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ABSTRACT

This study examined the rehearsal planning and practices of three selected high school band directors as they prepare their ensembles for performance. Three subjects were observed across five consecutive rehearsals for a total of approximately 641 minutes. Data was collected from structured interviews, videotape observations, field notes, analysis of instructional goals, and frequency and duration data collected on specified teacher and student behaviors. The observed rehearsal time was divided into rehearsal frames which are episodes of rehearsal time devoted to the correction of student performance. Rehearsal frames that included two or more performance trials were identified and extracted for detail analysis. Instructional activities within all analyzed rehearsal frames were measured in terms of rates, durations and proportions of time devoted to assigned teacher and student behavior which included teacher verbalizations, teacher modeling, teacher feedback, and student performance activities. One hundred-seventeen rehearsal frames were identified and analyzed to determine their instructional targets and the frequency and duration of specified teacher and student behaviors. Data from the structured interviews indicated that all participants agree that planning for rehearsals must take place before, after, and in some instances during rehearsals, rehearsal planning and should involve score study, listening activities, and research of the composer and performance practice of the selected repertoire used during rehearsals. Across all analyzed rehearsal frames multiple targets, articulation, and tempo were the most frequently observed rehearsal frame target categories. Teacher verbalization accounted for approximately 45% of the total time.
Directives were the most frequent verbalization. Modeling accounted for approximately 2% of the total time. The rate for negative modeling was higher than positive modeling. Student performance activities accounted for approximately 25%, with full performance (17%), sectional performance (7%), and individual performance (1%). Notes from field observations revealed that each participant was proactive in providing the proper environment for learning in the music concert band setting.
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INTRODUCTION

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that must involve meticulous instructional planning and preparation on a consistent basis. Planning instruction is a key element of the repeated process of teaching in which teachers have to make decisions about what is to be taught and how they will convey the lesson content to the student. According to Bage, Grosvenor, & Williams (1999) the purpose of instructional planning is to support the learning of the student. In addition, they also maintained that decisions made by the teacher while planning instruction have the potential to affect student learning in a positive manner.

According to Airasin (1997) the process of implementing and planning instruction is one of the most important activities for classroom instructors. Airasin ascertained that planning instruction is a context-dependant activity that includes consideration of pupils, teachers, and instructional materials. Airasin also contended that the instructional process consists of three general steps which include (a) selecting materials, organizing and planning learning experiences and learning objectives into a coherent and reinforcing cycle; (b) delivering or teaching the subject matter to the student; and (c) assessing student performance to determine whether the pupils have mastered the desired instructional goals. Airasin further ascertained that as teachers plan instruction it helps the teacher to reduce anxiety and uncertainly about their instruction, to review the subject matter prior to teaching the lesson(s), and to select various ways to get the lessons started.
According to Ormrod (2002) effective teaching begins long before students enter the classroom. An essential part of instructional planning is identifying the specific things we want our students to learn during a lesson or unit. Ormrod also mentioned that effective teachers spend a considerable amount of time in advance planning instruction. Ormrod also maintained that effective teachers, as they plan instruction, identify the skills and knowledge they want their students to acquire, determine an appropriate sequence to communicate the lesson content, and develop classroom activities that will promote learning, student motivation, and time on task.

Systematic observation research techniques utilized in education have evolved to become quite useful for researchers and educators to learn about student development and to assist in the development of appropriate curriculum and instructional methods. In addition, observational research techniques may assist the classroom teacher in making decisions about guiding instruction, pacing instruction, and preventing or solving instructional problems. Teachers can use observation research techniques to reflect on their own practices to improve teaching effectiveness, to aid in classroom management, and to assist in developing strategies for solving classroom problems.

Educators and researchers have applied systematic observation methods in music education research. Duke & Madsen (1991); Madsen & Madsen (1974); and Madsen & Yarbrough conducted various observation studies that examined the timing of specific behaviors of teachers while delivering instruction and examined teacher-student interactions. Arnold (1991); Byo (1990); Colwell (1995); Kostka (1984); Siebenaler (1992) and Yarbrough (1975) used observation to describe the allocation of time and activities in various music settings. Blocher, Greenwood, and Shellahamer (1997) and Brendell (1996) investigated teacher feedback in the music education classroom. Kostka (1984); Wagner & Strul (1979); and Yarbrough &

A substantial amount of systematic observation research exists that has examined what constitutes expert teaching in the band rehearsal setting. Expert band directors have been identified and examined in a number of studies to describe what behaviors and activities occur as they prepare repertoire during rehearsals. Worthy (2006) indicated that expert wind band conductors demonstrated a high level of artistic merit in their musical performances. According to Morrison (2000), one of the most important goals of instrumental music instruction is to facilitate the advancement of students’ performance skills. Cavitt (2002) asserts that instrumental music instruction is a highly interactive and complicated process in which the conductor must monitor a variety of performance and student behavioral variables while attempting to effect positive change in student performance. According to Taylor (1989), the teacher-conductor engages in a variety of behaviors while conducting a rehearsal. In addition, Taylor stated that specific behaviors and verbalizations must occur during rehearsal in order for the conductor to accomplish music learning in the least amount of time.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to explore the planning activities of three exemplary high school concert band directors as they prepare for rehearsals and to observe the teaching behaviors and student learning activities employed by each director during rehearsals. While there is an extant body of research that utilizes systematic observation in various music classroom settings, there are no studies in instrumental music education that have examined both
the planning activities and rehearsal activities of instrumental music teachers in the band setting. Data from this study is intended to provide positive insight for pre-service, novice, and practicing band directors as they attempt to develop and maintain effective and efficient planning and rehearsal techniques.

Research Questions

This study will be guided by the following research questions:

1. How much time does each director spend planning rehearsals and what activities are involved in planning rehearsals?

2. What are the frequencies in which the band directors address the following performance targets in selected rehearsal frames that include two or more student performance trials: articulation, dynamics, intonation/tone, multiple, pitch accuracy, rhythm accuracy, technical facility, tempo, and unidentified?

3. What are the frequencies, rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to teacher talking, teacher modeling, and the frequencies and rates of the following verbal categories: giving directives, relaying information, providing positive feedback, providing negative feedback in rehearsal frames that address instructional targets and include two or more student performance trials?

4. What are the frequencies rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to the following student performance activities: full ensemble play, sectional play and individual play?

Definition of Terms

For definitions of terminology common to rehearsal frames studies, see table 3 on page 42 and table 4 on page 43.
Limitations

The participants in this study were all high school band directors teaching in the State of Mississippi. Each participant was video recorded as they prepared their most advanced concert bands for their annual spring concerts. All interviews and video recordings were conducted within two weeks of their annual concert performances.

All observed behaviors of the teachers, student performance activities, and instructional activities that were identified were limited to those observed in the rehearsal frames selected for analysis. The presence of the observer may have affected the regular interactions and behaviors of the observed teachers and students in their regular rehearsal settings.

Although the selected participants in this study are to be considered exemplary band directors, these participants were not randomly selected. In addition, it is assumed that the time of year in which the research was conducted can affect the results. When the observations of this study were conducted, repertoire had already been prepared and presented for state concert band adjudication. Observations took place between state concert band adjudication and an annual spring concert. It is suggested that any generalizations beyond the findings from this limited sample of teachers and students should be made with caution.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Numerous researchers have examined both the learning and behavioral activities that take place in the music rehearsal. This literature review will focus on four specific areas: (a) scholarly writings on rehearsal planning (b) systematic observation studies that utilize the rehearsal frame as a unit of analysis, (c) studies involving the observation of music rehearsals, and (4) studies involving the observation of music teaching.

Rehearsal Planning

According to Colwell (1992), the rehearsal is the core of most instrumental music programs. He explained that what the conductor-teacher does with his or her rehearsal time may mean the difference between success and failure. Colwell maintained that as the conductor-teacher plans rehearsals, the music rehearsals should include a variety of activities such as: tuning, technical drills, form and style, intensive work on pieces in progress, sight-reading, and a run through of a “fun” tune. He further noted that as the conductor-teacher plans for rehearsals, they must prepare the musical score to become acquainted with the subtleties of the music, technical problems, bowing, fingering, and other unique problems of the various instruments that may occur.
According to House (1965) the principal point of contact between the ensemble directors and their students is in the rehearsal setting. He ascertained that unless the music director does a good job planning instruction and conducting rehearsals, the entire program may falter. In addition, House maintained that the director must try at all costs to manage rehearsal time in the most efficient and effective way to achieve music goals. House pointed out that the first step to planning and preparing successful instrumental rehearsals begins with score study in which the conductor should complete a detailed analysis of the work in regards to the transposition of parts as needed, tempos, dynamics, identifying important passages, and determining the stylistic treatment of the work. Secondly, House stated that prior to all music rehearsals, the physical environment of the rehearsal area must be prepared for rehearsal in regards to lighting, heating, ventilation, and seating arrangements. House indicated that music rehearsals should begin with announcements followed by warm ups, tuning, technical drills, reading of new material followed by the corrective study of previously read material. House pointed out that the rehearsal process involves correction, repetition, and further corrections and that it is up to the conductor to reassess, review, and address these matters effectively in future rehearsals.

Jones (1960) maintained that a conductor should not plan rehearsals only to develop proper skills and techniques, but should also use the rehearsal time to promote musical growth in the students in order to meet the challenges of the composer’s intent. In addition, Spicer stated that music rehearsals should address five objectives to maintain progress and musical growth. Those five objectives are consistency of tone, training of the ear, fluency and flexibility of the phrases, perspective of balance, and the finished product.

Bessom, Forcucci & Tatarinis (1974) ascertained that in order for any music director to plan an efficient rehearsal, the music director must first listen to the music to develop his or her
own feeling for the development for the style and interpretation of the music to be rehearsed. Next, they suggested that the conductor analyze the scores of the music in order to identify potential problems such as awkward intervals, difficult rhythmic patterns, problem fingerings and positions, and to identify elements of structural development and the overall form of the work. The authors outline an effective plan that included (a) warm-ups which involve tuning and technical drills, (b) the rehearsal of both music in progress and music to be learned and (c) sight-reading materials. In addition, Bessom, Forcucci & Tatarunis maintained that other factors that contribute to successful rehearsals include proper seating arrangements, organized music stands and folders, and proper lighting and ventilation of the rehearsal area.

According to Ulrich (1993), proper planning and preparation play two vital roles in the success of a performing ensemble. Ulrich suggested that some aspects of the preparation for a rehearsal take place well in advance of the rehearsal. He contended that the conductor should select repertoire based on the various strengths and weaknesses of the ensemble, consider the textural considerations of the compositions, know the biographical information about the composer, and examine pedagogical issues such as orchestration, tempo markings, and possible conducting problems. Ulrich further asserted that preparing seating arrangements, music folders, and sheet music well prior to rehearsal can help to ensure a positive musical environment.

Demorest (1996) maintained that developing an understanding of the compositional structure of the selected repertoire (form, texture, and voicing) should be the initial step to planning a successful rehearsal. He suggested that the conductor introduce the repertoire to the students by explaining the style and character of the work(s), discuss the historical background of the composition(s), have the ensemble listen to performances of the selected repertoire, and decide the order in which the selections will be taught.
According to Lamb (2005) adequate planning and pacing of rehearsals make all the difference in the world. Lamb also stated that the conductor-teacher must plan well for the music rehearsal. In order to facilitate effective rehearsals, Lamb further explained that as the ensemble director must select and look over all music to be rehearsed, mark notes on the music to be rehearsed, determine how each selection will be presented to the ensemble, and post the order of music to be rehearsed in order on the chalkboard.

The preparation and planning of the rehearsal plays a major role toward the development of any successful band program. As noted by Manfredo (2006), proper planning and clear verbalizations can improve one’s rehearsal pace and make the most of rehearsal time. Manfredo also maintained that the most important factor that affects the overall success of an ensemble rehearsal is the conductor’s ability to effectively manage time during rehearsals. He pointed out that conductors should prepare for ensemble rehearsals by (a) developing goals and objectives, studying and analyzing scores in order to develop an understanding of the repertoire’s harmonic and structural elements in regarding form, harmony, and instrumentation; (b) studying the music’s expressive components in regards to phrasing, dynamics and color; and (c) completing an analysis of pedagogical issues that may address fingering, positions, bowing, diction, and other technical considerations. Manfredo also asserted that proper planning for a music rehearsal allows the conductor to deal with unexpected events as they arise during rehearsals and helps prepare the conductor to make split-second decisions that affect the rehearsal effectiveness of the performing ensemble.

According to Broadnax (2010) music conductors face several challenges when directing and administering ensembles such as scheduling rehearsals, formulating rehearsal plans, and programming for concerts and other performances. He maintained that the content of the
director’s teaching and how the director plans for and prepares an ensemble will determine the extent to which the ensemble can produce a performance that inspires both the performers and the audience.

These authors agree that proper planning for rehearsals is vital for the success of any music program. These writings maintain that as teachers plan and prepare for music rehearsals they must formulate clear and realistic instructional goals, acquaint themselves with the music through various listening activities and score analysis, plan to address certain pedagogical issues before they occur, and prepare a physical environment that is conducive to learning.

Observation Studies that Utilized the Rehearsal Frame as a Unit of Analysis

In the present research, the rehearsal frame will be used as the unit of analysis to identify and describe the various behaviors and performance activities of the directors and students observed in band rehearsal settings. Using the rehearsal frame as the unit of analysis differs from some earlier studies because it allows the researcher to use both quantitative and qualitative data to describe what transpires during rehearsals in the moments where substantive changes are taking place in the performance and places emphasis on specific instructional targets, teacher behaviors, and student learning activities.

Duke (2000) defines the rehearsal frame as a unit of analysis for observation in music instruction that focuses on the achievement of instructional goals. According to Duke the rehearsal frame is organized in three main parts, each of which may contain a number of performance episodes. Most rehearsal frames begin when the conductor stops the ensemble during a rehearsal after identifying a specific performance target in need of adjustment or correction. During a rehearsal frame, the teacher typically employs various types of verbalizations, modeling styles, and student performance activities as he/she attempts to correct
or enhance the musical performance of the student(s). A rehearsal usually ends when the target is corrected or the conductor decides to move on in the rehearsal process.

Numerous researchers have conducted studies that utilized the rehearsal frame as the unit of analysis. Colprit (1998) conducted an observation study to examine the behaviors of 12 Suzuki teachers and 24 violin and cello students. A total of 72 consecutive lessons were videotaped. Lessons ranged from 30 minutes to 60 minutes in duration. A single musical segment that had been taught in previous lessons was chosen to be videotaped and analyzed. Each musical segment was categorized into episodes labeled rehearsal frames. A total of 338 rehearsal frames were identified. The target behaviors of the rehearsal frames included left hand behavior, right hand behavior, musical results, and other. Colprit reported 45% of the time was devoted to teacher talk, 20% was devoted to teacher modeling, and 41% was devoted to student performance. In addition, the instructional episodes between the teacher and student were rapid and brief.

In a similar study, Buckner (1997) examined teacher and student behaviors in 40 piano lessons taught by 20 teachers and two of their intermediate level students. One 8-12 minute segment of repertoire was taken from each videotaped lesson and was analyzed. Three hundred twenty eight rehearsal frames consisted of 1,395 student performance trials. The researcher identified each rehearsal frame as either successful or unsuccessful at the conclusion of the rehearsal frame. The targets were categorized as follows: (a) timing targets, (b) volume targets, (c) note and fingering targets, (d) technique targets, (e) non-observable targets, (f) physical adjustment targets, (g) sound targets, and (h) theory targets. The success rates of the described targets were as follows: (a) timing targets, 47%, (b) volume targets, 55%, (c) note and finger accuracy targets, 58%, (d) technique targets, 39%, (e) physical adjustment targets, 33%, (f)
sound targets, 50%, and (g) theory targets, 50%. In addition, Buckner compared the lessons of five teachers with the highest levels of success rates to the remaining teachers. It was concluded that the Rehearsal frames of the five teachers with the higher levels of success demonstrated a quicker pace of instruction, had nearly double the amount of positive feedback observed than the other teachers, and the rate of negative feedback was over three times the rate of the remaining teachers.

Taylor (2005) observed the practices of eight prominent Orff-Schulwerk teachers as they prepared to improve previously learned music for percussion instruments. During four group rehearsals, eight Orff-Schulwerk teachers and their students were videotaped. Taylor found that when teachers were working toward improving student performance, a fast pace of teaching occurred along with a high rate of instructional directives which focused on the mechanical aspects as opposed to musical performance aspects. Analysis of all rehearsal frames revealed that teachers spent approximately 37% of the time talking and 10% modeling. The mean duration of teacher talk was 3.3 seconds and the mean duration of 1.1 seconds. Directives was the most frequent type of verbalization and occurred at a rate of 5.4 times per minute. Positive feedback occurred twice as often as negative feedback, with mean rates of 1.1 and 0.5 rates per minute. Analysis of student behaviors across all rehearsal frames revealed that student performance accounted for approximately 50% of the total test time with the largest percentage of this time devoted to full ensemble performance (27%) followed by section performance at (14%).

The purpose of a study conducted by Westbrook (2004) was to investigate the effects of teacher personality types on teacher behaviors in the instrumental classroom. The subjects of this study were 15 high school instrumental music teachers and their students. All subjects were observed and videotaped while teaching a 30-minute lesson in a regular classroom setting. The observed behavior variables were: (a) teacher performance, (b) teacher verbalizations, (c) teacher
performance approximations, (d) eye contact, (e) proximity, (f) alteration of voice, (g) gestures, and (h) facial expressions. Following the review of the taped class sessions, rehearsal frames were extracted for analysis. After the rehearsal frames were analyzed, the subjects were administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (1923) and the Teacher Background Survey (2004) as treatment. The total observed time was 393.05 minutes. A total of 115 rehearsal frames were extracted for analysis. The rehearsal frames account for 43.19% (approximately 3 hours) of the total observed rehearsal time. In regards to teacher behaviors, results of the data showed that the mean frequency of the teacher verbalizations was 80.4 and occurred at a mean rate of 7.82 per minute. These verbalizations included information statements, questions, directives, and off-task questions. Across all observed rehearsal frames, the mean percentage of teacher modeling was 25.95% across all teachers. It was concluded by the researcher that temperament did not have an effect on the teacher behaviors that occurred in the instrumental music classroom.

Rice (2006) studied the perception of effective teaching of both novice and expert choral conductors. Participants included 24 novice and 24 expert choral conductors who observed two student teachers conducting a high school choir rehearsal. The participants viewed two stimulus video recordings in random order. The first taped observation was of pre-service students who were rehearsing a choir without any planned or special preparation. In the second stimulus video, the student teachers applied an outline of the rehearsal frame as they conducted the choral rehearsals. After the review of the stimulus videos, the observers were administered the Irwin Teaching Effectiveness Scale (1996). The overall mean scores of the ITES showed that the use of rehearsal frames during the rehearsals had a significant increase on the perceptions of effective teaching on both novice and expert choral conductors.
Henniger (2002) conducted a study to determine whether the perceptions of observers who are informed of specific instructional targets within lessons differ from those who are not informed about targets. A secondary purpose of this study was to determine whether the instructional setting would influence the observers’ perceptions. The participants of this study were music education majors (120) from seven different universities. Each participant had some formal training in observation. The instructional goals were explained to half the students. The other half received no information in regard to the instructional targets. After recording all lessons and rehearsals, the researcher extracted 6 rehearsal frames to be viewed by the participants. The participants were instructed to complete a questionnaire and to write clear and concise statements about what they saw and heard while observing the music lessons and rehearsals. Results of the study indicated that subjects who were not introduced to the instructional goals wrote more teacher-directed, inferential, and positive statements than the subjects that received information on the instructional goals. Across all observation conditions, 80% of the written observations pertained to the teachers, and only 14% of the writing pertained to the students. In addition, there was no significant difference between the subjects’ mean ratings of teaching quality.

Twelve expert choral teachers participated in a study conducted by Derby (2001) involving the process of vocal instruction in elementary, middle school, and high school choral rehearsals. Over a period of 36 rehearsals, 109 rehearsal frames were identified and analyzed in detail providing a record of teaching behaviors, proximal performance goals, and modifications in students’ vocal performance. Results of the study showed that teachers talked 33% of the time and teachers’ verbalization occurred at a rate of three per minute. The rate of teacher modeling was 1-2 per minute and occurred in approximately 6% of each rehearsal frame. Positive
modeling occurred more than negative modeling. However, teachers conveyed slightly more negative feedback than positive feedback. Regarding targets, the most frequent were diction, vowel shape, dynamics, and intonation. Over the course of all rehearsal frames, student achievement was high. There were no significant differences among the elementary, middle school, and high school rehearsals.

Montemayor (2006) observed 29 high school band directors and their performing ensembles during their first two rehearsals of a common music selection performed over a two day period. The first rehearsal was a “read through” which was recorded and evaluated by a panel of experts. The second rehearsal was also recorded and evaluated by observers using the Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale (1991). In addition, the second day, rehearsals were analyzed by the researcher according to the rehearsal model. The selected rehearsal procedures identified by the researcher included teacher feedback, student performance trials, time between “before” and “after” trials, and the manner in which each frame began and ended. Results indicated that no significant relationships were found between teachers’ effectiveness scores and any of the intra-rehearsal achievement. There were no significant correlations between performance quality and average rehearsal frame achievement. In addition, higher achievement scores were seen within rehearsal with one interim student trial compared to other rehearsal frames.

Ferley (2006) conducted an action research study of effective and efficient rehearsals in an eighth grade band setting. The subjects for this study were 28 eighth grade band students and their music teacher. Over a 10-week period, music classes were videotaped, reviewed and organized into rehearsal frames. The teacher behaviors and verbalizations were coded in selected rehearsal frames using: (a) instruction, (b) active music making, (c) classroom management, (d) waiting, and (e) announcements. The researcher utilized the rehearsal frame to calculate the
durations of each teacher behavior and to determine the proportions of time spent on teaching musical concepts; conducting active music making; classroom management; and waiting or wasting time. Based on the analysis of the rehearsal frames the following was reported: (a) most of the class time was devoted to making music, ranging from 15%-45%, (b) 0%-25% of class time was used to make announcements, and (c) less than 5% of class time was used for classroom management.

The purpose of Cavitt’s (1998) study was to investigate error correction strategies among expert band directors. The subjects of this study were five middle school and five high school band directors. Cavitt videotaped a total of 40 rehearsals (four of each band director) one to two weeks prior to the annual concert band festival. A total of 332 error correction rehearsal frames were identified and analyzed. Rehearsal frames ranged in length from 9 seconds to 21 minutes 6 seconds. Across all analyzed rehearsal frames that required two or more performance trials, the mean duration of rehearsal frames was 2 minutes 53 seconds and the mean number of rehearsal frames was approximately 33 per subject across all observed rehearsals. Analysis of all rehearsal frames revealed that teacher talk accounted for nearly 52% of observed instruction. The mean episode for teacher talk was approximately 8 seconds. The most frequent teacher verbalizations were directives and feedback which occurred at an overall rate of approximately 5 per minute. In addition, across all rehearsal frames full ensemble performance had the highest percentage of performance activities (19%) followed by sectional performance (16%) and individual play (5%). The most observed targets were tuning followed by articulation, rhythm, and multiple targets.

Cavitt (2004) examined the communication of information feedback by teachers in band rehearsals as they addressed intonation errors. Ten expert band directors, including five middle
school teachers and five high school directors were the participants in this study. Over a period of 40 videotaped rehearsals, 1949.5 minutes of rehearsal time, 332 rehearsal frames were extracted for analysis. Of the 332 rehearsal frames seventy-one rehearsal frames addressed intonation errors. Across all rehearsal frames, the total duration of rehearsal frames was 139.75 minutes. The episodes of intonation ranged in duration from 9 seconds to 9 minutes, with a mean duration of 1 minute 58 seconds. Teacher verbalization was the most frequent behavior demonstrated when addressing the intonation targets.

Worthy (2003) used the rehearsal frame as the unit of analysis to quantify the behaviors of an expert wind conductor rehearsing a high school honor band and an intercollegiate honor band. The conductor rehearsed the same literature with both groups. The researcher videotaped both ensembles as they prepared the selection from the initial reading to the final performance. The high school honor band had a total rehearsal time of approximately 7 hours, 13 minutes, and the college ensemble rehearsal time was approximately 7 hours and 40 minutes. A total of 280 rehearsal frames were identified. Worthy identified 153 rehearsal frames in the high school rehearsal and 127 rehearsal frames in the college rehearsals. The targets categorized by the researcher were: (a) articulation, (b) dynamics, (c) editorial, (d) intonation/tone, (e) pitch accuracy, (f) rhythm accuracy, (g) unidentified target, (h) multiple targets, and (i) other. The observed behaviors of the conductor included talking and modeling. The student behaviors that were observed were talking, full ensemble performance, sectional performance, and individual performance. The results of this study indicated that during the college rehearsals, the conductor was likely to focus on multiple targets as opposed to the high school ensemble rehearsals in which the conductor focused on single targets. In addition, there were shorter durations and higher rates of verbalizations observed in the high school rehearsals which indicate a faster pace.
than observed in the college ensemble rehearsals.

In a similar study, three expert wind conductors were observed by Worthy (2006) as they rehearsed intercollegiate honor bands under separate but similar circumstances. A total of 1,476 minutes of rehearsal time was observed and a total of 149 rehearsal frames totaling 314 minutes were extracted for analysis. In addition to the taped observations, the researcher kept observation field notes. The average duration of all observed rehearsal frames of all conductors was 2 minutes and 6 seconds. The instructional targets categories utilized were (a) articulation, (b) dynamics, (c) editorial, (d) intonation/tone, (e) pitch accuracy, (f) rhythm accuracy, (g) tempo, (h) unidentified target, (i) multiple targets, and (j) other. The results of this study revealed the following: (a) duration and frequency data in regard to modeling and addressing multiple performance targets among the conductors were similar, (b) the conductors tended to focus on multiple rehearsal targets, (58%) (c) approximately half of the rehearsal time was spent on talking and modeling and the other half involved student performance, and (d) the overall pace of each conductor’s rehearsal involved short episodes of conductor talk and modeling. Data from field notes revealed that the conductors had high expectations for musical performance, conducted efficient rehearsals with a sense of urgency; all conductors seemed to be well prepared and maintained a brisk instructional pace during their respective rehearsals.

Three expert beginning band directors participated in a study conducted by Worthy and Thompson (2009) to identify their common teaching and behavior characteristics. Over the period of three consecutive class periods, twenty-five rehearsal frames were identified and analyzed. The rehearsal frame targets were identified and categorized as articulation, dynamics, intonation/ tone, pitch accuracy, rhythm accuracy, tempo, technical facility, multiple, and other. Instruction categories used in this study included posture/instrument carriage, breathing/airflow,
and embouchure. All behaviors and targets were measured in frequency and duration. Results showed that pitch accuracy and multiple targets were the most frequent of the instructional targets while posture/instrument carriage was the most observed instructional target. Teachers talked approximately 64.41% of all rehearsal frames. Directives were the most frequent of teacher verbalizations and subjects demonstrated a high rate of teacher modeling. In addition, across all rehearsal frames, students performed less and at lower rates.

These systematic observation studies that utilized the rehearsal frame as a unit of analysis explored music education across the music curriculum in regards to instrumental music instruction, vocal music instruction, and piano instruction. Of the above studies, attention is drawn to the studies that observed teaching in the band setting. Results from the studies that observed teaching in the band setting revealed that percentages of teacher verbalizations ranged from approximately 52%-64% across all rehearsal frames and that student performance activities ranged from approximately 17%-43% across all rehearsal frames. These findings will be compared to the findings of the present study in Chapter 5.

In summary, there were some common findings: (a) teachers tended to verbalize more and model less during rehearsal frames; (b) the mean rate of positive feedback tended to be higher than negative feedback; and (c) full ensemble performance tended to account for the highest percentage of student performance activities.

Observation of Music Rehearsals

Over the past two decades researchers have observed the teaching activities and behaviors that occur during music rehearsals. Goolsby (1996, 1997, and 1999) conducted a series of studies that examined the use of teaching time and instructional behaviors of thirty pre-service, novice, and experienced band directors. In the first study (1996), sixty instrumental
rehearsals were observed. The dependant measures were preparation time, initial teacher talk, time in warm-up, time during musical selections, final teacher talk, and dismissal. Results indicated that pre-service teachers demonstrated the highest level of talk and allowed the least amount of student performance. Experienced teachers verbalized the least, allowed more time for breaks, and had a higher rate of student performance.

In the second of these studies, Goolsby (1997) investigated the verbalizations, modeling, and sequential patterns of teaching of pre-service, novice, and expert teachers (N=30) during rehearsals. A total of 60 videotaped rehearsals were observed for analysis. Results showed that the most targeted performance variable was rhythm/tempo; expert teachers used more time addressing ensemble sound; novice teachers spent more time addressing intonation; and pre-service teachers spent more rehearsal time on pitch accuracy.

In the third of these studies, Goolsby (1999) compared the teaching behaviors of novice (n=10) and experienced teachers (n=10) as they prepared identical band compositions. A total of 216 rehearsals were extracted for analysis. Goolsby found that novice band directors talked more and had a lower rate of class performance than experienced teachers. Experts addressed more musical elements than novice teachers.

Fiocca (1986) examined the rehearsal behaviors of selected junior high and middle school choir directors. The participants of this study were twelve exemplary middle school and junior high school directors who were selected on the basis of contest ratings. Data was collected through a rehearsal checklist form and a director questionnaire. A panel of three expert observers used the rehearsal form to indicate responses to the various behaviors of the conductors as they rehearsed their ensembles. Results revealed that non-verbal communication was generally positive, student talk was minimal, and discipline action was by and large unnecessary. In
addition, conducting patterns of the directors were clear and conductors projected a professional image while rehearsing the ensembles.

Skadsem (1997) observed the effects of conductor verbalization, dynamics markings, conductor gesture, and choir dynamic level of individual singers’ responses in music. The subjects of this study were 98 undergraduate and graduate music students and 48 high school students. The four treatment conditions were verbal instruction, written instruction, changes in conducting gestures, and volume changes in the choir. A panel of three expert judges analyzed the students’ responses. Results indicated that verbal instruction had the highest influence on the participants’ responses.

Worthy (2005) examined the effects of self-evaluation on the timing of teacher and student behaviors during laboratory music rehearsals. The subjects of this study were 14 undergraduate senior music education majors (choral music education, n=7, instrumental music education, n=6; elementary music education n=1) at a flagship institution in the southeastern United States. All participants were enrolled in a methodology course that addressed rehearsal techniques and classroom management. Each subject was required to conduct four 10-minute lab rehearsals for subsequent self-analysis. After each lab rehearsal, the participants used SCRIBE to collect frequency and duration data in regard to teacher verbalizations, teacher modeling, student verbalizations, and student performance. Results indicated that after self-analysis, there was a decrease in teacher talk and modeling and an increase in student performance time across all subsequent rehearsals.

Carvalho (1997) observed the relationship between conductor use or non-use of a score and choral students’ attentiveness and attitude. Subjects for the study were members of two choral performing ensembles from a large university located in the midwestern United States.
Over a four day period, the participants were videotaped during regular rehearsal sessions for the examination of their eye contact behaviors. The research design consisted of four experimental conditions: score/low eye contact, score/high eye contact, no score/low eye contact, and no score/high eye contact. Upon the conclusion of all observed rehearsals, a questionnaire containing questions regarding the issue of conducting with or without a score was given to the subjects. Carvalho found that across all observations, students’ pattern of eye contact were consistent under all treatment conditions and that the participants favored eye to eye communication with the conductor.

Kotchenruther (1998) examined the rehearsal priorities of twelve middle school string teachers. Data was gathered through the submission of three videotaped rehearsals by each director, an observation checklist that charted performance criteria, and written responses. Kotchenruther found that middle school orchestra directors tended to prioritize fundamental criteria, then physical criteria, followed by expressive and interpretive criteria. Based on these findings, the researcher recommended for further research in the area of rehearsal priorities of string teachers.

Morrison (2002) examined the effects of using recorded models on ensemble achievement in the instrumental rehearsal. Subjects for this study (N=64) were enrolled in two seventh-grade band classes. Over a period of five weeks, both groups studied “Russian Dance” (Gliere/arr. Story). The experimental group received treatment using a professionally recorded model, which was heard during rehearsals. During the treatment, students were asked to follow their parts visually and to finger along. The control group (n=30) was not exposed to the recorded model at any time during this study. Each class submitted 6 recordings, which were observed and evaluated by experienced and successful instrumental music educators. Each
recording was evaluated in the areas of pitch accuracy, tone quality, rhythmic precision, appropriateness of phrasing, and articulation. Morrison found out that both groups showed improvement in all areas. However, further results found that the model group scored higher in the area of pitch than the control group and had a higher rate of improvement in rhythm and phrasing. In addition, it was concluded that the use of recorded models may affect student attitude as much as achievement.

Grimland (2001) examined the characteristics of teacher directed modeling in the practices of three experienced high school directors. Over the course of one semester, each director was recorded during regular rehearsals. The recording yielded a 45-minute composite tape of each director. In addition, a text transcription was made of all taped material. Each participant was instructed to view their tape and extract teaching episodes that they identify as examples of modeling. Grimland categorized each modeling behavior into three categories: Audible, Visible, and Process modeling. Across all observations, it was found that teacher modeling was teacher generated and demonstrations were both musical and non-musical.

Hunter (2003) examined the relationship between interpersonal communication skill, teacher effectiveness, and conducting effectiveness of music education students. The subjects for this study were 30 music education students who had completed at least one semester of conducting class. Each participant submitted three 10-minute videotapes of themselves rehearsing with an ensemble. Following the completion of the third rehearsal, participants of the ensemble were administered a questionnaire on teacher interaction to gather data on the subjects perceived interpersonal communication style profile. In addition, three judges observed the first and third rehearsal for each student conductor using the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness (2003) to measure teaching effectiveness and the Conductor Observation Form to evaluate conducting
effectiveness among the student conductors. Hunter found that 11 student conductors were perceived as having helpful/friendly interpersonal communication styles, 11 subjects appeared to have understanding interpersonal styles, and 8 student conductors were perceived as having strict communication styles. The results also indicated significant differences between interpersonal communication skills, teaching effectiveness, and conducting effectiveness.

Napoles (2006) conducted a study that examined the verbal behaviors of teachers in music rehearsals at the middle school, high school, and collegiate levels on student attentiveness. Subjects for this study (n=20), were 6 middle school teachers (2 choral, 1 band and 3 orchestral) six high school instructors (4 choral, 2 band) and eight college teachers (3 choral and 5 band). A total of thirty 15-minute segment rehearsals were observed and analyzed. Data indicated that middle school teachers spent more time talking during rehearsals, the duration of teacher talk across all rehearsals related negatively to student attentiveness, and there was a significantly positive correlation between time of teacher talk and off-task behavior across all levels.

Rohwer (1997) studied the pedagogy of the musical preparations of a high school choral group and its conductor in a rehearsal setting. Over a two-month period, the interactions of the conductor and students were observed. Rohwer found that the majority of teaching time involved teacher-initiated directives, and teacher modeling.

Kelly (2003) conducted a study that examined video recordings of student teachers’ (N=36) time use of verbal and non-verbal teaching behaviors in middle and high school choral and instrumental ensembles. The duration of each videotape rehearsal ranged from 30 to 90 minutes in length. However only the first 30 minutes of each rehearsal was used in the investigation. The Continuous Response Digital Interface (CRDI) was used to analyze the following behaviors: instructional: verbal, instructional: non-verbal, rehearsal: verbal, rehearsal:
non-verbal, non-instructional: verbal, and non-instructional: non-verbal. Results of this study revealed that student teachers spent the majority of instructional time using non-verbal rehearsal behaviors. Subjects spent the least amount of time engaged in verbal non-instructional behaviors. In comparison it was shown that high school interns utilized more time using rehearsal behaviors while the middle school student teachers had a high rate of using instructional behaviors.

Jacobsen (2004) studied the use of verbal imagery used in rehearsals by experienced choral directors during rehearsals. Subjects for this study were eight select high school SATB (Soprano, Alto, Tenor, and Bass) choirs. Four regular rehearsals were observed and analyzed for verbal images which were self-identified and categorized by the participants. Across all observed rehearsals results show that choral directors in this study were almost evenly divided in their use of the rehearsal techniques of verbal imagery. Jacobsen also found that directors used a variety of verbal images to address individual problems while using single verbal images to manage multiple problems.

Brendell (1992) investigated the time usage, rehearsal activities, and student off-task behavior during the initial minutes of choral rehearsals. The participants of this study were 33 high school choral directors who were recorded and observed during a mixed ensemble rehearsal. The utilization of time and activities from the tardy bell to the rehearsal of the first selection of choral music was examined. Brendell found that conductors averaged 43.45 elapsed seconds from the tardy bell before verbalizing to the students and averaged 14 minutes 19 seconds of elapsed rehearsal before rehearsing the first selection of choral literature. In addition, the highest percentages of rehearsal time allotted to initial activities were sight-reading, 22.23%; and vocal warm-up, 9.63%. The highest percentages of student off-task activities were getting-ready, 26.14%; and physical warm-up, 18.48%.
These studies represent an examination of music rehearsals through observations, experiments, and qualitative inquiry. Emphasis of inquiry was placed on teacher verbalizations, teacher behaviors, student activities, and student behaviors exhibited during rehearsals. The results of these various types of inquiries suggest that expert teachers talk less and allow more time for student performance activities and pre service teachers tend to talk more and allow less time for student activities. In addition, data from these studies confirm that systematic observation, experimental inquiry and qualitative inquiry can be effective when used to evaluate teacher performance, testing the cause and effect of certain variables in the music classroom, and by providing the opportunity for individuals to become reflective teachers and learners.

Observation of Music Teaching

Allard (1992) conducted a study that compared the teacher time use, student attentiveness, and the performance quality of classes of specialist and non-specialists teaching elementary beginning string music. The participants of this study were 12 specialist and 29 non-specialist elementary string teachers. A total of fifty-three videotaped observations were submitted for analysis. Results indicated that there were no significant differences between the two groups in regarding overall preparation time, tuning time, other getting ready time, or the percent of performance time.

Yarbrough and Price (1989) conducted a study to examine whether music educators were applying in their own teaching situations what has been demonstrated through previous research to be effective teaching. The participants of this study (N=79) consisted of freshmen music education majors (n=30), sophomore music education majors (n=19), experienced instrumental music teachers (n=15), and experienced choral music teachers (n=15). Freshmen students submitted a videotape of teaching a song to preschool children; sophomore music education
students received training in direct instruction and then were videotaped while rehearsing a group of their peers; both experienced vocal and instrumental teachers were observed while teaching during their regular class sessions. A total of seventy-nine teaching situations were identified. Verbatim typescripts were used to analyze, count, and time units of teaching and student performance. The researcher categorized units of teaching as: teacher presentation of task; student response; and teacher reinforcement. Results of this study yielded the following: nearly one-fourth of the instructional time was spent presenting musical information and appropriate reinforcement; all groups spent an equal amount of instructional time giving directions of musical information; nearly 50% of instructional time involved musical performance, and experienced teachers were highly disapproving of students’ responses and pre-service teachers were highly approving.

Cassidy (1990) investigated the effect of intensity training on pre-service teachers’ instruction accuracy and delivery effectiveness. The subjects for her study were 52 elementary education students who were enrolled in a music methods course at a major southeastern university. Experimental subjects (n=26) were trained in teacher intensity and the control group (n=26) received no training. All teaching sessions were videotaped and analyzed by two expert observers. Cassidy found that experimental subjects incorporated more interactive musical activities into presentations than the control group.

Cowell (1995) observed the effect of teacher setting and self-evaluation on teacher intensity behaviors. The subjects for her study were 44 elementary education majors who were enrolled in an elementary music methods course. In this study the subjects taught lessons to their peers in the university classroom and to kindergarten children at the university nursery. All classes were videotaped and presented for analysis. After the participants taught their assigned
lessons, they were instructed to view their videotaped lessons and evaluate themselves using the Continuous Response Digital Interface (CRDI) or a behavioral checklist. Cowell found that neither classroom setting nor self-evaluation had a significant effect on the teacher behavior of the subjects.

Duke and Prickett (1997) examined the effect of differentially focused observation on evaluation and instruction. The subjects of this study were 143 non-music education majors who were instructed to observe three versions of an 11 minute applied violin studio lesson. The audio lesson of the three versions were the same, however the visual focus of the videotape was (a) teacher only, (b) student only, and (c) both student and teacher in view. All participants were instructed to evaluate 10 aspects of the lesson and to estimate the frequency of approval and disapproval. Results yielded that there were significant differences in the evaluations of teacher attitude and student attitude among the three control conditions.

Duke and Henninger (2002) conducted a study to examine whether third-party observers’ perceptions of learning would be affected by various forms of verbal correction when being observed during successful lessons. The participants of this study were 51 undergraduate music education students enrolled at The Ohio State University and the University of Texas at Austin. The participants were presented with two instructional videos of the instructor teaching a soprano recorder lesson to a fifth-grade student. During the first lesson, (directive lesson) the instructor corrected the student by stating directives and avoiding any negative feedback. During the second viewed lesson, (negative feedback lesson), the instructor corrected the student by using negative statements about the student’s performance. The researchers found no meaningful differences in the subjects’ responses between the two lessons.

Kostka (1984) conducted a study to gather data in regards to the rates and ratios of
teacher reinforcement, use of time, and the level of student attentiveness during private piano lessons. The subjects of this study were 48 private studio piano teachers along with two of their students. The students were divided into three groups: elementary level (n=34), secondary level (n=24), and adult level (n=35). Over an eight week period, a total of 96 lessons were observed through video and audio taping. Through the use of observation forms, it was concluded that: elementary students received the highest rates of approvals, secondary students spent more time engaging in performance activities, and high school graduates were most on task during all lessons. In addition, across all observed lessons, all students were on-task for at least 85% of the instructional time.

Arrau (1990) investigated the behaviors of six college and university group piano teachers. The participants submitted one videotape of themselves teaching ten consecutive first-term piano lessons for non-music majors for analysis. Through video observation, Arrau found that teacher activities accounted for 79.26% of the total instructional time; student activities and the use of media/materials accounted for 38.79% and 23.27% of instructional time. The most frequent behaviors observed during this study were teacher verbalizations (directions and teacher questions) and group performance.

Rowlyk (2008) examined the effects of improvisation on nonimprovisation music achievement of middle school instrumentalists. The participants of this study (N=93) were seventh and eighth grade instrumentalist from intact instrumental music classes. Percussion players were excluded. Each participant was assigned to either the experimental group (n=47) which received traditional instruction along with 10 minutes of improvisation per week; or the control group (n=46) which received only traditional instruction. All subjects performed the Music Achievement Measure as a pretest and posttest. After 18 weeks of instruction, a panel of
four independent judges concluded that no significant differences were found between group instruction, musical aptitude, and years of experience.

Watson (2008) examined the effect of aural versus notated instructional materials on achievement on self-efficacy in jazz improvisation. Subjects of his study were 62 college instrumental music majors enrolled at a midwestern university. All participants reported having limited or no experience with jazz improvisation. Each participant was assigned to either a group that received instruction that involved aural instruction in improvisation or a second group that received instruction that involved improvisation instruction through notated exercises. Following a pretest, three 70-minute treatment sessions over a four day period, and a posttest (Jazz Improvisation Self-Efficacy Scale), Watson found that both groups’ self-efficacy for jazz improvisation increased following exposure improvisation instruction. In addition, a significant interaction effect was also found for pre- to post instruction and instructional method, with the aural instructional group demonstrating significantly greater pre- to post instruction gains than the notation group.

Orman (2002) investigated the teaching activities of 30 experienced elementary music educators to determine how their teaching activities compared to the National Standards for Music Education. Her findings concluded that teachers spent the majority of instructional time talking. In regards to the nine National Standards, it was reported that only three standards were emphasized across all instructional time: Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music; performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music; and Reading and notating music.

In a similar study Bryson (1982) investigated the teaching activities of elementary music teachers to identify which twelve musical behaviors occurred most frequent. The participants of
this study were teachers from 6 school districts in northeast Mississippi. Results showed that over 50% of the subjects identified singing, listening, dancing, and integrating music with other academic subjects on a “regular” or “sometime” basis. In addition, less than 50% of the subjects indicated that they use instruments, or engage in compositional activities during their class lessons on a regular basis.

These research studies represent a myriad of observations and experiments designed to enhance music instruction and to allow teachers and pre service teachers’ opportunities to become better conductors, instructional planners, communicators, and facilitators in their respective music settings. Further observational studies are needed to replicate the existing research in the field. Educators and researchers should continue to investigate the interactions between the teacher and student in the music classroom so that those who enter or choose to remain in the profession will continue to have resources to improve their teaching skills.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study is to explore the planning activities of three exemplary high school concert band directors as they prepare for rehearsals and to observe the teaching behaviors and student learning activities employed by each director during rehearsals. Results of this study are intended to provide positive insight for pre service, novice, and practicing band directors as they continue to develop and maintain effective and efficient rehearsal techniques.

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How much time does each director spend planning rehearsals and what activities are involved in planning rehearsals?

2. What are the frequencies in which the band directors address the following performance targets in selected rehearsal frames that include two or more student performance trials: articulation, dynamics, intonation/tone, multiple, pitch accuracy, rhythm accuracy, technical facility, tempo, and unidentified?

3. What are the frequencies, rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to teacher talking, teacher modeling, and the frequencies and rates of the following verbal categories: giving directives, relaying information, providing positive feedback, providing negative feedback in rehearsal frames that address instructional targets and include two or more student performance trials?
4. What are the frequencies rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to the following student performance activities: full ensemble play, sectional play and individual play?

In addition to interviews and observations, field notes were taken to document each participant’s classroom environment, classroom management, warm-up procedures, and conducting. All data from the collected field notes will be reported in narrative form in the results section.

Subjects

Three experienced high school band directors were solicited to participate in this study. All the selected participants were males. The selection criteria for each potential candidate was based on the following: (a) teacher has taught for more than ten years; (b) has been employed at the present school for more than four years; (c) the director has consistently earned superior ratings at local, district, or state band festivals for past three years, and (d) recommendations from university music faculty and instrumental music education leaders.

I contacted each of the directors by telephone and described the nature of the study and explained their role in the study. I explained to each participant that I would interview them in regards to rehearsal planning and that I would be recording five consecutive rehearsals of their top performing ensembles. Each of the teachers that I contacted agreed to participate in the study. Each participant taught in a public high school located in central Mississippi.

Classification of schools included in this study were as follows: two 6A schools (student in grades 9, 10, 11, 12, and student populations greater than 1000 students), and one 5A school (student in grades 9, 10, 11, 12, and student population of 800-1000 students). Total years of
experience of the selected teachers ranged from 25 years to 30 years with a mean of 27.3 years of teaching experience.

Teacher A, at the time the study, had 27 years of teaching experience and had been employed at School A for 16 years. School A, at the time of this study, was classified as a 6A school. Over his 27 year career as a band director, Teacher A has been selected as Most Outstanding Music Educator through the National Federation of High Schools, School Band and Orchestra Magazine’s Top 50 Directors Who Make a Difference, and his concert bands have won superior ratings at the Mississippi High School Activities Association State Band Festival for the past 16 years.

Teacher B, at the time of the present study, had 25 years of teaching experience and had been currently employed at School B for eight years. School B, at the time of this study, was classified as a 5A school. Teacher B has been selected as Who’s Who in American Education, Phi Beta Mu Outstanding Band Director, and American School Band Director Distinguished Director. In addition, his concert bands at School B have scored superior ratings the Mississippi High School Activities Association State Band Festival for the past eight years.

Teacher C, the time of this study, had 30 years of teaching experience and had been employed at School C for 19 years. At the time of the present study, School C was classified as a 6A school. Teacher C’s symphonic band has consistently scored superior ratings at the Mississippi High School Activities Association State Band Festival for the past ten years.

Setting

Each participant was contacted by me via telephone and was asked to participate in the study. Prior to any observations, I submitted a research proposal to the Institutional Review Board of the University of Mississippi for approval to conduct research involving human
subjects. After the Institutional Review Board of the University of Mississippi approved the research proposal, I sent a letter of consent to the selected participants and their prospective building principals. Each participant and building principal consented to allow me to conduct the research.

The selected participants were interviewed, observed and video recorded over a two week period with the top concert ensemble during the regularly scheduled school day. The participants were asked to conduct rehearsals as usual. Videotaping began as soon as the conductor completed all administrative tasks and warm up procedures and started the rehearsal of the repertoire. Prior to the video observations, each participant was interviewed in person regarding rehearsal preparation. The author conducted a structured face to face interview with each participant using an author constructed instrument (Appendix A) to gather data. Each participant was asked the same questions. The interviews were recorded. Upon the conclusion of all interviews, the researcher reported each participant’s responses individually and compared the participants’ responses.

Observation Procedures

All concert band rehearsals were video recorded by me during the Spring semester 2010. A total of 15 concert band rehearsals (five of each participant) were video recorded using a digital video recorder mounted on a stationary tripod. Video recording began as soon as the rehearsal began.

After all recording was completed; each videotape was reviewed to identify rehearsal frames and their instructional targets. The starting time of each rehearsal frame was noted for later retrieval.
The rehearsal frame (Duke, 2000) is defined as a unit of analysis for observation in music teaching that focuses on the accomplishment of instructional goals. The rehearsal frame was the primary unit of analysis in the present research. As in previous research, rehearsal frames that include two or more student performance trials (Cavitt, 2003; Worthy, 2003, 2006, and 2009) will be identified for further analysis. Rehearsal frames with multiple performance trials allow the researcher to observe teacher and student behaviors more in depth than in rehearsal frames that require a single student performance trial.

Selected rehearsal frames were analyzed using the Simple Computer Recording Interface for Behavior Evaluation SCRIBE version 4.1 (Duke & Stammen, 2006) program. The SCRIBE program is a data analysis program that allows the researcher to label events in live observations or in Quick Time movies. As in previous studies (Cavitt, 2003; Worthy, 2003, 2006; and Worthy and Thompson; 2009), the SCRIBE program was utilized to record and summarize event durations and sequences of teacher verbalization (frequency and duration), teacher modeling (frequency and duration), and student performance activities (frequency and duration).

Each rehearsal frame was viewed multiple times to record teacher behavior and student performance activities. The first viewing was conducted to record frequencies and durations of teacher talk during rehearsal frames. During the second viewing, frequencies of specified teacher verbalizations during rehearsal frames were recorded. The third viewing was conducted to record frequencies and durations of positive and negative modeling during rehearsal frames. During the fourth viewing, frequencies of positive and negative feedback statements were recorded. The fifth viewing was conducted to record frequencies and durations of student performance activities. As I viewed each rehearsal frame, data were entered by clicking on the assigned button on the SCRIBE input window. Figure 1 is an example of the SCRIBE input window.
Classifications of teacher verbalizations, teacher behaviors, and student performance activities are presented in Tables 6-9. SCRIBE was used to generate the following data records: a graphic timeline of the events during an observation period (Figure 2), a chronology table of recorded events, (Table 1), and a summary table which includes the event frequencies, rates, total durations, proportions of total time for each observation category, mean durations calculated across instances of a given behavior, and corresponding standard deviations. Table 2 is an example SCRIBE summary table.
Figure 1: Scribe Input Window
**Figure 2: Scribe Graphic Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Teacher A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Student Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Table 1

*Sample Scribe Chronology Table*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
<td>00:03</td>
<td>00:13</td>
<td>00:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>00:13</td>
<td>00:19</td>
<td>00:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
<td>00:19</td>
<td>00:26</td>
<td>00:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>00:49</td>
<td>00:53</td>
<td>00:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
<td>00:53</td>
<td>00:56</td>
<td>00:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Sectional</td>
<td>00:56</td>
<td>01:03</td>
<td>00:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
<td>01:03</td>
<td>01:08</td>
<td>00:05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Sample Scribe Data Summary Table*

Total Observation Time: 01:44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Rate/Min</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>% Time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.010</td>
<td>00:46</td>
<td>47.46</td>
<td>00:07</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Full Ensemble</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Sectional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>00:39.6</td>
<td>37.89</td>
<td>00:07.9</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>00:11.6</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>00:05.8</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability

For purposes of reliability, three trained reliability observers with extensive backgrounds in instrumental music education and band conducting on both the high school and collegiate levels were recruited. One reliability observer was an active music educator on the collegiate level and has conducted several research studies that have utilized the rehearsal frame as a unit of analysis. Another reliability observer was a retired collegiate wind band conductor. The third reliability observer was a college faculty member and researcher who was currently teaching courses in instrumental music education. Each participant was instructed to view 20% of the rehearsal frames of an individual participant. The reliability observers were asked to identify and record the performance targets addressed by the conductor. The reliability observers then recorded their evaluations of rehearsal frame targets on a checklist constructed by the researcher. Reliability was calculated by dividing the number of agreements by the total of agreements plus disagreements (Derby, 2001). Inter-observer reliability was 90%.

Operational Definitions

Each of the following operational definitions used in this study were adapted from previous studies conducted by Buckner, 1997; Cavitt, 1998; Colprit, 1998; and Duke, 1999. Table 3 presents specific teacher verbalizations, teacher behaviors, and student performance activities that were analyzed in this study. Table 5 presents the specific instructional targets that were analyzed in the present study.
Table 3

Categories of Teacher Verbalizations, Teacher Behaviors and Student Performance Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>Any general or specific instruction(s) given by the teacher that indicate the student to perform a task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Ensemble Play</td>
<td>Performance in which all students play together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Play</td>
<td>Student performance in which one student plays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Any teacher verbalization that conveys information about subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feedback</td>
<td>Any verbalization(s) by the teacher that conveys negative evaluations of what the student has done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Modeling</td>
<td>Any incorrect or approximately incorrect demonstration of a performance by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>Any verbalization by the teacher that conveys positive evaluations of what the student(s) has done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Modeling</td>
<td>Any correct or approximately correct demonstration of a performance by the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectional Play</td>
<td>Student performance in which designated groups of two or more are asked to play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Any statement by the teacher to which the teacher expects the student to respond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Definitions of Instructional Performance Targets

Articulation- The manner in which the notes are played. Articulation includes note length, note shape, attacks, releases, slurring, and phrasing.

Dynamics- Refers to the adjustment and variation in volume. Dynamics include crescendos, diminuendos, balance, and blend

Intonation/Tone- Refers to a musician’s realization of pitch accuracy and the ability to adjust to play better in tune and produce the best tone quality.

Multiple- Refers to when the teacher addresses more than one target during a rehearsal frame.

Pitch Accuracy- This target refers to the correct performance of notes and the use of correct fingerings and positions.

Rhythm Accuracy- Refers to the timing and rhythmic precision among the ensemble.

Technical Facility- This target refers to the agility of wind players and percussionists while playing rapid passages.

Tempo- This target refers to the speed at which the ensemble performs. Close attention is given to retardando, accelerando, rushing, dragging, and tempo modulations.

Unidentified- These non-apparent targets that are identified by the teacher in which the teacher directs the ensemble to repeat passages without any feedback.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The present study was designed to explore the planning activities of three exemplary high school concert band directors as they prepared for rehearsals and to observe the teaching behaviors and student learning activities employed by each director during rehearsals. This study is intended to provide positive insight for pre service, novice, and practicing band directors as they continue to develop and maintain effective and efficient planning and rehearsal techniques.

Three experienced high school band directors from central Mississippi who were preparing their top performing ensembles for their annual spring concerts were selected to participate in this study. Each subject had 25 or more years of experience as a public school band director and a superior record of achievement at adjudicated festivals and professional recognition.

The results of this study are organized around the following research questions:

1. How much time does each director spend planning rehearsals and what activities are involved in planning rehearsals?

2. What are the frequencies in which the band directors address the following performance targets in selected rehearsal frames that include two or more student performance trials articulation, dynamics, intonation/tone, multiple, pitch accuracy rhythm accuracy, technical facility, tempo, and unidentified?
3. What are the frequencies, rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to teacher talking, teacher modeling, and the frequencies and rates of the following verbal categories: giving directives, relaying information, providing positive feedback, providing negative feedback in rehearsal frames that address instructional targets and include two or more student performance trials?

4. What are the frequencies, rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to the following student performance activities: full ensemble play, sectional play, and individual play?

**Research Question 1:**
**How much time does each director spend planning rehearsals and what activities are involved in planning rehearsals?**

Teacher A indicated that rehearsal planning is an on-going process but he usually spends approximately three to four hours per week in a formal setting planning for concert band rehearsals. Teacher A maintained that he usually plans for rehearsals during planning periods during the school day. Teacher A stated that as he plans for rehearsals, he asks himself the following questions: (a) What instructional activities can I use to help my students to better understand the subject content? (b) How can I break down the materials into smaller units of instruction? and (c) How can I implement additional instructional strategies for those students who do not master the instructional objective on the first attempt.

According to Teacher A, activities involved in planning rehearsals consist of listening to other recordings of the same repertoire and comparing those recordings to his ensemble in order to make positive adjustments. In addition, Teacher A stated that he views all scores prior to each rehearsal to identify and to anticipate pedagogical issues that may occur and also what to emphasize before, during, and after rehearsals in order to prepare for future rehearsals. Teacher A also maintains that the director should make sure that the physical environment of the
rehearsal area is organized to meet the needs of the director and students in regards to conductor podium, organization of the music, and the student seating and instrument storage areas.

Teacher B explained that he spends an average of two to three hours per week planning for music rehearsals. Teacher B stated that the activities that he engages in while preparing for rehearsals consist of listening to professional or the best available examples of repertoire so that he may compare those recording with his present group, reflecting on notes that he takes during rehearsals, and constantly reviewing all music scores so that he may identify areas of the music that may need extra attention and to identify teaching problems.

Teacher C indicated that he does not set aside any specific time to plan for rehearsals but he usually spends approximately fifteen minutes before rehearsal preparing for class. Teacher C maintains that rehearsal planning is a perpetual process in which he is always thinking of strategies to improve the rehearsal process. In regards to the activities he engages in while preparing for rehearsals, Teacher C stated that he analyzes music scores in an effort to identify and to address individual parts, intervals, difficult rhythms, note accuracy, harmonies, types of fingerings, trills, and other potential problems. In addition Conductor C states that he also listens to recordings of his present group and compares those recordings to professional recordings when professional recordings are available. In addition, Teacher C stated that he constantly reflects back on past rehearsals to prioritize and plan for future rehearsals.

The three high school band directors were observed as they conducted five consecutive rehearsals (a total of 15 rehearsals). Table 5 presents data in regards to total rehearsal time and total test time of rehearsal frames for each director. The total rehearsal time devoted to repertoire preparation was 641.32 minutes (approximately 11.09 hours). Across all rehearsals, 117
rehearsal frames were identified for further analysis, a total of 233 rehearsal minutes (approximately 4.28 hours) which is equal to 36% of the total recorded rehearsal time.

The total duration of rehearsal time for Director A was 217.39 minutes. From the 217.39 minutes of rehearsal time during which music was rehearsed, 39 rehearsal frames that required two or more student trials were selected for analysis, a total of 76.33 minutes which represents 35% of the total recorded rehearsal time. The total duration of rehearsal time for Director B was 202.53 minutes. From the 202.53 minutes of rehearsal time during which music was rehearsed, 34 rehearsal frames that required two or more student trials were selected for analysis, a total of 49.34 minutes which represents 24% of the total recorded rehearsal time. The total duration of rehearsal time for Director C was 221.48 minutes. From the 221.48 minutes of rehearsal time during which music was rehearsed, 44 rehearsal frames that required two or more student trials were selected for analysis, a total of 98.13 minutes which represents 44% of the total recorded rehearsal time.
### Table 5

**Total Rehearsal Test Time of Rehearsal Frames for each Director**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Duration of 5 Rehearsals (in minutes)</th>
<th>Mean Duration of Each Rehearsal (in minutes)</th>
<th>Total Number of Rehearsal Frames</th>
<th>Total Duration of Rehearsal Frames</th>
<th>Percentage of Repertoire Rehearsal Time Devoted to Rehearsal Frames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>217.39</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>202.55</td>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49.34</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>221.48</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98.13</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>641.32</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>223.8</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>213.80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2: What are the frequencies in which the band directors address the following performance targets in selected rehearsal frames that include two or more student performance trials: articulation, dynamics, intonation/tone, multiple, pitch accuracy rhythm accuracy, technical facility, tempo, and unidentified?

Instructional goals or targets in each rehearsal frame were categorized into one of the following categories: articulation, dynamics, intonation/tone, multiple, pitch accuracy, rhythm accuracy, technical facility, tempo, and unidentified. The instructional target categories are defined in Chapter 3. Table 6 reports the frequencies and percentages of the instructional targets by category among all participants. Across all 149 observed rehearsal frames, the most frequent rehearsal frame instructional targets were multiple (30%), articulation (25%), and dynamics (20%), followed by tempo (18%), intonation/tone (8%), and Unidentified (4%). There were no single-target rehearsal frames that addressed pitch accuracy, rhythm accuracy, and technical facility. The absence of rehearsal frames that addressed pitch accuracy, rhythm accuracy, and technical facility may be attributed to the fact that the selections have been previously performed and that these performance targets have been previously been addressed and corrected earlier in the school year.
Table 6

*Frequencies of all Rehearsal Frames by Target Category for Director A, B and C (N=149)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Category</th>
<th>Participant A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation/Tone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Accuracy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm Accuracy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Facility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 reports the frequencies and percentages of rehearsal frames with two or more performance trials. Across all observed 117 observed rehearsal frames, the most frequent rehearsal frame instructional targets were Multiple Targets (35%), Articulation (27%), and Dynamics (20%), followed by Tempo (13%), Intonation/Tone (5%), Unidentified (1%) and Technical Facility (1%). There were no rehearsal frames that addressed Pitch Accuracy, and Rhythm Accuracy.
Table 7

*Frequencies of all Rehearsal Frames by Target Category for Director A, B and C* (N=117)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Category</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation/Tone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Accuracy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm Accuracy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Facility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Research Question 3:**
What are the frequencies, rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to teacher talking, teacher modeling, and the frequencies and rates of the following verbal categories: giving directives, relaying information, providing positive feedback, providing negative feedback in rehearsal frames that address instructional targets and include two or more student performance trials?

Teacher behaviors (verbalizations and modeling) were measured to describe the teacher activities during rehearsal frames. Table 6 reports total frequency, rates per minute, duration, percentage, and mean episode durations for teacher verbalizations and teacher modeling across rehearsal frames selected for analysis. Rates per minute were calculated by dividing the total number of occurrences of each behavior by the total duration in minutes of the rehearsal frame. The mean episode duration for teacher verbalizations and teacher modeling were calculated by dividing the total duration of the observed behavior within the rehearsal frame in which the behaviors occurred by the number of occurrences of that observed behavior within the rehearsal frame.

Table 8 reports combined frequencies, rates, durations, percentages, and means for specified teacher behaviors across all 117 rehearsal frames. Across all rehearsal frames, teachers talked approximately 45.89% of the total test time. The mean duration of talking episodes was approximately 6.6 seconds at a rate of 4.0 per minute. Directives were the most frequent category of teacher verbalizations with a combined rate of 3.1 per minute followed by information at 0.25 per minute. Positive and negative feedback verbalizations occurred at rates of 0.58 and 0.21 per minute. Participants modeled approximately 2% of the total test time. The mean duration of teacher modeling was 6.6 seconds at a rate of 0.20 per minute. Further analysis of modeling revealed that positive modeling occurred at 0.17 per minute followed by negative modeling at a rate of 0.03 per minute.
Table 8

*Combined Frequency, Rate, Duration, Percentage, and Mean for Observed Teacher Verbalizations and Modeling in Rehearsal Frames (N=117)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Duration (min:sec)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Talk</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>102.34</td>
<td>45.89%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feedback</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Modeling</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Modeling</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Modeling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 9 reports individual frequencies, rates, durations, percentages, and means for specified teacher behaviors across all 117 rehearsal frames. Teacher A talked during approximately 45.19% of the total test time. The mean duration of talking episodes was approximately 6 seconds at a rate of 4.5 per minute. Directives were the most frequent category of teacher verbalizations occurring at a rate of 2.8 per minute followed by information at .25 per minute. Positive and negative feedback verbalizations occurred at rates of .71 and .18 per minute. Teacher A modeled approximately 1.3% of the total test time. The mean duration of teacher modeling was 6.6 seconds at a rate of .20 per minute. Further analysis of modeling revealed that positive modeling occurred at .10 per minute followed by negative modeling at a rate of .01 per minute.

Teacher B talked during approximately 40.64% of the total test time. The mean duration of talking episodes was approximately 6.6 seconds at a rate of 3.7 per minute. Directives were the most frequent category of teacher verbalizations occurring at a rate of 3.5 per minute followed by information at .22 per minute. Positive and negative feedback verbalizations occurred at rates of .38 and .16 per minute. Teacher B modeled approximately 1% of the total test time. The mean duration of teacher modeling was 3.6 seconds at a rate of .16 per minute. Further analysis of modeling revealed that positive modeling occurred at .14 per minute followed by negative modeling at a rate of .03 per minute.

Teacher C talked approximately 49.29% of the total test time. The mean duration of talking episodes was approximately 7.8 seconds at a rate of 3.7 per minute. Directives were the most frequent category of teacher verbalizations occurring at a rate of 3.3 per minute followed by information at .26 per minute. Positive and negative feedback verbalizations occurred at rates of .60 and .27 per minute. Teacher C modeled approximately 3.2% of the total test time. The mean
duration of teacher modeling was 6.6 seconds at a rate of .16 per minute. Further analysis of modeling revealed that positive modeling occurred at .23 per minute followed by negative modeling at rate of .05 per minute.
Table 9

*Individual Frequency, Rate, Duration, Percentage, and Mean for Observed Teacher Verbalizations and Modeling in Rehearsal Frames (Band Director A, n=39, total time= 76.33 minutes; Band Director B, n=34, total time= 49.34 minutes; Band Director C, n=44, total time= 98.13 minutes)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Categories</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Duration (min:sec)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Talk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>34:32</td>
<td>45.19%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>19:89</td>
<td>40.64%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>48:13</td>
<td>49.29%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Modeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>00:49</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>3:17</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Modeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Modeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4:
What are the rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to the following student performance activities: full ensemble play, sectional play, and individual play in rehearsal frames that include two or more performance trials?

Table 10 reports combined frequencies, rates, durations, percentages, and means for specified student performance activities across all 117 rehearsal frames. Full ensemble performance was observed in 17.34% of total test time. The mean duration of full ensemble performance was approximately 26.4 seconds at a rate of .57 per minute. Sectional play was observed in 7% of total test time. The mean duration of sectional play was approximately 42 seconds at a rate of .22 per minute. Individual play was observed in 1.4% of total test time. The mean duration of individual play was approximately 25.8 seconds at a rate of .09 per minute.
Table 10

*Combined Frequency, Rate, Duration, Percentage, and Mean for Observed Student Performance Activities for all Participants in Rehearsal Frames (N=117)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Rate (min:sec)</th>
<th>Duration (min:sec)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Performance Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Ensemble Play</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>56.51</td>
<td>17.34%</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectional Play</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Play</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 presents the individual frequency, rate, duration, percentage, and mean of observed student behaviors across all 117 rehearsal frames selected for analysis. Teacher A utilized full ensemble plays during approximately 21.30% of the total test time. The mean duration of full ensemble episodes was approximately 7.8 seconds at a rate of 1.5 per minute. Teacher A utilized sectional play during approximately 9.37% of the total test time. The mean duration of sectional play episodes was approximately 2.4 seconds at a rate of 1.0 per minute. Teacher A utilized individual play during approximately 4.1% of the total test time. The mean duration of individual play episodes was approximately 2.4 seconds at a rate of 0.9 per minute.

Teacher B utilized full ensemble play during approximately 28.66% of the total test time. The mean duration of full ensemble episodes was approximately 12.6 seconds at a rate of 1.3 per minute. Teacher B utilized sectional play during approximately 20.43% of the total test time. The mean duration of sectional play episodes was approximately 9.6 seconds at a rate of 1.2 per minute. Teacher B utilized individual play during approximately 4.8% of the total test time. The mean duration of individual play episodes was approximately 6 seconds at a rate of 0.3 per minute.

Teacher C utilized full ensemble play during approximately 26.84% of the total test time. The mean duration of full ensemble episodes was approximately 10.8 seconds at a rate of 1.4 per minute. Teacher C utilized sectional play during approximately 21.48% of the total test time. The mean duration of sectional play episodes was approximately 9.6 seconds at a rate of 1.3 per minute. Teacher C utilized individual play during approximately 3.49% of the total test time. The mean duration of individual play episodes was approximately 5.4 seconds at a rate of 0.4 per minute.
Table 11

*Individual Frequencies, Rates, Percentages, and Mean Duration for Specified Student Performance Activities in Observed Rehearsal Frames (N=117)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Duration (min:sec)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Ensemble Play</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14:03</td>
<td>28.66%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>26:30</td>
<td>26.84%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sectional Play</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td>9.37%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>20.43%</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>21.48%</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Play</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2:23</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3:42</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to interviews and observations, field notes were taken to document each participant’s classroom management, warm-up procedures, and conducting. Across all observed rehearsals, Teacher A demonstrated several effective approaches to classroom management. Teacher A met the students as they entered the classroom and monitored them as they gathered their music folders, took their seats and assembled their instruments. Students who were not playing their musical instruments were given worksheets to complete during the regular class time and were asked to work independently on their assignments. Teacher A took attendance, made announcements, and stated his goals and expectations prior to the start of each rehearsal. In addition, Teacher A listed instructional objectives and outlines of the rehearsal plans on the chalkboard for each rehearsal. The arrangement of the student’s seats were modeled after a typical concert band setting which allowed the teacher and the students to see each other easily and allowed the teacher to move among the ensemble as needed.

Teacher A was consistent during the warm up sessions of each observed rehearsal. Each warm up process began with a series of long tones on a series of scales which ranged from eight counts to sixteen counts. Following the long tone activities, the students were instructed to play some chorales to address balance, blend, dynamics, and intonation. As soon as the chorale exercises were completed, the brass players were instructed to play a series of lip slurs while the woodwind players engaged in playing long tones. Following the lip slur exercises, the students were asked to play a series of scales at different tempos, articulations, and dynamics. After all warm up activities were completed, Teacher A engaged in tuning activities for the various instruments which addressed specific tuning tendencies for each instrument.

Across all observed rehearsals, Teacher A showed competency as an ensemble conductor and rehearsal facilitator. A variety of core conducting traits such as stance, proper preparatory
beats, rebounds, and gestures were expertly demonstrated by Teacher A across all observed rehearsals.

Teacher B provided a physical environment that was conducive to learning. The physical environment was neat and orderly. Prior to the students entering the classroom, Teacher B organized the seating area for the students and placed their music folders on each student’s music stand. The seating arrangements allowed the students to enter the classroom and assemble their instruments with ease. Teacher B conducted all administrative tasks such as roll call, announcements, and the passing out other materials prior to all performance activities. In addition to administrative tasks, Teacher B had provided the class with a rehearsal outline on the chalkboard that listed the rehearsal playlist, objectives, and goals for the daily lesson.

Across all observed rehearsals, Teacher B instituted a consistent warm up process. Teacher B began the warm up process with a series of long tones. As teacher B instructed the students to play long tones, he stressed the importance of breath support, posture, tone control, and dynamics to the students. Following a series of long tones, Teacher B instructed the brass players to play a series of lip slurs. As the brass players performed the lip slurs, the woodwind players were instructed to continue to play long tones which required them to ascend and descend chromatically. Upon the completion of the lip slur exercises, the students were instructed to play a series of scales which required them to play at different tempos and different articulations. The scale exercises required each to play the full range of their particular instrument. Following the scale exercises, the students were instructed to play a series of chorales in both major and minor keys. As the students performed the chorales, Teacher B stressed the importance to balance, blend, attack, releases, and intonation. Following the playing of the chorales, Teacher A checked the intonation and tuning tendencies of each student.
Teacher B displayed expert competence as a conductor across all observed rehearsals. Teacher B’s conducting patterns were not only clear and concise; his conducting patterns reflected the interpretation of the music in regards to phrasing, style, tempo, and articulation. As Teacher B conducted his respective ensemble, occasionally he would sing certain passages as the students perform them and walk though the ensemble to assist the students in making adjustments in regards to intonation and pitch accuracy.

Across all observed rehearsals, Teacher C was proactive in providing a learning environment that was conducive for the instrumental music setting. Prior to the student entering the classroom, Teacher C listed the rehearsal plan on the chalkboard, organized the seating arrangements for the students, and placed both music and music stands in the desired areas for the students. As the students entered the classroom, Teacher C greeted them and monitored them as they gathered their instruments from the instrument storage area, stored their instruments cases, and assembled their instruments. All administrative tasks such as taking attendance, making announcements, and reminding the students of important dates and activities were done prior to the start of all observed rehearsals.

In regards to warm up procedures, Conductor C was consistent across all observed rehearsals. Conductor C started the warm up process with a series of long tones played on a series of scales. As the students performed the series of long tones, Conductor C stressed the importance of proper seating, posture, breathing, and tone production. Following the long tone exercises, Conductor C instructed the students to play a series of scales that utilized different note patterns, articulations, and tempos. When the students completed the scale exercises, Conductor C instructed the brass players to play a series of lip slur exercises. As the brass players performed the lip slur exercises, the woodwind players were instructed to play a series of
chromatic scales on each lip slur cycle. Following the lip slur exercises, the students were asked to play a series of chorales. As the students performed the chorales, Teacher C stressed the importance of balance, control, tone color of the ensemble, sonority of the various instruments, breathing, and correct posture. Upon the completion of playing the chorales, Teacher C tuned each individual student.

Across all observed rehearsals, Teacher C displayed competence as an ensemble conductor. As Conductor C rehearsed his respective ensemble, there was a consistent display of accurate preparatory beats and conducting patterns that were reflective to the style and interpretation of the rehearsed repertoire. In addition to demonstrating accurate conducting skills, Teacher C provided the students with clear verbalizations along with non verbal gestures such as eye contact and preparatory breathing.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the instructional planning and rehearsal techniques of selected high school band directors as they prepare their top performing ensembles for their annual spring concerts. Three exemplary high school band directors were selected to participate in the study. Prior to all videotaped observations, each participant was interviewed in regards to rehearsal preparation. This study is intended to provide positive insight for pre service, novice, and practicing band directors as they continue to develop and maintain quality rehearsal techniques.

Summary of Results

As indicated by the participants, rehearsal planning time among the participants ranged from one hour per week to three hours per week. Collectively the participants agree that planning for rehearsals, whether it be formal or informal, must take place before, after, and in some instances during rehearsals. All participants indicated that they engage in various types of listening activities as they plan for rehearsals. As indicated by the participants, the listening activities include: listening to professional recordings or the best available recordings of selections that they are currently playing or plan to play in order to get insight on interpretation and style; listening to other schools that have performed the repertoire that they are performing and researching their outcomes, and by listening to their own groups in order to make assessments and evaluations in order to improve the rehearsal process.
Each participant agreed that prior to the introduction of any new repertoire, the conductor must research the composer of the work, study the historical period of the work(s), grasp the important elements of the style of music, and communicate these findings to the students as these pieces are rehearsed. In addition, the participants maintained that the initial phase for planning for music rehearsals begins with a thorough and comprehensive analysis of all music scores. According to the participants, score analysis is important because this process enables the conductor to identify each component of the composition in regards to vertical alignment which involves texture, harmony, chord progressions, and counterpoint; and the horizontal aspect of music which involves melody, countermelody, and rhythm.

Table 6 presented the frequencies of rehearsal frames that included two or more performance trials. Across all 117 observed rehearsal frames, the most frequent rehearsal frame instructional targets were multiple targets (45%), articulation (27%) and dynamics (20%), followed by tempo (11%), intonation/tone (5%), technical facility (1%) and unidentified (4%). These results are similar to those of previous studies (Cavitt, 2003; Worthy, 2003). Cavitt (2003) reported that when comparing the error correction practices of expert high school directors and expert middle school directors during rehearsals, high school directors addressed multiple targets more frequently than middle school directors. Worthy (2003) reported that an expert wind conductor who rehearsed both a high school and a college honor band under similar conditions addressed more multiple targets more frequently during the college rehearsals.

Across all rehearsal frames, among all participants, multiple targets was addressed the most by teacher A (11%), Teacher C (10%) and Teacher B (9%). Articulation was addressed the most by Teacher A and Teacher C (9%) followed by teacher B (7%). Dynamics was addressed the most by Teacher C (8%), followed by teacher A (7%), and Teacher B (5%). Tempo was
addressed the most by Teacher B (11%), followed by Teacher A (4%), and Teacher C (3%).
intonation/tone was addressed the most by Teacher A (5%), followed by Teacher B (2%), and
Teacher C (1%). Unidentified was addressed the most by Teacher A (4%), followed by Teacher
C (3%). Teacher B had no rehearsal frames that addressed unidentified instructional targets.
There were no rehearsal frames for pitch accuracy, rhythm accuracy, and technical facility. It
can be assumed that rehearsal frames that addressed pitch accuracy, rhythm accuracy, and
technical facility were addressed earlier in the rehearsal process. The results of this study might
be qualified by the fact that the rehearsal of the repertoire observed during this study consisted of
selections that had been rehearsed weeks before their participation in this study and that each
group had performed the repertoire at various pre festivals, district festivals, and state festivals in
which each group scored superior ratings.

The total rehearsal time devoted to repertoire preparation was 641.40 minutes
(approximately 11.09 hours). Of the 11.09 hours of repertoire preparation time, 117 rehearsal
frames were identified for further analysis, a total of 233 rehearsal minutes (approximately 4.28
hours) which is equal to 36% of the total recorded rehearsal time. Rehearsal frames ranged in
time length from 27 seconds to 10 minutes 3 seconds with a mean duration of 1 minute 47
seconds. The mean duration of rehearsal frames in the present study is lower than those in
previous research. In a study conducted by Worthy (2006) to observe three expert wind band
conductors during rehearsals, the mean duration of rehearsal frames was 2 minutes 6 seconds. In
a similar study conducted by Worthy (2003) in which an expert wind band conductor rehearsed
both a high school honor band and an intercollegiate college band, the mean duration for the
observed rehearsal frames was 1 minute 55 seconds. In a study conducted by Cavitt (2004)
which examined the error correction process of middle school and high school directors, the
mean duration of all analyzed rehearsal frames was 2 minutes and 53 seconds. These rehearsal frames are shorter than those of previous studies. The shorter duration of rehearsal frames in the present study may be attributed to the fact that the students had previously rehearsed the music and the fact that the repertoire had been previously performed at various adjudicated pre-festival performances, local district, and state band contests.

In the present study, collectively, the participants talked approximately 46% of the total test time. These results are consistent with previous research conducted by Worthy (2006) in which three expert wind conductors talked approximately 47% of the total test time during their rehearsals. However, the percentage of teacher talk in the present study is lower than the teacher talk in previous studies conducted by Cavitt (2003) and Worthy (2003). Cavitt reported in her study that middle school and high school teachers talked approximately 53% of the total rehearsal frame duration. Worthy reported that an expert wind conductor who was observed rehearsing a college honor band talked nearly half (49.41%) of the total test time.

The mean duration for Teacher Talk across all rehearsal frames was approximately 6.6 seconds. These findings are consistent with research conducted by Cavitt (2003) in which mean duration of Teacher Talk for middle school and high school band directors across all rehearsal frames was 6.6 seconds. These results are also consistent to a similar study conducted by Worthy (2003) that observed an expert wind conductor as he rehearsed both a high school and college band. During the high school rehearsals, the mean duration of Teacher Talk across all rehearsal frames was 6.6 seconds. However, during the college band rehearsals, the mean duration of Teacher Talk across all rehearsal frames was higher at 9.6 seconds. Individual frequencies, rates, percentages, and means for specified teacher behaviors reported in Table 6 shows that Teacher A and Teacher C had similar percentages of talk time (45.19% for Teacher A and 49.29% for
Teacher B had a lower percentage (40.64%) of talk time than Teacher A and Teacher C. Across all rehearsal frames, the mean rate of teacher talk episodes was approximately 4 per minute. Teacher A had the highest rate per minute talking episodes at 4.5 per minute followed by Teacher B and Teacher C at 3.7 per minute. Teacher C had the highest mean duration of teacher talking episodes (7.8 seconds) followed by Teacher B (6.6 seconds) and Teacher A (6.0 seconds).

Of the categorized teacher verbalizations, directives occurred most frequently. These results are consistent with previous research conducted by (Cavitt 2003; Worthy 2003; and Worthy, 2006) that examined expert conductors as they rehearsed concert bands under similar conditions. In the present study, Teacher B had the highest rate of directives per minute (3.5 per minute) followed by Teacher C (3.3 minute) and teacher A (2.8 per minute).

The rates per minutes for information were similar among all participants. Teacher C had a higher rate of information statements per minute (.26) than Teacher A (.25 per minute) followed by Teacher B (.22 per minute). Teacher A had the highest rate of positive feedback statements per minute (.71 per minute) followed by Teacher C (.60 per minute) and teacher B rate was significantly lower (.38 per minute). Teacher C had the highest rate of negative feedback statements per minute (.27 per minute) followed by Teacher A (.18 per minute) and teacher B (.16 per minute). This data is not consistent with previous rehearsal frame studies. Data from earlier studies reported significantly higher rates negative feedback. The results of the present study may be attributed to the fact that many of the performance targets that may have required negative feedback had been corrected earlier in the school year.

Overall, teacher modeling occurred at an average rate of .20 per minute with an average mean duration of 6.6 seconds. These results are significantly lower than those presented in
previous research. In her observation of middle school and high school band directors, Cavitt (2003) reported that across all rehearsal frames, teachers modeled for approximately 6% of the total test time during rehearsals. Worthy (2003) reported that an expert wind band conductor modeled 6.19% as he rehearsed both a high school and college honor band under similar conditions. In the current study, the researcher is under the assumption that the lower rate of teacher modeling is attributed to the fact that at the time of the study, the participants had already exposed the students to the music and at the time of the observations the students had already performed the music.

In the present study Teacher C had the highest rates of positive modeling (.23 per minute) followed by Teacher B (.14 per minute) and Teacher A (.10 per minute). Teacher C had the highest rate of negative modeling per minute (.05) followed by Teacher B (.03 per minute) and teacher A (.01 per minute).

The frequencies, rates, durations, and proportions of times devoted to student performance activities (full ensemble play, sectional play, and individual play) were reported in Table 7. Full ensemble performance was observed in 17.34% of total test time with a mean duration of 26.4 seconds at a rate of .57 per minute. These results are lower than those reported in previous research (Cavitt, 2003; Worthy, 2003). Cavitt (2003) reported that both expert middle school directors utilized full ensemble performance approximately 19% of the total test time during rehearsals. Worthy (2003) observed that an expert wind conductor utilized full ensemble performance approximately 28.32% of the total test time during high school and college rehearsals. In the present study, Teacher B had the highest percentage of full ensemble performance (28.66%) with a mean duration of 12.61 seconds, followed by Teacher C (26.84%),
with a mean duration of 10.82 seconds, and Teacher C (21.30%), with a mean duration of 7.83 seconds.

Sectional play was observed in 7% of total test time. The mean duration of sectional play was approximately 42 seconds at a rate of .22 per minute. These results are lower than those reported in previous research (Cavitt, 2003; Worthy, 2003). Cavitt (2003) reported that both expert middle school and high school directors utilized sectional play approximately 19% of the total test time during rehearsals. Worthy (2003) observed that an expert wind conductor utilized sectional play approximately 28.32% of the total test time during high school and college rehearsals. In the present study, Teacher C had the highest percentage of sectional play (21.48%) with a mean duration of 9.6 seconds, followed by Teacher B (20.43%), with a mean duration of 9.6 seconds, and Teacher C (9.37%), with a mean duration of 5.4 seconds.

Across all observed rehearsal frames, individual play was observed in 1.4% of the total test time. These results are lower than those reported in previous research (Cavitt, 2003; Worthy, 2003). Cavitt (2003) reported that both expert middle school and high school directors utilized individual play approximately 5% of the total test time during rehearsals. Worthy (2003) observed that an expert wind conductor utilized sectional play approximately 2.53% of the total test time during high school and college rehearsals. In the present study, Teacher B had the highest percentage of individual play (4.8%) with a mean duration of 2.4 seconds, followed by Teacher A (4.1%), with a mean duration of 6.0 seconds, and Teacher C (3.49%), with a mean duration of 5.4 seconds.

The directors and their respective ensembles observed in this study had been rehearsing the concert repertoire approximately five to six weeks prior to observations. It can be assumed that observations completed earlier in the school year or before a contest or festival might result
in different rates of teacher behaviors and performance activities, such as higher rates of teacher modeling along with higher frequencies of individual play.

Data obtained from field notes revealed certain commonalities among the participants. The key observations were that each participant was proactive in providing the proper environment for learning in the music classroom. Prior to the students entering the classroom, each of the participants made sure that the physical environment of the music classroom was neat and orderly. Each of the participants monitored the students as they entered the classroom and assembled their instruments. All participants handled all administrative tasks such as attendance, announcements, and the distribution of instructional materials prior to any music instruction. Another key observation was that each participant listed a rehearsal plan and a listing of goals and objectives on the chalkboard for each rehearsal.

Across all rehearsals each of the participants was consistent in regards to their warm up procedures prior to the rehearsal of the repertoire. Each individual warm up procedure included a series of long tones, scales, fingering exercises, articulation exercises, lip slurs, and chorale studies. In addition, another common trait observed among the participants was that during each warm up procedure, emphasis was places on proper posture, proper breathing, proper tone production, and balance and blend. Upon the completion of the warm up procedures, each participant was very meticulous when tuning the various instruments. Not only did they tune the instruments to basic tuning notes such as F concert and B flat concert, the participants checked specific tuning tendencies on certain instruments prior to the music rehearsal.

Each participant demonstrated competency as an ensemble director and rehearsal facilitator. All participants demonstrated excellent conducting facility and technique that displayed clear down beats, clear conducting patterns, and the ability to maintain continuity of
tempo. Across all observed rehearsals it was evident that each participant had the ability to recognize, diagnose, and correct various musical problems as they occur in an efficient manner. Each participant appeared to have a comprehensive understanding of all the instruments and various music styles.

Discussion

The proper planning and preparation for music instruction is the best way to ensure that a music rehearsal is implemented efficiently. In order for the music educator to be prepared for rehearsals, lessons and activities must be planned out in advance. The proper planning of music rehearsals allows the teacher to anticipate challenges, manage class time, manage classroom discipline, and improve both student and ensemble performance. The summary of findings contained in this document display nearly a century of training and experience related to band pedagogy. The participants’ knowledge and understanding of the particulars of instructional planning and band rehearsing appears to be effective as evidenced in their written lesson plans, classroom management, routines and activities during the observed rehearsals, and each participants’ continued success as a practicing band director. Each participant’s lesson plans displayed a clear understanding of what is to be mastered during the rehearsal and how those objectives are to be mastered. In addition, each teacher explained the rationale of each objective to the students and provided the students with various routines and procedures that were designed to assist in the mastering of the objectives.

In regards to classroom management, each teacher had a system of proactive measures in place to deal with the management of the students. Prior to all rehearsals, each teacher reminded the students of the rules and regulations and what is expected of them, each teacher dealt with
interruptions effectively and efficiently, and the physical space of the classroom was organized to facilitate teacher and student movements between transitions.

The planning practices and pedagogical approaches used by each participant are similar in most aspects and the success and productivity of the individual participants seem apparent. This is evident based on each participant’s record of success and achievement as a practicing band director. It can be assumed that many students have benefited from the knowledge and expertise of the exemplary teachers presented in this document. The planning practices and pedagogical approaches used by the participants of the present study will forever shape my philosophy in regards to band pedagogy. As an educator, researcher and practicing band director I will constantly be reminded of each pedagogical approach as I face and address the pedagogical challenges of each student.

Recommendations for Further Research

It was the intent of this study to provide insight for novice and practicing band directors as they continue to develop and maintain quality rehearsal techniques. This study is different from previous studies that used the rehearsal frame as the unit of analysis in that the rehearsal planning activities of each director was examined. It is recommended that systematic observation and the rehearsal planning strategies be applied in future studies to address the following in instrumental music education:

1. Continue to observe and compare novice and expert teachers at different times of the school year and in different settings.

2. Use systematic observation to observe student teachers.

3. Conduct studies that will randomly select directors for interviews and systematic observations.
4. Conduct systematic observation studies in the marching band setting.

5. Conduct systematic observation studies in the jazz band setting.

6. Examine the planning practices of expert music teachers in different settings.

7. Examine and compare the planning practices of expert and novice music teachers.
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Letter of Participation

Renardo Murray
195 Lake Dockery Dr.
Byram, MS 39272
601-346-7807
rmurray426@aol.com

April 24, 2010

To whom it may concern:

I am a doctoral student in the Department of Music at the University of Mississippi. I am soliciting your participation in my doctoral research. The purpose of this study is to examine the rehearsal planning and practices of selected high school band directors.

The study is designed to answer the following questions:

1. How much time does each director spend planning rehearsals and what activities are involved in planning rehearsals?
2. What are the frequencies, rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to teacher talking and teacher modeling?
3. What are the frequencies and rates of the following verbal categories: giving directives, relaying information, providing positive feedback, providing negative feedback?
4. What are the frequencies rates, durations, and proportions of time devoted to the following student performance activities: Full Ensemble Play, Sectional Play and Individual Play?
5. What are the frequencies in which the band directors address the following performance targets in selected rehearsal frames?: Articulation, Dynamics, Intonation/Tone, multiple, Pitch Accuracy, Rhythm Accuracy, Technical Facility, Tempo, and Unidentified.

In addition to interviews and observations, field notes were taken to document each participant’s, classroom environment, classroom management, warm-up procedures, and conducting.

Enclosed is an Informed consent Form which should be mailed at your earliest convenience. I would like to contact you via telephone within the next week to confirm your willingness to participate, to set up an interview, conduct all observations, and to answer any questions that you may have. If you have any questions, please call, write, or contact me via email. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this proposal.

Sincerely,

Renardo Murray
APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form
Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Investigator: Renardo Murray, M.Mus.Ed
195 Lake Dockery
Byram, MS 39272
601-346-7807

Sponsor: Michael Worthy, PhD
Department of Music
University, MS 38677
662-915-1277

I ______________________________ graciously and voluntarily consent to be a participant in the doctoral research entitled “Instructional Planning and Rehearsal Practices of Three Selected High School Band Directors.” Renardo Murray, a doctoral candidate in music education at the University of Mississippi will conduct the research. I understand the purpose of this project is the examine the planning and rehearsal practices of selected high school band directors as they prepare their ensembles for performances.

I understand that my participation is voluntary. I further understand that I may withdraw from my participation at anytime and without explanation. I further understand that I will be videotaped and interviewed by the researcher. I understand that after the transcripts have been approved by me, the recordings will be destroyed as per my request.

I understand that I will be informed before all or part of this study is published in a format other than the discourse for which it was originally intended. I further understand that my consent and participation may be withdrawn at my request at anytime without prejudice, penalty or loss of benefits to which otherwise I am entitled.

I understand that I have the right to ask and have answered any questions concerning the study. I further understand that I may contact Renardo Murray, 195 Lake Dockery Drive, Byram, MS. 601-346-7807, for answers to questions about this research or my rights. I also understand that the results of the study will be sent to me upon my request. I verify that I have read and understand this consent form.

IRB Approval: This study has been reviewed by the University of Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board(IRB). The IRB has determined that this study meet the ethical obligations required by federal law and University policies. If you have any questions, concerns or reports regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the IRB at 662-915-7482.

____________________________  __________________________
Participant’s Signature  Date

____________________________  __________________________
Witness  Date
APPENDIX C

Demographic Information and Interview Questions

Scope: This structured interview contains questions that will investigate the rehearsal planning and preparation activities of selected high school band directors. All interviews will take place prior to each participant’s video observation. All participants will be interviewed face to face.

Demographic Information

Name of Subject _______________________________
School _______________________________________
Number of Years Teaching Experience _____________
Number of Years Employed at Present School _______

Interview Questions

1. How much time do you spend planning rehearsals? (hours per day, days per week)

2. What activities do you engage in while preparing for rehearsals? (score preparation, listening activities, etc.)
APPENDIX D

IRB APPROVAL

April 23, 2010

Mr. Renardo Murray
195 Lake Dockery
Byram, MS 39272

Dr. Michael Worthy
Department of Music
University, MS 38677

Dear Mr. Murray and Dr. Worthy:

This is to inform you that your application to conduct research with human participants, Rehearsal Practices of Three Selected High School Band Directors (Protocol 10-165), has been approved as Exempt under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

Please remember that all of The University of Mississippi’s human participant research activities, regardless of whether the research is subject to federal regulations, must be guided by the ethical principles in The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research.

It is especially important for you to keep these points in mind:

- You must protect the rights and welfare of human research participants.
- Any changes to your approved protocol must be reviewed and approved before initiating those changes.
- You must report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (662) 915-7482.

Sincerely,

[Diane W. Lindley]
Diane W. Lindley
Coordinator, Institutional Review Board
VITA
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