.2.1: Institutional Review Board Approval for Chapter 2 study.
Appendix B

CHAPTER 3 APPENDIX

B.1 Content Journal Analysis-Related Prompts

Unit 1, Journal 4, Prompt 1:

Discuss your experiences in the analysis-focused classes (Wed and Fri of this week). What were processes that you worked with this week (in small groups or larger groups); what are your preferred strategies for analytical work and what do you still need to work on in this area?

Unit 2, Journal 3, Prompt 1:

As preparation for class on Wednesday, you were asked to listen to two excerpts and make notes on them; we then studied the scores in class on Wednesday. Compare and contrast your experience listening outside of class (without a score) vs. in class (with the score). Did your perception of these pieces change when we worked with them in class? If so, how? If not, why not? What was the purpose of analyzing two such different pieces of music in a single class period--and ones that are in a different style from much of the music we have studied thus far?

Unit 2, Journal 3, Prompt 2:

Discuss your experience working with ensemble repertoire in class on Friday. What piece did you work on? How did the process go for you, and what did you learn on Friday that you didn't know before? What went well, and what could you do differently in future when approaching these ensemble analysis projects?

Unit 3, Journal 1, Prompt 1:

Discuss your understanding of the Vivaldi example from Wednesday's class--how did it go for you when identifying the sequences by ear? Do you find the score helpful or harder to process than the aural material? What concepts were you able to solidify through working on this piece during class (and after class), and what do you still want to improve on?

Unit 3, Journal 1, Prompt 2:
Discuss your experience during the repertoire analysis project on Friday--what are you learning about the music, what are you learning about your own skills and inclinations, and what are you learning about your weaknesses? (NOTE: If you select this option, it should go beyond the reflection quiz questions that are due as a part of that project itself.)

Unit 3, Journal 2, Prompt 1:

Looking back over the repertoire analysis project--what changes have you noticed in the way that you (individually) approach your piece? At a meta-level, what have you learned about yourself as a musician, theorist, analyst, performer? <Yes, your identity as a performer is also related to this project even if you are not performing these pieces!>

What new approaches to analysis in general have you learned or thought about, and what strategies would you employ if you were to start this project over next week?

Unit 3, Journal 3, Prompt 1:

Discuss strategies and methods for analyzing an excerpt that modulates. How can you observe that a modulation is occurring, and how can you identify where it occurs? What other factors come into play with analysis of a modulating excerpt that are different from a "regular" excerpt? What factors are unchanged when dealing with a modulating excerpt?

B.2 Interview Session Questions

Questions are separated into four different categories: analysis, musical understanding, performance, and the MUSC196 course. The questions are continuously numbered so that they can be easily referenced in the data chart in section B.3, although they were not always asked in this order.

B.2.1 Analysis

1. What does the term “analysis” mean to you?
2. Is analysis useful for a performer? Why or why not?
3. Do you use analysis in your private study?
4. Do you actively use the analytic skills taught in your music theory courses while learning music?

5. Do you think that analysis influences the way in which you perform music? How?

6. Do you prefer being given an analysis, or analyzing something yourself?

7. Do you have a preferred type of analysis?

8. Is music analysis incorporated at all in your instrument/voice lessons?

B.2.2 Musical Understanding

9. What does it mean to understand a piece of music?

10. Is it possible to understand music without analyzing it?

11. Does analysis assist in understanding a piece of music?

12. Does analyzing a piece of music detract from it in any way?

13. Can music be analyzed in different ways?

14. Can music be understood in different ways?

B.2.3 Performance

15. What does the term “performance” mean to you?

16. Is analysis necessary for a “correct” performance?

17. Could a performance be considered a sort of analysis?

B.2.4 MUSC196

18. How well are you comprehending the analysis skills taught in MUSC196?

19. Are analysis skills being taught effectively in MUSC196?

20. What methods of instruction do you find most understandable?
21. Do you think that this course material is assisting you in your professional goals?

22. How well did you understand last week’s lesson in music analysis?

23. Do you feel prepared for your homework assignments focusing on analysis?

24. Can you apply what you learned last week to music you are learning right now or music you may learn in the future?

B.3 Data Charts

Only data for interview questions that were answered with Yes/No/Maybe responses are included in this chart. Some students gave responses on multiple occasions in multiple interviews or tutoring sessions and are marked with an asterisk. Question 18 asks the students “how well” they are comprehending topics in MUSC196; positive responses are assigned a “Y” for yes, negative responses are assigned “N” for no, and mixed responses are assigned “M” for mixed/maybe. The chart is split into four sections which correlate with the three rounds of interviews and the tutoring sessions. The second chart condenses responses based on students’ latest answers.
Table B.3.1: Chart of student responses to Yes/No/Maybe questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Q21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3*</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Q21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B.4 Solo Repertoire Analysis Project Guidelines

MUSC 196, Fall 2018

**Final analysis project**

1. **Overview:** Your project is to analyze a piece (or part of a piece) of music (approximately 2-3 pages) from your repertoire (such as jury pieces!). You will conduct an analysis of the piece that is along the lines of our repertoire analysis and in-class analysis activities, and will explain it to me in a 5-minute analysis “interview”. Presentations will take place during finals week.

2. **Goals:** The ability to assign RN analysis to a piece is not the end goal of this class—rather, we are seeking to truly understand the music at a much deeper level, and as a first step we will analyze music using the various labels and terms that we have learned. This allows us to eventually move fluently between a small-scale, atomistic view and a large-scale comprehension of a piece of music.

3. **Requirements for analysis:** Make a full analysis of your selected piece, to be submitted as part of your final project. Your analysis should include:
   a. LSS, RN, FB, and NCT analysis
   b. Analysis of cadences
   c. Functional-level analysis (where appropriate)
   d. Analysis of phrase structures (sentences and periods)
   e. Analysis of form (A and B sections, main themes, departures and returns)
   f. Modulation (key areas and cadences), tonicizations, and applied chords

   Note that there will most likely be some elements of your piece that we have not yet officially learned how to analyze. For these elements, you should employ creative thinking and provide explanations for what you think is happening by relating it to analysis techniques/elements that we have already learned.

4. **Requirements for “interview”:** Obviously you cannot cover every detail of a piece of music in 5 minutes, so your goal is to demonstrate that you have a solid understanding of how the piece works, and a sense of its most interesting or unique characteristics. To help you organize your presentation, you should plan to choose 2-3 of the 4 topics listed below, and explain how you see these being worked out in your piece.
   a. Modulations (key areas and cadences), tonicizations, and applied chords
   b. Dissonance as an expressive device (embellishing tones)
   c. Periods and sentences (leading to larger-scale forms, as applicable)
   d. Motives

   Lastly, choose ONE of the three topics from your presentation and indicate how your analysis of that topic would help you to make musically informed decisions as a performer (or a teacher, conductor, etc.).

   Your presentation should include use of an annotated score (you should have one copy for me and one for you) as a visual aid. After your 5-minute “interview” is completed, we will discuss your analysis and further possible questions.

---

**Figure B.4.1:** Final analysis project guidelines, page 1.
What you need to submit:

1. The piece that you wish to use needs to be submitted and approved in advance—you should submit it no later than Friday, Nov. 16th, so that I can give you the go-ahead on your piece by the end of Thanksgiving break.
2. After your interview you will submit your fully annotated score.
3. As preparation for your presentation you should construct one page of notes (typed/written) to use during your presentation; these will also be submitted after the interview.
4. A reflection form (via a Canvas quiz), which must be completed by Friday, 12/14 at midnight.

Assessment of outcomes

The following outcomes will be assessed by means of this project; these are the only assessments of this outcome which will take place.

I can…

1. apply small-scale analytical principles (LSS, RN, FB, PF, NCT)
2. apply larger-scale analytical principles (cadences, motives and transformations, phrase/sentence/period structures, sequences, modulation)
3. connect knowledge gained to real-world applications
4. communicate acquired knowledge in spoken form
5. thoughtfully reflect and self-assess on my learning process and results
6. OPTIONAL: Take advantage of one of the following resources to help prepare for your final project (each graded on completion):
   - 20-minute tutoring session with Alex
   - Short guided analysis project on a different piece

Figure B.4.2: Final analysis project guidelines, page 2.
B.5 Institutional Review Board Approval

Institutional Review Board Approval for Chapter 3 study.

Figure B.5.1: Institutional Review Board Approval for Chapter 3 study.