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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Higher education has been criticized for failing to adequately prepare successful music educators in elementary and secondary schools. The basis for this criticism rests in the apparent belief that the classroom behaviors of these elementary and secondary school educators are seldom appropriate, in that students often are not learning. Some defenders of current college music education curricula might suggest that societal expectations are unrealistic. However, this investigator believes that the teacher preparation curricula are currently inadequate and should be modified to reflect the practical and successful teaching techniques currently being used by exemplary choral directors in the schools. It may be that the goals to be realized in the classroom are not unrealistic or unduly optimistic in relation to the importance of student learning. Rather, the haphazard way by which teaching techniques are identified, developed, and subsequently applied by these choral directors may prove to be major sources of unfulfilled expectations in school classrooms.

Many variables are involved in the teaching-learning process. Attempts by scholars over the years to define the "perfect" teacher have produced varied results. However, although they have often disagreed, researchers have generally considered the following subjective criteria to be important: personality, subject matter, classroom interaction, and teaching skills.
The emphasis upon education and certification has risen in importance during the past decade. Development of performance based programs has amply demonstrated the inadequate base for what is normally considered "effective" teaching. There is a definite breakdown between research in teacher effectiveness and the college curricula for music education. Designers of music education curricula may see better results if they examined more closely the products and procedures used by current exemplary educators. Impressive conclusions could be realized by observing effective teaching behaviors.

For decades, researchers have attempted to identify those characteristics and behaviors most closely associated with teacher effectiveness (Kratz, 1896; Ryans, 1948; Rosenshine, 1971; Dunkin and Biddle, 1974). Much of this research has been based upon random observation of teacher and pupil performance in the classroom and surveys reflecting the opinions of students, teachers, administrators, supervisors, and researchers themselves. Researchers have often disagreed over the importance of certain teaching behaviors or traits as they relate to teacher effectiveness. This investigator suggests that such disagreement is due to the elusive definition of "teacher effectiveness." Behaviors which have constituted effective teaching to one researcher may not have been considered so effective by another.

This study differs from others on the subject of teacher effectiveness in one major respect: it is asserted from the outset that the subjects of the study are to be effective teachers. Each of the junior high and middle school directors, who participated in this study, directed choral ensembles which achieved superior contest ratings. The subjects were further qualified on the basis of screening and evaluation by college professors, experts in the field of choral music education.
It is reasonable to assume that if this study reflects a high degree of similarity among these directors with respect to one or more teaching behaviors, these behaviors should be emphasized in the college music education curricula to better prepare future music educators in effective teaching methods. If the study does not reflect this similarity, perhaps future research should concentrate less upon what constitutes effective teaching and more upon the phenomenon of student learning.

Need for the Study

A modern college music education program can fully arm students with a plethora of teaching techniques, then disarm them by failing to address the adequateness, appropriateness, and effectiveness of those techniques. In the field of choral teaching, this investigator submits that certain teaching styles and approaches are more effective than others. These selected techniques should be emphasized and developed in the music education curricula.

Many studies (Ryans, 1948; Medley, 1963, 1977; and Rosenshine, 1971, 1976) of teacher effectiveness have been developed in order to better understand what constitutes good teaching. Teacher behavior and its impact on the teaching-learning process is a variable that has undergone much research. To the best knowledge of this investigator, no research, relative specifically to the effectiveness of junior high and middle school choral directors, has been undertaken. The junior high and middle school chorister presents unique problems at this age of adolescence. Voice change begins between the ages of ten to fourteen. Choral directors have specific problems that need to be addressed in order to keep the adolescent singing. Vocal ranges, types of
literature, composers and arrangers, as well as techniques for working with the changing voice are critical and need to occur. In a choral rehearsal, the behavior of the director plays a critical role in the teaching-learning process. An attempt to bridge the gap between the "ivory tower" and the "real world" should be made.

This study will identify the music teaching behaviors of exemplary choral teachers as demonstrated by junior high and middle school choral directors who have already achieved a high degree of choral teaching success. Results should provide some direction for the revision of college music education curricula as they relate to the effective development of quality junior high and middle school choral music educators.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to identify rehearsal behaviors of exemplary choral directors based upon observations and examination of junior high and middle school choral directors who have achieved a high degree of teaching success. The identification of common rehearsal behaviors apparent with each director was achieved by video taping classroom behaviors which were subsequently rated by a panel of experts, and by use of an extensive interview process.

Rehearsal behaviors relating to each director were observed and rated. These included:

1. manner;
2. vocal pedagogy;
3. non-verbal behavior;
4. verbal behavior;
5. conducting of the rehearsal;
6. classroom management;
7. sightreading and dictation skills;
8. keyboard skills.

Within each area, descriptive statements were included for evaluation by the panel of judges. A Likert Scale, ranging from “Strong Agreement” (Rating 5) to “Strong Disagreement” (Rating 1) was used for each of the statements.

Research Questions

Research Questions to be addressed were as follows:

1. What is the mean Likert Scale rating for each statement reflecting evaluations from all three judges of the twelve subjects as a group?

2. What are the degree of frequencies for each of the eighty-two rating statements?

3. What are the percentages for each of the statements contained within each category?

4. What is the reliability coefficient for each statement?

5. What is the reliability coefficient for each of the eight categories contained on the rating form?

An interview questionnaire was also used in the study. The questionnaire addressed:

1. Teaching experience:
   (a) mean for the total years of all subjects
   (b) mean for the total years at the present school setting

2. School criteria:
   (a) teaching schedules
   (b) type of school
   (c) distribution of students in the choir
(d) percentage of students who continued choral singing the following year
(e) percentage of students taking private instrumental or voice lessons
(f) number of choir concerts given in one school year
(g) additional hours spent outside of the school day either in extra rehearsals, preparation, and/or performances

3. Classroom procedures:
   (a) grading criteria
   (b) grade distribution for the choir
   (c) type of discipline used

4. Administration:
   (a) amount and type of support given
   (b) budget
   (c) scheduling

5. Musical training:
   (a) type of college degree
   (b) major instrument of the director
   (c) past and present conducting experience
   (d) conducting and performance activities of the director outside of school responsibilities

6. Choral rehearsals:
   (a) planning of the rehearsals
   (b) development of musical reading skills
   (c) sightreading of new choral music
   (d) educational media used during rehearsals

7. Pedagogical topics:
   (a) methodology used for the unchanged voice
   (b) methodology used for the changed voice
   (c) rewriting of any vocal music

8. Type of music selected:
   (a) voicing used
   (b) favorite composer and arrangers
   (c) criterion used by the director in selection of choir music

9. Music performances:
   (a) importance of music contest
   (b) number of choral concerts per year

10. Personal questions:
    (a) personal musical growth of the director
    (b) guidelines for a successful music program
11. Suggestions for improving college choral methods classes

Definitions

The following terms are described for specific understanding in this study.

**Choir** is an ensemble of singers comprised of changed, unchanged, and changing voices.

**Choir contest** is assessed by three judges on the performance of three choral pieces selected by the school director. One of the three octavos performed must be selected from the required list provided by the Ohio Music Education Association Contest List. Ratings are I through V with I being superior. Superior ratings are not limited to only one choir per competition.

**Classroom management** refer to taking choir attendance, announcements, and behavior problems.

**Conducting of the rehearsal** is a description of the activities that occurred during each class observed. For example, the director asked students to sing their individual vocal parts. Students marked their music with pencils. The praise factor was high and the goals of the rehearsal were stated at the beginning of the rehearsal.
Director is a teacher whose responsibilities are to teach choral music to the school population.

Director's manner refers to the behavior of the director in rehearsal preparation, speech inflection, a sense of humor, and pacing of the rehearsal.

Healthy vocal usage is proper production of the voice. This includes good posture and proper breath technique. A pleasant tone should be produced without strain and tension. All voice registers should be even and vocal quality consistent throughout the entire vocal range. Diction should be clear and easily understood.

Junior high school is a school comprised of grades 6, 7, and 8; 7 and 8; or 7, 8, and 9. The grade levels are decided individually by each school system.

Keyboard skills are accompaniments or music played at the piano (written accompaniments, vocal parts, or a combination of both).

Middle School is a school comprised of grades 5, 6, and 7; 6, 7, and 8; 7 and 8; or 7, 8, and 9. The grade levels are decided individually by each school system.
Non-verbal behavior includes the position of the director during the rehearsal (behind or in front of the piano). Conducting patterns were observed as was the amount of the conducting performed by each director.

Rehearsal is a scheduled class used for preparation of music for a performance.

Sightreading and dictation skills refer to developing better skills in reading a new piece of music.

Verbal behavior is addressed by how the director communicates with words. Was the verbal communication positive, encouraging, and motivating or sarcastic and angry in nature?

Vocal pedagogy is the teaching of vocal development.

There are many other concepts that could be described but these listed are representative of proper choral rehearsal techniques used in this study.

Assumptions Pertinent to the Study

This study proceeded on the basis of two major assumptions. They were:

1. Obtaining a high rating at music contest constitutes some measure of teacher achievement and student learning.
2. The teacher behavior recorded during one video taped rehearsal constitutes normal rehearsal behavior for that director. This investigator believed that these assumptions were appropriate and provided the basis for undistorted and meaningful conclusions.

Limitations of the Study

Only junior high and middle school choral directors were used as subjects in this study. Similar rehearsal techniques may be used in elementary, high school, or college choral settings but these age levels were not dealt with in this study.

The twelve subjects were selected in part by contest ratings and recommendations by university professors. Therefore if the choir did not participate in choir contest and receive a superior rating, the choir director was not considered for use in the study.

Video taping of one choral rehearsal created some limitations in making judgments concerning these directors. However, the great distance between schools of exemplary choral directors in Ohio prevented additional rehearsal observations. This investigator was limited to the video taping of one rehearsal and the Interview Questionnaire with which to make assessments. Results were based on the information each director chose to reveal to the investigator.

Summary

Identifying the rehearsal behaviors of exemplary junior high and middle school choral directors is absolutely necessary if the future of choral music
education is to improve. Determining similar characteristics these choral directors display, and how they develop their choirs, is of profound importance in revamping the content of college choral methods courses since only teaching methods that assist in creating exemplary choral programs should be taught. It is the purpose of this study to identify these rehearsal behaviors demonstrated by exemplary junior high and middle school choral directors.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Carnegie Report entitled "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century" (1986) states that for the past three years American education has begun to correct educational weaknesses with a commitment to quality. Reflecting this desire to improve the quality of education in our nation's schools, many studies have been undertaken to better understand why some teachers are effective and successful, and why others are not.

The results of this research have revealed both strengths and limitations of the American education process. Numerous studies have been completed where classroom activities were observed, teacher effectiveness measured, and implications suggested for improving teacher education. The investigators used different terminology in describing classroom events. These terms may coincide in meaning, but often the same term is used to express diverse occurrences. Therefore, these investigators experienced difficulties in understanding and comparing related research studies.

Social behavior is of little significance if taken out of context, and, therefore, cannot be studied in isolation. What is effective teaching in one set of circumstances may not be so effective in another classroom environment. Some characteristics of effective teaching may be general, but others most likely reflect specific teacher traits or particular characteristics of the students. The only way to determine which effective teaching strategies are general, and which ones are not, is by studying a given teaching strategy in various types of classrooms.
Teacher effectiveness has two distinct eras of research. The first is prior to 1960 which dealt with teacher characteristics or the personality of the teacher. From 1960 the research included use of observation instruments which focused on methods of teaching.

**Early Research of Teacher Effectiveness**

Research on teacher effectiveness began in 1896 with “What Makes a Good Teacher?” by Kratz. In this study, students were asked to describe their best teacher. From the descriptions by the students many characteristics were revealed. According to Medley (1972) many studies describing teacher characteristics appeared between 1896 and 1955.

The early studies dealt with the nature of teaching, and recognized that teacher effectiveness is a complex activity which had not been adequately or properly investigated. They sought to identify characteristics of good teachers, and generally focused on opinions formulated by students (Hart, 1936). The results suggest that students can not agree on the type of teacher they prefer, and that the typical student has little insight into teacher effectiveness.

Investigators began to make inquiries of principals, teachers, and administrators by giving them lists of behaviors/personality descriptions and asking them to select those they believed to be important for good teaching (W. N. Anderson, 1917). In later studies, educators and administrators were asked to create their own lists of important characteristics. Barr (1961, p. 135) distilled these lists into one group of fifteen personality factors:
1. buoyancy
2. consideration
3. cooperativeness
4. dependability
5. emotional stability
6. ethicalness
7. expressiveness
8. flexibility
9. forcefulness
10. judgment
11. mental alertness
12. objectivity
13. personal magnetism
14. physical drive
15. scholarliness

The first rating scales used for teacher evaluation were developed in 1913 (Elliott, 1915). By 1930, Barr (Barr and Emans, 1939) had examined 209 rating scales. His analysis did not attempt to explore specific personality traits. Instead, he concentrated on more general areas regarding teachers. Barr considered the following areas to be important:

1. instruction
2. classroom management
3. professional attitude
4. choice of subject matter
5. personal habits

6. discipline

Unfortunately, researchers could not agree on how teachers should behave in pursuit of the foregoing areas. In fact, the researchers could not even agree upon the areas to be rated, nor could they agree upon the effect these teachers had on their students. According to Medley, 1979, "... all of these lists characterized teachers perceived as effective" (p. 13).

There were problems associated with the use of rating scales, evaluators using the rating scales, and the outcome of measuring pupil achievement. The instrument of evaluation was very subjective (i.e. opinion related) and, therefore, often vague. In particular, the "raters" were frequently school administrators or supervisors who were prone to heavy personal bias, positive or negative, toward the teachers evaluated. "Two or more raters, observing the same teacher simultaneously, often disagreed on the quality of the teaching" (Barr, 1961, p. 141). "Good teachers could not be separated from poor teachers according to rating scale items" (Barr 1961, pp. ii, 143).

From 1948 to 1956, David Ryans conducted one of the largest teacher effectiveness, rating-type study. This study included over 6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools, representing approximately 450 school systems (Ryans, 1964, p. 67). Various personal characteristics of teachers such as understanding, friendliness, responsibility, stimulation, and imagination were evaluated and recorded. Ryans said:

A person's concept of a good teacher seems to depend on (a) his acculturation, his past experience, and the value attitudes he has come to accept, (b) the aspects of teaching which may be foremost in his
consideration at a given time, and (c) characteristics of the pupils taught. A description of competent or effective teaching must, therefore, be considered to be relative - relative to perhaps three major sets of conditions: (1) the social or cultural group in which the teacher operates, involving social values which frequently differ from person to person, community to community, culture to culture, and time to time; (2) the grade level and subject matter taught; and perhaps (3) intellectual and personal characteristics of the pupils taught (Ryans, 1960, pp. 370-371).

From this explanation of good teaching by Ryans, it becomes obvious that teacher effectiveness research is, of necessity, complex. Different grade levels and subject matter require differences in styles and teaching objectives and the behavior of both students and teachers alike are factors involved.

In 1978, Dr. Nathaniel Gage said that Ryans study was the single most extensive study of teachers to date, setting high standards in research of teacher behavior. The early research indicates that teaching behavior in the classroom was largely a function of personality or characteristic traits of the teachers. The main focus of the research was to identify those traits. Gage underscored the earlier findings that the study of teaching effectiveness was complex and incomplete, especially with regard to identifying effective teaching traits.

Later Research on Teacher Effectiveness

Since 1960, the focus of teacher effectiveness research has changed to the analysis of the teaching process in the natural environment of the classroom. Prominent in this area of research are Mitze, Medley, Biddle, and Flanders. "Less than twenty-five studies have been conducted on any specific variable such as teacher praise or teacher questions. These studies involved different
grade levels, subject areas, and student backgrounds" (Rosenshine, 1976, p. 61).

Mitzel classified teaching effectiveness criteria into product, process, or presage (1960, p. 1482). A product variable is the educational effect of student behavior resulting from academic growth initiated by the teacher. The process variable effects the product variable through teacher and student behaviors. The reaction of students to the instruction of the teacher, teacher clarity, and student attentiveness are process variables. The intelligence of the teacher, college grade point average, warmth towards students, and teaching success refer to the presage variable. All three variables are intertwined with the presage variable affecting the process variable and the process variable affecting the product variable.

Various observational instruments have been used for analysis of teaching behaviors. Over 90 different observational instruments were identified in "Mirrors of Behavior III" (Simon and Boyer, 1970). Of those, 76 had been used in school settings. Additional observational instruments were reviewed by Medley and Mitzel, 1963; Biddle, 1967; Dopyera and Lay, 1969; Nuthall, 1968, 1970; and Rosenshine 1970. Over 120 observational systems have now been found and are discussed by Rosenshine and Furst, (1973, p. 47). These observational instruments have diverse capabilities of monitoring:

1. current classroom practices
2. trained teachers
3. instructional systems
4. relationships between classroom activities and student growth

Investigators have used these instruments in a variety of ways in order to categorize and label instruction.
Observational instruments first dealt with teacher characteristics. A major change in focus, from the observation of the characteristics of the teachers to that of the behaviors of the teachers in eliciting learning from the students, occurred with these efforts. The Interaction Analysis by Flanders (1970) compared the behavior of teachers with the response of their students. He describes the techniques of Interaction Analysis:

Interaction analysis is a label that refers to any technique for studying the chain of classroom events in such a fashion that each event is taken into consideration. An observer sits in the classroom, or views a video-sound playback, or just listens to a voice recording and keeps a record of the flow of events on an observation form. He might punch the keys of some mechanical device if it is available. He is trained to use a set of categories. He decides which category best represents each event and then writes down the code symbol of that category. His speed of recording depends on the category system, the skill of the observer, and the difficulty of the interaction, but an average speed of 10 to 30 symbols per minute can be expected. The product of his observation is a long list of code symbols, one symbol to one event. An analysis can be made of the frequency of events in each category, a profile of the distribution can be drawn, or a simple display can be created which shows how each event is a part of the chain. Inferences about the chain of events can then be made, keeping in mind the limitations of the overall process (pp. 5, 6).

As found in Table 1, the Flanders technique involves seven teacher behavior categories and only two student categories. The teacher behaviors are:

1. Accepting feelings
2. Praising or encouraging
3. Accepting or using ideas of students
4. Asking questions
5. Lecturing
6. Giving directions
7. Criticizing or justifying authority
Table 1: Flander's Interaction Analysis Categories* (FIAC)

Teacher Talk:

1. Accepts feeling. Accepts and clarifies an attitude or the feeling tone of a pupil in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting and recalling feelings are included.

2. Praises or encourages. Praises or encourages pupil action or behaviors. Jokes that release tension, but not at the expense of another individual nodding head, or saying "um hm?" or "go on" are included.

3. Accepts or uses ideas of pupils. Clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a pupil. Teacher extensions of pupil ideas are included but as the teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five.

4. Asks questions. Asking a question about content or procedure, based on teacher ideas, with the intent that a pupil will answer.

5. Lecturing. Giving facts or opinions about content or procedures; expressing his own ideas, giving his own explanation, or citing an authority other than a pupil.

Initiation

6. Giving directions. Directions, commands, or orders to which a pupil is expected to comply.

7. Criticizing or justifying authority. Statements intended to change pupil behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing; extreme self-reference.

Pupil Talk:

Response

8. Pupil-talk-response. Talk by pupils in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits pupil statement or structures the situation. Freedom to express own ideas is limited.
Table 1 continued: Flanders’ Interaction Analysis Categories * (FIAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Pupil-talk-initiation. Talk by pupils which they initiate. Expressing own ideas; initiating a new topic; freedom to develop opinions and a line of thought, like asking thoughtful questions; going beyond the existing structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Silence or confusion. Pauses, short periods of silence and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is no scale implied by these numbers. Each number is classificatory: it designates a particular kind of communication event. To write these numbers down during observation is to enumerate, not to judge a position on a scale (Flanders, 1970, p. 34).

The two pupil behaviors are:

1. Response
2. Initiation

The Interaction Analysis by Flanders was designed to observe classroom behaviors of teachers as they interacted with students. Since both student and teacher behaviors are observed with the Interaction Analysis, it would seem more accurate if more behavior categories were available for the student. An unbalanced representation is given with seven teacher behaviors and only two pupil behaviors. An interaction analysis system which gives the students equal attention seems necessary.
Rosenshine (1971) and Rosenshine and Furst (1973) observed the processes of teaching in the classroom and related those to student learning. Rosenshine and Furst advocated this model for observations of teaching (Rosenshine and Furst, 1973):

1. Development of procedures for describing teaching in a quantitative manner;
2. Correlational studies in which the descriptive variables are related to measures of student growth;
3. Experimental studies in which the significant variables obtained in the correlational studies are tested in the more controlled situation. (p. 122).

These fifty process-product studies (Rosenshine and Furst, 1971) mentioned above attempted to identify relationships between the classroom behaviors of teachers and pupil achievement. The research reflects the following:

1. All the studies were conducted in classrooms with normal children.
2. In most studies only the class mean was employed in the analyses.
3. These studies focused on general teaching behaviors.
4. This review covers only the relationships between teacher behaviors and student achievement (p.43).

Teacher clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task-orientation as well as opportunities for students to learn the material, had good research backing. Use of student ideas (originally used by Flanders), negative criticism, use of structuring comments, types of questions, probing, and level of difficulty of instruction, had only some research support. However, the identification of these characteristics paved the way for future research.
Dunkin and Biddle (1974) reviewed studies on teacher effectiveness in a given context. Their studies of grades K-12 included observations of teaching in the classroom with the many evaluative systems being used. Dunkin and Biddle examined studies in classroom climate, management and control, the classroom as a social system, knowledge and intellect, logic and linguistics, and sequential patterns of classroom behavior. Many findings were reported such as support for classroom management, positive reinforcement for good behavior, verbal fluency, clarity, and the reduction of classroom criticism, to name just a few.

Research on teaching, after the work by Dunkin and Biddle, began to clarify behaviors that were stable throughout all the observations. One of the weaknesses in the earlier studies was the inability to focus on the actual process of teaching in the classroom. “Consistent results are probably more difficult to find because few (teacher effectiveness) studies have used similar observation instruments and studied at the same time period” (Soar, 1976, p. 261).

Dunkin and Biddle, as well as Mitzel (1960), classified teacher criteria of personality traits as presage and classroom behavior as process variables. The product variables were the outcomes of the teaching and how the students changed because of the interaction with the teacher and other students (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974, pp. 411-412).

The Competency Based Teacher Education (CBTE) movement has been influenced by this teacher effectiveness research. Higher standards for certification and promotion are currently being adopted based upon competencies demonstrated by effective teachers. Medley in 1977 used 289 studies (from an original list of 732), to examine the difference between the behaviors of effective and ineffective teachers. The criteria used in this project were (Medley, 1977, p. 5):
1. The study from which a relationship came had to be designed so that the relationship was generalizable to some population of teachers larger than the sample studied.

2. The relationship had to be both reliable enough to be statistically significant and large enough to be practically significant.

3. The measure of teacher effectiveness had to be based on long-term pupil gains in achievement areas recognized as important goals of education.

4. The process measure had to specify the behaviors exhibited in such a way that they could be reproduced as desired.

There were 613 conclusions that resulted from only fourteen of the 289 studies. These studies were examined as to how the teacher acted and how much the students learned from the teacher. The following quote effectively communicates the issues involved.

A strong relationship between a behavior variable and a measure of teacher effectiveness need not be regarded as evidence that the observed behavior caused the measured effect. Instead, we shall use the measure of effectiveness as an indicator of teacher competence, inferring that teachers who are effective are more competent on the average than teachers who are ineffective. The distinction between competent and effective implied in this statement is important and yet easy to forget. Competence has to do with how a teacher teaches and is measured in terms of the teacher's behavior; how effective a teacher is, is measured in terms of pupil learning. In other words, an effective teacher is always competent, but a competent teacher may not always be effective, for a multitude of reasons (Medley, 1977, p.6).

More specific observations have been made by Cruickshank (1986, p. 82) as reflected in the following quote.

A competent teacher of subject matter is likely to be developing positive attitudes for school as well; teachers who produce maximum
achievement gains are also likely to improve student self-concept the most; there is relatively little difference in the behaviors of effective teachers of reading and math in grade three or below; and patterns of teachers effectiveness with low SES (social economic status) pupils may differ considerably with those effective with high SES pupils. Medley also supports the importance of how teachers use pupil time and relatedly notes that it is in the ineffective teacher's class that time spent on academic activities is lowest, that there is the most independent and small group activity, and that the class spends the least time organized into one large group.

Studies involving teacher behaviors continued with Gage, 1978; Good, 1979, 1983; Brophy, 1979; and Brophy and Good, 1985. The studies varied according to class size, grade level, teacher and pupil characteristics, and subject matter. Research continues involving the impact of classroom organization and management, teacher behaviors, and subject matter teaching methods upon student learning behavior. This growing body of information contributes to the development of knowledge regarding the general area of appropriate teaching methodologies.

**Research Relating to Music Education**

In 1965, John Fosse completed a dissertation on “The Prediction of Teaching Effectiveness: An Investigation of the Relationships Among High School Band Contest Ratings, Teacher Characteristics, and School Environmental Factors.” Fosse's criterion for teacher effectiveness was the contest ratings received in the Illinois State Music Festival in 1961. The thirty subjects used in the study received a variety of contest ratings. All directors were male with three years of teaching experience at their present school. Data were also collected on family background from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.
Psychological characteristics of the directors were determined to be quite diverse. The directors who received superior ratings were aloof, optimistic, and methodical. The band directors receiving excellent ratings were idealistic and somewhat aloof. Directors whose bands received good ratings were gloomy, depressed, and could not maintain relationships with authority figures. Similar findings were observed for those band directors who did not take their bands to the competitions with those who received superior or excellent ratings. However, it was discovered that the directors who did not compete in the band contests were less competitive and more intellectualized.

In 1967, Snapp developed a modification of the Interaction Analysis by Flanders for the recording of behaviors in a fifth grade instrumental class. Verbal interaction between teacher and student was observed with the "teacher giving directions" being the highest characteristic of teacher behavior. Teacher praise was effective insofar as praise was given as a reinforcement for developing the musical skills of students rather than student talk. Table 2 shows the Modified System of Interaction Analysis for Music Classes by Snapp, 1967. The additions that Snapp made were musical activities that were recorded for both the teacher and the student.

"A Study of Rehearsal Techniques for Symphonic Band" was completed by William Vereen in 1968. His study identified a list of 275 rehearsal techniques appropriate for use with bands. The list was compiled from information collected through the interviewing and surveying of selected band directors, music teachers, and college professors. Vereen reports:

1. "collate and codify items [variables] believed to be most important to rehearsal techniques of symphonic bands;

2. furnish statistical analysis of each item by grade-level category;

3. isolate possible curricula content for educational method courses utilized in the teaching of future band directors;

4. contain heuristic value for future research relative to specific items concerned with rehearsal techniques of symphonic bands."
Table 2: Description of Categories for the Modified System of Interaction Analysis for Music Classes. (Snapp, 1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Number</th>
<th>Description of Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**INDIRECT: (TEACHER BEHAVIOR)**

1. ACCEPTS FEELINGS: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the student in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative, and expressed verbally or musically. Predicting and recalling feelings are also included.

2. PRAISES OR ENCOURAGES: praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, not at the expense of another individual, nodding head or saying "uh-huh" or "go on" are included.

3. ACCEPTS OR USES IDEAS OF STUDENT: clarifying, building, or developing ideas or suggestions of student or implied musical ideas as expressed through student musical activities.

4. ASK QUESTIONS: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answer.

**DIRECT: (TEACHER BEHAVIOR)**

5. MUSICAL ACTIVITIES: playing an instrument, clapping, singing, tapping of foot, or any other form of physical movement which demonstrate elements pertinent to the music process.

6. LECTURES: giving facts or opinions about content or procedure; expressing his own ideas; asking rhetorical questions.

7. GIVES DIRECTIONS: directions, commands, or orders with which students are expected to comply.

8. CRITICIZES OR JUSTIFIES AUTHORITY: statements intended to change student behavior from a nonacceptable pattern; "bawling out" someone; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing so as to achieve or maintain control; rejecting or criticizing a student's thought or deed.
Table 2 continued: Description of Categories for the Modified System of Interaction Analysis for Music Classes. (Snapp, 1967)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TALK: (STUDENT BEHAVIOR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>STUDENT TALK-RESPONSE:</strong> talk by students, in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits student’s statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>STUDENT TALK-INITIATION:</strong> talk by students, which they initiate. If “calling on” student is only to indicate who may talk next, observer must decide whether student wanted to talk. If he did, use this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUSICAL: (STUDENT BEHAVIOR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a.*</td>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUAL MUSICAL ACTIVITIES:</strong> those activities undertaken by one student which involve some form of physical movement and are pertinent to the process of making music, such as playing an instrument, clapping, singing, tapping of foot, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b.*</td>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUAL MUSICAL ACTIVITIES-CONDUCTED:</strong> the same student activities as category 11a except that they are performed while the teacher is conducting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a.*</td>
<td><strong>GROUP MUSICAL ACTIVITIES:</strong> the same musical activities as category 11a except that a group of students is involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b.*</td>
<td><strong>GROUP MUSICAL ACTIVITIES-CONDUCTED:</strong> the same musical activities as category 11a except that a group of students performs while the teacher is conducting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td><strong>SILENCE OR CONFUSION:</strong> pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes additions by Snapp.
Robert Erbes, in 1972, developed an observational system for categorizing, analyzing, and reporting the verbal interaction of directors and students during the musical rehearsals of large group ensembles. Erbes adapted the Rehearsal Observation System developed by Snapp for use in large musical ensemble rehearsals. The behavior of both the teacher and student was recorded in a sequential manner every three seconds. The categories used by Erbes include:

1. Conductor Uses
2. Conductor Encourages
3. Conductor Questions
4. Conductor Informs
5. Conductor Verbally or Nonverbally Demonstrates
6. Conductor Verbally Directs
7. Conductor Criticizes
8. Conductor Corrects
9. Student Verbally Responds
10. Student Verbally Initiates
11. Periods of Silence or Confusion
12. Periods of Student or Group Performance

Erbes concluded:

1. The conductor-student interaction in large group rehearsal is unique compared to academic classroom subjects. In a study of twelve rehearsals from research for this dissertation, informing, demonstrating, direction giving, criticizing, and correcting constituted 89 per cent of the conductor verbal behaviors. Encouragement of student behavior and performance constituted 7 per cent of the conductor verbal behaviors. Student verbal behavior consisted primarily of responses to conductor questions.
2. An interaction analysis system can indicate the socio-emotional climate of large-group rehearsal situations.

3. An objective and consistent coding of rehearsal interaction can be obtained with approximately fifteen hours of self-instruction, discussion, and practice in the technique.

4. A minimum proficiency level of coding rehearsal interaction can be obtained with approximately four hours of self-instruction and practice in the technique.

5. The independent nature of the RIOS categories did not cause serious problems in objectively categorizing rehearsal interaction by the investigator and other research personnel. Some confusion occasionally existed in discriminating between categories of Informing and Directing. It was often difficult to discriminate between rapid shifts in Criticizing, Correcting, and Informing (Erbes, 1972, pp. 136-138).

Temple, 1973, conducted a study to ascertain if bands receiving a superior rating in Ohio state band competitions could sightread better, and prove a higher level of music achievement than bands that were "recommended" as outstanding by a panel of judges. Some of the conclusions from the study are as follows:

1. No significant difference existed between sightreading abilities of students in competition bands and non-competition bands.

2. Directors with more extensive educational backgrounds developed students who sightread at a higher level.

3. The wider the scope of musical activities in which a student participated, the greater the sight-reading strength of that student, especially if the student's activities included solo competition participation, choir, and private instruction (1979, pp. 107-108).

Yarbrough, 1973, examined the effect of magnitude of conductor behaviors on performance, attentiveness, and attitude of students in mixed choruses. Three
high school choruses and one university chorus were observed in behaviors which included: eye contact, physical closeness, volume and modulation of voice, gestures, facial expressions, and rehearsal pace. Results indicate that there is no significant difference in the performance, attentiveness, or attitude of the students based on the magnitude of the conductor behavior. However, three of the four groups received their lowest ratings with low magnitude conductors and two of the choruses received their highest ratings with the high magnitude conductors.

A study conducted by Kay Reynolds (1974) involved gathering data about small instrumental performance classes. A modified form of the Observational System for Instructional Analysis by Hough and Duncan (1972) was used. Expansion of the appraisal categories and use of coding symbols to include particular instrumental music teaching behavior were added to the original as well as musical direction and codification of teacher error. Results indicate that the modified Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA) is helpful in measuring teacher and student behaviors occurring in small instrumental performance classes (p. 124). The modified OSIA accurately measured the behaviors of teachers and students. The study also found that the teachers used a wider variety of positive appraisal behaviors than did the students.

Verbal behavior during rehearsals of five choral directors was investigated by Thurman in 1978. Tape recordings of the director verbal behaviors were made using a professional choir, a university choir, two high school choirs, and one clinic choir. Results indicated that rehearsal time was spent on the average in the following ways:
1. 35-40 per cent of the rehearsal time was verbal communication.

2. 50-60 per cent of the rehearsal time included verbal comments and applied directly to factors of the choral performance.

3. Directors also did more demonstrating than verbal imagery and more disapproval feedback was given.

Yarbrough and Price published a study in 1980 on prediction of performer attentiveness based on rehearsal activity and teacher behavior. Six high school ensemble directors and students, randomly selected from two mixed choruses, three bands, and one orchestra, were videotaped for the purposes of this study. The following was observed:

More on-task behavior occurred during performance time than during non-performance time, which supports previous research, indicating that music or activity may be intrinsically reinforcing. During nonperformance there were more disapprovals than approvals. However, because of the low frequency of social reinforcement as compared to academic reinforcement, it may be unwise to conclude that disapprovals increased off-task behavior. Few social tasks were presented or reinforced during these rehearsals (JRME, Vol.29, #3, 1981, p. 215).

In 1980 Robert Spradling studied the effect of duration and frequency of "time-out" from performance on the attentiveness and attitude of students who performed in a university band. Results indicated that students are more attentive during performance, doing activities than during "time-out" activities.

A profile of rehearsal interaction for five selected high school band conductors was investigated by Pontious in 1982. The Rehearsal Interaction Observation System (RIOS) modified by Erbes was used for analysis of the rehearsals. A time and frequency study of the verbal behavior by the conductors allowed for the identification of rehearsal techniques used by the conductors. Pontious
found that 78 per cent of the time these conductors were very direct, but nonsupportive in their verbage. Fifty per cent of the rehearsal time was spent with reference to phrasing, dynamics, and rhythm. Conductor talk occupied 42 per cent of the rehearsal time while the remaining 58 per cent was used for active rehearsing.

Robert Carpenter (1986) conducted an analysis of fourteen junior high and high school band rehearsals. Each conductor was observed and audio taped an average of 4.3 times over a nine week period. Summary of the results are as follows (pp. 69-73):

1. The conductors did not use pedagogy very effectively for instruction.

2. Teacher-conductors are more disapproving than approving in their comments during rehearsals.

3. Comments will most often concern rhythm, dynamics/expression, style/articulation, and instrumental fundamentals rather than tone, correct notes, theory, intonation, blend/balance, or tempo.

4. Demonstration/modeling and questioning occur less than do verbal technical directions to initiate student behavior.

5. There are notable differences between junior high and senior high rehearsals. Personal qualities, organization, use of pedagogy, and error detection skills were rated higher in senior high schools. Junior high conductors are more approving and concern themselves with social behavior in giving feedback. However, such feedback was limited to rhythm and correct notes. In the senior high, intonation, blend/balance, dynamics/expression, and style/articulation are discussed.

Researchers have not always agreed on the behaviors and characteristics that are essential for effective teaching. This investigator suggests two explanations for this lack of unanimity. First, much of the past research has
focused upon teaching behaviors and characteristics in relative isolation --
divorced from student achievement. The assumption has been that one would
recognize effective teaching when it occurs. Second, even where teacher
effectiveness has been related to student achievement, such achievement has
not been measured by uniform standards but has occurred as a result of external
variables. These variables are often unrelated to the effectiveness of the teacher.

The question, therefore, is what kind of process should be followed so that
"effective" teachers are the ones scrutinized when studying issues related to
identifying desired teacher behaviors. It would seem logical that one must first
identify the product as exemplary, then study the behaviors the director used
to achieve the product.

If learning has occurred, the teacher must be effective. A choir which has
achieved a superior rating at a district music contest and has also developed
a positive reputation has obviously learned something in the classroom - both
collectively as a choir and as individual students. As stated by Medley (1977)
"competence has to do with how a teacher teaches and is measured in terms
of the teacher's behavior; how effective a teacher is, is measured in terms of
pupil learning" (p.6). Indeed, the junior high and middle school choral setting
is ideal for the study of teacher effectiveness since the levels of class achievement,
as opposed to individual student achievement, are identifiable and measurable.
Junior high and middle school choral directors who consistently produce the
"product" must be considered effective. They merit close observation since
it must be assumed that there exists a strong relationship between the quality
of their choirs and their effectiveness as a teacher.

Perhaps in no other area of education can such a direct correlation be made
between the success of the class as a whole and the success of the teacher.
For example, overall high performance of students in an algebra class may be due to exceptionally high intelligence of a few of the students, or it might result from effective presentation of the material by the teacher. In a choir, a few well-trained voices will not save an entire choir from a mediocre performance. Each choir member must learn to work as a member of the entire ensemble. Thus, successful choirs result from the desire of students to learn coupled with the effective teaching skills of the director.

This study commences with an examination of effective methods and procedures used by choral directors. Most earlier studies attempted to distill the qualities of effective teaching by examining the behaviors of teachers. This research is designed to increase understanding of the nature of effective choral teaching by identifying the similarities in the rehearsal behaviors of exemplary junior high and middle school choral directors.

Teaching effectiveness research has not carried over into the area of music generally, nor has it carried over into the area of choral rehearsal techniques in particular. Due to the relative lack of research, this study was conducted in an attempt to fill a portion of the gap in the knowledge about teaching effectiveness for middle school and junior high choral directors.
CHAPTER III
MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter involves discussions concerning the subjects, the evaluative instruments, and the procedures used to identify the rehearsal behaviors of the twelve exemplary choral directors. A description of the equipment used to record the rehearsals and responses of the subjects is also included.

Subjects

The junior high and middle school choral directors who subsequently served as subjects in this study were selected by using a two-fold process. First, the superior contest ratings for all sixteen Ohio Music Education Association districts were collected by contacting chairpersons for district junior high and middle school choir contests. Using this information, forty-five choir directors were identified. Second, selected university methods professors, representing the various regions of Ohio, were then contacted to determine the instructional reputation for each of the forty-five choir directors. (See Appendix A noting the school locations of the twelve subjects and the two pilot schools.) The twelve directors who received the most commendations by the university methods faculty were subsequently designated as "exemplary" junior high and middle school choral directors for purposes of this study. The investigator was of the opinion that this type of procedure was an effective means of dealing
with the complex problem of identifying exemplary middle school and junior high choral directors.

The twelve choral directors represented diverse areas of Ohio culturally, socially, and economically. The mean membership for each of the twelve choirs was seventy-three, with means of twenty-three boys and fifty girls in each ensemble. Seven of the twelve choirs rehearsed five days a week and the remaining five choirs rehearsed twice a week. All twelve choirs rehearsed for an average of 45 minutes per rehearsal.

Six of the choir directors were male and six of the directors were female. All subjects were Caucasian and had an average of sixteen years of teaching experience. Each had been at their present school an average of nine years. Each had a baccalaureate degree in music and 42 per cent had a master of music degree. Sixteen per cent of all subjects had taken post graduate work, with none of the twelve directors having completed the doctorate.

**Instruments Of Evaluation**

This portion of Chapter III includes information regarding (1) the Director and School Survey; (2) the Interview Questionnaire; (3) and the Rehearsal Rating Form. These evaluative instruments were developed by the investigator for the purpose of collecting the needed information upon which conclusions could be reached.

**Director and School Survey**

Interviews were arranged with each of the twelve directors. After preparations for each interview were completed, an introductory letter and
a questionnaire were sent to each director. The purpose of the survey was to solicit information regarding the number of years of teaching experience, choir performance activities, school population, and permission received by both the choral director and principal to participate in the study. The introductory letter confirmed an earlier telephone conversation asking the consent of each director for participation in the study. The letter also explained particular details of the study and confirmed the date of the video taping and interview. (The Director and School Survey are presented in Appendix B.)

**Interview Questionnaire**

The interview questionnaire was developed to serve three functions:

1. to establish a format for the interviews;
2. to obtain information peculiar to each director including teaching responsibilities and teaching schedules;
3. to gather information on the changing voice and other related issues.

The Interview Questionnaire was pilot tested with two middle school choir directors. This original interview form had ample space designated for essay-type responses to various questions which took considerable time for completion.

The final Interview Questionnaire form included a listing of all possible responses for each question. In addition, space was given for additional responses which might not otherwise be available for a particular question. The investigator then checked the appropriate response given by each director. During the actual thirty to forty-five minute interview with each director, the investigator completed the Interview Questionnaire. (The revised version of the Interview Questionnaire is presented in Appendix C.)
Rehearsal Rating Form

The evaluation of the rehearsal video tapes for the twelve subjects was obtained by using the rehearsal rating form. This rating form was based on a Likert scale of 5 to 1, with 5 indicating "Strong Agreement" and 1 indicating "Strong Disagreement." The "Neutral" response of 3 was to indicate neither agreement nor disagreement. This response category eliminated guessing (Abeles, Hoffer, and Klotman, 1984, p. 253). For each statement, the three judges were asked to respond in one of the following ways:

- **Strong Agreement:** mark 5
- **Agreement:** mark 4
- **Neutral:** mark 3
- **Disagreement:** mark 2
- **Strong Disagreement:** mark 1

There were 82 items using both positive and negative statements relating to the director. These were: manner, vocal pedagogy, non-verbal and verbal behavior, conducting of the rehearsal, classroom management, use of sightreading, dictation, and keyboard skills.

The twelve video tapes were subsequently submitted for evaluation to a panel of three university professors, all of whom have had successful public school teaching experience. They are currently involved in evaluating music classes as a normal part of various university music methods courses they instruct. In addition, all three are recognized as leaders in the field of choral music education and continue to serve as adjudicators and clinicians for choral competitions and festivals.

The rating form for each director was first read by the three judges, then discussed with the investigator. This clarified possible misunderstandings.
involving terminology found on the rating form. Next, the first choral director tape was played. Once the actual evaluation process began, there was no consultation between judges and/or the investigator. The judges were allowed time between tapes to complete the rating form before the next tape was begun. There were three separate evaluation sessions reviewing four separate choral director tapes each time. Evaluation of all twelve tapes was completed within ten days.

As for the Interview Questionnaire, the Rehearsal Rating Form used by the panel of experts was pilot tested. The two middle school choir directors used for the piloting of the Interview Questionnaire also gave permission for the investigator to video tape one of their rehearsals. Using the original rating form, graduate students evaluated these rehearsals. Certain problems surfaced and suggestions were made to correct the form. These problems included a failure to keep the positive statements equally weighed in every category. This was also the problem with some of the negative statements. Clarification was necessary for some statements, while others were removed because of being redundant or ambiguous. Spacing was improved on the form for easier tabulation. (The final version of the Rehearsal Rating Form is contained in Appendix D.)

**Evaluation Procedures**

**Evaluation of Individual Subjects**

All twelve choral directors were video taped in a rehearsal situation and subsequently interviewed. This was completed within a three week period of
time which provided consistency for relative pupil development and number of choral rehearsals. Interviews were conducted from the middle of March through the first week of April, 1986.

Before the director began the rehearsal, he or she was asked to rehearse the choir as he or she would under normal conditions. The intent was to record on tape a “typical” choral rehearsal. The investigator began video taping the rehearsal as soon as the students entered the room. The camera was positioned in the back of the rehearsal room and remained on the director during the entire time. The interview was conducted immediately following the video taping of the rehearsal because the investigator did not want the directors to be influenced by the content of the interview. The investigator followed guidelines outlined in the books entitled Effective Interviewing by Tolor and The Helping Interview by Benjamin to improve and standardize interviewing procedures and techniques. The investigator tabulated the interview questionnaire for analysis. Percentages and means were derived for scheduling, education, voicing of the choirs, choral literature, grading, and discipline.

**Equipment**

The interview audio tapes were recorded on Scotch AVX 90 Studio Master cassettes with a Sony cassette-corder TCM-2. All taping was done with the same equipment. The video tapes were made by using a Panasonic VHS Portapak with mobile camera (model WV-3240) and 3M Scotch Color Plus T120 Professional Videocassette VHS. The VHS tapes were played for the panel of judges on a Zenith color television (model S1983W6) and a Panasonic video cassette recorder.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The source of all data presented and analyzed in this chapter is derived from information found on the completed thirty-six rating forms (three rating forms per subject) and the twelve interview questionnaires (one questionnaire per subject). The rating form and the interview questionnaire will be analyzed using means, percentages, frequencies, and correlation coefficients.

Rating Form: Data and Analysis

Likert Scale Applied to Eight Areas of Study

The rating form was used as an instrument of evaluation by the panel of three judges. Data collected were divided into the following eight categories of study for each director:

1. manner;
2. use of vocal pedagogy;
3. verbal behavior;
4. non-verbal behavior;
5. conducting of the rehearsal;
6. classroom management;
7. use of sightreading and dictation skills during rehearsal;
8. keyboard skills and use of the piano.
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Within each category, a number of descriptive statements were presented for evaluation by the judges on a Likert Scale ranging from "Strong Agreement" (Rating 5) to "Strong Disagreement" (Rating 1). A Rating 3 for any descriptive statement indicated neutrality, i.e., the judges neither agreed nor disagreed with the applicability of the statement.

For the purpose of this study, a rating in the range of more than 2.5 to less than 3.5 indicates neutrality. In other words, a rating which falls within these limits does not indicate sufficient agreement or disagreement by the judges for a particular statement. Thus, any rating from 1 to 2.5 indicates varying degrees of disagreement, while a rating from 3.5 to 5 indicates varying degrees of agreement.

The data for each dependent variable was analyzed in the computer facilities of The Ohio State University using the SPSS-X statistical package which computed the reliability of the judges' responses to each statement, including the agreement of the judges with each other as well as a judge's own consistency.

Analysis of the rehearsal data as found on the rating form for each of the eight categories included the following information:

1. The mean Likert Scale rating for each statement reflecting evaluations from all three judges of the twelve subjects as a group;
2. The frequencies for each of the eighty-two statements;
3. The percentages for each of the statements contained within each category;
4. The reliability coefficient for each statement;
5. The reliability coefficient for each of the eight categories contained on the rating form.
Reliability of Statements

Eighty-two statements have been included in this study for analysis. These were selected on the basis of use in earlier studies (Major/Lowder, 1982), and on the basis of the investigator's own experience in the classroom. A low reliability coefficient (less than .70) (Guilford, 1978, p. 87) for any statement may indicate either: (1) that the statement is poorly worded; (2) that the statement has differing interpretations by the judges; (3) that the judges understood the statement but responded to the statement inconsistently as a group or individually; or (4) a combination of 1, 2, and 3.

Percentages and Means

Since this is a descriptive study, percentages will take on added importance. High percentages for 4 and 5 ratings, or for 1 and 2 ratings, will indicate commonalty for the particular statement. For evaluation purposes, 1 and 2 ratings will be considered as disagreement and 4 and 5 ratings will be considered as agreement. The relative degree of agreement or disagreement will be reflected in the mean scores for each statement.

Category I: Director's Manner

Category I, Director's Manner, consisted of nine statements describing particular director rehearsal behaviors. Overall, the reliability coefficient of .88 for this category was very high. The three judges were asked to evaluate whether the director demonstrated thorough preparation for the class, varied speech inflection, positive reinforcement, sense of humor, and dictatorial or inflexible
teaching mannerisms. In addition, judges were asked to determine if the director maintained an appropriate rehearsal atmosphere and an effectively paced rehearsal. Subjects were also rated on their ability to admit their mistakes to the class.

As found in Table 3, the attribute most commonly shared by all directors was their ability to maintain a rehearsal atmosphere (Statement #3). The judges either agreed or strongly agreed that this statement applied to 83.2 per cent of the subjects rated. Further, the reliability of the statement tied with Statement #6 as the most reliable statement in the group. Two other statements which received at least a .70 reliability coefficient were also applicable to the subjects as a group. Approximately two-thirds of the subjects used varied speech inflection (Statement #2) and demonstrated thorough preparation for the rehearsal (Statement #1).

The judges agreed that 72.2 per cent of the subjects did not exhibit a dictatorial, inflexible manner of directing the rehearsal (Statement #7). This finding would not be inconsistent with the results of Statement #4 concerning the use of the director’s sense of humor in the rehearsal. In Statement #4, although the mean indicates that a sense of humor was neither particularly descriptive nor non-descriptive of the subjects as a whole, the judges did agree that 38.8 per cent of the subjects used humor effectively, and such usage is usually inconsistent with an inflexible or dictatorial teaching style.

Lowest reliability for statements contained in Category I were found for Statements #5 and #9. Statement #5, which concerned the ability of a director to admit a mistake to the students, received a reliability rating of .55, and a mean score of 3.3. Since the judges determined that the statement was inapplicable to over 72 per cent of the subjects, there was undoubtedly little
Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category I: Director's Manner</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thorough preparation.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Varied speech inflection.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appropriate rehearsal</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atmosphere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Admitting a mistake.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[26]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positive reinforcement.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A dictatorial inflexible</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An effectively paced</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehearsal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fast paced rehearsal.</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evidence presented to determine whether a particular subject routinely admitted to a mistake.

Statement #9 received the lowest reliability coefficient (.29) within Category I. The judges were asked whether the directors conducted a “fast-paced” rehearsal. The unreliability of the statement was due to varying ideas among the judges as to what constituted “fast” pacing in contrast to “slow” pacing. It may have been that the lengths of the rehearsals were confounding factors regarding pacing. In other words, effective pacing for a thirty minute rehearsal may have been dramatically different from an effectively paced sixty minute rehearsal. In any event, the judges determined that directors varied in their ability to pace the rehearsal in an effective manner (Statement #8). Thus, it would appear that the judges were able to identify “effective” pacing, but were unable to agree upon what constitutes “fast” pacing.

Statements #4, #5, #6, #8, and #9 were not particularly applicable to the subjects as a group, since the mean scores for the statements ranged from 2.5 to 3.5. It is noteworthy that Statement #6, which dealt with positive reinforcement to the students, had a very high reliability coefficient (.87) but a mean score (3.2). This would tend to indicate that positive reinforcement by the director during a rehearsal is not necessarily required in order to achieve an exceptional junior high and middle school choir program. In summary the exemplary choir directors demonstrate: (#1) thorough preparation; (#2) varied speech inflection; and (#3) appropriate rehearsal atmosphere.

Category II: Vocal Pedagogy

Fourteen statements were analyzed to determine activities in the area of Vocal Pedagogy. The results are presented in Table 4. Category II, Vocal
**Table 4.**

**Category II: Vocal Pedagogy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Rehearsal began with warm-up exercises.</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Choral music was used for warm-up.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The choir demonstrated healthy vocal usage.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Imitations were used effectively to correct student performance.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Breath support was emphasized effectively.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Voice change was dealt with positively.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Phrasing was taught well.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Proper vowel coloration and pronunciation were achieved.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The articulators and enunciation of vowels and consonants were stressed.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Proper use of the vocal mechanism was taught.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Quality choral literature was used.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedagogy, achieved a very high overall reliability coefficient of .88. Each of the statements addressed the direct or indirect use of pedagogical principles by the directors throughout the course of the rehearsal. Among the behaviors observed and rated by the judges were use of warm-ups, proper breathing, proper vowel coloration and pronunciation, intonation, and choice of literature.

The highest mean (3.88) was achieved for Statement #1 concerning the use of warm-up exercises. Statement #1 also achieved the highest reliability coefficient (.97) within Category II. The other statement with a mean score of 3.5 or better and a reliability of .70 or better was Statement #14. The panel of judges observed that two-thirds of the directors made use of good quality choral literature.

Statement #2 relates to the use of the choral music itself as a warm-up. The data demonstrate that Statement #2 is reliable (.81), and that it was considered by the judges as non-descriptive of 69.4 per cent of the directors. Thus, information for Statements #1 and #2 strongly indicates that warm-up exercises were used by the directors prior to the beginning of other rehearsal activities, and that the warm-ups consisted of content other than from the choral music under study.

Students displaying healthy vocal usage, Statement #3, achieved a high mean score (3.86) and a reliability coefficient of .64. The judges agreed or strongly agreed that 77.7 per cent of the rehearsals by the directors demonstrated healthy vocal practice. In view of this high percentage, the lower reliability coefficient is probably due to inconsistencies among the judges as to their description of healthy singing.

The data reflect no other statement which was widely applicable to the directors as a group (i.e., a statement for which the subjects scored a mean of 3.5 or higher or 2.5 or lower). Some statements, however, did come close
as for Statement #13 concerning the use of the vocal mechanism. The results of Category II are: (#1) rehearsal began with warm-up exercises; (#2) choral music was not used for warm-up; (#3) the choir demonstrated healthy vocal usage; and (#4) quality choir literature was used.

**Category III: Director's Non-Verbal Behavior**

Eight statements reflecting types of director non-verbal behavior were included in Category III as seen in Table 5. Four of the eight statements (#3, #6, #7, and #8) achieved a reliability rating of .70 or better. Overall reliability for the entire category was .55. None of the statements achieved a mean score of 3.5 or more, although Statements #5, #6, and #8 were found not to apply to the subjects as a group (i.e., rating of 2.5 or less).

The judges disagreed as to whether Statement #1 was applicable to the subjects. Fifty-eight and three-tenths per cent of the directors were thought to have effectively conveyed messages to the students in a positive, motivating, and encouraging manner. However, the judges felt that 30.4 per cent of the subjects studied did not communicate in this way.

Similarly reviews were mixed on Statement #2 concerning the ability of the class to follow the conducting of the rehearsals. While 52.7 per cent of the directors conducted musical numbers in a way that was easy to follow, the judges felt that 24.9 per cent did not. Interestingly, the judges also felt that Statement #2 was neither applicable nor inapplicable to a large segment (22.2 per cent) of the directors observed.

From the eight statements presented, Statements #6 and #8 appeared to have applicability to the group of directors as a whole, but only in a negative sense. The judges found that 58.2 per cent of the directors did not conduct
### Table 5.

**Category III: Director's Non-Verbal Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication was positive, encouraging, and motivating.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conducting clear and easily followed.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Director remained behind the piano.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Director remained in front of the choir.</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Director moved into sections and sang.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Director conducted the entire rehearsal.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Director played most of the rehearsal.</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Director played 50% and conducted 50%</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
during the entire rehearsal (Statement #6, reliability coefficient .79), and that they did not play the piano 50 per cent of the time and conduct the other 50 per cent of the time (Statement #8, reliability .80).

The data pertaining to Statement #8 are of interest when viewed in light of the reactions of the judges to Statements #6 and #7. All three statements had high reliability coefficients. The judges concluded that the directors did not conduct during the entire rehearsal, and that they did not play and conduct on a 50/50 time basis. The judges split, however, as to whether the directors as a group played during most of the rehearsal: 44.7 per cent of the directors played during most of the rehearsal while 50 per cent did not. Since 50 per cent were not playing the piano and since the directors as a group did not conduct during the entire rehearsal, it can only be assumed that 50 per cent of the directors spent most of the rehearsal time talking and instructing students in some other way. Only a portion of the rehearsal time was spent in playing the piano and conducting the ensemble. Category III concludes with these statements: (#5) directors did not move into sections and sing and (#8) director did not play 50 per cent and conduct 50 per cent of the time.

**Category IV: Director's Verbal Behavior**

As for the Non-Verbal Behavior category, the Verbal Behavior category received a low overall reliability coefficient of .53. The summary is given in Table 6. Seven statements were included in this category. These included descriptive qualities of the directors such as use of positive reinforcement, sarcasm, shouting, singing along with the students, and verbal images. Statement #4, regarding the use of sarcasm, received an acceptable reliability coefficient of .77. Information for Statement #2 and #7 appear to be of little use as evidenced
Table 6.

**Category IV: Director's Verbal Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication was positive, encouraging, and motivating.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director sang parts with sections.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive verbal reinforcement given.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sarcasm was used in rehearsal.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A raised voice or yelling occurred.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A serious, business-like image was projected.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A humorous, light-hearted image was projected.</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by reliability ratings of -.04 and -.34, respectively. Despite the low reliability scores for most of the statements, analysis of Statements #6 and #7 indicates that most of the directors communicated a serious, business-like image. Statement #6 achieved the only mean score in excess of 3.5 for this category (3.77) with a reliability coefficient of .61. Seventy-five per cent of the directors projected a serious image through their verbal communications to students, while only 16.66 per cent did not. Conversely, the judges found that Statement #7 (director projected a humorous, light-hearted image with his verbage) was not applicable to 66.66 per cent of the directors studied. Although reliability for Statement #7 is negative at -.34, the percentages are in accord with the results of Statement #6 which had a significantly higher reliability coefficient.

The data reflect that Statement #4, concerning the use of sarcasm by the directors during the rehearsal, were reliable but not applicable to the subjects generally. Statement #4 achieved a mean score of 2.08 indicating fairly strong disagreement by the judges that the statement was applicable to the directors observed. In other words, over 72 per cent of the directors did not use sarcasm as a rehearsal technique.

Statement #1, which concerned the use of positive, encouraging, and motivating verbal communication by the director, received a reliability of .57 and a mean score of 3.42. The judges felt that Statement #1 could be ascribed to nearly two-thirds of the directors (63.89 per cent) but not to the other one-third (33.33 per cent).

As was the case in Statement #6 of Category I (Director's Manner), the use of positive reinforcement received a neutral mean score (3.05). This indicated that approximately one-half of the subjects used positive reinforcement with their students (41.5 per cent) while the other half did not (44 per cent).
Shouting or raising the voice by the director (Statement #5) seemed to be inapplicable to most of the directors (94.44 per cent) and applicable to only 5.55 per cent of the directors. Still, this statement received a low reliability coefficient of .44 despite a convincing 1.5 mean score. The four statements revealed by the twelve exemplary choir directors were: (#4) sarcasm was not used in the rehearsal; (#5) a raised voice or yelling did not occur; (#6) a serious, business-like image was projected; and (#7) a humorous, light-hearted image was not projected.

**Category V: Conducting of the Rehearsal**

Fourteen statements used to describe the conducting of the rehearsal by each director were included in this category, which achieved an acceptable overall reliability coefficient of .73, as found in Table 7. Only Statement #11 achieved a reliability coefficient of over .70 (.73) and a mean score in excess of 3.5 (3.9). However, statements #2, #3, #7, #8, #9, #10, and #12 received reliability scores in excess of .70 and mean scores under 2.5.

Seventy-five per cent of the directors played both vocal parts and accompaniment on the piano (Statement #11). This confirms the data associated with Statements #9 and #10, that most of the directors did not play only vocal parts or only accompaniment on the piano.

Statement #1, concerning whether the director provided each student with his or her own music, was applicable to 75 per cent of the directors, despite a .61 reliability score. This coefficient is low, in all probability because individual judges interchanged “Agree” scores of 4 with “Strongly Agree” scores of 5 indiscriminately among the various director subjects. Either a judge agreed that students had their own music or he disagreed. The Agree/Strongly Agree
Table 7.

**Category V: Conducting of the Rehearsal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Each student had copies of music.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The music was memorized.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students were asked to sing their parts.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students were called upon to answer questions about the music.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students marked music with pencils.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. High praise factor.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Singing began when students entered.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7 continued.

**Category V: Conducting of the Rehearsal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Goals of the rehearsal stated at the beginning.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Only parts were played.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Only accompaniment was played.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Parts and accompaniment were played.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A student pianist played.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The majority of the music was acappella.</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A small percentage of the music was acappella.</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distinction is meaningless for this question and undoubtedly affected the reliability coefficient. Another reason for the discrepancy was the fact that the video camera was primarily on the director during the taping of the rehearsal.

The music was not memorized in two-thirds of the rehearsals observed (Statement #2) nor did 78 per cent of the subjects call on individual students to sing his or her part (Statement #3). Almost two-thirds of the rehearsals did not begin with singing as soon as the students entered the room (Statement #7). The goals of the rehearsal were not stated at the beginning of the rehearsal two-thirds of the time (Statement 8). In 92 per cent of the rehearsals the choirs did not sing a majority of the music acapella. However, some acapella singing was performed in slightly over half (55 per cent) of the rehearsals. In conclusion all twelve subjects in Category V demonstrated: (#1) each student had copies of music; (#2) the music was not memorized; (#3) students were not asked to sing their vocal parts individually; (#5) students did not mark music with pencils; (#8) goals of the rehearsal were not stated at the beginning; (#9) more than vocal parts were played on the piano; (#10) more than accompaniment was played on the piano; (#11) parts and accompaniment were played; (#12) a student pianist and other teachers played; and (#13) the majority of the music was not acapella.

**Category VI: Classroom Management**

Of the ten statements comprising Category VI, four received reliability coefficients in excess of .70 (Statements #2, #4, #6, and #9). The summary of Classroom Management can be observed in Table 8. The reliability coefficient for the entire category was .47. Of the four reliable statements, Statement #9 had application to all directors. Eighty-eight and eighty-eight hundreds per
Table 5.

**Category VI. Classroom Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student took attendance.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students dismissed by a signal from the teacher.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student leaders in the choir.</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Announcements were made before the rehearsal.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Announcements were made after the rehearsal.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No announcements made.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reprimands were made during the rehearsal.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category VI: Classroom Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Few behavior problems occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Talking occurred from students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students raised hands before speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cent of the rehearsals did not contain excessive student talking. Statement #9 had a mean score of 1.7.

Despite a low reliability score of .35, Statement #8 achieved a mean score of 3.97. Slightly over 80 per cent of the rehearsals were marked by only a few student behavior problems. This finding confirms the results of Statement #7, which demonstrated that most students were not reprimanded 97 per cent of the time. Again, reliability coefficients of these two statements are low primarily because of indiscriminate assignment by particular judges of "1" and "2" rating scores ("Strong Disagreement" versus "Disagreement") to the various rehearsals observed.

Statements #3, #4, and #5 dealt with the director making announcements to the class. Mean scores, generally negative, were 2.2, 2.6, and 2.3 respectively, for the three statements. In a majority of the rehearsals, the data indicate that some announcements were made by the director to the class, not necessarily before or after the rehearsal. By implication, the announcements that were made from the director occurred during the choral rehearsal. The results drawn from Classroom Management were: (#3) there were no student leaders in the choir; (#5) announcements were not made after rehearsal; (#7) no reprimands were made during the rehearsal; (#8) few behavior problems occurred; and (#9) no talking occurred from students.

Category VII: Sightreading and Dictation Skills

Analysis of the data collected from the eight statements in Category VII clearly indicates that the .49 reliability coefficient is a result of rating inconsistencies peculiar to each of the three judges individually rather than to the degree of agreement or disagreement among the judges as a group.
In fact, as found in Table 9, the judges concurred that each of the statements contained in this section had applicability to the subjects as a whole, either positively or negatively.

All eight statements in Category VII for Sightreading and Dictation Skills had implication for all twelve subjects. Statement #1, "no sightreading was done with the choir," was applicable to 83.33 per cent of the directors. It would appear that only one or two of the directors were willing to expose their choirs to a new piece of music or a new section of a piece of music on the day that the class was to appear before a video camera.

The remaining seven statements reflected a strong consensus of inapplicability to the directors as a group. The mean scores for Statements 2 through 8 ranged from 1.3 to 1.7, clearly indicating strong consensus among the judges that such statements were universally inapplicable to the subjects as a group. Therefore, it may reasonably be inferred that the directors, as a group, did not rehearse sightreading, rhythm, or dictation exercises with their choirs.

These results suggest that the directors, as a group, did not want to "experiment" with new music or rhythms on the date of the filming of their rehearsal in an attempt to "put their best foot forward" in front of the camera. This would tend to be confirmed by the results of the interview questionnaire which indicated that such sightreading and dictation exercises did constitute an important part of the choral director's classroom procedure. In conclusion the exemplary choir directors indicated: (#1) no sightreading was done; (#2) the choir did not sightread a new piece of music; (#3) no dictation was taken; (#4) the choir did not sightread a phrase on the board; (#5) the choir did not sightread a section of the music with piano; (#6) Kodaly hand signs were not
### Table 9.

**Category VII: Sightreading and Dictation Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No sightreading was done.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>[22] [8] [0] [2] [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Choir sightread a new piece of music.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>[0] [2] [0] [9] [25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dictation was taken.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>[0] [0] [0] [10] [26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Choir sightread a phrase on the board.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>[2] [0] [0] [9] [25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Choir sightread a part of the music with piano.</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>[1] [0] [0] [10] [25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kodaly hand signs were used to sightread.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>[0] [0] [0] [10] [26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rhythm drill was done.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>[0] [5] [0] [10] [21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students clapped and counted the music.</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>[0] [2] [1] [10] [23]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
used to sightread; (#7) rhythm drill was not performed; and (#8) students did not clap and count the music.

Category VIII: Keyboard Skills and Use of the Piano

Of the twelve statements the judges were asked to consider in Category VIII, three had applicability to the subjects as a whole: Statements #1, #2, and #4. See Table 10 for the conclusions of Keyboard Skills and Use of the Piano. The judges found that two-thirds of the directors played vocal parts accurately (Statement #1, mean 4.0; reliability .80), while also observing that none of the subjects played the vocal parts inaccurately. Similar results were obtained for Statement #2 which required the judges to determine if the choral directors played the written accompaniments accurately (mean 3.8; reliability .80). The judges were also in general agreement that Statement #4 applied to the subjects as a group, i.e. that the piano playing of the directors displayed rhythmic vitality. This statement was found true for 53 per cent of the directors. The reliability for Statement #4, however, was low at .35. The results of keyboard skills and use of the piano are: (#1) vocal parts were played accurately; (#2) written accompaniments were played accurately; and (#4) accompaniment displayed rhythmic vitality.

Interview Questionnaire

In addition to the Rating Form, a questionnaire was completed by each of the twelve subjects (six male and six female) during an interview which immediately followed the video taping of the choir rehearsal. The duration of the interview was approximately thirty to forty-five minutes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>[Frequency]</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vocal parts played accurately.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Written accompaniments played accurately.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accompaniments were improvised effectively.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accompaniments displayed rhythmic vitality.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Good eye contact was achieved while playing.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category VIII: Keyboard Skills and Use of the Piano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Music was located on top of the piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Music was located on piano's music rack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The director stood and played.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The director sat on a stool and played.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subjects represented a diverse sampling of grade levels. There were two seventh grade choir directors, two eighth grade choir directors, five combined seventh and eighth grade choir directors, and three ninth grade choir directors.

The mean years of teaching experience for all directors was sixteen years with an average of ten years at their present school. In addition to their junior high and/or middle school choral responsibilities, ten out of the twelve subjects taught general music classes, five conducted high school swing choirs, and six conducted high school choirs. One choir director also taught a voice class and one assisted with the band program.

Seven of the directors had both baccalaureate and masters degrees, with two having additional post graduate course work. One had an honorary doctorate as a minister of music. One director, who had a baccalaureate degree, attended two different universities.

All twelve directors were undergraduate voice majors with eight of them minoring in piano. One director received a double major in voice and piano. The remaining minors were obtained in clarinet, organ, and tuba.

The primary conducting experience during college training for nine of the directors was in the area of choral; the remaining three directors had been engaged primarily in instrumental conducting. Since college, each director has focused primarily upon choral music education.

Eight of the twelve directors performed and/or directed community musicals and plays in addition to their school music responsibilities. The four, who were not currently involved in outside musical activities, had participated in outside musical functions in the past.

Seven of the twelve directors rehearsed their school choir daily. The remaining five rehearsed only three times a week. The average length of the
choir rehearsals for all twelve were 46 minutes. The mean for each choir was 73 members with 23 boys and 50 girls.

Thirty-nine per cent of all choir members played in the school band and/or orchestra. Six and nine tenths per cent of the choir members took private piano lessons. Five directors reported very few choir students taking private voice lessons. This small percentage was only 1.8 per cent of the choir members. The other seven directors reported that their students did not take private voice lessons. All directors indicated that they worked with their students individually, enabling each student to gain more confidence in singing and voice production. The amount of individual time spent by the director depended on the student and his or her particular needs as well as on the schedule of the director.

Each choir gave an average of 4.3 concerts per school year, with a range of three to eight concerts. Seven choirs performed for school assemblies. Reasons stated for not performing school concerts were a lack of discipline in the student body and the administrative denial of permission to allow students to be dismissed from class for music assemblies.

All but three directors gave letter grades for the choir members. The grade distribution indicated that 73 per cent of the students earned A's; 19 per cent earned B's; and the remaining 8 per cent earned C or below. The criteria for the grading were based upon class attendance, concert attendance, musicianship skills, and good attitude about singing and choir. These criteria were followed by all twelve directors. Only two of the twelve subjects had student contracts for the class. The contracts, specifying requirements for maintaining certain grades, concert expectations, and discipline procedures were sent home for parents to review, sign, and return to the director.
In presenting new music, all the directors indicated they would first discuss the entire piece with the choir and point out difficult intervals, key changes, style, and any other challenging sections of the music. Five of the directors would have the choir try reading through the composition from beginning to end without pause. The remaining seven would work the music phrase by phrase. Four out of the twelve directors stated they rehearsed the music in sectionals as well.

All twelve directors were asked how they dealt with changing voices of junior high and middle school students. Ten indicated they guided students to sing lightly and sing only where their voice felt comfortable. Seven educators taught students how to use the falsetto voice. Proper breath and maintenance of good air flow was encouraged by five of the twelve. Ten out of the twelve subjects rewrote the choral literature performed by their choirs, changing the octaves and specific parts for the changing voice.

Nine of the choirs performed SAB and three part music. One of the nine choirs also sang some two part music. Three choirs performed some SATB and one of these also performed SSATB.

Ten of the twelve directors stated part singing was taught in the elementary school. The other two directors began teaching part singing at the junior high or middle school level.

The composers and arrangers most often recommended by these directors were: Joyce Eilers Bacak, Roger Emerson, Linda Spevacek, Natalie Sleeth, Jill Gallina, and Ed Lojeski. The directors felt that these composers and arrangers were sympathetic to this age of voice, composed in acceptable ranges, and achieved good voicing.
All directors agreed that they took rehearsal time to develop music reading skills. This was achieved by clapping and counting rhythm patterns from music and/or rhythm sheets and interval recognition.

All directors were unanimous in desiring a change in choral methods classes at the collegiate level. They preferred college professors promoting actual public school participation in conducting and rehearsing choirs, working the changing voices, and having more “hands on” experience prior to student teaching. More training in vocal pedagogy and conducting was requested by four of the twelve subjects. Other desired areas of improvement were diction and sightreading classes, and recognizing what vocal part is missing or being sung incorrectly in the music.

Music contest was considered to be of great value to the musical growth of the choirs. All twelve choirs participated annually in choral competitions. The participation allowed the students to observe and compare other choral groups to themselves. It also gave them the opportunity to strive for musical excellence on three choral octavos. The overall experience was very positive, according to the directors. This is not surprising since participation in music contest was a part of the subject selection process.

Each director felt he or she continued to grow musically by attending music conventions and reading the Music Educators Journal and The Choral Journal. Three of the directors judge other choral contests and two others participate in combined choral festivals where there is sharing of ideas with other choral directors.

Five of the directors spend one to five hours per week outside of the school day either in performance, rehearsal, and/or preparation. One director spends an average of six to ten additional hours per week. Two spend eleven to fifteen
additional hours per week. One spends sixteen to twenty hours per week and one spends twenty-one to twenty-five hours additional time. Two directors said they spend over twenty-six hours in additional time outside of school time.

Eleven of the twelve directors agreed the administration was supportive of their music program by providing budget, attending concerts, and giving compliments to the director. In addition, four of these eleven directors agreed that encouragement was provided to the students by the administrators for the participation in the music program. Scheduling problems were also solved by school administrators.

Finally, each subject was asked: “In your opinion, what has made the choral program outstanding in your school system?” All agreed that the dedication of the students was the major reason for music excellence. Eight agreed that they themselves were enthused and felt dedicated to promote a high level of music education program in the junior high and middle school. Five stated administrative support and assistance in scheduling helped to make a successful music program. Other contributing factors included: parental support, music coordinator support, love for students, desire to do the best you can do, good instruction, special activities such as musicals, and the excellent quality of the performers and the performances.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to identify rehearsal behaviors of exemplary choral directors based upon observations and examination of junior high and middle school choral directors who have achieved a high degree of teaching success. Ratings were obtained from a panel of experts after they had observed video tapes of twelve junior high and middle school choral rehearsals conducted by exemplary choral directors. The data derived from the rating forms for each director were organized into the following eight categories:

1. manner;
2. use of vocal pedagogy;
3. verbal behavior;
4. non-verbal behavior;
5. conducting of the rehearsal;
6. classroom management;
7. use of sightreading and dictation skills during rehearsal;
8. keyboard skills and use of the piano.
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Additional information was obtained from a director interview questionnaire. This instrument was designed to collect data regarding teaching behaviors and the respective school environments.

**Procedures**

Twelve exemplary junior and middle school choral directors participated in the study. The investigator traveled throughout Ohio to interview and video tape one choir rehearsal of each subject. The taped rehearsals were considered representative of the normal rehearsal for each of the twelve choirs.

The directors for the study were selected on the basis of quality programs represented in part by superior contest ratings at the Ohio Music Education Association district competition and by recommendations from selected college music professors throughout the State of Ohio. The subjects used represented rural, suburban, and urban schools of Ohio. (See Appendix A for school locations.)

Data were collected for the study by the Rehearsal Rating Form (Appendix D) and the Interview Questionnaire Form (Appendix C). The Interview Questionnaire form was used by the investigator during the interview process to record the answers given by the directors. The Rehearsal Rating Form was used by the panel of experts to rate and record their specific responses to the various aspects of the rehearsals conducted by the twelve. A panel of three experts reviewed all twelve video tapes of each rehearsal conducted by the subjects. The Rehearsal Rating Form (Appendix D) was used to provide evidence of the presence or observance of the various rehearsal behaviors the panel of experts were judging. A Likert Scale rating of 5 to 1 (5 meaning “Strongly Agree” and 1 meaning “Strongly Disagree”) was used for each of the eighty-
two items on the rating form. Frequency counts and percentages for each of the items were subsequently determined. Reliability coefficients for each statement and for each of the eight categories were also computed.

The investigator used the Interview Questionnaire Form (Appendix C) to ask direct questions of each director. Topics covered on the interview questionnaire related to education, the changing voice, voicing of the choir, rehearsal strategies, preferred composers and arrangers, choral literature, discipline, support of the administration, and scheduling.

**Summary of Results**

**Category I: Director's Manner**

The mean score for the nine statements in Category I was 3.2. with the reliability coefficient for this group of statements being .88. Of the nine statements, three were outside of neutrality by virtue of a rating over 3.5 or under 2.5. Therefore, these statements have implications for the group of subjects as a whole. The three statements indicate:

#1. Thorough preparation.
#2. Varied speech inflection.
#3. Appropriate rehearsal atmosphere.

**Category II: Vocal Pedagogy**

Category II had a mean score of 3.1 for all fourteen statements. The reliability coefficient for this group was .88. Of the nine statements, four had a rating
of over 3.5 or under 2.5. Therefore, these statements have implications for the group of subjects as a whole. The four statements reveal:

#1. Rehearsal began with warm-up exercises.
#2. Choral music was not used for warm-up.
#3. The choir demonstrated healthy vocal usage.
#14. Quality choral literature was used.

**Category III: Director’s Non-Verbal Behavior**

Eight statements in Category III had a mean score of 2.9. The reliability coefficient for this category was .55. Two of the eight statements were over 3.5 or under 2.5. Therefore, these two statements have implications for the group of subjects as a whole. The two statements indicate:

#5. Directors did not move into sections and sing.
#8. Director did not play 50 per cent and conduct 50 per cent.

**Category IV: Director’s Verbal Behavior**

The mean score for the seven statements in Category IV was 2.8 with the reliability coefficient being .53. Four of the statements displayed a rating of over 3.5 or under 2.5; therefore, these statements have implications for the group of subjects as a whole. The four statements reveal:

#4. Sarcasm was not used in rehearsal.
#5. A raised voice or yelling did not occur.
#6. A serious, business-like image was projected.

#7. A humorous, light-hearted image was not projected.

**Category V: Conducting of the Rehearsal**

Category V had a mean score of 2.6 for the fourteen statements, with a reliability coefficient of .73. Ten statements resulted in a rating over 3.5 or under 2.5. These ten statements have implications for the group of subjects as a whole and indicate:

#1. Each student had copies of music.

#2. The music was not memorized.

#3. Students were not asked to sing their vocal parts individually.

#5. Students did not mark music with pencils.

#8. Goals of the rehearsal were not stated at the beginning.

#9. More than vocal parts were played on the piano.

#10. More than accompaniment was played on the piano.

#11. Parts and accompaniment were played.

#12. A student pianist and other teachers played.

#13. The majority of the music was not acappella.

**Category VI: Classroom Management**

The mean score for the ten statements in Category VI was 2.6, with a reliability coefficient of .47. Five of the ten statements consisted of a rating over 3.5 or under 2.5. These five statements have implications for the group of subjects as a whole.
#3. There were no student leaders in the choir.

#5. Announcements were not made after rehearsal.

#7. No reprimands were made during the rehearsal.

#8. Few behavior problems occurred.

#9. No talking occurred from students.

**Category VII: Sightreading and Dictation Skills**

Eight statements in Category VII had a mean score of 1.7. The reliability coefficient for this group was .49. All eight statements had a rating over 3.5 or under 2.5; which indicated implications for the group of subjects as a whole. The eight statements were:

#1. No sightreading was done.

#2. The choir did not sightread a new piece of music.

#3. No dictation was taken.

#4. The choir did not sightread a phrase on the board.

#5. The choir did not sightread a section of the music with piano.

#6. Kodaly hand signs were not used to sightread.

#7. Rhythm drill was not performed.

#8. Students did not clap and count the music.

**Category VIII: Keyboard Skills and Use of the Piano**

The mean score for the twelve statements in Category VIII was 3.2, with a reliability coefficient for this group of .66. Three statements had ratings over
3.5 or under 2.5. Consequently, the following three statements have implications for the group of subjects as a whole.

#1. Vocal parts were played accurately.
#2. Written accompaniments were played accurately.
#4. Accompaniment displayed rhythmic vitality.

**Interview Questionnaire**

The Interview Questionnaire which was completed by each of the twelve directors during an interview with the investigator showed many common variables of exemplary choral directors. All junior high and middle school grade levels were represented by the twelve subjects (six male and six female). The average teaching experience for each director is sixteen years. All directors were voice majors in college and have baccalaureate degrees in music. In addition, five have completed master of music degrees. The primary conducting experience for all twelve subjects is choral music education. All directors spend many additional hours, outside of the scheduled school day, performing or rehearsing their school ensembles. Many are performing and directing community musicals in addition to school responsibilities.

Each choir had a mean of seventy-three members with twenty-three boys and fifty girls. The rehearsal averaged forty-six minutes. Seven of the twelve directors rehearse their choir daily. All directors indicated that they work with their students individually to develop better vocal skills. An average of four concerts per year is given by each of the twelve choirs.

Grading by each director is based upon class and concert attendance, good musicianship, and positive music attitude. Differing methods of sightreading
new music are used. The students changing voice is worked positively by
the directors. Quality choral literature is also used.

Improvements in choral method classes at the collegiate level for future
choral directors were requested by these exemplary choral directors. More
practical "hands on experience” prior to student teaching, increased training
in vocal pedagogy, more information regarding the changing voice, and
additional experiences in the area of choral conducting were all deemed
necessary.

Music contest participation is considered to be of great value to the musical
growth of the middle school and junior high choirs. Each of the twelve choirs
participated in annual choral competitions. This fact is not surprising to observe
since successful participation in the Ohio Music Education Association contests
was a part of the subject selection process.

These exemplary choral directors felt that attending music conferences,
reading music journals, and participating in choral festivals were essential to
remaining informed as a professional music educator. Student enthusiasm,
administrative and parental support, and the director’s own dedication to
promote a high level of music education in their individual schools are viewed
as components of a successful choral music program.

Findings and Implications

The results presented in Chapter IV are based upon the evaluation by a
panel of experts of one on-site video taped rehearsal and the subsequent
interview conducted by the investigator. Summaries of this study should be
confined to the subject population. These findings are set forth below.
Category I: Director's Manner

The directors who are considered to be "exemplary" maintain an appropriate rehearsal atmosphere and demonstrate thorough preparation for class.

Category II: Vocal Pedagogy

Rehearsals for each of the twelve choirs always begin with warm-ups rather than using choral music to begin the rehearsal. Quality literature is used by each director in relationship to proper voice ranges and the age of the students.

Good, healthy vocal usage is apparent with each chorister. The methods each director used in order to maintain good vocal pedagogy varies but deals with breath support, tonal placement, intonation, voice change, phrasing, vowel coloration, pronunciation, articulation and enunciation of vowels and consonants. The pedagogical concept of a high, light forward tone is not universally shared by all directors. Perhaps the difference in the presentation of the vocal pedagogy was observed because the panel of judges was instructed to evaluate only what appeared on the video tape. Because of the fine quality of sounds that were produced by the choirs, good vocal pedagogy is clearly evident. The degree of emphasis placed upon vocal pedagogy during each rehearsal, and the nature of the "ideal" sound, would require further study.

Category III: Director's Non-Verbal Behavior

Non-verbal communication for the most part is positive, encouraging, and motivating to the choir members. Conducting patterns are clear and easily followed by the students. However, in the majority of the choral rehearsals,
the director does not direct the entire time. Therefore, rehearsal techniques from the keyboard are critical for success.

Directors play the piano during part of the rehearsal and visually conduct the remaining part of it. To what degree each individual director conducts or accompanies is solely an individual matter. At times directors simply give verbal instructions to the ensemble. Five of the twelve directors play the piano the majority of the time. The remaining seven directors conduct most of the rehearsal using a student or teacher accompanist.

Category IV: Director's Verbal Behavior

The directors, as a group, project a serious, business-like image when talking to their choir, but do not use sarcasm or raise their voices when talking to the students. The directors sing the vocal parts for each section of the ensemble to demonstrate correct style, pitches, phrasing, or proper technique. In some cases the director displays improper musicianship to demonstrate, by contrast, what not to do.

Category V: Conducting of the Rehearsal

The majority of the time, vocal parts and accompaniment are played on the piano for each choir. However, over one-half of the choirs perform a portion of the rehearsal acappella. Different sections are rehearsed without playing parts or playing the accompaniment. There is no established manner by which class goals are stated in the rehearsal. The fact that few students mark their printed score with pencils might be due to the fact that some pieces are memorized.
In most rehearsals, the warm-up exercises begin after the students are in their seats.

**Category VI: Classroom Management**

Student talking is minimal during rehearsals. No students are reprimanded by the director. Announcements are made at differing points within the rehearsal.

**Category VII: Sightreading and Dictation Skills**

The majority of the choirs do not sightread during rehearsals. Two directors required their ensemble to sightread a phrase from the board or from the music, but no complete sightreading of a new piece of music was performed. Some rhythmic patterns are clapped, with references being made to incorrect rhythms.

**Category VIII: Keyboard Skills and Use of the Piano**

Choral directors are competent at the keyboard but do not play during the entire rehearsal. Vocal parts and accompaniments are played accurately, even when played by a student accompanist.

**Discussions**

Perhaps no social institution receives as much attention, or unsolicited public critique, as our educational system. American education is undergoing continual scrutiny in public school teaching and preparation for future teachers at the collegiate level. One only has to read *A Call For Change in Teacher*

The Holmes and Carnegie Reports, released earlier this year, propose to revamp entire education programs at colleges and universities throughout the country in order to improve the status and the professionalization of teaching. The reports call upon colleges and universities to thoroughly rethink and revise teacher training programs. One proposed revision would delete the undergraduate degree in education and require a graduate degree. It is recommended that undergraduates major in a liberal arts area, then major in teacher education in the masters degree program. Different kinds of certification would be granted based upon the demonstration of appropriate expertise and experience.

Relying on competent teachers in model school sites is absolutely necessary if the foregoing proposals are to work, especially as found in The Holmes Report. Bridging the gap between the "ivory tower" and the public schools is a must in order to achieve the goals as outlined in these national reports.

The information found in this study lends some insight into what exemplary junior high and middle school choral directors do and do not do. These are not necessarily the only teaching behaviors held in common by the exemplary junior high and middle school choral directors. However, it is logical to believe that the development of these music teacher behaviors in certification programs is critical if future choral directors are to be competent upon entering their middle school or junior high classroom as first year teachers.
Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further research are suggested in the area of exemplary choral music education.

1. A more detailed study should be developed which would examine multiple rehearsals for each director. Such a study would enable investigators to more accurately assess the relative importance of each of the eight categories of director rehearsal behaviors described in the study.

2. Observation of effective and efficient means of teaching posture, respiration, phonation, resonance, registration, and diction (areas of vocal pedagogy) are needed to determine the most helpful teaching tools for choral directors.

3. How to correct the problems of vocal pedagogy and musical accuracy within the choral rehearsal in the most productive manner needs to be researched.

4. More effective and efficient ways in working with the changing voice at this grade level is of great necessity.

5. Instead of junior high and middle school directors, high school exemplary choral directors could be used, in a similar study. After the initial descriptive study was completed, comparisons could be drawn between the two.
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Map of Ohio
★ Location of Pilot Schools in Ohio

- Location of the Twelve Subject Schools In Ohio
APPENDIX B

Director's Letter and Survey Form
Dear ________________,

What a pleasure it was talking to you on the phone about the study I am engaged in of "Exemplary Middle School Choral Directors." Thank you for agreeing to participate in this dissertation research. Your program is certainly indicative of all of your hard work and dedication to your choral program. You have been recommended to me based upon your choir's superior ratings at large group contest and recommendations of various college professors.

This study entails a personal interview and the video taping of a choral rehearsal in your school. The data collected will be analyzed to determine trends and patterns of exemplary choral director behavior. A conclusion of the study will furnish a valuable tool for university administrators determining the needed curricula and antecedent experiences of future choral directors. The results of the study will also be sent to you so that you can see the pattern and trends of "Exemplary Middle School Choral Directors."

Please complete the enclosed form at your earliest convenience. If possible, please send a map with directions to your school from Columbus. It would be most appreciated. A self-addressed envelope has been provided.

I am looking forward to seeing you on Monday, April 7, 1986 at 6:45 a.m. If you have further questions, feel free to call me at The Ohio State University, 614-422-6389 or at my home, 614-457-3592.

Again, thank you for your time and participation in this study.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela H. Fiocca

enc.
SURVEY FORM

Exemplary Choral Director's Name: ________________________________

School Phone Number: ___________ Best Time to Call: ___________

Home Phone Number: ___________ Best Time to Call: ___________

Home Address: _____________________________________________________________

Street   City  Zip

School Address: _____________________________________________________________

Street   City  Zip

I have taught ____________ years.

I have been in my present position ____________ years.

The middle school choir's activities include: (check)

_____ Fall Concert  _____ Christmas Concert  _____ Festivals

_____ Contest  _____ Musical  _____ Spring Concert

_____ Other _____________________________________________________________

The total school population is: ____________________________________________

The total population for the entire school district is: _________________________

_____% of the middle school choir members study piano with private teachers.

_____% of the middle school choir members study voice with private teachers.

I would be willing to participate in the proposed study of successful junior high and middle school choral directors. My school principal also agrees to the study.

YES               NO

Your Signature: ______________________ Date ______________________

Principal's Signature ______________________ Date ______________________

Thank you for your time and cooperation.
APPENDIX C

Interview Questionnaire
Name of Director: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Home Address: ________________________________________________________________

Telephone: _______________ District # ______________________________

School Name: _________________________________________________________________

Address: _________________________________________________________________

Type of Choir ___________________________ Grade Level ______________

Audition or Not Audition

Your Present Teaching Level: _______________________________

   elementary           junior high           middle school           high school

Years of Teaching Experience: ___________

Years of Experience at the Present Level: ___________

Teaching areas: (check one or more):

   ______ choir: (how many choirs)
   ______ general music
   ______ theory
   ______ music appreciation
   ______ band
   ______ orchestra
   ______ swing choir

Colleges Attended:

_________________________________________________________ Degree____________________

_________________________________________________________ Degree____________________

_________________________________________________________ Degree____________________

College Courses Beyond Bachelor Degree __________________________________________

College Courses Beyond Master’s Degree __________________________________________

Your present Middle School/Junior High includes grades ______ to ______
The number of periods in the school day, not including the homeroom period: __________.

Your Present Teaching Schedule:

Before School Activities:

   Homeroom:
   Period 1:
   Period 2:
   Period 3:
   Period 4:
   Period 5:
   Period 6:
   Period 7:
   Period 8:
   Period 9:

   After School Activities:

Scheduling of Choir Students: (Rotation System)
Do you see your students daily? ____________________________

Do you see them every other day? ____________________________

How often do you see your students per week? ____________________________

Different rotation: ____________________________

Length of each class period ____________________________

Length of each class period: ____________________________

Does your school schedule allow for students to be in both the band and the choir program ____________________________

If not, what is the reason? ____________________________
What percentage of your choir members play in the band and/or orchestra?

The number of middle school students in your middle school choir during the 1985-86 school year: 

Distribution of the students in your choir:
Males: _____________________ Females _____________________
Part I: _____________________
Part II: _____________________
Cembaliata: _____________________
Bass: _____________________

What percentage of the choir students take private piano lessons? ________

What percentage of the middle school choir students receive private voice lessons? _____________________

Does the choir have sectional rehearsals? ________
If yes, what is the length of the section rehearsal? _____________________
If yes, how often are the sectionals? _____________________
If yes, when are the sectionals held? _____________________ before, during, or after school

What is the structure of the sectional? _____________________

How many concerts does your middle school choir present during a typical school year? _____________________

Does the choir perform for school assemblies? _____________________

What is the grade distribution for the choir subject?

___________ A's
___________ B's
___________ C's
___________ D's
___________ F's
___________ Satisfactory
___________ Unsatisfactory
___________ No grade is given for the class
What is your criterion for grading the choir members?

- Class Attendance
- Test Scores (paper & pencil)
- Test Scores (singing - in quartets or solos)
- Music Memorized
- Concert Attendance
- Contest Attendance
- Good Musicianship
- Learns the choir music
- Contract signed by students and parents
- Good attitude about choir and singing
- Ear Training

How many of your choir members continue from year to year?

- 6th - 7th grade
- 7th - 8th grade
- 8th - 9th grade

Do you consider the administration supportive of your program? __________

How are the administrators supportive?

- Provide budget
- Attend concerts
- Encourage the students to participate in the program
- Give compliments to me the director
- Scheduling of classes
- Teacher is given free reign with the music program
- Teacher is given out of school time for rehearsal/performances
- Has a music supervisor for the district
- Out of school rehearsal time
- Other ________________

What was your major instrument in college? ________________

What was your minor instrument in college? ________________

Double Major? _______ What were the instruments: ________________

Was your major conducting experience in college choral or instrumental? ____

What is your major conducting experience since graduation? ________________
Are you a conductor or performer outside of school music responsibilities?  

If yes, what do you do?  

During the first reading of new music, what do you do:  

- Talk through the music with the students first  
- Have a sectional  
- Work phrase by phrase or sections of the music  
- Read the composition from beginning to end without pause, if possible  
- Begin a detailed rehearsal of the composition without a complete read-through  
- Use a combination of the above  
- Allow the composition of dictate the type of approach  
- Play a recording and students learn from the recording  
- Other  

Do you utilize educational media (tapes, recordings, accompaniment tapes) in your teaching?  

Which is given principle attention?  

How do you handle discipline in the choral ensemble?  

- Verbal Reprimand  
- Demerits and after “x” number of times will lower grade  
- Show disappointment in the student with looks  
- Praise only the good behavior and ignore the rest  
- Lower Choir grade for inappropriate behavior  
- Student does not get to attend the social activity of the choir  
- Parent Involvement  
- Develop Self-Discipline within the students  
- Detentions  
- Other  

How do you deal with the changing voice?  

- Falsetto  
- Work individually with the student  
- Explain to the students that it is okay for the voice to change  
- Keep changing the voice parts to meet the needs of the students  
- Allow the boys to sing lightly and only sing where it is comfortable  
- Teacher tries to develop cleaner closure of the vocal folds  
- Insist on the proper breath  
- Maintain use of good air flow  
- Have the changed voices sing the part where it is most comfortable
Listen to the voices often (once a month) - switching parts where necessary
Rewrite the choral music to fit the needs of the choir
Other

How do you deal with the changed voice?

Allow the student to sing the part most comfortable for him
Encourage forward, light singing
Insist on proper posture
Insist on good breath
Revoice
Work with individual voice
Work with the falsetto voice
Other

Do you rewrite any of the choral literature used in your choir? __________

If yes, how do you rewrite it?

Change the octave of the music
Add octaves to the music
Write a particular part for the changing voice - perhaps only 3-4 notes
Other

Describe the type of music your choir performs:

Madrigals
Broadway and Show tunes
Spiritual
Classical Music
Popular - Top 10 Music
Lieder
Folk Songs
Seasonal
Contest Music
Contemporary (Jenson, Shaw, Eilers)
Sacred
Other
What voicing do you use for this choir:

_____ All Unison
_____ Two part
_____ Three part
_____ SACB
_____ SSA
_____ SATB
_____ SA
_____ SAB
_____ SSATB
_____ SSAB

Who are some of your favorite composers and arrangers for the middle school choir that you use?

Eilers
Emerson
Galena
Lojeski
Sleeth
Speakek
Other

Why do you use these composers?

_____ Good text for this age
_____ Sympathetic to the junior high voice
_____ Good range
_____ Good harmonies and choral structure
_____ Good voicing
_____ Other

Is part singing taught in the elementary school? 

Do you take rehearsal time to develop reading skills?

If yes, what type of drills do you do?

_____ Counting and clapping of rhythm patterns for music
_____ Counting and clapping of rhythm patterns from book material
_____ Dictation of rhythm patterns
_____ Melodic dictation
_____ Melodic sightreading using music
_____ Melodic sightreading from book material
_____ Melodic sightreading from chalkboard
_____ Interval relationships (major and minor chords)
_____ Choir students take general music in addition
_____ Other
What improvements would you like to see made in choral method classes at the college level to better prepare you for teaching?

- Piano skills in the choral setting
- Conducting
- Music selection
- Work with the changing voice
- Vocal pedagogy
- Pacing
- Classroom teaching before student teaching
- Sightreading and error detection
- Diction classes
- Other

Do you believe that music contest can be of significant value to the musical growth of choirs?

How many years have you taken your choir to contest?

Do you take the choir every year or subsequent years?

Who accompanies your choir?

What percentage of music is done acappella?

What do you do for yourself to continue to grow musically?

- Perform in professional organization
- Conduct a professional ensemble
- Read the MEJ and ACDA Journals
- Attend music conventions
- Visit college professors and college choirs
- Have visiting directors in to work with my choir:
- Attend summer workshops
- Judge competitions
- Participate in choir festivals and clinics
- Look for new choral music
- Other

How many additional hours do you spend outside of school time either in extra rehearsals, preparation, and/or performances each week?

- 1-5 hours
- 6-10 hours
- 11-15 hours
- 16-20 hours
- 21-25 hours
- Above 26 hours
In your opinion, what has made the choral program outstanding in your school system?

- Dedication of the students
- Administration support (scheduling and encouragement)
- Dedication of the director to the choral program
- Good instruction
- Additional activities (musicals, excellent concerts)
- Music coordinator
- Desire to do the best you can do
- Good music curriculum
- Other

Any additional information to share that has not been covered in this interview:
APPENDIX D

Rating Form For Each Choir Director
In the columns below check the box that best describes the statement. Choose only one number for each item. Mark according to the following:

If you STRONGLY AGREE mark: 5
If you AGREE mark: 4
If NEUTRAL or UNDECIDED mark: 3
If you DISAGREE mark: 2
If you STRONGLY DISAGREE mark: 1

DIRECTOR'S MANNER:

1. Thorough preparation
2. Varied speech inflection.
3. Appropriate rehearsal atmosphere.
4. Appropriate sense of humor.
5. Admitting a mistake.
6. Positive reinforcement.
7. A dictatorial inflexible manner.
8. An effectively paced rehearsal.
VOCAL PEDAGOGY:

1. Rehearsal began with warm-up exercises.
2. Choral music was used for warm-up.
3. The group demonstrated healthy vocal usage.
4. Imitations were used effectively to correct student performance.
5. Breath support was emphasized effectively.
6. Good tone placement.
7. Voice change was dealt with positively.
8. Phrasing was taught well.
9. Proper vowel coloration and pronunciation were achieved.
10. The articulators and enunciation of vowels and consonants stressed.
11. Intonation problems identified and solved.
12. High, light forward tone achieved.
13. Proper use of the vocal mechanism was taught.
14. Quality choral literature was used.
**DIRECTOR'S NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Communication was positive, encouraging, and motivating.
2. Conducting clear and easily followed.
3. Director remained behind the piano.
4. The director remained in front of the choir.
5. Director moved into sections and sang.
6. Director conducted the entire rehearsal.
7. Director played most of the rehearsal.
8. Director played 50% and conducted 50%.
DIRECTOR'S VERBAL BEHAVIOR:

1. Communication was positive, encouraging, and motivating.

2. Director sang parts with sections.

3. Positive verbal reinforcement given.

4. Sarcasm was used in rehearsal.

5. A raised voice or yelling occurred.

6. A serious, business-like image projected.

7. A humorous, light-hearted image projected.
CONDUCTING OF
THE REHEARSAL:

1. Each student had copies of music.
2. The music was memorized.
3. Students were called upon to sing their parts.
4. Students were called upon to answer questions about the music.
5. Students marked music with pencils.
6. High praise factor.
7. Singing began when students entered.
8. Goals of the rehearsal stated at the beginning.
9. Only parts were played.
10. Only accompaniment was played.
11. Parts and accompaniment were played.
12. A student pianist played.
13. The majority of the music was acappella.
14. A small percentage of the music was acappella.

STRONGLY AGREE—STRONGLY DISAGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE—STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Student took attendance.
2. Students dismissed by a signal from the teacher.
3. Student leaders in the choir.
4. Announcements were made before the rehearsal.
5. Announcements were made after the rehearsal.
6. No announcements made.
7. Reprimands were made during the rehearsal.
8. Few behavior problems occurred.
9. Talking occurred from students.
10. Students raised hands before speaking.
SIGHTREADING AND DICTATION SKILLS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE—STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No sightreading was done.

2. Choir sightread a new piece of music.

3. Dictation was taken.

4. Choir sightread a phrase on the board.

5. Choir sightread a part of the music with piano.

6. Kodaly hand signs were used to sightread.

7. Rhythm drill was done.

8. Students clapped and counted the music.
KEYBOARD SKILLS
AND USE OF
THE PIANO

1. Vocal parts played accurately.
2. Written accompaniments played accurately.
3. Accompaniments were improvised effectively.
4. Accompaniments displayed rhythmic vitality.
5. Good eye contact was achieved while playing.
6. An appropriate piano tone quality was produced.
7. Pedals of the piano used effectively.
8. Music was located on top of the piano.
9. Music was located in the stand on the piano.
10. The director stood and played.
11. The director sat on a stool and played.
12. The director sat on the bench and played.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: