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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine the effect of differentiated music on classroom behaviors and attitudes of middle school band members. Special, differentiated music, was written to find out if the level of class participation (students on task) would increase with its use. The differentiated music consisted of three parts from which each player could choose: a simple two note harmony, melody, and an advanced counterpoint.

Sixth, seventh, and eighth grade band classes were included in the study. A series of eight class sessions, fifteen minutes in length from each grade, were videotaped over a period of four weeks on successive Tuesdays and Thursdays. Baseline and treatment sessions were established with the baseline consisting of the use of typical band method material, and the treatment including the use of differentiated music. Each grade level ran a different length of baseline and treatment time periods. Data were collected to measure the percent of students on task for baseline and treatment for each grade level. Other areas evaluated included the amount of class time spent playing, teaching, and dealing with discipline and interruptions. Teacher comments were measured, as was survey information.
from the students regarding their enjoyment levels and self assessment.

The use of the differentiated music did not show an increase in the number of students participating as had been expected. Rather the discipline of the students became the prominent issue. Correlations showed that as negative behaviors increased, attitude toward the class and personal achievement decreased.

Future research in this area should be done in a setting and through instruction where student attention and relatively good discipline is maintained. If the classroom discipline problem area could be reduced or eliminated, comparison of differentiated music versus other types of materials might yield different results.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Introduction To The Study

The past one hundred years have witnessed a great struggle in the education and care of children with disabilities. From total separation to full inclusion into regular classrooms, numerous educational ideas and methods have been developed and attempted. One practice that has been around in various forms during the past century is the idea of differentiation. As the name implies, differentiation is an approach that recognizes the uniqueness of each individual. In differentiated education, all students are working toward the same goal within the same time frame but using techniques that recognize their individual strengths. Today, the term differentiation is used primarily in reference to including students with disabilities into the classroom within the least restrictive environment as required by law.

Most typical band music today is rated by degree of difficulty in the individual parts. An inclusive band class in which the students have a wide range of ability levels finds that undifferentiated music provides an appropriate challenge for only a small segment of the band. Many
students appear to find the music either too difficult or too easy where they are often observed to lose interest.

It is intended that differentiated music recognize the uniqueness of individuals, while at the same time addressing the wide range of ability levels in an inclusive band class. Even though the original use of differentiated music in the present study came from an attempt to provide suitable challenges for students with disabilities, it also recognized that the non-disabled students could benefit equally well. In the present study, the effect of using differentiated music was measured primarily by whether or not there was an increase in the participation level (herein called "on-task") of all students and not just the students with disabilities.

A look at the history of differentiation and how it evolved to serve students with disabilities provides an understanding of the development and application of differentiated music and its intended goals.

Need for the Study

Legislation. The past 25 years have been watershed years regarding legislative efforts to extend basic living and educational rights to individuals with disabilities. The year 1975 saw the United States Congress pass Public Law 94-142, part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act (PL 94-142) which gave the right to a free public education to all children with disabilities (Hardman, Drew, & Egan, 1999, p.23).
Even though rights for children with disabilities had been debated for many years, little progress was made until the United States Supreme Court ruled in 1954 in the civil rights case of Brown vs. Topeka, Kansas, Board of Education that schools must provide an equal education for students of all races. Even though this case is associated with racial segregation in education, it was also used as a precedent in the efforts to obtain equal educational rights for students with disabilities (Hardman, Drew, & Egan, 1999, pp.20-22).

In the case of Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1970), the court ruled that children with mental retardation had a right to a free public education. A year later, the court ruling of Mills vs. Board of Education of the District of Columbia brought the educational rights for students with disabilities under the protection of the fourteenth amendment of the United States Constitution. Two years later, PL 93-112, Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504, stated that programs receiving federal funds could not deny benefits to individuals with disabilities (Hardman et al. 1999, pp. 20-22).

Public Law 99-457, the Education of the Handicapped Act amendments, was passed in 1986, and strengthened the intent of PL 94-142 by connecting the receipt of federal funds to the education of all children between the ages of three to five with disabilities. PL 99-457 also provided for early intervention programs for infants (Hardman et al. 1999, pp. 20-22).
In 1990, P.L. 101-336, The Americans with Disabilities Act, commonly known as ADA, gave civil rights protection for individuals with disabilities in all public areas to include public services, accommodations, transportation, and telecommunications. The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments from 1986 were renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and extended the definition of a disability to include autism and traumatic brain injury.

Most recently in 1997, Public Law 105-17, Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, now referred to as IDEA '97, required that schools provide the necessary resources to improve student outcomes rather than just provide for an education (Hardman et al. 1999, p.23). Among the basic principles of IDEA '97 were the requirements of a free and appropriate education (FAPE), an individualized education program (IEP), and placement in the least restrictive environment (LRE) (Hardman et al. 1999, p.24).

The "IDEA" that most music educators have been concerned about is the placement of exceptional students into the least restrictive environment. Such placement should be expected and welcomed as the National Standards for Arts Education state: "All students deserve access to the rich education and understanding that the arts provide, regardless of their background, talents, or disabilities" (Consortium of National Arts Education Association, 1994, p.7). However, many music educators have not been trained
to work with exceptional students, and very few have been involved in the IEP process (Frisque, Niebur, & Humphreys, 1994).

**History.** Documentation exists which shows that music has played a role in special education since the mid nineteenth century. As an example, nineteenth century photographs from deaf institutions show guitars, pianos, and drums. However, there are no descriptions regarding how these instruments were used at this time. In the early years of the twentieth century, we know that music was used as a diagnostic tool before the invention of sophisticated audiology equipment and as a vehicle for teaching speech to the mentally retarded (Solomon, 1980).

**Educational Separation.** The educational separation of "different" individuals was generally the rule throughout most of the twentieth century. Such separation was accomplished by either placing these different children into separate educational groups within the classroom or school or by placing them into separate institutions.

Susan Hart expressed a concern about breaking the students into different, or differentiated, groups. It was felt that these attempts to match the ability level of the student to the academic level of the education would have a negative effect on the self esteem of the below average learners (Hart, 1996, p.50).

**Tiered Activities.** Carol Ann Tomlinson recently promoted the use of tiered activities as one of the strategies for supporting differentiation in the classroom.
In a tiered activity model, the students work on building the same skills only at different levels of complexity. A differentiated piece of band music would be very similar to these tiered activities in that the students would be working on the same song using appropriate playing techniques that would match their own level of ability. In a performance, the students would all be contributing to the overall image that the audience hears and sees. All students should come “away with pivotal skills and understandings, and each student [would be] appropriately challenged (Tomlinson, 1999, p.83).

Tomlinson said that advanced learners can become mentally lazy when not appropriately challenged (Tomlinson, 1995, p.14). In order to prevent this mental laziness, we should move away from the one-size-fits-all instruction towards challenging “students individually by offering a variety of learning and working arrangements” (Tomlinson, 1995, p.28).

Relevant Literature

Differentiated Education. Whereas much has been written regarding inclusion and differentiation in general education, little research appears to have been conducted in the area of music education. The research that has been done in music education has mostly been that of conducting surveys to find out what effects the music teachers felt that mainstreaming and inclusion would have on their music classes. The study of specific techniques that can be used
to teach inclusive music education classes is largely an untapped area.

It is interesting to note the appearance and exclusion of certain key words in the ERIC (Education Resources Information Center) database as indicated in the Thesaurus of Eric Descriptors (1995). The word "mainstreaming" first appeared in June, 1978, relating to the placement of exceptional students in regular classrooms but still having separate resources to address their special needs. The appearance of the word "mainstreaming" was a logical step following the passage of PL 94-142 in 1975.

The word "inclusion" first appeared in the Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors in December, 1994 and related to exceptional students being fully integrated into regular classrooms and activities (Thesaurus, 1995).

Although the word "differentiation" (also differentiate, differentiated) has appeared with several meanings in publications for over a century, there is no listing for this word in the Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors. There is a mention of "differentiated staffs" beginning in May, 1969, but there are no other forms or uses of the word listed (Thesaurus, 1995).

The word "differentiate" has appeared in discussions regarding education since the latter parts of the nineteenth century. In 1924, John Louis Horn wrote the book, The Education of Exceptional Children: A consideration of public school problems and policies in the field of differentiated education. In chapter five,
Horn posed the question, "What Is Differentiated Education?" (Horn, 1924, p.90) Discussion had taken place in an effort to determine whether it was better to group students in schools by age or by intelligence. The superintendent of schools in St. Louis, Dr. W. T. Harris had commented around 1875 on the "hopeless inflexibility of the grade system, which threw children together merely on the basis of approximate equality of chronological age, and held them together for an entire year, when the most promising were sent on, and the worst pupils were held back and compelled to repeat everything and work another year before an opportunity to advance was given them" (Horn, 1924, p.90). Dr. Harris resolved his problem by promoting students twice a year. Other attempts to resolve this problem entailed varying the speed of the course work, varying the course work itself, or giving "special attention to individuals within the group" (Horn, 1924, p.92).

Horn discussed what appears to have been an early form of differentiation in Santa Barbara in which all students were to be in school for exactly eight years with the amount of work for each child determined by the abilities of each child. The school was divided into three ability levels: minimum, average, and more than average (Horn, 1924, p.92-93).

Horn went on to say that "Varying the rate of progress over an identical course of study is not differentiation" (Horn, 1924, p.92). He said that differentiation must be
qualitative and not quantitative (Horn, 1924, p.96). His example of quantitative differentiation was one in which all students start out towards a common goal, but the students drop out at various points along the way. How much they accomplished is the quantitative differentiation. In qualitative differentiation, all students reach a common goal, but the methods used in reaching that goal are different (Horn, 1924, p.97).

The educational separation of "different" individuals gained momentum in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Many provisions for the funding and establishment of schools and institutions during this time can be found in many of the state constitutions (White, 1950).

Dr. Frank S. White wrote that differentiated education was "distinct and separate ... for different groups, classes, and races of people" (White, 1950, p.2). Some of the groups served through differentiated education at this time were "the blind, deaf, mutes, mental defectives, physical defectives, delinquents, religious denominational groups, and national and racial groups" (White, 1950, p.2). Groups also included were those with the opportunity and capability to gain "superior knowledge and skill for a particular profession or vocation" (White, 1950, pp.2-3). In 1875, the State of Nebraska provided funding for farmers, professionals, and juvenile delinquents through an agricultural college and a state university (White, 1950, p.90).
In 1957, Emmett Albert Betts said that differentiation referred more to the rate (speed) of learning rather than a style of learning with emphasis on the individual. With children learning at different rates, the difference between the learning levels achieved grows larger with the passage of each year. The gaps between the learning levels in elementary school are rather narrow which makes the teaching process for the students at the various levels easier to prepare for and to teach (Betts, 1957, p.3-5). Later, Betts stated that “appropriate materials are obtained so that instruction may be differentiated at all stages in terms of the pupils’ levels of achievement” (Betts, 1957, p.717).

Mainstreaming and Inclusion. Johnson and Darrow indicated that the word mainstreaming was first used in the early 1970’s to describe the integration of children with disabilities into regular classrooms in response to PL 94-142 (Johnson and Darrow, 1997).

The mainstreaming of the 1970’s and 1980’s developed into inclusion in the 1990’s. “Inclusion differs from mainstreaming in that students with disabilities are educated in their home schools, in age-appropriate and grade-level-appropriate classes, and most often on a full time basis” (Johnson and Darrow, 1997). Also mentioned as a basic idea of inclusion is “zero rejection” which means that “no student can be denied access to academic programs on the basis of disability” (Johnson and Darrow, 1997).
Even though music educators agree with the idea of inclusion, there is still debate going on as to the advantages and disadvantages of inclusion. Inclusion appears to minimize the negative effects of labeling students, segregating students on the basis of their disability, and placing them in an environment that is inconsistent with the real world. On the other hand, music educators are not usually trained to work with students who have disabilities, have a negative attitude towards inclusion, and believe that students with special needs will demand excessive amounts of teacher time, impede the progress of other students, and fall further behind without services provided in the special classroom (Johnson and Darrow, 1997).

Johnson and Darrow (1997) reported that in a study by Wang, Anderson, and Bram "academic and social performance of students with special needs in mainstreamed settings was superior to those students educated in special classes." This same study also found that special needs students who were educated in regular classes full time outperformed those who were in regular classes half time.

Social interactions of disabled and non-disabled students in an integrated classroom were studied for evidence of positive interactions among these students. It was found "that music and music classroom experiences can facilitate positive social interactions between severely handicapped and nonhandicapped students primarily when structured for that purpose." It was believed that this
acceptance could extend into non-music environments (Jellison, Brooks, & Huck, 1984).

In order to promote on-task behavior, it is important in a music class to keep the students actively engaged in some type of a musical activity (Forsythe, 1977). In 1997, when Johnson & Darrow studied the attitudes of band students towards inclusion, they specifically chose to work with instrumentalists "...because past research [Atterbury, 1986 and Gfeller, Darrow, & Hedden, 1990] had shown that this area of music education was perceived to be the most challenging setting for including students with disabilities." More specifically, Gfeller, Darrow, and Hedden (1990) posed in their research what they listed as question number six: "Do music educators perceive specific types of handicapping conditions as more difficult to integrate into the mainstream?" Responses from music educators in this study who had "... previous direct teaching experience with students having that condition" responded "...that students with emotional or behavioral disorders and hearing impairments are the most difficult to mainstream" (Gfeller et al. 1990).

The effect on students of the behavior of teachers and conductors has been evaluated through numerous studies in music. Sims (1986) found that three to five year old students were most attentive when the teacher "exhibited high magnitude nonverbal affect, and when they were given a hand-movement activity in which to participate." In a somewhat related study, Yarbrough (1975) found "that the
magnitude of conductor behavior ['what a conductor can do to make a rehearsal more interesting'] had no significant effect on the performance, attentiveness, and attitude of the students in mixed choruses." However, it was found that several of the groups did receive their lowest ratings during low magnitude conditions and that off-task behavior was lowest during high magnitude conditions.

Six years following the passage of PL94-142, the largest classroom problems, as perceived by music educators, were making the adjustment to an increase in the spread of individual differences and having too large a number of handicapped students in the classroom (Gilbert and Asmus, 1981).

In the years of mainstreaming, there were a number of concerns expressed by music educators regarding how mainstreaming was handled. Overall, music teachers found that they were expected to take on the music education of these exceptional students with inadequate training. A survey of over 700 music teachers by Gilbert and Asmus indicated a significant gap between these teachers' experiences with exceptional children and their knowledge of how best to teach these integrated groups (Gilbert and Asmus, 1981; see also Atterbury, 1987).

The responses of Southern music educators to a survey by Atterbury indicated several problem areas regarding mainstreaming. There was no assistance available from a teacher aid in 87% of the respondents. Ninety percent reported no extra time in working with the mainstreamed
children. Participation in the IEP process was missing in 84% of the cases. Only 3% received appropriate information on the exceptional children. Eighty-two percent reported insufficient budgets in providing special materials for mainstreamed children (Atterbury, 1987).

Another survey showed that 62% of the respondents said that handicapped students were effectively mainstreamed. However, 50% said that handicapped students' music education needs would be better met in special classes. Sixty-one percent felt that handicapped students would hamper the progress of non-handicapped peers. (Gfeller, et al. 1990)

A study of mainstreaming practices in Arizona found that 94% of music educators had taught special education students, but 40% of them had received no training at all in this area. Most of those who had received training felt that it was not adequate. The conclusion reached in this study was that effective mainstreaming in school music classes in Arizona did not exist. Music teachers had received little or no training in the area of special learners. Special learners were included in regular music classes, but music teachers received inadequate resources with little extra preparation time (Frisque, Niebur, and Humphreys, 1994).

Public schools today are encountering more students with learning disabilities than ever before, and many of these students exhibit ADHD (Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder) characteristics. Some of the common
characteristics include difficulty in paying attention or completing anything requiring sustained mental effort. These students are often easily distracted and can exhibit impulsive behavior (Hardman et al., 1999, p.177). "Research indicates that males with ADHD outnumber females in ratios varying from 4:1 to 9:1" (Hardman et al., 1999, p.178).

ADHD (Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder) is not defined in IDEA, but has often been discussed along with other learning disabilities (Hardman et al, 1999, p 176). Perhaps one of the reasons that ADHD has not been defined within IDEA is that the medical community cannot agree on a specific set of causes and characteristics.

These surveys indicated that music educators generally felt that they were not adequately trained and that they did not receive the necessary preparation time or materials for appropriate education of exceptional children. Many educators also felt that students with disabilities would receive a better music education if they were taught separately from the non-disabled children.

**Time Spent in the Classroom.** No studies were found regarding class time spent in performance activities in inclusive instrumental music classes. However, general studies of class time use have been conducted for vocal and instrumental classes from elementary to college level. Class time usage was generally broken down into performing, teaching, and getting ready. Minor areas of time usage reported in various other studies included warmup, sight-reading, individual/small group performing, and discipline
(Goolsby, 1996; Moore, 1981; Witt, 1986; Brendell, 1996; Madsen and Geringer, 1983; and Moore and Bonney, 1987).

In one study of class time for elementary classes, high school and college choral and instrumental classes, and private lessons, the mean teaching time was 38.9 percent and the mean performing time was 43.3 percent. Another 17.9 percent of the time was spent getting ready (Witt, 1986). Another article studied various university classes and found that the choral and instrumental music ensembles spent 63.6% of rehearsal time in performance activities (Madsen and Geringer, 1983).

Thomas Goolsby broke down the class performance time into four sections (full ensemble, sections/groups, individuals, and exercises) and three teacher levels (student teachers, novice teachers, and experienced teachers). As teacher experience rose, class performance time rose and verbal teaching time went down (1996).

One study was found which gave discipline information as a percent of class time. This study was done by Goolsby (1996) in a review of time spent in instrumental music class rehearsals for middle and high school bands. The mean percentages of class time devoted to discipline for student teachers was 3.6%. For novice teachers, the mean percentage of time devoted to discipline was 3.5%. And the mean percentage of time devoted to discipline for experienced teachers was 0.9%. Goolsby also found that the percent of class time spent on musical instruction and performance
(playing instruments) was 76.9% for student teachers, 67.3% for novice teachers, and 80.6% for experienced teachers.

**Encouragements, Criticisms, and Teacher Affect.** A study was conducted in the early 1970’s by Kenneth Murray on teacher and student behaviors and their effect on performances of high school choruses. On a historical note, Murray cited a study by Maurer (1969) which found that only 7.4 percent of the responses that were made by conductors were approving responses. Another cited study by Kirkland (1968) showed that only 5 percent of responses were approving responses. In his own study, Murray found disapproval rates that ranged from 20 percent to 71 percent. Murray found that the groups who had the higher approval rates also had higher performance ratings, but not by a significant amount (Murray, 1975).

Carpenter (1986) studied the verbal behaviors of teacher-conductors in both junior high and high school band classes. Carpenter said that “despite educational concerns for positive teaching, teacher-conductors tend to be far more disapproving than approving during than rehearsals.” In a summary of feedback verbalizations for junior high classes as a percent of total comments, musical approvals were 12.3%, and musical disapprovals were 73.1%, social approvals were 0.7%, and social disapprovals were 13.8%

Madsen and Madsen (1981) reported that higher teacher approval ratios have resulted in lower percentages of off-task student behavior. In a study of teachers in the Southwestern United States, the teacher approval ratio was
23.2%, and the off-task student behavior was 59.2%. In a study in Leon County, Florida, the teacher approval ratio was 84.4%, and the off-task student behavior was 24.4%. Madsen and Madsen pointed out the “in most well-controlled classrooms where a great deal of academic learning is accomplished, the average off-task is approximately 20% for the entire classroom.”

Other studies tracked verbal praise with student interpretation of such praise (Taylor, 1997) and positive feedback as a component of verbal instruction in rehearsals (Goolsby, 1997). In the Goolsby study, the number of positive feedbacks averaged from 8.5 to 10.0 per rehearsal. Disapprovals were not tracked in either of these studies.

Teacher affect was studied by Wendy Sims (1986). A teacher who had low affect rarely looked at the students and rarely changed facial expressions. A teacher who had high affect was constantly looking around at the students and used many facial expressions to indicate such emotions as excitement, happiness, and enthusiasm. An interesting by-product of this study was the finding that students exhibited more on-task behavior when the teacher went from low affect to high affect. In contrast, the students exhibited more off-task behavior when the teacher went from high affect to low affect. Low teacher affect was likely closer to what students experienced in the classroom, so “perhaps when this condition came first children had no reason to react strongly in a negative way, whereas when high affect preceded it there was much more contrast,
producing a stronger negative reaction when the more exciting condition was removed (Sims, 1986).” This could suggest that students might react negatively to changes in their routines with increased off-task behavior when accompanied by lower teacher affect.

When considering all of the effects and ramifications of mainstreaming and inclusion on music education, music educators must remember that the goal of the many pieces of legislation is to provide the same educational opportunities to all students with disabilities as is provided to students without disabilities. At one time, this meant taking care of the educational needs of the special learners in separate but equivalent settings. The law now specifies that these special students are to be educated in the least restrictive environment along with non-disabled students. While doing this, we need to keep in mind that the music education objectives should not change when working with students with disabilities. It is good to remember five of the principles of teaching and learning that are often found in research-based methods for teaching social behaviors and academic subjects to the handicapped: (1) Start at the child’s level, whatever that may be. (2) Emphasize success experiences early. (3) Proceed by logical and successive increments toward progressively more complex skills and concepts. (4) Maintain high interest by using naturally reinforcing experiences. (5) Gradually direct the class toward greater independence so that the subject, in this case, music, becomes its own reinforcer.
and the concepts and skills become internalized (Forsythe and Jellison, 1977).

**Purpose of the Study**

In his role as editor of the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, Harry E. Price (1997) called for more research into the attitudes and techniques of the music educators towards successful handling of inclusion in music education. He said, "For more than 20 years, as a result of legislative mandates, there have been continuing efforts to open America's classrooms to all students; however these efforts have necessitated some changes for teachers, administrators, and students. Change and acceptance have come slowly. Although most educators support the philosophy of inclusion, there is an ongoing need to identify and describe specific attitudes and techniques to successfully realize the concept in the music classroom" (Price, 1997). McDonnell called for "educational practices [to be] validated in order to have a positive impact on inclusion in the schools (Hardman et al., 1999, p.133).

This study is important because "P.L. 94-142 is almost two decades old, yet there is a paucity of research literature on music education for students with disabilities" (Frisque et al. 1994, p.94). It is hoped that the use of differentiated music will increase the attending behavior of a middle school band class and address a concern of Larsen who discussed in 1978 the underachievement of a large number of students who are
"simply unmotivated, (or) poorly taught" (Hardman et al. 1999, p.181).

This study of the use of differentiated music in an inclusive band class is an answer to the following charge:

The inclusion of students with disabilities into music programs requires that music educators be prepared to create a learning environment that varies with the needs and abilities of their students as well as one that fosters positive relationships among students. Music educators must continue to explore methods through which they can provoke the musical and personal growth of all students in an inclusive environment (Johnson and Darrow, 1997, p.174).

This research study of providing differentiated music to a middle school band class is an attempt to identify and validate whether this teaching technique can be used successfully in an inclusive instrumental music classroom.

Research Questions

1. Attending Behavior. What effect will the selection of music instruction materials have on the percentage of students on task during treatment (using differentiated music) compared with baseline (using standard method material) for each class session and each grade level?

2. Class Time. What effect will the selection of music instruction materials have on the percentage of class time spent on teaching, playing instruments, discipline, and interruptions for each class session and each grade level?

3. Teacher Comments. Will there be a similar pattern of teacher encouragements and criticisms during baseline and treatment?
4. Student Enjoyment and Self Assessment. What is the level of student enjoyment for each class? Also, what is each student’s assessment of how well they played for each class? What are the class averages for each area of evaluation for each class session and each grade level for baseline and treatment?

Operational Definitions For This Study

Differentiated Music. Music performed in a multi-level band class. A multi-level band class contains students playing instruments at the beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels of proficiency. The differentiated music used in the present study contained music parts at all three skill levels for all wind (woodwinds and brass) instruments. The three parts named in the arrangements for this study were: descant, melody, and harmony.

Students On Task/Playing Instruments. Students on task were identified as those who were playing instruments. Since it was not practical to listen to the sound coming from each instrument, a student was considered to be playing his or her instrument if the instrument was in the appropriate playing position for that instrument. Drummers were considered to be on task if they were moving their arms with sticks in hand over the drum head.

Discipline Time. Discipline time was taking place if the teaching and playing process was interrupted by inappropriate behaviors of a student, a group of students, or the entire class. Examples of inappropriate behaviors
were: talking, playing instrument without permission, walking around room without permission, and body movements that attract attention. During discipline time, the director/teacher was addressing these interruptions through either verbal or non-verbal means.

**Playing Time.** Playing time was measured as time in which the entire group was supposed to be playing their instruments. The time in which individuals and smaller groups were playing was considered teaching time and was not included as a part of the playing times of this study.

**Interruption Time.** Interruption time was measured as time in which an outside influence stopped the teaching or playing time of a class. Examples of interruption time included: PA announcement, visitor entering the room to interact with the teacher or a student, fire drill.

**Teaching Time.** Teaching time was measured as time in which the director was engaged in a verbal or physical activity relating to one or more students in the class. Teaching time could include the playing of instruments of an individual or a small group. Teaching time included class time that did not qualify as playing time, discipline time, or interruption time.

**Teacher Encouragements.** A teacher encouragement was a comment made by the teacher acknowledging something positive from a student or the class. Examples of encouragements include: "That sounded good." "Excellent!" "I like the way you do that." An encouragement was not limited to a request, such as an attempt to get a student
to do something, rather it was any comment that provided feedback to the student when something positive was observed. Teacher encouragements were both musical and social and could occur in teaching time, playing time, discipline time, and interruption time.

**Teacher Criticisms.** A teacher criticism was a comment made by the teacher that acknowledged negative behavior from a student or the class. Criticisms were social only and could occur in teaching time, playing time, discipline time, and interruption time. A criticism was not limited to a request to correct a negative behavior, rather it was any comment that provided feedback to the student when something negative was observed.
Chapter 2
Methodology

Introduction

The primary reason for conducting this study was to investigate the effect that differentiated music had on the on-task behavior of middle school band students in an inclusive band class of an urban middle school.

This chapter includes a description of (a) the setting and the subjects; (b) the independent variables; (c) the dependent variables; and (d) the instructional process.

Setting and Subjects

Setting. This research study took place within the three band classes of an urban middle school in a large Midwestern city. Most of the students in this school came from low income families with 80% of the families qualifying for free or reduced lunch.

The middle school day consisted of eight forty-three minute class periods. There was a 30 minute homeroom class before first period which was not counted as one of the eight class periods. One of the eight periods served as lunch time. During two of the periods, all students attended what were referred to as Unified Arts classes. The
Unified Arts classes consisted of music, art, and physical education. Each of the band classes met every day for the entire year. Other than the choir classes which also met every day for the entire year, the rest of the Unified Arts classes met every day for only one nine week quarter.

Subjects. The total enrollment in this middle school at the time of this study was 406 students. Of these 406 students, 134 were in the sixth grade, 117 were in the seventh grade, and 105 were in the eighth grade. Another 50 special students (SED) were counted separately for grade level purposes. Of the 134 students in the sixth grade, 35 (26.1% of sixth grade) were in the band class. The average attendance for the sixth grade band class for the eight sessions of the study was 22.6, or 64.6%. Of the 117 students in the seventh grade, 29 (24.8% of seventh grade) were in the band class. The average attendance for the seventh grade band class for the eight sessions of the study was 16.4, or 56.6%. Of the 105 students in the eighth grade, 20 (19.0% of eighth grade) were in the band class. The average attendance for the eighth grade band class for the eight sessions of the study was 11.9, or 60%.

Regardless of grade level, each of the band classes included both beginning students and advanced students. Of the 35 students in the sixth grade band class, 22 (63%) were beginners; of the 29 students in the seventh grade band class, 17 (59%) were beginners; and of the 20 students in the eighth grade band class, 9 (45%) were beginners. The
eighth grade band class was the only band class in which beginners made up less than half of the class.

Exceptional students were represented in each of the band classes. The sixth grade band class included two DH (Developmentally Handicapped) students and one SLD (Specific Learning Disability) student. These three exceptional students made up 8.6% of the sixth grade band class.

The seventh grade band class included three DH, four SLD, and one SED (Severe Emotional Disability) students. These eight exceptional students made up 27.6% of the band class.

The eighth grade band class included one DH student. This exceptional student made up 5.0% of the eighth grade band class.

Overall, 12 of the 84 band students were officially designated as special education students. These 12 exceptional students made up 14.3% of the band classes.

An information letter was sent home to the parents of the students prior to the beginning of the study advising them of the upcoming research study. (see Appendix A)

Independent Variable: The Music

Band Method. The independent variable consisted of the music that was used during the study. During the baseline sessions, the music used came from the Ed Sueta Band Method, Book One. The Sueta method was chosen to represent a typical band method for the baseline part of this study
because it was the band method that had been used for most of the past ten years at this school. Book One was chosen because of the high numbers of beginners in each of the band classes. The advanced students were told to think of the Sueta Book One as a review since this study took place towards the beginning of the school year. The advanced students were also told that they would be serving as models for the beginning students. See Appendix B for the exercise numbers and the order in which the Sueta music was used. The Ed Sueta Band Method was not used for warmups. Instead, at the beginning of the class period, the band classes played typical warmup exercises such as scales and long tones. At the end of the class period, if time allowed, regular sheet music songs were played.

**Differentiated Music.** During the treatment sessions, the band classes played the differentiated music that had been arranged for this project. See Appendix C for the differentiated music.

The differentiated pieces of music consisted of an eight measure tune with an added upper and lower part. The tune, or melody, was placed in the middle. The melody part was just what its name suggested. In the arrangements used for this study, songs were selected that contained simple, easily-recognizable, eight measure melodies. It was intended that the melody part be playable by the average band student.

Below the melody was a simple whole note harmony which consisted of only two notes. The harmony part contained
whole notes using only two different pitches that appeared in the harmonic structure of the melody. These pitches are among the first notes taught to beginning band students (concert pitch): b-flat, c, d, e-flat, and f.

The upper, or discant part, was meant to be a challenging complement to the melody. The discant part was contrapuntal in nature often using higher pitches and faster notes (eighth notes) than what was found in the melody. The difficulty level of this part was intended to be a challenge to the more advanced students in the group.

Played together, the music consisted of a melody with harmony and counterpoint. The percussion part was played by snare drum and bass drum. The snare drum part mirrored the rhythm in the discant. The bass drum part consisted of various combinations of half notes and half rests.

The differentiated parts were different from typical part music found in standard band arrangements. A standard band arrangement might have three clarinet parts, for example. These three parts are not usually written with three levels of difficulty in mind such as easy, medium, and difficult. Rather, the degree of difficulty of the parts is dictated by the level of the entire arrangement, and it is possible that all parts could be considered to be difficult. In the differentiated music used in this study, the harmony parts were intended to be playable by any beginner in the early days of instruction. At the other end of the spectrum, the discant part was intended to be a challenge to the most advanced student.
Dependent Variables

Students on Task. The number of students actually playing instruments was stated as a percent of the total number of students who were in class and could have been playing their instruments. This percent was measured at predetermined intervals of ten seconds during each of eight class sessions. Since the number of students playing varied not only within the class but also from class to class, a class mean was calculated for each session.

Class Playing Time. Total class playing time was measured as a percent of the total session time. Playing time began when the entire group was directed to start playing instruments (students with horn to mouth) and ended when the group stopped playing instruments. Playing time could be followed by teaching, discipline, or interruption time.

Class Teaching Time. Total class teaching time was measured as a percent of the total session time. Teaching time included teacher talk, modeling, or other interactions with a student or a group of students. Teaching time did not include discipline or interruption time.

Class Discipline Time. Total class time spent in discipline was measured as a percent of the total class time. Included in discipline time were statements or requests intended to correct negative behaviors that were directed toward an individual, a group of individuals, or the entire class. It was thought that discipline time should be tracked in this study because class and
individual discipline appeared as a topic at many school faculty meetings.

**Class Interruption Time.** Total class time spent while listening to announcements, or time spent in communicating with visitors coming into the classroom for various types of school business, was measured as a percent of the total class session time.

**Student Enjoyment and Student Self-Assessment.** Since the students were the recipients of the knowledge and training of the teacher, feedback was desired from the students to find out what they thought of the differentiated music. A Likert five point scale was used to find out not only how much they enjoyed the class but also how well they thought they played for that day. See Appendix D for this student survey form.

**Teacher Comments**

During each session, in addition to the dependent variables, teacher comments were monitored. The total number of social and musical encouragements and the total number of social criticisms from the teacher were counted. Musical criticisms were considered as a component of teaching time. It was possible for teacher comments to appear in teaching time, playing time, discipline time, and interruption time.
Equipment And Its Usage

Each class was videotaped through the use of an RCA Small Wonder VHS-C home video camera. The camera was set to tape on the ninety minute mode.

The video camera was place on a tripod on a large table in the corner of the room. Elevation of the camera allowed for a clearer line of sight to each of the students to see whether or not the instruments were at the mouth in playing position. Elevating the camera also made it possible to see movement in the arms and hands of the drummers to determine if they were playing along with the rest of the band.

Sony VCR model number SLV-765HF was used for playback. In one set of viewing sessions, the VCR was placed on a table along with a thirteen inch RCA TV and a Power Macintosh 7200/90 computer. This arrangement allowed for easy use of the SCRIBE™ 2.0b19 (Duke, 1997) data collection software. The data for time spent in playing instruments, teaching, discipline, interruptions, and teacher comments were all collected using this setup. The data for percent of students on task was collected by feeding the Sony VCR into a 27 inch Sony TV. The pause function on the VCR provided a perfectly still and observable picture which made it easy to count the number of students in attendance and the number of students who were on task at any given point.
The Process

One of the goals of music education in the classroom is to have every student participate in a musical activity and enjoy what they are doing. Because of the large number of students who play in a band and the wide diversity of these students, this is a difficult goal to accomplish in a typical band class. By placing beginners in the same class as advanced students, this goal becomes especially difficult to achieve. One of the reasons for this study was to provide empirical evidence that would show whether or not providing music with differentiated parts would increase the number of students on task in an inclusive band class of an urban middle school.

The idea for the music used in this study came from the regular education design of differentiation in which each student worked towards the same goal in their own appropriate manner. In a differentiated, inclusive band class, each player could be considered to be working towards the goal of performing a piece of music, but with each player playing a musical part appropriate to him or her. Unless a specific learning objective was taking place, each student was free to choose his or her own part when playing differentiated music.

Each class was videotaped eight times on successive Tuesdays and Thursdays with the first session beginning on a Tuesday. Within each videotaped class was a session fifteen minutes in length to be used for the purposes of this study. The fifteen minute sessions began after
attendance and warmups. The beginning of the fifteen minute session would begin with the use of the word "time." One example would be, "It is now lesson time." Another example would be, "It is now time for some songs." When recording data from the videotape, the counters for the VCR and Scribe™ were reset to zero at the same moment that the word "time" was spoken on the videotape. Both the VCR and Scribe™ counters measured minutes and seconds, and both were within two seconds of each other at the end of the fifteen minute session.

The first two sessions of the eighth grade band, referred to as baseline, used lesson material from the Ed Sueta Band Method, Book One. Beginning with the third session, the 8th grade band used differentiated music, referred to as treatment. The Sueta music was not used at all during the treatment sessions.

The first four sessions of the seventh grade band, also referred to as baseline, used lesson material from the Ed Sueta Band Method, Book One. Beginning with the fifth session, the seventh grade band used differentiated music, also referred to as treatment. As with the eighth grade band, the Sueta music was not used at all during the treatment sessions.

The first six sessions of the sixth grade band, referred to as baseline, used lesson material from the Ed Sueta Band Method, Book One. Beginning with the seventh session, the sixth grade band began using the
differentiated music, the treatment. The sixth grade band did not use the Sueta music during the treatment.

The music that I arranged into differentiated music consisted of the concert b-flat scale, Hot Cross Buns, French Song, Merrily We Roll Along, and Go Tell Aunt Rhodie. (see Appendix C) All of this music is in the public domain free from any copyright infringement issues.

During the first two sessions, the eighth grade band played Lesson 6, exercises 3, 4, 5, and 6; and Lesson 7, exercises 1, 2, and 5 in the Sueta book. During sessions three and four, the eighth grade band played the differentiated versions of Hot Cross Buns and French Song. In session five, the differentiated version of Merrily We Roll Along was added to the other two differentiated pieces. The remainder of the sessions were spent working on the differentiated arrangements of Hot Cross Buns, French Song, and Merrily We Roll Along. Beginning with session three, the band warmed up with a differentiated arrangement of the concert b-flat scale.

During the first four sessions, the seventh grade band played Lesson 5, exercises 5, 6, and 7; Lesson 6, exercises 3, 4, 5, and 8; and Lesson 7, exercises 1, 2, and 5. In the fifth session, the 7th grade band played the differentiated versions of Hot Cross Buns and French Song. Beginning with the sixth session, Merrily We Roll Along was added to the two previous differentiated arrangements. Beginning with the fifth session, the 7th grade band warmed up with a differentiated arrangement of the concert b-flat scale.
During the first six sessions, the sixth grade band played the Sueta Lesson 3, exercises 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9; and Lesson 4, exercises 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9. During sessions seven and eight, the differentiated version of Hot Cross Buns was played. The sixth grade band warmed up with a differentiated arrangement of the concert b-flat scale in sessions seven and eight.

At the end of each session, a student volunteer passed out the Student Evaluation sheets (See Appendix D). Each student was asked to rate two statements: (1) I enjoyed band today. (2) I played well today. Each student provided a response to each of these statements by circling one of five points of a Likert scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. The students placed the evaluation sheets in a specially marked box upon completion to provide assurance of anonymity. The students were instructed not to put their names on the sheets. The Student Evaluation sheets were not distributed at the fourth session of the sixth grade. Evaluations were completed for all other sessions at all three grade levels.

Upon completion of all taping sessions, each videotaped session was viewed three times for data. During the first viewing, using SCRIBE™, the entire fifteen minute time period for each class session was broken into one of four categories: (1) Playing time, (2) Teaching time, (3) Discipline time, and (4) Interruption time. In the second viewing of each session, SCRIBE™ was used for tallying the number of encouragements and criticisms.
The third viewing of each session was used to determine the percentages of students playing instruments. Rather than using SCRIBEM, the taped session was viewed on the larger screen TV. The tape was paused at each ten second interval in which the band was playing beginning with the tenth second. First, the total number of students present was counted, and this number became the class attendance figure. While still paused, the number of students playing instruments was counted. From these two numbers, a percentage of the class engaged in playing music was obtained. This procedure was done each time the class was performing at a ten second interval point. The timed events chronology printout from SCRIBEM for each session was used to accurately identify each ten-second interval point at which the band was playing. After the percentage numbers of students actively engaged in playing instruments were obtained for each of the identified points on the tape, the mean was calculated for each session.
Chapter 3
Results

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study along with related tables. First, interobserver agreement information is presented. This information is followed by data on the attending behavior for each class session which is reported as a percentage of students playing instruments. Also reported are class times spent teaching, playing instruments, taking care of discipline in the classroom, and handling class interruptions. The numbers of teacher encouragements and criticisms are given. Next, student survey data is provided indicating the levels of student enjoyment and the self assessment of how well the students felt that they played their instruments. Finally, correlations are made of the student surveys to playing time, teaching time, discipline time, and percent of group on task.

Interobserver Agreement

Interobserver agreement measures were collected for 5 of the 24 sessions (20.8%). Table 1 summarizes results by class for percent of time spent (playing, teaching, discipline, interruptions), and percent on task. The range
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>% Time Spent</th>
<th>% On Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Percentage of Interobserver Agreements for Percent of Time Spent, Teacher Comments, and Percent On Task
for agreements on percent of time spent was 88.0% to 97.6% with the mean being 94.6%. The range for agreements on percent on task was 80.0% to 100.0% with the mean for percent on task being 88.2%.

Attending Behavior - Students on Task

Beginning with the tenth second of each class session and every tenth second thereafter, it was first determined whether or not the class was playing instruments as a group. If so, the number of students playing instruments was compared to the total number of students in attendance which yielded the percent of students playing instruments. An average class percentage number was obtained for each session which was compared to the other class sessions to determine the amount of increase or decrease of the number of students playing when comparing the baseline sessions (the use of standard method music) to the treatment sessions (the use of differentiated music). This information is reported as being "on task" and can be seen on Table 2.

Within each grade level, the mean percent on task was higher during the baseline sessions than during the treatment sessions.

The mean percent on task for the sixth grade band class during its six baseline sessions was 54.0%. Please note that the data for the fourth session for the sixth grade band is not included in this report as student
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Baseline % On Task</th>
<th>Treatment % On Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>270.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.61</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>237.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>180.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>161.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>341.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.83</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Students on task as average percent per session
evaluations were not collected for that session. The mean percent on task for the sixth grade band class during its two treatment sessions was 47.5%.

The mean percent on task for the seventh grade band class during the four baseline sessions was 59.25%. The mean percent on task for the seventh grade band class during its four treatment sessions was 45.0%.

The mean percent on task for the eighth grade band class during the two baseline sessions was 80.5%. The mean percent on task for the eighth grade band class during its six treatment sessions was 56.8%

The sixth grade had the lowest rate of reduction in percent on task when the treatment sessions are compared back to the baseline sessions. The eighth grade had the highest rate of reduction in percent on task. The reduction in the percentage of students on task in the sixth grade from 54.0% in the baseline to 47.5% in the treatment represented an average reduction in class participation of 12%. The reduction in the percentage of students on task in the seventh grade from 59.25% in the baseline to 45.0% in the treatment represented an average reduction in class participation of 24.1%. The reduction in the percentage of students on task in the eighth grade from 80.5% in the baseline to 56.83% in the treatment represented an average reduction in class participation of 29.4%.

The mean for the sixth grade baseline sessions was 54% with a standard deviation of 12.04%. During session #2, the percent on task was 69.00% which was over one standard
deviation from the mean. This was the only session for the sixth grade that exceeded one standard deviation. Although relatively close, the sixth grade had the narrowest difference in standard deviation between baseline of 12.04 and treatment of 10.61. Also note the the standard deviation was lower for the treatment than for the baseline. In raw numbers, the percent on task in baseline ranged from 43% to 69% and in treatment from 40% to 55%.

The standard deviation of the seventh grade was less than the sixth grade in baseline and more in treatment. The range for percent on task for the seventh grade in the four baseline sessions was 52.00% to 60.00%. The range for percent on task in the treatment sessions was 32.00% to 60.00%. The standard deviation in the treatment sessions of the seventh grade was substantially higher at 20.28 than that of the baseline sessions of 9.50. The difference between the standard deviation of the baseline and treatment was much greater than that found in the sixth grade.

At 80.50 in the baseline sessions, the eighth grade had the highest mean on task of any grade level in either baseline or treatment. The eighth grade also had the highest standard deviations in both baseline (16.26) and in treatment (37.81). The range for percent on task for the eighth grade baseline sessions was from 69.00% in the first session to 92.00% in the second session. The range for percent on task for the six treatment sessions was from
32.00% in the fourth session to 79.00% in the eighth session.

Percent of class time spent playing, teaching, and dealing with discipline and interruptions

Sixth Grade. The percent of playing time for the sixth grade during baseline ranged from 1.0% and 0.8% in sessions two and three to 15.3% in session six. (see Table 3) The mean for playing time in the baseline was 8.57%. During treatment, the percent of playing time was 4.4% for session seven and 7.0% for session eight.

Teaching times for both baseline and treatment for the sixth grade both averaged about half of the total class time. The mean for teaching was 53.23% during baseline and 49.30% during treatment.

The amount of discipline time varied greatly for the sixth grade during baseline. The discipline time during baseline ranged from 4.0% of class time during session four to 87.0% during session three. The mean for discipline time during baseline was 34.63% with a standard deviation of 31.69. The mean for discipline time during treatment was 44.90 with a range of 23.2% in session seven to 66.6% in session eight. The standard deviation during treatment was 30.69.

Only three of the eight sessions for the sixth grade experienced interruptions, and they all came in baseline. The mean for interruptions was 3.55% with 4.2% in session two, 15.9% in session five, and 1.2% in session six.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6th Grade Baseline</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7th Grade Baseline</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8th Grade Baseline</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Percent of class time spent playing, teaching, and dealing with discipline and interruptions
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Seventh Grade. Playing time for the seventh grade was higher than it was for the sixth grade. In baseline for seventh grade, playing time ranged from 10.3% of the class time in session two to 13.8% of the time in session four. The mean for playing time in baseline was 11.50% with a standard deviation of 1.56. Playing time in treatment ranged from 4.7% in session seven to 17.9% in session five. The standard deviation for playing time during treatment was 11.52.

Teaching time during baseline ranged from 12.0% of total class time in session one to 77.3% in session four. The mean for teaching during baseline was 44.83% with a standard deviation of 28.49. The mean for teaching time during treatment was 49.05% with a range from 39.1% during session eight to 64.6% during session five. The standard deviation for teaching time during treatment was 17.45.

Discipline time during baseline for the seventh grade ranged from 8.9% during session four to 47.1% during session one with a mean of 33.23% and a standard deviation of 17.46. During treatment, discipline time ranged from 17.4% in session five to 55.7% in session eight. The mean for discipline time during treatment was 39.65%, and the standard deviation was 24.95.

For the seventh grade, interruption time appeared in only two sessions, and both of them appeared only during baseline. Interruption time was 28.3% of total class time during session one and 11.8% of total class time during
session three. The mean for interruption time was 10.03% during baseline with a standard deviation of 13.39.

**Eighth Grade.** Playing time for the eighth grade during baseline was 11.2% of total class playing time for session one and 16.7% for session two. The mean for playing time during baseline was 13.95% with a standard deviation of 3.89. Playing time during treatment ranged from 11.8% during session five to 25.3% during session four. The mean for playing time during treatment was 21.70% with a standard deviation of 11.60.

Teaching time during baseline was 69.7% of total class time during session one and 81.0% during session two. The mean for teaching time during baseline was 75.35% of the total class time with a standard deviation of 7.99. During treatment, teaching time ranged from 53.6% of total class time during session five to 80.3% during session seven. The mean for teaching time during treatment was 68.68% with a standard deviation of 22.19.

Discipline time during baseline for the eighth grade was 8.6% of total class time during session one and 1.0% during session two. The mean for discipline time during baseline was 4.80 with a standard deviation of 5.37. During treatment, discipline time ranged from 0.0% of total class time during session seven to 34.6% during session five. The mean for discipline time during treatment was 9.62% with a standard deviation of 29.85.

Interruption time for the eighth grade appeared only during baseline. Interruption time totaled 10.4% in session
one and 1.3% in session two. The mean for interruptions during baseline was 5.35% with a standard deviation of 6.43.

**Teacher Comments: Encouragements and Criticisms**

**Sixth Grade.** During baseline for the sixth grade, there were eight total encouragements. (see Table 4) Session five had five of these encouragements with session two having two encouragements and session six having one encouragement. Sessions one, three, and five had zero encouragements. The mean for encouragements was 1.33 with a standard deviation of 1.97.

The total number of criticisms during baseline was 16. Session three had eight criticisms, session two had four criticisms, session six had two criticisms, sessions four and five had one criticism each, and session one had zero criticisms. The mean for criticisms for baseline was 2.67 with a standard deviation of 2.94.

There were no encouragements during treatment. The total number of criticisms for treatment was nine. Session seven had eight criticisms and session eight had one criticism. The mean for criticisms was 4.5 with a standard deviation of 4.95.

**Seventh Grade.** During baseline for the seventh grade, the number of encouragements totaled five. There were two encouragements in sessions one and four, one encouragement in session three, and zero encouragements in session two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Teacher comments: Encouragements (+) and Criticisms (-)
The mean for encouragements in baseline was 1.25 with a standard deviation of 0.96.

There was a total of nine criticisms during baseline. There were six criticisms in session three and three criticisms in session four. Each of sessions one and two had zero encouragements. The mean of criticisms during baseline was 2.25 with a standard deviation of 2.87.

There were no encouragements during treatment. During treatment, there were 26 criticisms. Sessions five and six had seven criticisms each, session seven had 12 criticisms, and session eight had zero criticisms. The mean of criticisms during treatment was 6.50 with a standard deviation of 6.70.

**Eighth Grade.** During baseline, there was a total of four encouragements with sessions one and two having two encouragements each. The mean for encouragements during baseline was 2.00 with a standard deviation of 0.0.

Baseline had a total of five criticisms with zero criticisms in session one and five criticisms in session two. The mean for criticisms was 2.50 with a standard deviation of 3.54.

During treatment, there was a total of 10 encouragements which ranged from four encouragements in session six to zero encouragements in each of sessions four and seven. The mean of encouragements was 1.67 with a standard deviation of 3.45.

The number of criticisms during treatment totaled 15 with a range from zero criticisms in session seven to six
criticisms in session three. The mean of criticisms during treatment was 2.50 with a standard deviations of 4.83.

**Student Enjoyment and Self Assessment**

At the end of each session, the students completed a survey which indicated their enjoyment of the class (see Table 5) and an assessment of how well they thought that they had played their instruments (see Table 6). They marked their answers on a five point Likert scale. A score of 5.0 indicated high enjoyment of the class and a high feeling that they had played well. A score of 1.0 indicated that they had not enjoyed the class and a feeling that they had not played well. A score of 3.0 indicated that the students were undecided as to whether or not they enjoyed the class or played well. The student responses were scored and averaged for each class. The results follow.

**Enjoyment, Sixth Grade.** Timing problems developed during the third and fourth sessions of the sixth grade as survey forms were not distributed before the end of class. One form was turned in for session three, and no forms were turned in for session four. Results are presented as submitted from the students.

Student enjoyment was generally on the positive side during baseline as four of the five sessions reported a student enjoyment average above 3.0. The mean of student enjoyment during baseline was 3.08 with a standard deviation of 1.23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>6th Grade</th>
<th>7th Grade</th>
<th>8th Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Student enjoyment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>6th Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th>7th Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th>8th Grade</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>22.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Student self assessment
During treatment, student enjoyment averaged 3.55 for session seven and 3.95 for session eight. The mean of student enjoyment during treatment was 3.75 with a standard deviation of 0.28.

**Enjoyment, Seventh Grade.** Student enjoyment during baseline for the seventh grade averaged 3.12 for session one, 4.00 for session two, 2.63 for session three, and 3.0 for session four. The mean for student enjoyment for baseline was 3.19 with a standard deviation of 0.58.

The student enjoyment for treatment showed a decrease from the student enjoyment for baseline. The average enjoyment of the classes by students during treatment ranged from 1.47 to 2.20 with a mean of 1.96 and a standard deviation of 0.59.

**Enjoyment, Eighth Grade.** Student enjoyment for the eighth grade was generally higher during treatment than during baseline. The average enjoyment level was 2.55 during session one and 3.33 during session two. The mean for enjoyment during baseline was 2.94 with a standard deviation of 0.55.

The average enjoyment level of the eighth grade during treatment ranged from 2.10 in session three to 4.33 in session six. The mean for enjoyment during treatment was 3.45 with a standard deviation of 1.72.

**Self Assessment, Sixth Grade.** In general, the sixth graders felt that they played well. The average self assessment level for baseline ranged from 3.71 during session five to 5.00 during session three. The mean for
self assessment during baseline was 4.06 with a standard deviation of 0.57.

During treatment, the self assessment levels were 4.05 for session seven and 4.00 for session eight. The mean for self assessment during treatment was 4.03 with a standard deviation of 0.04. This indicates that the sixth grade did not feel that they played any better during the treatment than during the baseline.

**Self Assessment, Seventh Grade.** The average self assessment level for baseline ranged from 2.68 during session three to 3.82 during session two. The mean for self assessment during baseline was 3.40 with a standard deviation of 0.52.

The average self assessment level for treatment ranged from 2.27 during session six to 3.67 during session seven. The mean for self assessment during treatment was 3.00 with a standard deviation of 1.01. This indicates only a slight decrease in the self assessment of how well the seventh graders felt they played during treatment as compared to baseline.

**Self Assessment, Eighth Grade.** The average self assessment level for baseline was 3.36 for session one and 4.33 for session two. The mean for baseline was 3.84 with a standard deviation of 0.69.

The average self assessment level for treatment ranged from 3.00 in session four to 4.78 in session six. The mean for treatment was 3.80 with a standard deviation of 1.49. With the mean of baseline and treatment being so close
together, it appears that the students felt that they played just as well during treatment as they did during baseline.

Correlation of student surveys to playing time, teaching time, discipline time, and percent of group on task.

Table 7 was drawn up to determine whether or not any correlations exist between how much the students enjoyed class and how well they played when compared to class playing time, teaching time, discipline time, and time on task. When reviewing correlations, it is important to remember that correlations are not cause-and-effect. They just show relationships.

When all grades and all sessions are considered together, there appears to be a rather strong correlation between the percent of students who are on task/playing instruments and their enjoyment of the class and assessment of how well they felt that they played. The percent on task to enjoyment for all grades and all sessions had a correlation factor of 0.412. The correlation of percent on task to the overall assessment of how well they played was a factor of 0.536.

The strongest correlation of percent on task to student enjoyment and self assessment appeared in the seventh grade. With a factor of 0.814, there was a very strong correlation between the percent of students playing instruments and their feelings that they played very well. In other words, as more seventh graders were on task and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Playing Time</th>
<th>Teaching Time</th>
<th>Discipline Time</th>
<th>Percent On Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Grades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>-.500</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>-.746</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>-.570</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>-.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>-.453</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Correlation of student surveys from all sessions to playing time, teaching time, discipline time, and percent of group on task.
playing their instruments, they felt that they were playing better and indicated an increased enjoyment of class. The eighth grade had similar correlations in these same areas with a factor of 0.847 between percent on task and their self assessment. A strong correlation is also seen between the percent of students playing instruments and their enjoyment of the class.

The eighth grade showed strong correlations between their enjoyment of class and the four measured areas of playing time (r = .330), teaching time (r = .515), discipline time (r = -.453), and percent on task (r = .482). These eighth graders indicated that they enjoyed class somewhat more as playing time increased and much more as teaching time increased. Their enjoyment of the class decreased when the discipline time increased. Their enjoyment of the class was higher as the percentage of students playing instruments increased.

The eighth graders' assessment of how well they played increased by only a small amount (r = .077) as their playing time increased. Their assessment of how well they played decreased by a small amount as discipline time increased.

An interesting set of figures appeared in the enjoyment and self assessment areas of the seventh grade. There is a moderate negative correlation (r = -.361) that indicates that as playing time increased, their assessment of how well they played decreased.

Sixth graders' enjoyment of class rose by a substantial amount as the playing time increased (r = .656).
An interesting note is that as teaching time increased, they appeared to enjoy class more ($r = .690$) but felt that they did not play as well ($r = -.596$).

For the sixth graders, there was a high correlation that indicated that as discipline time increased, their enjoyment level decreased ($r = -.746$). But then, these same sixth graders indicated that they felt that they played better as discipline time increased ($r = .596$). The percent of sixth graders playing showed little correlation to their enjoyment of class. However, these same sixth graders felt that they did not play as well as the percent of students playing increased.

**Results Summary**

During baseline, the sixth graders had the lowest percent of students on task, and the eighth graders had the highest percent of students on task. During treatment, all three grade levels experienced a decrease in percent of students on task. The eighth graders had the highest percent of students on task during treatment while the seventh graders had the lowest percent of students on task during treatment. However, the eighth grade had the largest drop in percentage of students on task when comparing treatment back to baseline.

The sixth grade had the lowest percent of class time playing whereas the eighth grade had the highest percent of class time playing. These percentages were the same for both baseline and treatment.
Interestingly, while the eighth grade had the highest percent of class time playing, they also spent the highest percentages of class time in teaching when compared to the seventh and eighth grades.

The sixth grade spent the larger percentage of time on discipline when compared to the seventh grade. The eighth grade spent by far the lowest amount of time on discipline when compared to both the sixth and the seventh grades.

The total number of teacher comments for each grade level showed very similar numbers. The sixth grade had a total of 33 comments, the seventh grade had a total of 30 comments, and the eighth grade had a total of 34 comments. However, there were some differences in where these comments were placed. For example, the treatment sessions for both the sixth grade and the seventh grades showed no encouragements at all. The treatment sessions for the eighth grades showed encouragements given in all but the fourth and seventh sessions. Both the sixth and the seventh grades showed both encouragements and criticisms in the baseline sessions and only criticisms in the treatment sessions.

A review of the student enjoyment and self assessment numbers indicated that overall the students assessment of how well they think that they played was higher than their enjoyment of the class.

Interpreting the correlations of student enjoyment and self-assessment was difficult. One would think that as playing time increased, student enjoyment and self
assessment would increase also. However, half of the correlations showed that a decrease in playing time had a positive effect on the student enjoyment and self-assessment.

One of the strongest correlations indicated that, for all class sessions, as discipline time increased, the enjoyment level decreased. Another strong correlation indicator was that as the percent on task increased (i.e. more students playing instruments), more students felt that they played better.
Chapter 4
Discussion

Introduction

This chapter contains a discussion of the results of the research study regarding the effects of differentiated music on the attending behavior of an inclusive urban middle school band class. These results will be discussed as they pertain to the research questions that were presented in Chapter 1. Following the discussions specific to the research questions will be the summary and suggestions for future studies.

Research Question Results

1. Attending Behavior. What effect will the selection of music instruction materials have on the percentage of students on task during treatment (using differentiated music) compared with baseline (using standard method material) for each class session and each grade level?

An initial look at the mean scores on Table 2 suggest that the differentiated music had a negative effect on the on-task level of each of the band classes. In the sixth grade, the mean score for the treatment sessions showed a 12 percent reduction in the percentage of students who were playing their instruments when compared to the baseline.
sessions. The seventh grade showed a 24 percent reduction in the percentage of students who were playing their instruments, and the eighth grade showed a 29 percent reduction in the percentage of students who were playing their instruments when compared to the baseline sessions.

A look at the percent on-task for each session of each grade showed a great variability in on-task behavior during both baseline and treatment. The fact that there appears to be no discernible pattern to the scores for percent on-task plus the fact that none of the scores were very close to the mean suggests the likelihood of other variables impacting the percent of students on-task.

The scores for percent on-task for the treatment sessions of the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades and for the baseline sessions of the seventh and eighth grades show similar patterns.

It is interesting to note that the percent of students on-task decreases during the first two sessions of the treatment for each of the grade levels. It is also interesting to note that the highest percent on-task score for each group came in one of the baseline sessions. A possible explanation of this could be that the students might have been more comfortable with their traditional method book during the baseline sessions and needed some time to get used to the use of the differentiated music that was used in the treatment sessions. Further research could determine if this was the case.
2. Class Time. What effect will the selection of music instruction materials have on the percentage of class time spent on teaching, playing instruments, discipline, and interruptions for each class session and each grade level?

It is difficult to conclude whether or not the differentiated music affected the playing time in the treatment sessions for all grade levels. Could class discipline have had more of an effect on amount of playing time than did the music? The mean percent of class playing time in the treatment sessions went down in the sixth and seventh grades and up in the eighth grade. The mean percent of class teaching time in the treatment sessions went down for sixth grade, up for seventh grade, and down for eighth grade. The mean percent of discipline time went up in the treatment sessions for all three grade levels. Interestingly, the sixth and seventh grades had larger discipline times in treatment, and saw their playing times decrease when going from baseline to treatment. The eighth grade had relatively small discipline times and showed an increase in playing time.

The playing (performance) times reported in this study ranged from a low of 5.70% for sixth grade treatment to 21.70% for eighth grade treatment. Other studies reported higher performance (playing) times than those reported in this study. Witt (1986) reported the mean performance time for students at all levels from elementary to college to be 43.3%. Moore (1981) reported the mean performance time for elementary students to be 41%. Madsen and Geringer (1983)
reported a mean performance time for university students of 63.6%.

It appears that the amount of class time spent on
discipline did have a greater effect on the amount of
playing and teaching time than the type of music used. The
eighth grade class sessions averaged the least amount of
discipline time and had the highest amount of playing and
teaching times. The sixth and seventh grade class sessions
spent a relatively large amount of time on discipline with
much lower playing and teaching times than what was found
in the eighth grade. A follow up question might ask why was
the discipline time so much higher in the sixth and seventh
grade classes than in the eighth grade class.

Interruptions were experienced in 58% of the baseline
sessions. However, none of the groups had any interruptions
in any of their treatment sessions. Since interruptions
came from any number of sources, it was impossible to
speculate the reason for this reduction in interruptions.

Regarding discipline, a look at school disciplinary
statistics as they related to the band classes proved to be
interesting. The school district in which this study took
place used two methods of suspension for serious
disciplinary offenses. First time and non-threatening
offenses usually received an in-school suspension which
kept the offending students in school but separate from the
rest of the students and tightly monitored. Repeat and
threatening offenses usually received an out-of-school
suspension.
The daily absence report for the school indicated the students who had received an in-school and an out-of-school suspension. The school absence records for 70.5% of the days in the first semester were available for inspection (this study took place in the first semester). These absence reports were reviewed to track the in-school and out-of-school suspensions for the band students. Due to secretarial absences in the school office, the school absence report was not published every day. These records showed that at least 16 (42.1%) of the band members in the sixth grade were suspended, either in-school or out-of-school, for at least one day. For the seventh grade band class, at least 12 (38.7%) of the band members were suspended for at least one day; and in the eighth grade, at least 8 (28.6%) of the band members were suspended at least one day.

The sixth grade band class, which had the highest percentage of students who had been suspended for at least one day, spent the highest percentage of class time on discipline in both baseline and treatment. Conversely, the eighth grade band class, which had the lowest percentage of students who had been suspended for at least one day, spent the lowest percentage of class time on discipline in both baseline and treatment.

3. Teacher Comments. Will there be a similar pattern of teacher encouragements and criticisms during baseline and treatment?
Encouragements and criticisms were the comments that students received from their teachers regarding the efforts of the students in class. In this study, comments by the teacher/researcher were counted as encouragements or criticisms if they provided feedback to the student about something the student said or did.

Teacher comments could have been heard during any of the four categories of class time used in this study - playing, teaching, discipline, and interruptions. However, teacher comments were detected only in the teaching and discipline categories of class time. Of the 27 encouragements that were counted, all took place during teaching time. Encouragements were a reaction of the teacher to positive musical and social behaviors. Of the 80 criticisms counted, 31 took place in discipline time and 49 took place in teaching time. Criticisms were a reaction of the teacher to negative social behaviors.

There were 107 total comments in this study throughout the 24 sessions. This low rate of teacher interaction averaged 4.46 comments per session (0.30 comments per minute). Of the 107 comments, 27 were encouragements which averaged 1.13 per session (0.075 per minute). The 80 comments that were criticisms averaged 3.34 per session (0.22 per minute).

A question that arises here is why there were so many more criticisms and so few encouragements? Although this question is impossible to answer as this was not a controlled part of the study, there appears to be a slight
connection to the discipline issues previously discussed. For example, in looking at the sixth grade baseline sessions, the third session had the highest number of criticisms (8) and the highest amount of class time spent on discipline (87%). A similar connection appears to exist between number of criticisms and amount of class time spent on discipline in all sixth grade baseline sessions except the first session. However, the treatment sessions show an opposite relationship. The seventh session had eight criticisms and spent 23% of the class time on discipline whereas the eighth session had only 1 criticism but spent 67% of the class time on discipline. This apparent discrepancy found in the treatment sessions could be explained by the fact that comments and requests that were made to correct negative behaviors took up measurable time and were counted as a part of discipline as found in the eighth session. The eighth session class that experienced an extended discipline time had many negative behaviors that needed to be addressed by comments and requests from the teacher that took up measurable time. The seventh class session that had more criticisms but a much smaller amount of class discipline saw that most minor negative behaviors were taken care of with short comments from the teacher, such as, “You are talking.” Comments such as this took virtually no measurable time which meant that they would not qualify as discipline time. So, whereas there are some connections of criticisms to discipline times, such relationships do not exist in all cases.
Data from the present study showed that there was an average of 1.13 encouragements per 15 minute session which can be compared to previously cited studies of Goolsby (1997), Murray (1975), and Madsen and Madsen (1981).

4. Student Enjoyment and Self Assessment. What is the level of student enjoyment for each class? Also, what is each student’s assessment of how well they played for each class? What are the class averages for each area of evaluation for each class session and each grade level for baseline and treatment?

At the end of each class session, the students completed a survey that indicated whether or not they enjoyed the class that day and also whether or not they felt that they played well that day. The use of a five point Likert scale allowed the students to give this feedback in degrees rather than just a ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ One end of the scale had ‘Strongly Agree’ and ‘Agree’ with the other end of the scale having ‘Strongly Disagree’ and ‘Disagree.’ In the middle was ‘Undecided.’ With five points going to ‘Strongly Agree’ responses and one point going to ‘Strongly Disagree’ responses, three points were given to ‘Undecided’ responses.

It appears that both the sixth and eighth grades enjoyed class more in treatment than in baseline but they each felt that they played about the same. The sixth grade, which had positive enjoyment scores in both baseline and treatment showed a small increase in its enjoyment score going from a mean score of 3.08 in baseline to a mean score
of 3.75 in treatment. The eighth grade had a smaller
increase than the sixth grade. Also, the eighth grade
started out with a negative enjoyment mean score of 2.94 in
baseline. The increase in enjoyment for the eighth grade
was less than moderate in rising to a mean score of 3.45.
The mean scores for self assessment for baseline and
treatment were about the same for the sixth grade (4.06 -
4.03) and the eighth grade (3.84 - 3.80).

The seventh grade enjoyed class more during baseline
by a fairly large amount and felt that they played better
in baseline by only a slightly moderate amount. The mean
score for the seventh grade enjoyment went from a positive
score of 3.19 to a negative score of 1.96, and their mean
score for self assessment went from a positive score of
3.40 to an undecided score of 3.00.

Summary and Suggestions for Future Studies

At the inception of this project, the focus was on
those exceptional students who had been formally diagnosed
as DH (Developmentally Handicapped), SLD (Specific Learning
Disability), and SED (Severe Emotional Disability) and
whether or not methods used in the education of these
students could be used to increase the on-task levels of an
entire class of instrumental musicians. However, when the
research data showed that a substantial amount of time was
spent on classroom discipline, I went back and looked at
this project from a different viewpoint.
At first glance, it appeared that the use of differentiated music did not have the effect on the band classes that I had anticipated. What was the reason for this apparent failure of the music? One hypothesis that I investigated was the possible existence of an undiagnosed group of students with learning disabilities. Even though this might have been a possibility, there are no data to support this hypothesis, so I considered the likelihood that the discipline problems came from the non-exceptional students.

Of the 16 sixth grade band students who had been suspended, only three (19%) had been formally diagnosed and placed in one of the special education programs. Of the 12 seventh grade band students who had been suspended, only 5 (42%) had been formally diagnosed and placed in one of the special education programs. The eighth grade band class had 8 students suspended of which only one (13%) had been formally diagnosed and placed in one of the special education programs.

Students suspended accounted for 36 (43%) of the 84 total number of students in the band. Of those 36, only nine were in any of the special education programs. If the assumption is made that most of the discipline problems in the band classes were caused by these 36 students who had been suspended at least once, then it must be said that the regular students were the ones who were causing most of the discipline problems. The exceptional students were only a small part of the problem.
Music teachers who have brought mainstreaming and inclusion into their classrooms have indicated concerns about the attending needs of these exceptional students and whether the music teachers have the necessary training and supplies to work with them. The results from this study indicate that these concerns are not a problem to the degree that had been anticipated.

In summary, the use of the differentiated music did not show an increase in the number of students on-task. Rather the discipline of the students became the prominent issue that likely prevented the differentiated music from working as planned. Several theories can be advanced about the discipline problems and reasons for their increase in treatment.

Switching to the differentiated music meant that the students found themselves in a less structured environment. When playing the baseline method book material, there were no choices to make about which part to play, so the students concentrated on and played what was in front of them. With the differentiated music, the students were free to choose from one of three musical parts. This decrease in structure could have decreased their concentration and focus and easily resulted in an increase in negative behaviors.

With the baseline method book material, all students played the same part which meant that they all got to play the melody when playing songs. With the differentiated music, only those playing the middle part were playing the
melody. When they were encouraged to play either the easier or the more advanced parts, the students gave up the opportunity to play the melody.

Both the sixth grade and the seventh grade classes recorded no encouragements during treatment sessions when the differentiated music was being used. This meant that at a time when they most likely needed some encouragement, they were not getting it. If these students were having problems in playing the differentiated music and receiving no encouragement, they could have become frustrated resulting in an increase in negative behaviors.

In a middle school setting, sixth graders typically have more behavior problems than eighth graders as illustrated by the suspension records cited earlier. This is coupled with the fact that with normal attrition, many of the students with behavior problems drop out of band by the eighth grade. Thus it might be expected to spend less time on discipline in eighth grade than in sixth grade as was experienced in this study. One more factor is that this sixth grade class was well-known for being difficult to handle, as acknowledged by the school principal and classroom teachers.

For future study of differentiated music, I would recommend that the independent and dependent variables be controlled so that the music can be evaluated more on its own merit with minimal effect from discipline issues. One way to do this would be to establish guidelines and controls for the use of encouragements and criticisms.
Another would be to have only two parts to choose from with the differentiated music.

Another recommendation has to do with the fact that the research for this study was conducted in the first semester of the school year towards the end of the first grading period and into the second grading period. In retrospect, it is possible that there were some extraneous factors in this area that could have had an impact on the research data.

One factor could be the fact that student rosters for the Unified Arts classes (music, art, and physical education) were not set until several weeks had passed into the school year. Another is that the majority of students who participated in the band needed to use a school-owned instrument as they were unable to rent or buy their own instrument. I am usually reluctant to begin passing out school instruments to those in need until I feel that I have identified all of the needy students. This year, by the time the band classes began settling into their own routines, the research sessions had begun. It is possible that the results would have been different had this research study been done at another time of the school year when the students and teacher were more comfortable with each other.

Even though this research study did not produce the results that I was looking for, differentiated band music might be effective in a different environment or with a different student population. Future research in this area
should be done in a setting that is able to maintain student attention and relatively good discipline. If the classroom discipline problem area can be reduced or eliminated, the use of differentiated music could possibly show improved results.
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APPENDIX A

Information Letter to Parents
October 18, 1999

(school) Band Parents and Guardians:

During the next two months, I will be introducing new music into each band class (6th, 7th, and 8th grades) that will give the students more freedom of choice as to what they play. It is my opinion that each student has a pretty good idea of what they can and cannot do and will choose music that is better suited to their own level of success when given the option to do so.

The music will have three parts for the students to choose from with all three parts being on the same page. This will allow each student the freedom of whether or not to let others know which part they will be playing. The difference in each part will be in the degree of difficulty from easy and basic to advanced and challenging.

With each band class containing students at all levels of development from beginning to advanced, it is very difficult finding music that allows and encourages all students to play at the same time. With the 'differentiated' music that I will be writing for the band classes, I am hopeful that more students will participate for longer periods of time with increased enjoyment.

During the next two months, I will be videotaping all three band classes eight times in order to determine the level of class participation. The reason I'm videotaping is so I can go back after the rehearsal and check on how well the group is participating. I want to see if more students are participating when we use the special arrangements (where students choose their own parts) than when we play from our usual band method book. I will be focusing on the band as a whole, not on any individual student. There will also be an anonymous form for the students to complete and turn in after each videotaped class to indicate their degree of enjoyment for that class.

Please feel free to call or stop by the school and see me if you have any questions regarding this research study.

Sincerely,

David Perry, Director
(school) Middle School Bands
APPENDIX B

Suetta Book One - Lesson Sequence
LESSON SEQUENCE

Lesson 2- #1
Lesson 1- #2, 1
Lesson 2- #2, 3, 4, 5
Lesson 3- #1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9 (Hot Cross Buns)
Lesson 4- #1, 2, 3, 4 (French Song), 8 (Merrily We Roll A long), 9 (Oats Peas Beans)
Lesson 5- #5 (Lightly Row), 6, 7, 8
Lesson 6- #3, 4, 5 (Go Tell Aunt Rhodie), 8 (Twinkle, Twinkle)
Lesson 7- #1, 2, 5 (Looby Loo), 6 (German Waltz), 7, 8
Lesson 8- #1, 2, 3 (Yankee Doodle), 4 (College Song), 5 (Blow The Man Down), 6 (Lovely Evening)
Lesson 9- 5, 6 (Music In The Air)
Lesson 10- #2 (German Waltz), 3 (The Barcarolle), 5 (Lightly Row), 6 (Old English Air), 7 (Austrian Waltz)
APPENDIX C

Differentiated Music
Hot Cross Buns
French Song

Conductor

Discant

Melody

Harmony

Drums
French Song

Clarinet

Discant

Melody

Harmony
Merrily We Roll Along

Conductor

Discant

Melody

Harmony

Drums

89
Merrily We Roll Along

Clarinet

Discant

Melody

Harmony
Go Tell Aunt Rhodie

Clarinet
B-Flat Scale (Concert)

Clarinet

Discant

6

12

Melody

6

12

Harmony

6

12

95
APPENDIX D

Student Evaluation
STUDENT EVALUATION

Today’s Date________________

I enjoyed the class today (circle one):

strongly agree  agree  undecided  disagree  strongly disagree

I played well today (circle one):

strongly agree  agree  undecided  disagree  strongly disagree