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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A major trend in teacher education is an emphasis on clinical and field experience prior to student teaching. Students are required to participate in activities involving direct contact with children as early as the freshman year. In music teacher education courses, preservice students often design and teach music lessons to their peers and/or to children in the schools. The need for offering a variety of preservice experiences in music teacher education for music education and elementary education majors alike has been articulated by a number of professionals (Grunow, 1984; Kuhn, 1968; Music Educators National Conference, 1972; Nicolucci, 1982; Pratt, 1981).

Many state certification agencies have reinforced the trend through mandated requirements for clinical and field experience (Erbes, 1984; Ohio Department of Education, 1983). However, it is erroneous to assume that the mere addition of preservice experiences to the curriculum will satisfy the need for blending practical experience with educational theory for either music education majors or elementary education majors who take music education courses in order to fulfill teacher certification requirements. In times of educational and financial stress, it is particularly imperative that colleges and universities identify the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values
needed by prospective teachers and provide the most efficient and
effective experiences possible in both theory of instruction and
instructional practice (Friedman, Brinlee, & Dennis Hayes, 1980;
Leonhard, 1983).

Initial impetus was given to offering more direct experiences in
teacher education in 1948 through a report published by the Sub-
committee of the Standards and Surveys Committee of the American
Association of Teachers Colleges. This report advocated the develop-
ment of professional laboratory experiences, defined as, "all those
contacts with children, youth, and adults (through observation,
participation, and teaching) which make a direct contribution to the
understanding of individuals and their guidance in the teaching
learning process" (Flowers, Patterson, Stratemeyer, & Lindsey, p. 7).
Sharpe (1956) and Conant (1963) further stressed that course effective-
ness is increased when accompanied by campus-based and field-based
professional laboratory experiences.

A 1976 report by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher
Education emphasized that "effective teacher education incorporates
both field and campus experiences in applied and foundational learning"
and stated that "the teacher education laboratory should be a
laboratory for the study and development of teaching knowledge and
skills. This laboratory should be expanded to include instructional
procedures such as microteaching, simulation, modeling, and demonstra-
tion" (p. 93). The Commission believed that through a diverse series
of laboratory experiences, the complexities of classroom teaching could
be broken down into manageable "teaching acts in a minimally threatening environment" (p. 93). Furthermore, the Commission urged that the design of teacher education include a "continuous interlocking relationship between theory and practice" (p. 94). From 1976 to the present, the Commission's recommendations have been reiterated by several writers in teacher education (Friedman, Brinlee, & Dennis Hayes, 1980; Garland, 1982; Joyce & Weil, 1980).

The ability to maintain a balance between educational theory and practice remains a critical issue for music teacher educators. In an address at the University of Illinois, Dr. Charles Leonhard pointed out that the intellectual and operational reconciliation of theory and practice in music teacher education programs has yet to be accomplished. He stated, "Essentially we fail to provide a model in the organization and conduct of instruction for our students." He challenged music teacher educators to be "specialized experts" who, in their own teaching, "persistently analyze the process and products of music instruction," whose "every teaching act exemplifies the reconciliation of theory and practice" (1983, p. 7). Clearly, the main responsibility in the teacher education curriculum is to produce teachers who do likewise.

Contemporary social learning theory, as developed by Albert Bandura and associates at Stanford University in the 1960s, offers a research basis for the use of models, in particular, videotaped models, in teacher education. The use of videotaped teacher models became an integral part of the microteaching paradigm introduced by Allen, Bush,
McDonald, and others at Stanford in 1963. Modeling, as described by Allen and Ryan, was to be "the natural instructional counterpart of the practice dimension of microteaching" (1969, p. 31). In spite of research on the effects of modeling in teacher education during the last 20 years, the use of various models in elementary music teacher education has received minimal research attention. Therefore a primary aspect of the present study concerns the effectiveness of two types of models: live versus videotaped.

Observation of master teachers has been a component of teacher training since the early 1800s. The purpose of observation in clinical and field experiences today is "to direct attention to what an effective teacher does which has proven to be effective (according to a vast amount of research data) in producing high levels of appropriate student behavior" (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1980, p. 37). However, it is essential that observation be systematic. According to Madsen and Yarbrough,

systematic observation helps one to direct attention to specified teacher and student behaviors, define categories of appropriate and inappropriate behavior, and differentiate the distinctive features of both teacher and student behavior. This is the first step for the beginning teacher toward acting in a more effective way in the music teaching situation. (p. 38)

It is important, therefore, that students receive training in the analysis and evaluation of the act of teaching. Training in systematic observation skills has been described by a number of writers in music education (Holt, 1973/1974; Madsen & Madsen, 1981; Madsen & Yarbrough, 1980; Moore, 1974/1975, 1976a, 1976b; Nelson, 1980). Observation training ranges from following a simple lesson outline to highly
structured paradigms of documenting overt student and teacher behaviors. Alternative approaches to discrimination training can be valid and effective. Therefore, another primary focus of the study is the examination of a structured process for discrimination training in music methods for elementary education majors.

The Need for the Study

It is common practice within elementary general music methods classes, for both the music major and the elementary education major, to include experiences ranging from clinical demonstrations, lesson modeling, observation, and peer teaching, to field observation and mini-teaching. A number of these approaches have been investigated (Holt, 1973/1974; Reifsteck, 1980/1981; Sung, 1982/1983; Ten Eyck, 1983, 1984). However, much of the content and practices in elementary general methods classes frequently is based on what is believed to be effective without the necessary research verification.

Furthermore, identification of types of preservice music education experiences specifically for elementary education majors is difficult because variations in course structure exist throughout the country. State Departments of Education regularly require methods in music education for elementary teaching certification. However, in many universities, the course consists of a one-term program (semester or quarter) which includes instruction in music fundamentals and literature, in addition to instruction in music materials and methods. At The Ohio State University, the music education program for elementary
education majors consists of a three-quarter sequence during which music fundamentals, literature, and methods are presented separately. When music methods are a separate course, it is possible to concentrate primarily on materials and methodology and to design experiences which will provide a solid foundation for the self-contained classroom teacher who may have to teach his/her music without the aid of a music specialist. In spite of the difficulty in establishing general patterns of preservice experiences for the elementary education major, the need for extensive research remains.

This need is particularly evident in the use of modeling, an approach which appears to be prevalent in courses for preservice teachers. Although the syllabus for an elementary music methods class typically includes instructor demonstration (both live and videotaped), the practice is rarely questioned as a valid approach. In addition, preservice teachers are regularly taught the components of an effective music lesson plan and the characteristics of effective teaching. However, these analyses are usually made on an informal basis rather than in the context of a highly structured approach. Sometimes preservice students are also offered the opportunity to teach music lessons to their peers (simulation) or to grade school students; other times, the college students only observe the modeled lessons and assume that the effects of modeling will transfer to their actual teaching.

Furthermore, it is common to find that preservice students are often intimidated and anxious at the prospects of taking a music methods course and of teaching music. Although research evidence is
mixed, it appears that it is possible to modify students' level of confidence in their ability to teach music in the elementary schools through elementary general music methods courses (Logan, 1967; Moore, 1975/1976, 1976a; Nelson, 1980; Reifsteck, 1980/1981). In the context of a music methods course, there exists a continuing need to determine which preservice experiences most effectively aid students in developing knowledge and skills in music teaching which contribute to confidence in their music teaching ability.

Statement of the Problem

The present study represents an attempt to provide a workable balance between theory and practice in a music methods course for elementary education majors. It was designed to establish a research basis for some experiences commonly included in music methods courses.

More specifically, the purpose of the study was to determine the differential effects of modeling and discrimination training on selected music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement among elementary education majors.

The Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study was to answer the following question:

What are the differential effects of the following four treatments on music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement:

(a) live model with discrimination training and active participation,
(b) live model with active participation,
(c) videotape model with discrimination training and passive participation,
(d) videotape model with active participation?

The following subpurposes were also investigated:

1. How do the four treatment groups compare on the basis of expert and instructor evaluation and student self-evaluation?

2. What are the differential effects of the four treatments on six selected music teaching skills:
   (a) use of instructional materials,
   (b) sequencing and pacing,
   (c) teacher musicianship,
   (d) teacher explanations,
   (e) provision for pupil participation, and
   (f) personal characteristics?

3. What are the effects of the four treatments on pre-post changes in students' level of confidence in their ability to teach elementary school music?

4. What is the relationship between and contribution of the following background variables to subjects' music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement:
   (a) the number of professional education courses completed,
   (b) the number of professional education courses, currently enrolled,
   (c) the number of years of applied piano instruction,
(d) the number of years of applied vocal or instrumental instruction,
(e) the number of years of elementary general music instruction,
(f) the number of years of junior/senior high school music performance experience,
(g) the number of high school elective music courses taken,
(h) the number of years of college-level music performance experience,
(i) the number of college-level music courses taken,
(j) the number of years of community music performance experience,
(k) Music 270 (Basic Experiences in Music: Fundamentals) course grade,
(l) Music 271 (Basic Experiences in Music: Literature and Listening) course grade, and
(m) cumulative grade point average (including currently enrolled quarter)?

5. What is the relationship between and contribution of entry-level of confidence to music teaching skills and achievement?

Definitions

Music 370: Music for Elementary Teachers. A required music methods course for elementary education majors at The Ohio State University, usually taken in the junior or senior year, involving music
literature, materials, and methods for teaching music in the elementary school. Activities include participation in singing, moving, listening, performing, and creative experiences designed to enhance the preservice teachers' understanding of content and methodology appropriate to the elementary school music curriculum.

Preservice teachers. Junior or senior elementary education majors who are enrolled in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. The terms preservice teacher, preservice student, elementary education major, and subject are used interchangeably.

Discrimination training. A process of systematic observation and discussion whereby preservice students are taught to analyze and to evaluate the components of an effective music lesson. These components include characteristics of a well-planned music lesson and specified teacher competencies (with corresponding operational definitions). An Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form provides a guide for analyzing various teaching behaviors.

Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form. A modification of an evaluation form developed and validated by Sung (1982/1983), used for lesson analysis by the discrimination training treatment group. It was also used for peer teaching lessons, instructor and self-evaluations, and for evaluation by experts of students' final videotaped teaching.

Selected music teaching skills. The following six teacher competencies contained in the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form used as a basis for evaluating effective teaching:

(a) use of instructional materials,
(b) sequencing and pacing,
(c) teacher musicianship,
(d) teacher explanations,
(e) provision for pupil participation, and
(f) personal characteristics.

**Live Model.** A live demonstration of an elementary general music lesson, presented to a group of preservice teachers by the instructor in the context of a music methods class.

**Videotape model.** A videotaped version of the live-model lesson, presented to another group of preservice teachers during a music methods class.

**Active participation.** The active involvement by subjects in simulating the musical responses of a specified grade level during the modeled and peer teaching lessons.

**Passive participation.** The observation-only by subjects during modeled lessons.

**Confidence level.** The degree to which students express assurance in their ability to teach elementary school music.

**Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pretest, Posttest).** An investigator-developed form designed to assess preservice students' entry-level and exit-level confidence in their ability to teach elementary school music.

**Achievement.** The degree to which preservice students have acquired cognitive understandings of music methods and materials as measured by the **Music Achievement Test** (Midterm and Final Exam),
developed by the investigator.

Peer teaching lesson. A complete (8-14 minute) music lesson, developed by preservice students, presented to their peers.

Music 370 Background Questionnaire. An expert-validated questionnaire, based on the work of Holt (1973/1974), which ascertains the preservice teachers' professional education and musical background.

Selected background variables. An adaptation of the list of variables described by Holt (1973/1974), designed to determine the extent of musical and professional education background of Music 370 students. These variables include the following:

(a) the number of professional education courses completed,
(b) the number of professional education courses, currently enrolled,
(c) the number of years of applied piano instruction,
(d) the number of years of applied vocal or instrumental instruction,
(e) the number of years of elementary general music instruction,
(f) the number of years of junior/senior high school music performance experience,
(g) the number of high school elective music courses taken,
(h) the number of years of college-level music performance experience,
(i) the number of college-level music courses taken,
(j) the number of years of community music performance
experience,
(k) Music 270 (Basic Experiences in Music: Fundamentals) course grade,
(l) Music 271 (Basic Experiences in Music: Literature and Listening) course grade, and
(m) cumulative grade point average (including currently enrolled quarter).

Assumptions

It is assumed that students enrolled in the two experimental sections of Music 370 were reasonably representative of elementary education majors in their background experiences both musically and professionally.

It is assumed that students answered both the Music 370 Background Questionnaire and the Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pretest, Posttest) honestly.

It is assumed that a panel of experienced music teacher educators can effectively evaluate preservice music teaching skills by viewing a videotaped sample of the teacher's performance.

Limitations

A music methods course can be structured in numerous ways. The study was limited, however, to the investigation of the main variables of modeling and discrimination training as they affected students' music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement within a
demonstration-peer teaching approach.

Only those music teaching competencies which can reasonably be expected from elementary school classroom teachers were considered. College curricular expectations for music majors were excluded.

Furthermore, the study examined the effects of modeling and discrimination training on selected music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement. Therefore, no attempt was made to determine the extent to which those skills transfer to actual teaching in the schools.

The subjects for the study were elementary education majors who were enrolled in the 12:00 and 1:00 sections of Music 370 for the Winter Quarter at The Ohio State University. Random assignment to treatment groups and peer teaching sequences was feasible within sections; however, registration determined the population of the two sections.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The survey of related research is divided into the following areas: theoretical background of modeling and discrimination training, modeling and discrimination training in teacher education, music teaching competencies for preservice teachers, attitudes of preservice teachers toward music teaching, and modeling and discrimination training in music teacher education.

Theoretical Background of Modeling and Discrimination Training

The use of modeling and discrimination training in teacher education is based primarily on the theory of social learning developed by Albert Bandura and associates at Stanford University during the 1960s and 1970s. Social learning theorists hold that complex behavior can be acquired almost entirely through imitation. Furthermore, modeling may be the only means by which some behaviors can be produced (Bandura, 1965a, 1965b, 1969, 1971, 1974, 1977; Bandura & Walters, 1963).

Research indicates that modeling influences can produce three different types of effects, depending on the different processes involved:
First, an observer may acquire new response patterns that did not previously exist in his behavioral repertoire. . . . Second, observation of modeled actions and their consequences to the performer may strengthen or weaken inhibitory responses on observers. . . . Third, the behavior of others often serves merely as discriminative stimuli for the observer in facilitating the occurrence of previously learned responses in the same general class. (1969, p. 120).

In his writings, Bandura distinguishes between acquisition and performance of a matching behavior (1965a, 1965b, 1969, 1971). The acquisition phase "is concerned with the manner in which variables operating at the time of exposure to modeling stimuli determine the degree to which the modeled behavior is learned." The performance phase is concerned primarily "with factors governing persons' willingness to perform what they have learned" (1969, p. 129). In other words, acquisition of a modeled behavior is a function of stimulus contiguity-mediational theory while performance is a result of reinforcing consequences.

According to contiguity-mediational theory, when one observes a modeled sequence of responses, "the observer acquires, through contiguous association of sensory events, symbolic or representational responses possessing cue properties that are capable of eliciting, at some time after a demonstration, overt responses corresponding to those that had been modeled" (1965a, p. 328). However, observational learning is significantly hindered in the absence of essential components: attentional, retention, motor reproduction, and incentive/motivational processes (Bandura, 1969, 1971, 1974, 1977). Absence of any one of the processes can result in nonacquisition of the modeled behavior.
It is important to note that Bandura consistently emphasizes that attentional processes are a first consideration (1965a, 1965b, 1969, 1971). Nevertheless,

simply exposing persons to modeled responses does not in itself guarantee that they will attend closely to them, select from the total stimulus complex the most relevant events, and perceive accurately the cues to which their attention has been directed. An observer will fail to acquire matching behavior at the sensory registration level if he does not attend to, recognize, and differentiate the distinctive features of the model's response. Discriminative observation is therefore one of the requisite conditions for observational learning. (1971, pp. 16-17)

In 1963, Bandura, Ross, and Ross examined the effect of film-mediated aggressive models on imitative behavior in young children. They believed that aggressive models could be ordered on a continuum from reality-based (i.e., live models) to fantasy-based (i.e., cartoon characters). Film-based models were regarded as in between. They predicted that the farther away the model was from reality, the weaker the tendency for subjects to imitate the model behavior. Experimental

Group 1 was exposed to a live aggressive model; Group 2 was exposed to a filmed model of the same condition; Group 3 was exposed to a cartoon of an aggressive model, presented in a manner similar to cartoons regularly shown on television; Group 4 served as a control group. It was found that subjects who viewed the aggressive models, regardless of source, demonstrated nearly twice the amount of aggressive behavior as subjects who were not exposed to aggressive models. Based on these results, it appears that the use of filmed models can be as effective as live models in influencing some aspects of behavior.

In order to test the contiguity-mediational theory of observa-
tional learning, Bandura, Grusec, and Love (1966) designed a study to investigate the effects of symbolization and incentive set on delayed reproduction of modeling stimuli. Children were assigned to one of three groups: facilitative symbolization, passive observation, or a competing symbolization condition. While viewing a film-mediated adult model of novel patterns, Group 1 simultaneously verbalized each action of the model. Subjects in the competing symbolization group were asked to count "1 and a 2, and a 3, and a 4, and a 5" continuously while watching the film, purportedly to see if they could pay attention while viewing. Subjects in the passive observation group were instructed simply to attend to the movie. The investigators found that subjects "who generated verbal equivalents of the modeling stimuli during exposure subsequently reproduced more matching responses than the passive viewers, who, in turn, showed a higher level of acquisition than children in the competing symbolization treatment" (p. 499).

Social learning theorists have made a substantive contribution to the understanding of social behavior acquisition through the use of observational learning. This contribution may have significant implications for both teacher education and music teacher education.

Music educators consistently use teacher modeling to demonstrate correct instrumental performance or vocal production. Live and video models of music classes are an integral part of the music education curriculum. If Bandura's findings can be generalized to music teacher education, one would expect research evidence to indicate that video models are at least as effective as live models in developing matching
behaviors in music teacher education students. However, such research evidence does not exist at this time.

Furthermore, the Bandura et al. study (1966) raises some critical questions for elementary general music teacher education. When an instructor demonstrates a live example of an elementary level music lesson, college students are often asked to simulate the musical responses of the grade-school students for whom the lesson is designed. At the same time, students are expected to process the component parts of the lesson plan (i.e., objectives, materials, activities, procedure, etc.). Summarizing the Bandura et al. study, Young states,

If the observer verbalizes a model's behavior, he will perform significantly more imitative responses than the observer who passively observes the model. Observers who continuously perform a competing response while viewing a model produce fewer imitative responses than those who passively observe. (1969, p. 397)

When these comments are applied to music teacher education, it appears that those students who observe a modeled lesson (whether live or videotaped) and who verbalize the components of the teacher's behavior will more readily imitate those behaviors. That is, they will be able to teach an elementary general music lesson more readily than students who passively observe the model with no discussion. However, what is the effect of role playing and processing the components of a lesson simultaneously without discussion, on the acquisition of the modeled behavior? Does the simulation constitute a competing response or an enhancing response? To what extent does active participation only in a demonstration lesson militate against acquisition of modeled behaviors? These are issues which are addressed in the present study.
Modeling and Discrimination Training in Teacher Education

Much of the research in the development of theoretical foundations of social learning theory has been conducted with children. Allen, McDonald, Young, Orme, Berliner, and others at Stanford in the 1960s felt that the same questions regarding the efficacy of models in changing behavior would be pertinent in teacher education.

Extensive reviews of literature on the use of modeling in teacher education have been conducted by Berliner (1969), McDonald (1972), McKnight (1971), Sadker and Cooper (1972), Turney, Clift, Dunkin, and Traill (1973), and Young (1969). Most studies involved consideration of symbolic (written or verbal) models versus perceptual (film-mediated) models and variations in feedback (self-feedback, reinforcement, confirmation, and/or forms of discrimination training).

Various teaching strategies have been investigated by a number of authors: higher-order questioning (Acheson, Tucker, & Zigler, 1974; Allen, Berliner, McDonald, & Sobol, 1967; Claus, 1969); probing questions (Orme, 1970; Orme, McDonald, & Allen, 1967); and reinforcement (McDonald, Allen, & Orme, 1967; Rutherford, 1971/1972). Lange (1970) applied social learning theory to effect change in student-teacher interaction through video modeling. Koran, Snow, and McDonald (1971) considered the relationship of teacher aptitude to observational learning of analytic questioning skills. Variations of modeling and feedback treatments on different teaching strategies have produced inconsistent results (Berliner, 1969; Turney et al., 1973).

The effectiveness of three types of modeling procedures was
investigated by Allen et al. (1967). They compared symbolic versus perceptual modeling, pure lessons (positive instances) versus mixed lessons (positive and negative examples of higher order questions), and exact matching of the model lesson versus designing a lesson which matched in principle. Based on the modeling procedures, subjects were evaluated on their ability to transfer the skill of higher order questioning to a different lesson. All groups increased questioning skills significantly. However, there was no difference between the perceptual and symbolic modeling groups. Positive examples produced greater transfer. Finally, exact matching of the model behavior resulted in a greater number of higher order questions during practice sessions, but the increased number of questions did not transfer to the final lesson. The most significant aspect of the study was the presence of supervisor-controlled discrimination training during the modeling treatment. While subjects were viewing the model, the supervisor pointed out salient characteristics of the model's behavior. The authors did not report any discussion connected with the discrimination training. In the symbolic modeling treatment, a complete transcript, including supervisor's discriminating remarks, was provided for the students. This approach is consistent with Bandura's recommendation that observers differentiate the distinctive features of a model presentation as part of the acquisition phase.

McDonald et al. (1967) examined discrimination training in the context of a feedback treatment. They sought to determine the effect of self-evaluation and cued (i.e., discrimination training) reinfor-
ment on the frequency of positive reinforcement of pupils' participatory responses. Treatment consisted of mode of feedback, type of reinforcement, and amount of discrimination training among four groups: control, self-feedback, reinforcement-only, and reinforcement plus discrimination training. The reinforcement-only subjects were given positive acknowledgment by the supervisor when an appropriate response occurred in their videotaped lessons. The reinforcement plus discrimination training group not only was acknowledged for appropriate responses by the supervisor, but also was given specific discrimination training which "consisted of pointing out salient cues to which reinforcement should be attached, suggestions related to the immediacy, affect-loading and types of reinforcement the teacher could use, and finally, the effect of such behavior upon pupil participation" (p. 31). McDonald et al. determined that reinforcement plus discrimination training was significantly stronger in producing both verbal and non-verbal reinforcement of pupil participation.

In order to focus more closely on the presence or absence of cueing (i.e., discrimination training), Claus (1969) conducted a follow-up to the McDonald et al. (1967) study. She, too, utilized the findings of social learning theory and noted that observational learning involved both sensory registration and symbolic encoding processes. Claus pointed out that sensory registration of visual images could be accomplished by use of a film-mediated model while symbolic encoding (of a subject's attending responses) presumably could be enhanced by overt verbal responses provided by an external agent prior to or during the performance of a criterion behavior. (p. 9)
Claus used the McDonald et al. definition of cueing with the supervisor classifying questions following the behavior of either the model or the subject (during feedback). Claus found that cued modeling was more effective in developing teachers' questioning behaviors than absence of cueing, feedback cueing, or modeling and feedback cueing.

Modeling has been described as an acquisition variable whereas feedback is a performance variable. Therefore, Claus suggests that, if teachers do not have the questioning behavior to begin with, one would expect there to be a greater difference from modeling treatment. She offers supervisor familiarity with the model, supervisor interference with interns' perceptions during feedback, and a "cosmetic effect" as additional explanations for differences.

Different results, however, were obtained by Young (1968) in a study concerning the effect of contingent versus non-contingent focus on the lecturing skill of redundancy. Subjects viewed both the video model and a tape of their teaching, independent of a live supervisor. A supervisor-recorded audio track which directed students to focus on the salient aspects of the skill of redundancy was superimposed on the model presentation. Visual prompts were also utilized. Contingent feedback involved supervisory comments recorded over students' performance tapes. On a videotaped posttest, those students who were cued in both the modeling and feedback treatments rated significantly higher in the use of visual highlights and verbal redundancy. Young recommended a contingent focus in modeling and feedback experiences.

Orme (1970) examined other combinations of the cueing and modeling
variables in teacher training where probing questions were the dependent variable. One group of subjects (Raters) rehearsed the key discriminations by classifying and labeling the skills involved in the criterion behavior (probing) through reading a symbolic model prior to viewing the video model. Subjects were cued on the salient features of the model by the supervisor during their observation. Upon completion of the video model lesson, subjects were given a rating sheet which was explained and discussed as a means to enhance their ability to analyze the model performance. They were then asked to view the video model again and to rate the performance on probing questions. Students were given immediate feedback by the supervisor who replayed the tape and commented on the probing aspects of the lesson. This process was repeated for Model B. Subjects then planned and taught a posttest lesson of their choice.

Another group (Direct Practice) viewed Model A with discrimination training provided by the supervisor. They then planned and taught two lessons which were also viewed with the supervisor who cued and reinforced appropriate examples of probing. Suggestions were also made for improvement and for alternative approaches. Their third lesson was a posttest with no feedback.

A third group, Observers, were individuals who were linked to a member of the Direct Practice group. Each Observer participated in modeling, discrimination training, practice, and feedback vicariously. It was believed that "the absence of any kind of overt practice should be offset by the strong emphasis on cueing and prompting" (p. 4). Each
member of this group then planned and taught a posttest lesson. A fourth group acted as a control group which planned and taught three lessons in addition to the pretest.

Orme found that the Direct Practice treatment was significantly more powerful than the other alternatives. Furthermore, Observers were significantly higher in response strength of probing than the Raters. Orme proposed that the discrimination training experience may need to be shaped more systematically.

The investigators cited thus far have concentrated primarily on modeling and feedback variables in teacher education without regard for specific subject area. Where modeling has been a variable, symbolic versus perceptual models, with or without discrimination training have been employed. Only one study was found which compared videotape versus live model presentations in teacher preparation. The study was conducted by Martin and Fanslow (1980) in home economics education. Acquisition of demonstration and laboratory teaching strategies using modeling and practice variables were the focus of the study. Effectiveness of strategies was measured in terms of student achievement scores and student performance. The research design contrasted live with video modeling and practice with no practice. Martin and Fanslow obtained the following results:

Demonstration Experimental Findings:

1. There was no difference between the groups in terms of achievement.
2. A significant difference in student performance was found in
favor of the videotape modeling group. There were no differences between the practice/no-practice groups.

Laboratory Experimental Findings:

1. There were no differences between groups in achievement or performance.

The authors caution that the results must be interpreted conservatively due to sample size, instruction time, low level of effectiveness, and the degree of rehearsal. They especially emphasize that practice of a teaching strategy should not be abandoned as a result of insignificant findings. However, they do recommend at least the feasibility of using videotape models in teacher preparation.

Most studies in teacher education base their use of film-mediated models on the work of social learning theorists. Certainly greater control can be exercised over a video model as opposed to a live model. yet, results are inconclusive, and important questions remain. Turney et al. (1973) point out that "the question of the most effective model or combination of models is still fairly open" (p. 27). How long should the model lesson be? How can the discrimination training process be more tightly structured? How many times should the model be viewed to insure maximum effectiveness? Do different subject areas present different needs in terms of type of model to be utilized, skill to be learned, practice to be done, and transfer to be obtained? The present study examines some of those issues.
Elementary Music Teaching Competencies

In designing a music teacher education program, and more specifically, in structuring a methods course, it is essential that many aspects be considered. What basic competencies (i.e., knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values) should preservice teachers possess? What competencies are they expected to possess? What competencies can they reasonably acquire through the teacher education curriculum? What can be accomplished in music education courses for elementary teachers when only one or two courses (music fundamentals and/or music teaching techniques) are required?

The Music Educators National Conference has delineated a number of music skill competencies which should be developed prior to teaching in the schools. According to the MENC Report (1972), all classroom teachers should possess skills in the following areas:

Skills in Making Sounds
make and conduct music

Skills in Organizing Sounds
guide the creative experiences of children
utilize simple procedures used in composing music
utilize various kinds of notation where appropriate

Skills in Hearing Sounds
perceive aurally the basic sound-events of music
respond physically
be receptive to music
Skills in Teaching

guide students in musical experiences
utilize resources.

Picerno (1970) questioned classroom teachers to determine the extent of their responsibility for elementary music. Among teachers surveyed, 22% were involved in teaching songs; 21% were involved in other musical activities including "music appreciation, correlation of music and social studies, folk songs and dances, rhythm band, playing records, playing guitar and Tonette music, listening to and discussing jazz, studying the backgrounds of composers, and group singing" (p. 250). Picerno observed that 73% of the teachers indicated that they have at least some responsibility for music in the classroom.

Logan (1967) conducted a survey of in-service classroom teachers to ascertain the musical skills in which they felt teaching competence. More than 80% felt adequately prepared to teach songs, rhythmic responses, and listening skills. Fifty percent or better felt prepared to work with music series, rhythmic or melodic instruments, music fundamentals, and other selected classroom skills.

A survey was devised by Pendleton (1975/1976) to determine what aspects of teaching elementary school music can reasonably be expected from the classroom teacher. He named 14 categories of music skills which classroom teachers feel are within range of their teaching competence. These skills include a) teaching rote songs, rounds, and singing games; b) considering tonal, rhythmic, and aural elements of music; c) using song books to introduce musical notation; d) responding
to rhythmic patterns and creating free rhythmic response to music; e) matching pitches; f) directing dances and games; g) playing accompaniments on and teaching the use of rhythm instruments; h) using music to supplement other subject areas; and i) creating original music. He further urged college instructors to encourage positive attitudes by preservice teachers toward teaching music in the schools.

Burnsed and Price, in a recent survey, (1984) examined categories of content common to music methods courses for elementary classroom teachers. In addition, they asked classroom teachers to evaluate each category according to its importance. Two content categories emerged: music fundamentals and music teaching techniques. Teachers ranked singing, playing instruments, reading music, and developing aural skills as most significant in the fundamentals category. In the teaching techniques category, they ranked, "singing, listening to music, movement to music, forming objectives, playing instruments, and the integration of music with other subjects" (p. 5) as most important. The authors noted one unusual finding: those teachers who do teach music rated their methods courses as less valuable than those who do not teach music.

These studies indicate that the classroom teacher is often expected to assume at least partial, and sometimes total responsibility for elementary school music. Teachers seem to be willing to teach music if they have solid education in both music fundamentals and music teaching techniques. It is imperative, therefore, that teacher education programs address the problem of developing the required
competencies in preservice teachers prior to certification.

Preservice Teachers' Attitudes Toward Music Teaching

Loree (1971) has reported on a number of studies concerned with shaping teachers' attitudes. He concludes that attitudes of preservice teachers can be modified through both information input and through experiences. He specifies the conditions under which change can occur:

Change is facilitated when the source of information is respected, when the initial attitude is not firmly entrenched, when the communication reflects attitudes that are consistent to the needs of the receiver, and when the communication is acceptable to important reference groups of the receiver. (p. 110)

Loree maintains that these conditions are met in teacher education programs.

A study was undertaken in music education by Evans (1958) to determine what factors affect the attitude of elementary classroom teachers toward teaching music. In-service teachers were questioned on musical background and present teaching environment. He found a generally favorable attitude among the sample toward teaching music. Teachers expressed feelings of adequacy, confidence, willingness, and success in teaching music. Aspects of confidence level considered included singing and teaching songs, accompanying simple melodies, utilizing rhythmic activities, correlating music with other subjects, and designing listening lessons. Those teachers with greater musical experience exhibited more favorable attitudes toward music teaching. Evans stated that improved college music teaching would facilitate a more favorable attitude on the part of preservice teachers, and he
noted that music education courses are both significant and effective in preparing elementary classroom teachers. He cited negative experiences in music and lack of satisfaction and success as reasons for negative attitudes toward music teaching.

Establishing an environment where positive feelings toward a subject and toward its teaching are fostered is important. Research on the effectiveness of various methodologies in music education can investigate the effect of the variables on change in attitude toward or level of confidence in teaching the subject matter. A few studies have been conducted in music fundamentals and music teaching methods which consider change in level of confidence as a factor.

Simpkins (1980/1981) investigated the effect of videotape feedback on the confidence of prospective elementary classroom teachers in a music fundamentals course. An investigator-developed Confidence Scale measured level of confidence in skills (i.e., "I can play autoharp accompaniments to simple melodies written in \( \frac{2}{3} \) time"). A Self-Assessment Scale consisted of statements such as, "I find counting melody rhythms easy." Both measures were answered on a 10-point Likert scale. Simpkins concluded that both video feedback and participation in classroom activities are effective in promoting positive growth in skill confidence and self-assessment.

Tunks (1973/1974) constructed an Attitude Behavior Scale to measure attitudes toward the value of elementary school general music. Tunks found that the Scale was suitable for measuring attitudes toward the value of elementary general music by elementary education majors in
a music fundamentals course. He also determined that viewing videotapes of a music specialist teaching elementary general music has no significant effect on students' attitudes.

Three experimenters considered attitude change as a factor in a music methods class. Reifsteck (1980/1981) compared the effect of field and peer teaching experiences on the development of music teaching competencies of preservice elementary classroom teachers. A secondary hypothesis was that field experiences would increase subjects' positive self-perceptions regarding their ability to teach music. Subjects rated their teaching ability on an investigator-designed self-perception questionnaire. The author found that there were no significant differences between the peer teaching and field experience groups on either music teaching skills or self-perception. Both treatments improved music teaching skills and self-perception.

Nelson (1980) examined the effect of differential feedback procedures on music teaching skills and attitude of preservice teachers. The regular music questionnaire of the university with six additional questions was used to measure attitude. The questions dealt with response to the instructor, course content, exams, and grades. Results of the questionnaire indicated that students held a positive attitude toward the course and the instructor regardless of feedback condition.

Moore (1974/1975, 1976a) studied the effect of differential teaching techniques on achievement, attitudes, and teaching skills of elementary education majors. He specifically applied contingency-
managed instruction, of various forms, in elementary music classes. His posttest attitudinal survey was the Student-Instructional Rating System (SIRS) which included categories of instructor involvement, student interest, student-teacher interaction, course demands, and course organization. The contingency-managed groups maintained more positive attitudes regarding the course and instructor than the other groups.

In studies of attitude change in music fundamentals and music methods classes, a variety of approaches have been used. However, there is no conclusive evidence which identifies the most effective means for developing a positive attitude toward music teaching or for acquiring a high level of confidence in student's teaching ability, nor is there any guarantee that these affective attributes will transfer to the actual teaching situation. Measurement approaches have included highly validated instruments, university-designed rating scales, and instructor-developed questionnaires. Again, no one instrument was shown to be more effective than another.

Modeling and Discrimination Training in Music Teacher Education

The use of symbolic models for instrumental and elementary general music education majors has been documented by Rosenthal (1984) and Sung (1982/1983), respectively. Rosenthal examined the effects of a guided model, model only, guide only and practice only on the accuracy of advanced instrumentalists' musical performance. She found that subjects who heard an aural model only of the correct performance
attained significantly higher scores on subsequent performance than other treatments. She noted that

direct modeling, without any added verbiage may be more effective in helping a student perform accurately. If the teacher chooses to provide a verbal explanation, then it may be most effective if it is done in conjunction with a direct model. (p. 7)

Sung (1982/1983) investigated the effects of differentially structured lesson plans on the elementary music teaching behaviors of sophomore music education students. She compared two types of symbolic models: highly-structured and partially-structured lesson plans. Subjects using highly-structured lesson plans scored significantly higher on music teaching skills during the initial lessons, but there were no significant differences between groups on posttest teaching.

Ten Eyck (1984) carried Sung's research one step further by examining the effect of perceptual and symbolic models on music teaching behaviors of music education and music therapy majors. Results indicated that neither the perceptual model in combination with the symbolic model nor the symbolic model alone had any significant effect on the teaching behaviors of the preservice teachers. Ten Eyck speculated that lack of transfer of the model to the actual teaching may have been due to the absence of guidelines for observation of the videotape modeled lesson.

In the previously cited study by Moore (1974/1975, 1976a), contingency managed groups were divided according to contingency managed and contingency managed-lecture groups. Students receiving the latter treatment viewed videotaped models as part of the lecture-discussion process. The combination of contingency managed reinforce-
ment and teacher modeling in the lecture-discussion treatment produced a significantly higher degree of teaching skill than the contingency managed instruction alone. However, Moore does not report the nature of the discussion connected with the modeling.

Social learning theory and research in teacher education have shown that the effectiveness of modeling is contingent on some form of discrimination training. The specific nature of the discrimination training, however, varies widely among researchers. Systematic observation techniques (i.e., the counting and recording of overt behavior as demonstrated by teachers, students, and/or self) have been reported in detail (Madsen & Madsen, 1981) and have been utilized in music teacher education (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1980). The technique of systematic self-observation has been applied to music therapy (Madsen & Alley, 1979) and to music teacher education studies which follow.

The purpose of a study by Yarbrough, Wapnick, and Kelly (1979) was to compare the effect of videotape feedback approaches on conducting skills of beginning conductors. The observation form group viewed their teaching tapes and rated themselves according to the categories delineated by Madsen and Yarbrough (1980). (Training in the use of the form was not reported.) The instructor feedback group viewed their video teaching tapes with a conductor-teacher who pointed out conducting problems, made suggestions for improvement, modeled the correct technique, etc. There were no significant differences between the two experimental groups on a conducting posttest.

In another investigation, Moore (1976b) analyzed the effects of
videotaped feedback and self-evaluation on teaching skills, musicianship, and creativity of preservice elementary teachers. One group had received the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form prior to teaching and were instructed to teach for the expectancies and to use the form for self-evaluation; they were rated significantly higher on teaching skills, musicianship, and creativity in all categories except student participation, rate of "OK's," and percent of approvals than the other groups. Moore suggests research in the areas of creativity, lesson organization, and teaching pace.

Gonzo and Forsythe (1976) developed a library of videotaped choral rehearsals which could be used as models of appropriate teaching behaviors. In the initial phase of development, the tapes were used in three ways: class viewing and discussion, independent viewing, and class viewing in a longer quiz section with discussion. Later, video experimental examples were organized that covered aspects of behavior modification. In these examples, the critical incident was played, the tape was stopped while the incident was discussed, and the example was replayed. Later, students were asked to view two rehearsals as a posttest, using the observation form developed by Madsen and Madsen (1981). The students had not used the observation form prior to the posttest. In this study, the use of videotaped models had no significant effect on students' posttest evaluation skills. However, students who viewed the video models exhibited a more positive attitude toward the course than the group who only engaged in discussion of behavioral principles.
Nelson Killian (1981) examined the effect of systematic videotape observation, unguided videotape observation, and instructor verbal feedback on music teaching skills. In the study, students received discrimination training on each teaching skill described by Madsen and Madsen (1981). Systematic observation teachers viewed their teaching tapes and counted and recorded behaviors. Unguided observation teachers viewed their tapes and listed behaviors which could be continued or improved. Instructor feedback teachers were verbally reinforced on appropriate teaching behaviors by the instructor during private meetings. No significant differences between feedback groups were found on music teaching skills. Future research areas included necessity of discrimination training and evaluation of other teaching skills.

Holt (1973/1974) conducted an evaluation study of two units of instruction in a music methods class for elementary education majors. The units (observation-discussion and presentation-participation) were designed to provide an orientation to general music teaching and learning. Two of the treatment groups observed live, modeled lessons taught by an elementary general music specialist; these observations were followed by a class discussion using investigator-designed observation forms which became more complex as the course progressed. Students were given the observation forms prior to the modeled lessons, and discussion centered around the specific aspects on which students should focus. In addition, one of the two observation-discussion groups also participated in the presentation-participation unit of
instruction. Achievement was measured by students' viewing and evaluating film-mediated (motion pictures) examples of other elementary music specialists; students completed a Test of Music Teaching and Learning Awareness which was a composite of observation forms used during Lessons 3 and 4. Data indicated that music teaching and learning awareness was most enhanced by a combination of presentation-participation and observation-discussion. Holt's study was the only research in elementary music education which utilized a live model treatment with discrimination training.

Ten Eyck (1983) investigated the effects of simulation and discrimination training on music teaching behaviors of music education and music therapy majors. Discrimination training consisted of instruction in the use of an adapted Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form (Moore, 1976b) with operational definitions and practice in discrimination analysis while viewing videotaped examples of student lessons. Simulation consisted of a peer teaching lesson, evaluated with the observation form, taught prior to the field teaching experience. Results showed that observation training and observation training with simulation had a significant effect on teacher reinforcement rate, lesson organization, and percent of lesson plan directions implemented. There were no significant differences between experimental and control groups on percent of approvals, student participation, reinforcement effect, musicianship, or teacher creativity.
Summary of Related Research

Five areas of related research were examined: theoretical background of modeling and discrimination training, modeling and discrimination training in teacher education, music teaching competencies for preservice teachers, attitudes of preservice teachers toward music teaching, and modeling and discrimination training in music teacher education.

Bandura and other social learning theorists have determined that modeling is a highly effective means by which to acquire certain behaviors. The effects of modeling seem most significant during the acquisition phase of learning. However, the observer must differentiate the distinctive aspects of the modeled behavior if the first step in acquisition is to occur. Research shows that filmed models can be as effective as live models. It also appears that learners must assume an active role in verbalization of the modeled behavior.

Based on findings in social learning theory, teacher educators have investigated the use of symbolic and perceptual models in microteaching. Modeling effectiveness seems to be a function of the nature of the dependent variable where some skills are more amenable to the effects of film-mediated models while other skills are more amenable to the effects of symbolic models. In one study, live versus videotape modeling produced no significant differences in student achievement. Discrimination training has been a major focus of a number of studies, and it takes various forms. In spite of the
research in teacher education, the effects of modeling and discrimination training are inconclusive.

Basic competencies in music teaching for preservice teachers have been described by the Music Educators National Conference (1972). Other writers have designed surveys to ascertain the extent to which classroom teachers have responsibility for elementary general music, to establish a list of musical skills in which teachers feel competent, and to determine what skills can reasonably be expected from classroom teachers. Music teaching competencies seem to fall into two categories: music fundamentals and music teaching techniques. Many classroom teachers must assume at least partial responsibility for elementary music. Furthermore, teachers are willing to carry out that responsibility if they feel adequate and competent in the task. Often this competency is developed in the teacher preparation curriculum.

Preservice teachers' attitudes toward and level of confidence in music teaching can be modified through both college curricula and through positive experiences. The use of video feedback, participation in classroom activities, peer teaching and field experiences, and contingency managed instruction are approaches that affect attitudes positively. No one approach has emerged which is identified as the most effective means for increasing the confidence level of preservice teachers toward teaching music.

Finally, it appears that modeling, by itself, will not facilitate change in teacher behaviors. Discrimination training in a systematic fashion is a necessary component of the educational process.
Approaches have included systematic counting and recording of behavior, cued viewing of a videotaped model, live observation and discussion of a music lesson, and discrimination training which employed the use of an observation form with operational definitions, discussion, and practice. Holt's dissertation (1973/1974) involved observation of a live model and the use of an observation form. However, he did not investigate the effect of the approach on music teaching skills, music teaching confidence level, or achievement.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

The purpose of the study was to investigate the differential effects of modeling and discrimination training on selected music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement in music methods for elementary education majors.

This chapter includes a description of (a) Music 370: Music for Elementary Teachers, (b) the subjects, (c) the research design, (d) treatments, (e) development and validation of dependent measures, and (f) equipment.

Description of Music 370: Music for Elementary Teachers

At The Ohio State University, Music 370 is one of three courses required by the College of Education for elementary teaching certification. It is usually taken by juniors or seniors enrolled in the College of Education. Music 270: Basic Experiences in Music (Fundamentals) and Music 271: Basic Experiences in Music (Literature and Listening), are prerequisites for the course. However, Music 271 may be taken concurrently with Music 370.

Music 370 is designed for the preservice elementary classroom teacher to provide both a "basic orientation to the purposes and content of music in elementary schools" and an "opportunity to apply
teaching strategies to music in the classroom" (Division of Music Education, 1983, p. 1). Course objectives are based on the premise that the elementary classroom teacher often will be required to assume responsibility for music instruction in the schools. Offered every quarter, Music 370 meets five days a week for ten weeks and carries three quarter hours of credit. This methods course is designed to provide a laboratory, lecture/discussion setting through which preservice students:

1. Explore and evaluate music literature, teaching aids and methods of teaching music for elementary school-aged children.

2. Study, discuss, become aware of specific musical understandings (concepts) which are developed in the elementary school.

3. Discuss, modify, and adapt materials for handicapped students.

4. Develop lesson plans and present music lessons to peers.


The clinical and field experience component of the course is normally divided into three categories: (a) observation of filmed or videotaped music lessons; (b) classroom simulation/demonstration wherein preservice students actively participate in musical activities (singing, moving, listening, performing, and creating) and are instructed in planning, teaching procedures, and strategies appropriate to the elementary music curriculum; and (c) peer teaching simulation. Although the course offered at The Ohio State University's regional campuses may provide for field experiences, professional laboratory experiences at the Columbus campus are limited to clinical experiences.
The present study was conducted at the Columbus campus.

Musical materials (songs, movement activities, compositions, references, etc.) are selected from a wide variety of sources commonly used in elementary school music. Most recently, the required text has been *Musical Growth in the Elementary School* (4th ed.) (Bergeethon & Boardman, 1979). The syllabus for Music 370 is found in Appendix A.

**Description of the Subjects**

Subjects for the study were 37 elementary education majors enrolled in two sections of Music 370 at The Ohio State University during Winter Quarter 1984. Both sections (12:00 and 1:00) were taught by the investigator.

Subjects were either juniors \(N = 15\) or seniors \(N = 22\) in the College of Education. Five students had completed student teaching, but none had begun full-time teaching in the schools. All students had taken at least one education course; thirty-five had taken at least three education courses.

Although Music 270 is normally a prerequisite to Music 370, one student was taking it concurrently. Another student was taking Music 271 concurrently.

**Research Design**

The research design involved various combinations of experiences in modeling, participation, and post-lesson discrimination training. The sequence is outlined in Table 1.
Table 1

Research Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>demonstration film with preliminary discrimination training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 live-model lessons with post-lesson discrimination training, active participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>demonstration film with no discrimination training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 live-model lessons, active participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>demonstration film with preliminary discrimination training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 videotape-model lessons with post-lesson discrimination training, passive participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>demonstration film with no discrimination training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 videotape-model lessons, active participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = live model/discrimination training/active participation  
2 = live model/active participation  
3 = videotape model/discrimination training/passive participation  
4 = videotape model/active participation
Intact classes were arbitrarily assigned either to the live-modeling treatment (12:00) or to the videotape-modeling treatment (1:00). Within each section, students were randomly assigned either to the discrimination training treatment group or the modeling-only treatment group. Intact discrimination training groups were arbitrarily assigned either to active or to passive participation. In addition, the order in which students presented their peer teaching lessons was randomly assigned.

Description of Discrimination Training

Discrimination training was operationally defined as a process of systematic observation and discussion whereby preservice students were taught to analyze and to evaluate the components of an effective music lesson. This process included analysis of the characteristics of a well-planned music lesson and of effective music teaching as well as the assessment of a model lesson execution.

According to Bloom (1956), analysis "emphasizes the breakdown of the material into its constituent parts and detection of the relationships of the parts and of the way they are organized" (p. 144). Thus, after observing modeled lessons, students in certain experimental groups were taught to examine the different sections of the music lesson and discussed how the various objectives flowed into the activities and specific methodology. The main emphasis in analysis was on "how" the teacher conducted the model lesson.

Evaluation involves a judgment based on established criteria, in
this case, specified teacher competencies. Students were taught to appraise the extent to which the lessons exhibited teacher competencies characteristic of an effective music lesson. The analysis and evaluation activity using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form constituted the discrimination training procedure for the respective experimental treatment.

Description of Modeled Lessons

A total of 13 elementary-school level music lessons were developed by the investigator (Teaching a Rote Song - 4 lessons; Teaching a Movement Lesson - 4 lessons; Teaching a Listening Lesson - 4 lessons; and Music Synthesis Lesson - 1 lesson) Each modeled lesson was a complete lesson of an average of 16 minutes' duration and contained the following sections:

- **Objectives:** Statement of musical concepts to be developed
- **Statement of corresponding behavioral objectives**
- **Activities:** List of musical activities included in the lesson
- **Materials:** List of musical sources and required supplies
- **Procedures:** Exact sequence of the lesson including the method of set induction and order of presentation
- **Summary:** Activities, questions, and statements providing closure for the lesson.
Songs, movement activities, compositions, and supplementary materials were chosen from sources commonly used in elementary school music. Skills in each set of modeled lessons corresponded to the respective skills (rote song, movement, etc.) in the peer lessons which were subsequently taught by the subjects. Objectives, musical concepts, and materials appropriate to the activity and grade level were selected. A complete set of lesson plans is included in Appendix B.

General Course Orientation

During the first week of classes, emphasis was on development of understanding of the basic musical concepts and skills which are taught in elementary school music. All subjects were introduced to writing music lesson plans and to designing conceptual and behavioral objectives for music. They received information on sources of music series and reference materials. Discussion also centered around the teaching of a rote song and the use of instrumental accompaniments and music reading to enhance the understanding of musical concepts. Subjects had the opportunity to sing individually and as a group and to perform on melody and rhythm instruments. Examples were chosen primarily from their textbook, _Musical Growth in the Elementary School_ (4th ed.) (Bergethon & Boardman, 1979).

Initial Experimental Treatment

After one week, those treatment groups (1 and 3) which engaged in
discrimination training during the main treatment phase received an initial (one class period) discrimination training experience consisting of three parts: (a) class discussion of an elementary music teaching evaluation form, (b) class viewing of a filmed music lesson, and (c) post-film class discussion/analysis of the lesson using the evaluation form as a guide.

The discussion of the elements of an effective music lesson and characteristics of effective music teacher competencies are summarized on the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form. After the class discussion, students viewed the filmed music lesson, Discovering Form in Music (Wilets, 1967). This particular filmed music lesson was chosen because it represented the type of synthesis lesson which would be expected during the final peer teaching lesson. In the film, the teacher used a wide variety of music activities and materials which served as a model of a multi-activity approach. Students then analyzed and evaluated the film in small-group discussion facilitated by the instructor using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form as a guide. This training occurred in the room regularly scheduled for Music 370 at the 12:00 and 1:00 time periods.

In order to be exposed to the same example of lesson synthesis, Groups 2 and 4 viewed the filmed music lesson, Discovering Form in Music, without the instructor. They were asked to write a brief summary of the film and were involved in no other analysis or discussion apart from the written assignment. The film was shown in the viewing room of the Learning Resources Center (Lord Hall) during the
same 12:00 and 1:00 class periods as Groups 1 and 3.

Main Treatment Phase

All students had the opportunity to peer teach five times, including teaching a song by rote (twice), teaching a movement activity, teaching a listening lesson, and teaching a lesson which was a synthesis of skills developed during the quarter (posttest synthesis lesson). During the peer lessons, all subjects were active participants, either by teaching or by simulating the "child's" musical involvement and responses.

On each of two days prior to peer teaching of the rote song, movement, and listening lessons, subjects in Group 1 (n = 9) observed a live, instructor-modeled music lesson while actively role playing the appropriate grade level. They were instructed to analyze the model according to the guidelines presented during the discrimination training process as they participated in the lesson. After each lesson, they engaged in discrimination training as a group, facilitated by a trained, experienced elementary music education faculty member, using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form as a guide. Thus, these students received two live-model lesson treatments prior to each peer teaching, except for the final synthesis lesson, before which students received only one live-model lesson treatment. Subjects in Group 1, therefore, actively participated in and analyzed a total of seven live-model lessons. Overall attendance by Group 1 was at the 92% level.
Group 2 (n = 8), which was the other half of the 12:00 section, followed the same procedure of active participation as Group 1. They also simulated appropriate grade level responses with respect to musical concepts and musical activities. However, when Group 1 departed to engage in discrimination training, Group 2 remained in the room to participate in an additional live-model lesson. Thus, they experienced a total of 13 modeled lessons using the live-model only/active participation approach. At no time was their attention directed to lesson analysis or discussion. Overall attendance by Group 2 was at the 95% level.

Group 3 (n = 10) from the 1:00 class observed a videotape of the instructor-modeled lesson which had been recorded during the live lesson presentation one hour earlier. Students were instructed to view the lesson in light of discrimination training they had received. Some chose to take notes; others merely observed. However, they did not actively participate in the lesson. Following the presentation, these students were taken to another room by the discrimination training facilitator who led them through the post-lesson training identical to Group 1. Group 3 observed only five videotaped lessons due to a technical error during the first movement lesson. Overall attendance for Group 3 was 90%.

The remainder of students in the 1:00 class served as Group 4 (n = 10). They observed the videotaped model and simulated student response. Thus, they engaged in active participation during the lesson while observing the videotape. While Group 3 received post-lesson
discrimination training, Group 4 remained to participate in the additional videotaped music lesson. However, they viewed and participated in 11 lessons instead of 13 due to a technical error during the first day of movement lessons. Overall attendance for Group 4 was 83%.

Because the investigator was involved in additional model presentations for Groups 2 and 4, and in order to maintain a greater degree of objectivity in the discrimination training process, an experienced elementary music education faculty member was asked to serve as facilitator for the post-lesson analysis and discussion. The faculty member had had extensive experience in teaching Music 370 and was well-versed in procedures and approaches to the course. During each live and videotaped model lesson presentation, she functioned as a passive participant. After each presentation for Groups 1 and 3, respectively, she led the subjects to another room where the discrimination training analysis was conducted. All discrimination training episodes were audio taped and were checked by the investigator for consistency of approach across the lessons.

Finally, in order to parallel the assignment following the original synthesis lesson example (Discovering Form in Music), students in Groups 2 and 4 were asked to write a brief summary of activities after the final live or videotaped synthesis lesson. The Daily Plan for Music 370 is found in Appendix C.

**Development and Validation of Dependent Measures**

To assess the effects of the independent variables, four dependent
measures were developed: Music 370 Background Questionnaire, Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pretest, Posttest), Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form, and Music Achievement Test (Midterm and Final Exam).

Development and Validation of Music 370 Background Questionnaire

The Music 370 Background Questionnaire was adapted from a questionnaire used by Holt (1973/1974) as well as from questionnaires previously used on an informal basis by the investigator. The instrument was designed to gather information regarding preservice teachers' music background and training as well as to ascertain coursework completed in the professional education sequence (Appendix D).

An initial version of the questionnaire was developed in December 1983 and was submitted for validation to three faculty members in music education at The Ohio State University. The faculty members agreed that the form was appropriate for Music 370 students and would provide useful information.

In addition to serving as an instrument for determining the contribution of students' backgrounds to effects of treatment, entry-level confidence, and achievement, the instrument was used informally to evaluate the similarity of the two experimental classes in terms of background.
Development and Validation of Music Teaching Confidence Form
(Pretest, Posttest)

An initial version of the Music Teaching Confidence Form was developed by the investigator in December 1983 and administered as a pilot to one Autumn Quarter section of Music 370. The 19 statements on the form were derived from course objectives described in the syllabus.

Students were asked to respond to a series of statements which were prefaced with the phrase, "At the beginning of the course, I was confident that I could do the following: ". The "posttest" was written on the reverse side of the paper and used the same 19 statements. This time, however, the statements were prefaced with the phrase, "I am now confident that I can do the following: ". Students were instructed to circle the number on a five-point Likert scale which best corresponded to their feelings at the beginning and end of the quarter. The scale ranged from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1).

Students informally reported that the confidence statements reflected course objectives and were a meaningful estimate of their level of confidence in their ability to teach elementary school music. Two music education faculty members reviewed the initial version and suggested some slight revisions.

The revised Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pretest, Posttest) was prefaced with the phrase, "At this point, I am able to do the following: ", and contained the original 19 confidence statements (Appendix E).
Development and Validation of Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form

The Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form (Appendix F) was an adaptation of an evaluation form used by Sung (1982/1983). The original form was developed for use in Music 470: Introduction to Music Education, designed for sophomore-level music education majors. It is the first required music education course in the professional sequence and involves an initial teaching experience at the elementary school level.

Sung reported the process whereby the form was developed and validated in considerable detail (pp. 35-48). In validating the initial form, experts were asked to assess the "1) degree of importance to successful elementary general music teaching; 2) appropriateness of the operational definitions; 3) degree of assessibility of each teaching competency; and 4) degree to which each teaching competency is important at the sophomore level" (pp. 36, 39).

For the purposes of the present investigation, the category of "Classroom Management" was eliminated. During the presentation of peer teaching lessons, the preservice teachers attempted to simulate appropriate grade level responses only in their understanding of musical concepts and activities. Typical social behavior of elementary school students was not part of the peer teaching process.

The final adapted form with the operational definitions was submitted to three music education faculty members who agreed on its appropriateness for Music 370 students (Appendix G).
Description of Music Achievement Test, Midterm and Final Exam

A 50-item criterion-referenced Music Achievement Test (Midterm) was devised by the investigator. It consisted of 20 True-False statements, 23 Short Answer segments, and 30 Short Answer segments. Questions were derived from class lectures and handouts, peer teaching and demonstrated lessons, and the textbook, Musical Growth in the Elementary School (4th ed., Bergethon & Boardman, 1979).

A 68-item criterion-referenced comprehensive Final Exam was also devised by the investigator. It consisted of 20 True-False statements, 23 Short Answer segments, and 25 Multiple Choice listening exercises. These questions, also, were derived from class lectures and handouts, peer teaching and demonstrated lessons, and the textbook (Appendix H).

Data Gathering Procedures

During the first week of classes, all pre-service students in the two experimental sections of Music 370 Winter Quarter participated in a general orientation to teaching music in the elementary school. In addition, they responded to the Music 370 Background Questionnaire and the Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pretest) during class time. The Music Achievement Test (Midterm) was administered during the final exam week at the end of the quarter. The Pretest and Posttest forms were coded in order to assess gain-scores. Both exams were reviewed by a music education faculty member for their appropriateness for Music 370.
fifth week of classes. The Music Achievement Test (Final Exam) was administered during final exam week.

Subjects were evaluated by the investigator, using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form, for four of their five peer teaching lessons. They also used the form for self-evaluation of Lessons 1-4. The fifth lesson was videotaped and evaluated by a panel of experts (three music education faculty members from other major universities), using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form.

Student grades for Music 270, Music 271, and current grade point average were obtained from two sources: the Office of the Registrar and School of Music. The day of the final exam, students were asked to sign a form releasing their grades from the Registrar's Office (Appendix I). These forms were submitted to the Registrar's Office and a notarized copy of student grades for the respective courses was received. Those grades not available through the Registrar's Office were obtained from School of Music records. Three current grade point averages were unavailable. Also, one student was not required to take Music 271 and thus reported no grade for the course.

An outline of the data gathering design is found in Table 2.

Establishing Interjudge Reliability

Three elementary music education faculty members at three different universities were chosen to evaluate the final videotaped teaching tapes. An initial letter of request was sent to each faculty member in March 1984 (Appendix J). A follow-up phone call was made mid-March.
Table 2

Data Gathering Design

Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pretest)

Music 370 Background Questionnaire

Treatment

Peer Teaching Evaluation: Teaching a Rote Song

Peer Teaching Evaluation: Teaching a Rote Song

Treatment

Peer Teaching Evaluation: Teaching a Movement Lesson

Music Achievement Test (Midterm Exam)

Treatment

Peer Teaching Evaluation: Teaching a Listening Lesson

Treatment

Peer Teaching Evaluation: Teaching a Music Synthesis Lesson

(Postrtest)

Music Teaching Confidence Form (Postrtest)

Music Achievement Test (Final Exam)

Release of Grade Form
A total of 37 (12-14 minute) videotaped peer teaching synthesis lessons were available for analysis at the end of the quarter. These lessons were randomly dubbed onto six master, half-inch, 120 minute color video cassettes.

The first 13 lessons (35%) were selected for the reliability check among the three evaluators. There were six lessons on Tape A and 7 lessons on Tape B. Each evaluator was asked to view each lesson on Tapes A and B and to rate the peer teaching using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form according to the criteria described in the Operational Definitions of Specific Competencies. Each Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form was coded with the subject's number and grade level which corresponded to a visual label on the videotape. Directions for evaluating (Appendix K), copies of Tapes A and B, Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form, and the Operational Definitions of Specific Competencies were sent to each evaluator. The judges were told that if the reliability was high, they would have to evaluate only one additional tape of eight lessons each.

Each music teaching competency was rated on a Likert scale of one to five. A conservative estimate approach to reliability was computed in the following manner: It was decided that the agreement levels for each skill were to be weighted according to perfect agreements, agreements, disagreements, and double disagreements. A perfect agreement was reached when any two experts had identical numerical ratings. Perfect agreements counted as two agreements. When two judges were within one number of each other, an agreement was reached
(counting as one agreement). When two judges disagreed by two numbers, a disagreement was scored (counting as one disagreement). Finally, when judges disagreed by three or four numbers, two disagreements were tallied (counting as a double disagreement).

Interjudge reliability was established by dividing the number of "agreements" by the total number of "agreements plus disagreements." Therefore, the average interjudge reliability for the 13 lessons was $r = .75$. This reliability level was deemed sufficiently high to warrant no further reliability check among the three judges. Therefore, the remaining 24 lessons were divided among the judges and were independently evaluated.

**Equipment**

A complete list of recording equipment for the final peer teaching lesson and the modeled lessons is included in Appendix L.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of the study was to investigate the differential effects of modeling and discrimination training on selected music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement among elementary education majors. The data reported in this chapter include analyses of (a) ratings of total music teaching skills and six selected music teaching skills; (b) the relationship between and contribution of selected background variables to selected music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement; and (c) informal evaluations of Music 370. The data were analyzed with both parametric and nonparametric tests in order to examine the data from different perspectives in view of the small sample size.

Music Teaching Skills

All subjects (N = 37) taught five peer teaching lessons during the quarter. The fifth lesson (Posttest) was videotaped and evaluated independently by a panel of music education experts from three major universities. These data, measured by the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form, were the principle means of comparing treatment groups for differences in selected music teaching skills. Thirteen scores, resulting from the interjudge reliability check, were derived
as an average of the ratings by the three experts. The remaining 24
scores were derived from the rating of an individual judge. Additional
analyses of Lessons 1-4 were based on evaluations by the investigator
and by each student (self-evaluation). Total music teaching scores for
Lessons 1-4 were averaged in these comparisons.

Mean scores and standard deviations of the expert evaluations of
Lesson 5 and the investigator evaluations of Lessons 1-4 are displayed
in Table 3. A One-Way Analysis of Variance (Nie et al., 1975)
indicated that there were no significant differences between the four
groups on the experts' total music teaching evaluation scores (Table
4). The nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by
Ranks (Hull & Nie, 1981) also revealed no significant differences
between groups (Table 5).

Obvious disparities (see Table 3) in levels of assessment between
the experts (Lesson 5 Posttest) and the instructor (Lessons 1-4)
prompted interest in an analysis comparing these ratings. A Two-Way
Analysis of Variance (Ray, 1982) of music teaching scores is shown in
Table 6. Although there were significant differences between expert
and instructor evaluations, there were no significant differences
between treatment groups, and no significant interaction occurred.
Thus treatment differences were not evident, irrespective of evaluation
source.
Table 3

Total Music Teaching Mean Scores and Standard Deviations:

**Expert and Instructor Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.5667</td>
<td>12.9476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.3500</td>
<td>8.3142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72.4600</td>
<td>10.9602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73.4200</td>
<td>11.3538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor Evaluation (Lessons 1-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84.3888</td>
<td>7.3202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83.2875</td>
<td>9.0880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81.8100</td>
<td>8.3527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85.3100</td>
<td>7.0797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Analysis of Variance of Experts' Total Music Teaching Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>390.1022</td>
<td>130.0341</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4066.2991</td>
<td>123.2212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4456.3984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Experts' Total Music Teaching Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.679</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Music Teaching Scores: Group by Evaluator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>228.0190</td>
<td>76.0063</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.6600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3491.4714</td>
<td>3491.4714</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Evaluator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>229.3593</td>
<td>76.4531</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1454.3141</td>
<td>44.0701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average instructor evaluations of Lessons 1-4 (N = 36) were also compared with average student self-evaluations. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 7. A Two-Way Analysis of Variance (Table 8) revealed significant differences between instructor and student evaluation for composite music teaching performance. However, there were no significant differences and no significant interaction between treatment groups.

Selected Music Teaching Skills Evaluations

The following six categories of the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form were analyzed separately to assess selected music teaching competencies: use of instructional materials, sequencing and pacing, teacher musicianship, teacher explanations, provision for pupil participation, and personal characteristics. Posttest (Lesson 5)
Table 7
Average Total Music Teaching Mean Scores and Standard Deviations
by Evaluator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Instructor Evaluation</th>
<th>Student Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 84.3888</td>
<td>Mean: 78.0666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD: 7.3202</td>
<td>SD: 10.8531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83.2875</td>
<td>80.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81.8100</td>
<td>76.3900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86.6222</td>
<td>79.5666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0841</td>
<td>7.0149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Two-Way Analysis of Variance of Average Total Music Teaching Scores:

Group by Evaluator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>163.9938</td>
<td>54.6646</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>524.3401</td>
<td>524.3401</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group by Evaluator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.6785</td>
<td>16.8928</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.5754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>804.1362</td>
<td>25.1292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expert evaluator mean scores, standard deviations, mean ranks, and analyses of variance are presented for each subcategory.

Use of Instruction Materials

Use of instructional materials included the appropriate use of high quality music literature, music activities/experiences, supporting teaching materials, and students' ability to teach music within a musical context. Instructional materials mean scores and standard deviations are found in Table 9. Both the parametric and nonparametric analyses showed no significant differences between the four groups (Tables 10 and 11).
Table 9

Instructional Materials Mean Scores and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.7000</td>
<td>3.1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.2125</td>
<td>5.2903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9700</td>
<td>2.9159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6700</td>
<td>2.8937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Analysis of Variance of Instructional Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.8869</td>
<td>11.6290</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>425.5906</td>
<td>12.8967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>460.4773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Instructional Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sequencing and Pacing

Sequencing and pacing evaluation included students' ability to sequence the lesson effectively, to allocate time for different musical activities, and to keep the lesson moving effectively. Mean scores and standard deviations are shown in Table 12. Tables 13 and 14 show the subsequent two analyses of variance. There were no significant differences between the four groups on the sequencing and pacing competency.
### Table 12
**Sequencing and Pacing Mean Scores and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9667</td>
<td>2.4799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1000</td>
<td>2.0563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9900</td>
<td>2.1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6100</td>
<td>2.9838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13
**Analysis of Variance of Sequencing and Pacing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.8326</td>
<td>5.6109</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>201.9178</td>
<td>6.1187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>218.7504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Sequencing and Pacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ H_{df} = 4.294, \quad df = 3, \quad p = .231 \]

Teacher Musicianship

The teacher musicianship rating included students' ability to demonstrate an accurate understanding of the musical concept being taught and to provide an effective model for musical performance. Means and standard deviations are found in Table 15. Analyses of variance presented in Tables 16 and 17 again revealed no significant differences between the four groups.
### Table 15

**Teacher Musicianship Mean Scores and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3667</td>
<td>1.4335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2875</td>
<td>1.8742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.6000</td>
<td>1.9026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9600</td>
<td>1.4508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16

**Analysis of Variance of Teacher Musicianship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5403</td>
<td>0.8468</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>92.5527</td>
<td>2.8046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>95.0930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Teacher Musicianship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Explanations

Ratings of teacher explanations represented an assessment of the students' ability to explain academic content clearly, to ask good quality questions, and to give clear teacher directions for student responses. Table 18 shows the means and standard deviations for this category. No significant differences between groups were indicated in Tables 19 and 20, respectively.
Table 18

Teacher Explanations Mean Scores and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0444</td>
<td>2.6206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7375</td>
<td>2.6758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.2700</td>
<td>2.2988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>2.1339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

Analysis of Variance of Teacher Explanations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.7790</td>
<td>4.9263</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>193.6018</td>
<td>5.8667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>208.3809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Teacher Explanations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.210</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provision for Pupil Participation

Evaluation of provision for pupil participation determined students' ability to support and encourage the best efforts of students. Mean scores and standard deviations are given in Table 21. No significant differences were found between groups by the analyses in Tables 22 and 23, respectively.
Table 21
Provision for Pupil Participation Mean Scores and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6333</td>
<td>1.2679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2875</td>
<td>0.7586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9100</td>
<td>1.0322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9000</td>
<td>1.1005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22
Analysis of Variance of Provision for Pupil Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2412</td>
<td>0.7471</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.3777</td>
<td>1.1327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.6189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23
Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Provision for Pupil Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Characteristics**

The final subcategory, personal characteristics, included students' ability to maintain a sense of humor, to modulate the voice with inflections, to control and to vary speed of speech, to show enthusiasm while teaching, to speak clearly and understandably, and to use standard English. Table 24 displays the means and standard deviations. The analyses in Tables 25 and 26 revealed no significant differences between the four groups.
Table 24

**Personal Characteristics Mean Scores and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.8556</td>
<td>4.2556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.8125</td>
<td>2.8498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.7200</td>
<td>2.7624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.2800</td>
<td>2.7120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

**Analysis of Variance of Personal Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.4688</td>
<td>15.8229</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>336.6031</td>
<td>10.2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>384.0718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Personal Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Results of Analysis of Selected Music Teaching Skills

Both parametric and nonparametric One-Way Analyses of Variance were applied to the total music teaching skills scores and the six selected music teaching skills. The analyses revealed no significant differences between treatment groups. A Two-Way Analysis of Variance was applied to the total music teaching scores in order to determine expert (Lesson 5 Posttest) compared to instructor (Lessons 1-4) evaluations. Average evaluations of Lessons 1-4 by the instructor were significantly higher than the expert evaluation of the Posttest, but there were no significant differences between groups on either evaluation source. An
additional Two-Way Analysis of Variance was applied to the average total scores of Lessons 1-4 to compare differences between instructor and student self-evaluations. Although instructor evaluations were significantly higher, once again, there were no significant differences between treatment groups.

**Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest, Posttest, Change)**

Preservice students' confidence in their music teaching ability was measured by the **Music Teaching Confidence Form** (Pretest, Posttest). An analysis of the Pretest mean scores and standard deviations is found in Table 27. The data from the Analysis of Variance (Table 28) indicate no significant differences. It was of interest, however, to note that a Fischer test of Least Significant Differences revealed significant differences between Group 1 ($\bar{X} = 65.22$) and Group 2 ($\bar{X} = 55.75$). A Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance revealed no significant differences between groups (Table 29).

Music Teaching Confidence (Posttest) mean scores and standard deviations are presented in Table 30. Analyses of variance tests (Tables 31 and 32) revealed no significant differences between groups.
Table 27

Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest) Mean Scores and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65.2222</td>
<td>7.4963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.7500</td>
<td>6.9642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61.2000</td>
<td>13.9268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.8000</td>
<td>5.9591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

Analysis of Variance of Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>406.8419</td>
<td>135.6140</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2854.2534</td>
<td>86.4925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3261.0952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29
Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.552</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30
Music Teaching Confidence (Posttest) Mean Scores and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86.2222</td>
<td>8.4673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89.2500</td>
<td>4.5277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85.9000</td>
<td>9.5388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87.9000</td>
<td>4.9542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31

Analysis of Variance of Music Teaching Confidence (Posttest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63.9474</td>
<td>21.3158</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1756.8540</td>
<td>53.2380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1820.8013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32

Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Music Teaching Confidence (Posttest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-post changes in music teaching confidence levels are shown in Table 33. A One-Way Analysis of Variance (Table 34) indicated that differences between groups approached significance. A post hoc test of Least Significant Differences revealed significant differences between Group 1 ($\bar{X} = 21.0$) and Group 2 ($\bar{X} = 33.5$). However, the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance (Table 35) showed no significant differences between groups.

**Music Achievement**

Music achievement was measured by the Music Achievement Test (Midterm, Final Exam). Means and standard deviations for the combined midterm and final exam scores are provided in Table 36. Although a One-Way Analysis of Variance revealed no significant differences

### Table 33

**Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest-Posttest) Mean Change Scores and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.0000</td>
<td>7.9687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.5000</td>
<td>7.9102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.7000</td>
<td>13.4499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.1000</td>
<td>7.1406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34

**Analysis of Variance of Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest-Posttest) Change Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>698.6770</td>
<td>232.8923</td>
<td>2.534</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3032.9980</td>
<td>91.9090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3731.6748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35

**Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest-Posttest) Change Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.625</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between groups, a post hoc Fischer LSD test was applied to the data. According to Fischer's LSD, there were significant differences ($p < .05$) between Group 2 ($\bar{X} = 93.0$) and Group 4 ($\bar{X} = 83.8$). However, the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance showed no significant differences between groups.

Table 36
Music Achievement Mean Scores and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87.2222</td>
<td>8.1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93.0000</td>
<td>9.8561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86.1000</td>
<td>8.6339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.8000</td>
<td>7.9554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37
Analysis of Variance of Music Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>396.7398</td>
<td>132.2466</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2456.0535</td>
<td>74.4259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2852.7932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38

Mean Ranks and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on Music Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Results of Music Teaching Confidence and Music Achievement

Results from the analyses of variance on Music Teaching Confidence revealed that there were no significant differences between the four treatment groups with respect to Pretest and Posttest levels. Post hoc differences ($p < .05$) were found between Groups 1 and 2 on the Pretest only. Change of level of confidence within groups approached significance; the post hoc LSD indicated differences between Groups 1 and 2.

Analyses of the Music Achievement Test scores showed no significant differences between groups. However, the LSD did reveal significant differences between Groups 2 and 4.
Multiple Regression Analysis of Selected Background Variables

Of secondary interest was the relationship between and contribution of background variables to selected music teaching skills, music teaching confidence level, and music achievement. Tables 39-41 delineate the Pearson Product Moment Correlations between variables which were significant at the $p < .05$ level. The most frequent correlations were found with the variables of teacher musicianship (f.o. = 3), personal characteristics (f.o. = 4), composite music teaching score (f.o. = 3), music achievement (f.o. = 5), music teaching confidence level (f.o. = 4), and grade point average (f.o. = 5). The highest correlation was noted between music achievement and grade point average ($r = .50$). In general, the correlations were low.

Stepwise multiple regression was used to ascertain the contribution of the background variables to students' composite music teaching score, entry-level of confidence, and music achievement. The correlation coefficients for the total multiple regression are shown in Appendix M. Significant correlations are underlined.

Although the original correlation between composite music teaching score and grade point average ($r = .3384$) was significant at the $p < .02$ level, grade point average did not make a significant contribution to composite music teaching score when subjected to stepwise multiple regression analysis. This was due to adjustment of the degrees of freedom as a result of four cases of missing data. No other significant variables entered into the regression analysis of the composite music teaching score.
Table 39
Correlations Between Selected Music Teaching Skills and Background Variables (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher musicianship and grade point average</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher musicianship and instrumental background</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher explanations and grade point average</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for pupil participation and junior/senior high school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance experience</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics and professional education courses completed</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics and applied piano instruction</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics and elementary general music background</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics and junior/senior high school performance experience</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 40

Correlations Between Composite Music Teaching Skills, Confidence Level (Pretest), Music Achievement, and Background Variables (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite music teaching score and grade point average</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite music teaching score and music achievement</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite music teaching score and confidence level (Posttest)</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music achievement and professional education courses, currently enrolled</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music achievement and grade point average</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music achievement and Music 270 (Fundamentals) course grade</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music achievement and Music 271 (Literature and Listening) course grade</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music achievement and college-level performance experience</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching confidence level (Pretest) and instrumental background</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching confidence level (Pretest) and junior/senior high school performance experience</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching confidence level (Pretest) and community performance experience</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching confidence level (Pretest) and music teaching confidence level (Posttest)</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41

Correlations Between Selected Background Variables (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average and Music 270 (Fundamentals) course grade</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average and Music 271 (Literature and Listening) course grade</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average and instrumental background</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average and college-level performance experience</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average and number of college-level music courses taken</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental background and Music 270 course grade</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school music courses taken and Music 271 course grade</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied piano instruction and elementary general music background</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied piano instruction and music teaching confidence level (Posttest)</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional education courses (currently enrolled) and community performance experience</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional education courses (currently enrolled) and high school courses taken</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 42 displays the single step of the multiple regression analysis for the significant variable, community performance experience. No other variable contributed significantly to music teaching confidence (Pretest). Table 43 indicates that community performance experience accounted for 26% of the total variance in music teaching confidence (Pretest) among the 32 subjects.

Table 44 contains the single step of the multiple regression analysis for the significant variable, grade point average. No other variable contributed significantly to music achievement. Table 45 shows that grade point average accounted for 27% of the total variance in music achievement among the 32 subjects.

Therefore, although the original Pearson Product Moment Correlation revealed significant correlations between a number of variables, rejection of four missing data sets resulted in fewer degrees of freedom. As a result, no single variable or combination of variables made a significant contribution to the composite music teaching score. Community performance experience contributed to 26% of the variance in music teaching confidence (Pretest), and grade point average contributed to 27% of the variance in music achievement.
Table 42

Stepwise Multiple Regression on Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest):

Step 1 -- Variable Entered Is Community Performance Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>804.076</td>
<td>804.076</td>
<td>11.071*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2251.438</td>
<td>72.627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables in Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F-Remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comper</td>
<td>4.3258</td>
<td>0.5129</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
<td>11.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables Not in Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>F-Enter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tmth</td>
<td>-0.3298</td>
<td>0.9949</td>
<td>3.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>0.8960</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>0.0368</td>
<td>0.9769</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>0.1051</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
<td>0.9995</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>0.3414</td>
<td>0.9929</td>
<td>3.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr</td>
<td>0.1884</td>
<td>0.8550</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgen</td>
<td>0.2325</td>
<td>0.9801</td>
<td>1.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jisper</td>
<td>0.1992</td>
<td>0.8944</td>
<td>1.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsors</td>
<td>0.2378</td>
<td>0.9978</td>
<td>1.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colper</td>
<td>-0.1684</td>
<td>0.9964</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colors</td>
<td>0.0948</td>
<td>0.9902</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table 43

Final Summary of Regression on Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>804.076</td>
<td>804.076</td>
<td>11.071*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2251.438</td>
<td>72.627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Number of Variance</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>Mult. R SQ</th>
<th>Change in RSQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5129</td>
<td>0.2631**</td>
<td>0.2631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**percent accounting for total variance of music teaching confidence (Pretest)
Table 44

Stepwise Multiple Regression on Music Achievement: Step 1 -- Variable Entered Is Grade Point Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>717.870</td>
<td>717.870</td>
<td>11.699*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1902.190</td>
<td>61.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables in Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Std. Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F-Remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>13.3641</td>
<td>0.5234</td>
<td>3.9072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables Not in Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>F-Enter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>-0.3086</td>
<td>0.9880</td>
<td>3.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmth</td>
<td>0.0826</td>
<td>0.9630</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>0.2939</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>2.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>0.2091</td>
<td>0.8767</td>
<td>1.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit</td>
<td>0.2002</td>
<td>0.8974</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>0.1692</td>
<td>0.9852</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr</td>
<td>0.1135</td>
<td>0.9308</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgen</td>
<td>-0.3347</td>
<td>0.9978</td>
<td>3.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jisper</td>
<td>0.0790</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacrs</td>
<td>-0.2699</td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td>2.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colper</td>
<td>0.2991</td>
<td>0.9252</td>
<td>2.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colors</td>
<td>-0.1582</td>
<td>0.9190</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comper</td>
<td>0.1206</td>
<td>0.9769</td>
<td>0.443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table 45
Final Summary of Regression on Music Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>717.870</td>
<td>717.870</td>
<td>11.699*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1902.190</td>
<td>61.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Number of Variance</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>R SQ</th>
<th>Change in RSQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5234</td>
<td>0.2739**</td>
<td>0.2739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**percent accounting for total variance of music achievement

Informal Evaluations of Music 370

At the end of the quarter, students were asked to describe their reactions to various facets of the course. These responses were anonymous, and it was not possible to determine to which treatment group each subject belonged.

Given a hypothetical situation where students were asked by their principal to teach elementary school music in their own classroom, 65% replied that they would feel confident in teaching music, having taken Music 370. In addition, student reaction to the modeled lessons was
generally positive. However, there were mixed responses to involvement in the discussion groups. Seven students felt that the two groups should have exchanged places at times; they also suggested that all students view the model and discuss the lesson. Informal comments can be found in Appendix N.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the differential effects of modeling and discrimination training on selected music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement among elementary education majors. The study was designed to answer the following main question and subquestions:

What are the differential effects of the following four treatments on selected music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement:

(a) live model with discrimination training and active participation,
(b) live model with active participation,
(c) videotape model with discrimination training and passive participation,
(d) videotape model with active participation?

How do the four treatment groups compare on the basis of expert and instructor evaluation and student self-evaluation?

What are the differential effects of the four treatments on six selected music teaching skills:

(a) use of instructional materials,
(b) sequencing and pacing,
(c) teacher musicianship,
(d) teacher explanations,
(e) provision for pupil participation, and
(f) personal characteristics?

What are the effects of the four treatments on pre-post changes in students' level of confidence in their ability to teach elementary school music?

What is the relationship between and contribution of the following background variables to subjects' music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement:

(a) the number of professional education courses completed,
(b) the number of professional education courses, currently enrolled,
(c) the number of years of applied piano instruction,
(d) the number of years of applied vocal or instrumental instruction,
(e) the number of years of elementary general music instruction,
(f) the number of years of junior/senior high school music performance experience,
(g) the number of high school elective music courses taken,
(h) the number of years of college-level music performance experience,
(i) the number of college-level music courses taken,
(j) the number of years of community music performance
experience,
(k) Music 270 (Basic Experiences in Music: Fundamentals) course grade,
(l) Music 271 (Basic Experiences in Music: Literature and Listening) course grade, and
(m) cumulative grade point average (including currently enrolled quarter)?

What is the relationship between and contribution of entry-level of confidence to music teaching skills and achievement?

Summary of Procedures

Thirteen elementary general music lessons were developed by the investigator for use as model demonstration lessons. A written lesson plan consisting of objectives, activities, materials, procedures, and summary was followed for each lesson. Materials, activities, compositions, and songs were selected from sources regularly used in elementary school music.

Thirty-seven elementary education majors enrolled in two sections of Music 370 during Winter Quarter 1984 at The Ohio State University served as subjects for the experiment. Intact classes were assigned arbitrarily to either live or videotape modeling treatment. Within class sections, students were randomly assigned to discrimination training/no discrimination training treatment. The intact discrimination training groups were arbitrarily assigned to either active or passive participation.
The first week of the quarter consisted of a general orientation to elementary general music teaching and included information on sources of music series and reference materials; on designing lesson plans, writing behavioral and conceptual objectives; and on the use of melodic and rhythmic accompaniments. During this time, students were asked to fill out the Music 370 Background Questionnaire and the Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pretest).

Discrimination training has been defined as a process of systematic observation and discussion whereby preservice students are taught to analyze and to evaluate the components of an effective music lesson. The process included analysis of the characteristics of a well-planned music lesson and of effective music teaching as well as the assessment of model lesson execution. Therefore, after one week of instruction, those treatment groups which were to engage in discrimination training participated in an initial training experience of three parts: (a) class discussion of the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form with operational definitions, (b) class viewing of the filmed music lesson, Discovering Form in Music (Wilets, 1967), and (c) post-lesson class discussion and analysis of the filmed lesson using the evaluation form as a guide. This process was facilitated by the investigator. Those groups not receiving discrimination training viewed the same film independently and wrote a brief summary of its contents.

All students taught five music lessons to their peers during the quarter. These peer teachings included teaching a song by rote
(twice), teaching a movement lesson, teaching a listening lesson, and teaching a lesson which was a synthesis of skills and approaches. The first four peer lessons were evaluated by the instructor and by student self-evaluation using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form. The fifth peer teaching (Posttest) was videotaped and was evaluated by a panel of three music education experts from other major universities. They also used the EMTEF for evaluation purposes.

On each of two days prior to peer teaching the rote song, movement, and listening lessons, Group 1 observed a live, instructor-modeled music lesson. They were instructed to analyze the lesson according to the guidelines presented during the discrimination training process while actively simulating the musical understanding and responses of the appropriate grade level. After each lesson, a trained, experienced, elementary music education faculty member facilitated their post-lesson discrimination training using the EMTEF as a guide. Group 1 observed a total of seven live-modeled lessons.

Group 2 followed the same procedure of active participation as Group 1. When Group 1 departed to engage in the discrimination training, Group 2 remained to participate in another live-modeled lesson. At no time during their 13 modeled lessons was their attention directed to analysis or discussion.

Group 3 observed five videotapes of the instructor-modeled lessons which had been recorded during the preceding live presentation. They were instructed to analyze the lesson in light of the discrimination training they had received. However, this group did not actively
participate as "students" in the activities. Rather, they functioned as passive participants. Following the presentation, they were taken to another room and were led through a post-lesson training identical to Group 1.

After the departure of Group 3, Group 4 remained to participate in an additional videotaped lesson. They, too, simulated the musical understanding and responses of the appropriate grade level and were not involved in lesson analysis or discussion. They observed a total of 11 videotaped lessons.

Five weeks into the quarter, all students took the Music Achievement Test (Midterm). During final exam week, students took the Music Achievement Test (Final Exam) and filled out the Music Teaching Confidence Form (Posttest) and Release of Grade Form. They also informally evaluated Music 370.

The Music 370 Background Questionnaire was an adaptation of one used by Holt (1973/1974). The Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pretest, Posttest), created by the investigator, was based on the syllabus for Music 370 and was designed to determine the degree to which preservice students felt confident in teaching elementary school music. Both forms were content-validated by music education faculty members prior to administration.

The Music Achievement Test (Midterm, Final Exam) was developed by the investigator on the basis of class lecture and discussion, peer teachings, and textbook reading assignments. Both tests were examined by a music education faculty member for their appropriateness to the
content of the course.

The Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form included all the categories designed by Sung (1982/1983) except "Classroom Management." Although the EMTEF was developed for an introductory music education course, music education faculty members agreed that it would be appropriate for evaluating competencies of Music 370 students.

A total of 37 (12-14 minute) videotaped peer teaching Posttest lessons were available for analysis. Thirteen lessons were chosen for the interjudge reliability check. Judges were three elementary music education faculty members from three major universities. Average interjudge reliability was $r = .75$. The 24 remaining lessons were then independently evaluated by the experts.

Finally, Lessons 1-4 were rated by the instructor and by students' self-evaluation using the EMTEF. An average total teaching score was derived for each treatment group on the four lessons by instructor and student self-evaluations, respectively. These averages were used for later analysis.

**Summary and Interpretation of Findings**

The findings are presented in the order of research questions.

**Main Question**

What are the differential effects of the following four treatments on music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement:

(a) live model with discrimination training and active participation,
(b) live model with active participation,
(c) videotape model with discrimination training and passive participation,
(d) videotape model with active participation?

Both parametric and nonparametric analyses reveal no significant differences between treatment groups on total music teaching skills scores when evaluated by university experts.

Although no significant differences occurred between groups, students in all groups appear to be rated as relatively successful in their teaching. A total of 95 points would constitute a "perfect" score on the EMTEF. Expert ratings range from an average of 66.56 points (69.79%) in Group 2 to 73.42 points (77.26%) in Group 4. Since the differential treatments appear equally effective in developing music teaching skills, the choice of live or videotape models seems contingent on practical considerations as well as on instructor priorities.

A significant body of literature exists which would indicate that focus on the salient features of a lesson is essential to the development of similar teaching behaviors. Therefore, although the present study reveals that the presence or absence of discrimination training is equally effective for these teaching skills, it would be unwise to eliminate lesson analysis and discussion totally without further extensive research. Nevertheless, discrimination training can take a variety of forms. Practical considerations may warrant independent student viewing and analysis of both live and videotaped
models, using the EMTEF or a version such as that described by Madsen
and Yarbrough (1980).

In addition, the effects of active versus passive participation
are open to further investigation. The present study was designed to
examine what typically occurs in music methods classes: Students are
asked either to observe a modeled lesson (passive participation) or to
simulate the musical responses of the "student" (active participation).
This activity is premised on two assumptions: College-age students
apparently are able to simulate elementary students' responses and to
process lesson methodology simultaneously. Based on the data, it
appears that active participation does not militate against at least
short-term retention of methodology. However, the role that active
participation through simulation plays in enhancing the coding
processes required for retention is open to question.

Although parametric and nonparametric analyses indicate that there
are no significant differences between treatment groups on the
Music Teaching Confidence (Pretest), a post hoc LSD does reveal a
significant difference between Groups 1 and 2. Fortunately, the groups
were generally equivalent at the outset. On the Posttest, there are no
significant differences between groups. Students informally report
that Music 370 did alter some of their feelings toward music education.
They generally exhibit a positive reaction to the modeled lessons.
However, students in the discussion groups describe mixed responses to
the discrimination training.

Music Achievement Test analyses reveal no significant differences
between treatment groups. This finding is not surprising since only six test items were specifically written to differentiate between treatments. It was speculated, however, that differences in treatments might also be evident in the demonstration of cognitive understanding. The only differences observed are between Groups 2 (\( \bar{X} = 93.0 \)) and Group 4 (\( \bar{X} = 83.8 \)). Apparently, students can develop cognitive understanding while not demonstrating the ability to actualize the skills.

The lack of statistically significant differences between groups on music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement could also be due to a number of other factors. First, the sample size was relatively small. Because mean differences are notable and often approach significance, it is likely that a larger sample would result in differences between groups. Indeed, if directional hypotheses had been generated, there would probably have been significant differences when analyzed by one-tailed t-tests, especially on teaching skills between Groups 1 and 2 compared to Groups 3 and 4. Third, large within-group variances are noted in the analyses. This may be due to the fact that The Ohio State University has an open enrollment policy which would account for wide variances in subjects within groups. Finally, perhaps the social learning theory of Bandura may not be as applicable to content-specific methods courses.

**Subquestion #1**

How do the four treatment groups compare on the basis of expert and instructor evaluation and student self-evaluation?
When the panel's ratings are compared with both instructor and student self-evaluations, it is observed that university experts' ratings are consistently lower than the instructor's or the students'. Average instructor ratings of Lessons 1-4 range from 81.81 points (86.1%) in Group 3 to 85.31 points (89.8%) in Group 4. Analysis of differences between experts' Posttest ratings and instructor average ratings reveal that even though instructor evaluation is significantly higher, there are no significant differences between treatment groups.

Furthermore, student ratings on Lesson 1-4 range from 76.39 points (80.0%) in Group 3 to 80.82 points (84.0%) in Group 2. The number of subjects for this comparison was 36 due to incomplete ratings by one student on all four lessons. Therefore, Group 4 averaged 86.62 points (instructor's ratings) for this comparison. When instructor and students' evaluations are analyzed, the data reveal that instructor evaluations are significantly higher. Nevertheless, there are no significant differences between groups on the treatment.

Relatively low ratings of the final lesson by the experts suggest that this lesson was a formidable task for the students. The lesson was intended to be a synthesis of skills and activities acquired during the quarter. Students were given a final class project which was to be an interdisciplinary unit with music as the main focus of different lesson plans. They were instructed to choose a grade level and topic (e.g., animals, nutrition, a country, etc.), to develop a week's series of 30-minute complete music lessons, to design appropriate visual aids, and to compile a list of activities and materials in other subject
areas which would correlate with the topic. The Posttest was a 14-16 minute modified lesson from the unit. The project was organized completely by each student with minimal instructor input. Students had four weeks in which to complete the project. However, considering the amount of time required, it is quite possible that the task was too difficult in light of other responsibilities. Extrapolating a music lesson from the final project also may have contributed to the ratings of students by the panel.

Furthermore, although many students had had the experience of peer teaching videotaping through their microteaching experiences in the College of Education, many expressed consternation at suddenly being faced with videotaping of their final lesson. That discomfiture could also have contributed to poorer performance.

In addition, the focus on Lessons 1-4 was on a main activity approach whereas the Posttest lesson was a multi-activity approach. It is the investigator's observation that students performed better when concentrating on fewer simultaneous activities. In general, students appeared not to teach as well in the synthesis lesson as they had previously. This may account for higher evaluations on the part of the instructor for Lessons 1-4.

It is interesting to compare these findings with those of Doane's study (1983) where the teaching behaviors of sophomore music education students are evaluated both by experts (university course instructors) and by the students. He concludes that students tend to evaluate their own teaching behaviors with higher scores than do expert observers. In
the present study, the course instructor ratings of students' teaching behaviors were significantly higher than the students. Expectations for music teaching performance dictate instructor evaluations. Music education, as a content discipline, is a novel experience for most elementary education majors. Yet, they come to the course with at least some background in general education methodology. Doane's subjects were sophomore music education students in an introductory music education course; subjects in the present study were juniors and seniors in the College of Education. Sophomore music education students, perhaps as a result of their applied music background, may have an inflated idea of their ability to teach elementary school music whereas elementary education majors, perhaps as a result of trepidation at taking a "music methods" course, may underrate their ability to teach effectively. Differences between the two samples, then, would have contributed to differences in results.

Subquestion #2
What are the differential effects of the four treatments on six selected music teaching skills:

(a) use of instructional materials,
(b) sequencing and pacing,
(c) teacher musicianship,
(d) teacher explanations,
(e) provision for pupil participation, and
(f) personal characteristics?
Both parametric and nonparametric analyses reveal no significant differences between treatment groups on any of the six selected music teaching skills when evaluated by university experts. In fact, group ranges of two of the skills are quite small: teacher musicianship (range = .60 points) and provision for pupil participation (range = .62 points). The largest range is found in personal characteristics (range = 2.91 points). The average range of the six selected music teaching skills is 1.63 points.

Furthermore, if the average scores for each skill are collapsed to a scale of 1-5, the average rating for provision for pupil participation is 3.7. Use of instructional materials and personal characteristics are each rated 3.6. Teacher musicianship averages 3.3. Sequencing and pacing each average 3.2. This perspective supports the observation that, according to evaluations of university experts, preservice students performed fairly well on music teaching skills.

It was expected that the treatments would have the greatest impact on all skills except teacher musicianship and personal characteristics. However, the data do not support this expectation. It is possible that other teaching skills may be more amenable to variations in modeling and discrimination training. It is also possible that effects of the treatments may have been obscured by reasons already cited: nature of the Posttest, videotaping the Posttest, and number of musical activities required. It is also possible that live versus videotaped models and presence or absence of this particular form of
discrimination training may indeed be equally effective in developing selected music teaching skills.

**Subquestion #3**

What are the effects of the four treatments on pre-post changes in students' level of confidence in their ability to teach elementary school music?

A review of the literature on professional laboratory experiences in music for elementary education majors shows that, up to now, no one experience emerges which is guaranteed to develop music teaching confidence in preservice teachers. The data in the present study reveal that all groups increased their level of teaching confidence considerably. Pretest-Posttest change in level of confidence between treatment groups approach significance ($p < .07$). However the only significant differences in change scores are between Groups 1 and 2. These data seem to support the use of different forms of modeling and discrimination training in the development of music teaching confidence.

**Subquestion #4**

What is the relationship between and contribution of selected variables to subjects' music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement?

The strongest correlation occurs between music achievement and grade point average ($r = .50$). Music achievement also correlates with
four other variables: professional education courses (currently enrolled), Music 270 and 271 course grades, and college-level performance experience. Other significant correlations are found with teacher musicianship (f.o. = 3), personal characteristics (f.o. = 4), music teaching skills (f.o. = 3), music teaching confidence level (f.o. = 4), and grade point average (f.o. = 5).

In examining the correlation between selected variables, it is interesting to note that there is a significant correlation between applied piano instruction and Posttest music teaching confidence level ($r = .32$). Although the instructor emphasizes that the use of recordings in music lessons is appropriate, it is also expected that students demonstrate a basic level of proficiency on the piano. Even though the need for this proficiency is not evident at the start of the course, it is possible that use of applied piano background skills enhances preservice students' level of music teaching confidence by the end of the quarter.

In spite of the correlation between music teaching skills and grade point average, adjustment of the degrees of freedom which occurred during the stepwise multiple regression results in contribution of no variables to music teaching skills. This finding is surprising since at least half of the students have taken at least three fourths of their professional education courses. Yet, even this variable does not contribute significantly to music teaching skills.

Community musical performance experience contributes to 26.0% of the total variance in entry-level music teaching confidence. Five of
the 37 subjects had participated in community musical performance
groups on an average of 3.4 years. Four of these five had scores of 70
or better on the Music Teaching Confidence Pretest. Apparently the
experience of these subjects is of sufficient magnitude to make a
significant contribution to entry-level of music teaching confidence.

Grade point average contributes to 27.0% of the total variance in
music achievement. When music fundamentals, literature, and listening
are presented as courses separate from music methods, there is always
the belief that they form a foundation upon which to build the music
methods course. In the present study, Music 270 and 271 correlate only
with music achievement, and even then, they are not the strongest
predictors of music achievement. There is often a time lapse for many
students between Music 270, 271, and 370. Perhaps there would be a
higher correlation between Music 270, 271, and music teaching skills,
confidence level, and achievement if the courses were taken in closer
proximity to one another.

Subquestion #5

What is the relationship between and contribution of entry-level
of confidence to music teaching skills and achievement?

The data show that students' entry-level of confidence is not
significantly related to either music teaching skills or achievement.
In fact, there is a negative correlation between entry-level of
confidence and music achievement (r = -.20). It could be that students
who are not confident in their teaching ability must apply themselves
to a greater degree and are more successful in developing cognitive understanding than students with a higher level of teaching confidence.

Conclusions

Based on the data, the following can be concluded:

1. Live and videotaped models are equally effective in developing selected music teaching skills in preservice teachers. There are no significant differences between the groups on total teaching scores or the six subcategories: use of instructional materials, sequencing and pacing, teacher musicianship, teacher explanations, provision for pupil participation, and personal characteristics.

2. Discrimination training in the form of analysis and evaluation of the components of a music lesson and of teacher effectiveness, is equally as effective as participation in additional demonstration lessons in developing selected music teaching skills.

3. It also appears that active participation by simulating musical responses of a given grade level does not act as a competing response which would militate against acquisition of selected music teaching behaviors.

4. The type of model, presence or absence of discrimination training, and form of participation by themselves do not significantly affect the development of students' confidence in their ability to teach elementary school music. The confidence level of all groups increased during the quarter. It is possible, therefore, to affect
level of teaching confidence in a 10-week course. It appears that changes in students' level of confidence are possible through a variety of preservice experiences.

5. Furthermore, music achievement seems to be minimally affected by variations in modeling, discrimination training, or participation mode.

6. Although a number of selected background variables correlate significantly with music teaching skills, confidence level, and achievement, only community performance experience and grade point average are significant predictors of music teaching confidence and music achievement, respectively. The fact that variables approach significance in the stepwise multiple regression analysis indicates that a larger sample may have altered the results considerably.

7. Finally, the extent to which students express confidence in teaching music at the entry level is neither related to nor a significant predictor of later acquisition of selected music teaching skills and achievement.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the data, the following recommendations for further research are offered:

1. Replication of the study with a larger sample.

2. Replication of the study with music majors and/or special education majors.
3. Development of differentially-structured lesson plans to be used in conjunction with video teaching tapes with elementary education majors.

4. Examination of the effect of videotaped self-evaluation using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form after each peer teaching.

5. Investigation to determine the long-term effects of modeling, discrimination training, and participation mode on the acquisition of music teaching skills and the development of positive self-confidence toward teaching music.

6. Comparison of the effects of modeling and discrimination training on peer teaching versus field experiences with music and nonmusic majors.

7. Examination of the effects of modeling, discrimination training, and participation modes on the acquisition of other music teaching competencies, such as questioning behaviors, set induction, and closure.

8. Comparison of the effects of modeling by one teacher versus modeling by a variety of teachers of both sexes. Comparison of the effects of demonstrations of music lessons with college-age "students" versus demonstrations with grade-school students.

9. Behavioral analysis of the effects of modeling and discrimination training on the teaching skills of teacher verbal reinforcement, nonverbal reinforcement, and use of instructional time.
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APPENDIX A

SYLLABUS FOR MUSIC 370
SYLLABUS

Music 370: MUSIC FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

This course is designed for prospective elementary classroom teachers to provide:

a) Basic orientation to the purposes and content of music in elementary schools.

b) Opportunity to apply teaching strategies to music in the classroom.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

To provide a laboratory setting in which students will:

1. Explore and evaluate music literature, teaching aids and methods of teaching music for elementary school-aged children.

2. Study, discuss, become aware of specific musical understandings (concepts) which are developed in the elementary school.

3. Discuss, modify and adapt materials for handicapped students.

4. Develop lesson plans and present music lessons to peers.

5. Investigate musical activities in relation to elementary curriculum and school environment situations.

CLINICAL AND FIELD EXPERIENCES (Note: Regional campuses may provide field experience)

A. Observation or review of films and video tapes 1-3 Hours

Purposes:

1. To gain insight into a variety of music teaching techniques.

2. To observe children involved in various musical activities and note their skills and reactions.

Evaluation: Informal assessment in follow-up classroom discussion.

B. Classroom simulation/demonstration 10-12 Hours

Purposes:

1. To engage students in active participation in musical activities:
   a) Singing - unison and part-singing
   b) Movement - free and directed movement, organized dance
   c) Listening - creative and physical responses, discussion
   d) Playing instruments - melodic, rhythmic and harmonic
   e) Creative experiences - improvisation, accompaniments, movement, artistic and verbal original responses.

2. To instruct students in planning, teaching procedures and strategies for presenting musical experiences to children.
3. To focus attention on anticipated understandings and development of musical skills by children.

Observation: Follow-up classroom discussion.

C. Peer teaching simulation

Purposes:
1. To provide students opportunity to plan, organize and present music lessons.
2. To share content and musical activities from developed projects.
3. To develop confidence in students' own teaching potential in music.

Evaluation:
1. Written critique of plans and teaching procedures by instructor.
2. Informal discussion and/or written comments by peers.

TOPICAL OUTLINE

A. Purposes of music in elementary schools.
B. Music curriculum in relation to the total elementary curriculum.
C. Teaching and learning processes with emphasis on musical understandings developed through experiences in singing, playing instruments, moving to music, listening, creating melodies, accompaniments, and artistic expressions.
D. Child development characteristics and implications for teaching music.
   1. Music for handicapped students - adaptation and modification
E. Literature sources: basic music series, supplementary song books, recordings.

METHOD OF EVALUATING THE STUDENT

1. Written teaching plans and projects
2. Observation of participation and peer teaching with written critique by instructor
3. Midterm and final examination
4. Written summaries of assigned readings or book reviews (Optional with instructor)
5. Class notebook (Optional with instructor)

APPENDIX B

MODEL LESSON PLANS
ROTE SONG 1: GRADE 3

Objectives:

In a two-part song, the chorus is sung after each verse.  
(Conceptual Objective)

Students will develop understanding of two-part form by 
singing the refrain between each verse.  (Behavioral 
Objective)

Repeated words in a song may have a different melody 
each time.

Students will develop understanding of the melody by 
singing the correct melodic line for each "there's one 
wide river to cross" and by naming them as same or 
different.

The rhythm of the melody is made up of patterns that may 
be repeated and used for accompaniment.

Students will develop understanding of the rhythm by 
clapping, singing, and playing rhythm sticks on the 
repeated rhythmic pattern "there's one wide river to 
cross."

Activities:  
singing, performing, listening

Materials:  
o stuffed animals
o song-picture book One Wide River to Cross 
  (Rojankovsky)
  o word charts: Noah, ark, Jordan; melody, refrain 
o rhythm sticks 
o music for "One Wide River to Cross"

Procedure:

1. We brought some animal friends to school today. 
   They are getting ready for a boat trip.  We are going to 
   help them learn a song for the trip.  This will be a 
   long trip over a wide river.  Listen to the song as I 
   sing it.

2. Who was the captain of the boat?  What is another 
   name for boat?  What was the name of the river?  (Refer 
   to word chart.)

3. The song had only two big sections.  The refrain is 
   repeated each time using the same words.  Teach refrain 
   by phrases (echo).
4. Listen for the repeated words in verse 1. What words were repeated? Was the melody same or different each time? Sing "there's one wide river to cross."

5. Let our animal friends sing along all the way through. Were any words repeated from the first verse?

6. Echo clap pattern "there's one wide river to cross." What words matched? Play and speak the pattern with rhythm sticks. Sing and play the repeated pattern.

Summary: You did a good job of helping our friends get ready for their trip. Our song had two parts. The refrain was the repeated big section. Where the words were repeated, the melody changed each time. (Refer to charts.)

There will be many animals besides our friends here. Let's sing the song all the way through while I show you the pictures and words. (Use song-picture book.)

Running Time: 17:24
ROTE SONG 2: GRADE 5

Objectives: Two strands of sound can occur simultaneously.

Students will develop an understanding of "round" by correctly singing "Ifca's Castle" in two parts.

An ostinato is a repeated melodic or rhythmic pattern.

Students will develop an understanding of ostinato by playing a repeated melodic pattern on the resonator bells and by singing the same pattern as a chant.

Melodies may move by step or by skip.

Students will develop an understanding of melodic movement by correctly identifying the ostinano pattern as moving by step or by skip.

Activities: singing, reading, listening, performing

Materials: o map of England
          o "Ifca's Castle"
          o resonator bells (F, C); mallets
          o rhythm pattern chart

Procedure: 1. Set induction: point out castle on England map; point out that castles are usually on high ground.

2. Sing song; teach by phrases; sing as two-part round.

3. Clap patterns on rhythm chart; which corresponds to words in the song? which words?

4. Add accompaniment on resonator bells (F, C). Pattern was a little stubborn; this is called an ostinato; the repeated melodic pattern goes through song; sing with letter names.

5. Sing with ostinato.

6. Chant pattern with song; called a chant (show chart).

7. Look at the resonator bells; what two pitches? step or skip apart?
Summary: When we have the same melody sung by different groups coming in at different times, that is called? Played a repeated melodic pattern -- what is it? Did it move by step or skip? Repeated sung patterns as a?

Running Time: 14:04
ROTE SONG 3: KDG

Objectives: Music moves in relation to an underlying beat.

Students will develop understanding of beat by tapping/clapping the beat with the song "Colors." Students will move according to the directions on the recording.

Activities: singing, moving, listening, performing

Materials: o colored construction papers (red, green, blue, yellow) and charts o "Colors" (Hap Palmer) cassette tape

Procedure: 1. Review names of colors: green, blue, red, yellow.

2. Listen for your color in the song while I point to the color charts.

3. Sing along with the chorus. Go over words.

4. Sing chorus, adding movement on verses.

5. Echo clap some beat patterns using different body parts.

6. Sing entire song with beat patterns on chorus, movement on the verses.

Summary: Review different colors used in the song. Who had those colors in their clothes? What kind of pattern were we adding with our bodies? Beat.

Running Time: 14:50
ROTE SONG 4: GRADE 1

Objectives: Music moves in relation to an underlying beat.

Students will develop understanding of beat by moving to the beat of "The Elephant."

The tempo of the music may change.

They will observe changes in tempo while walking with lowered "trunks."

Activities: singing, moving

Materials: 1 cassette of "The Elephant" (Hap Palmer)

Procedure: 1. Yesterday our third grade friends went for a boat ride. However, the elephant didn't come. Listen to our song and see why.

2. What did it sound like the elephants were doing? Discuss.

3. Learn song by rote whole.

4. Show me how the elephants would move slowly; now how they would move rumbling.

5. Sing song, adding elephant movements. How did the song move? Fast and slow are known as the tempo.

Summary: You did a good job as elephants moving to the slow and fast tempo.

Running Time: 11:11
MOVEMENT 1: GRADE 5

Objectives: People of different countries use music and dance as a means of expression and communication.

Students will develop understanding of style by performing the folk dance "Milanovo Kolo."

Music can move in an accent grouping of fours.

They will develop understanding of meter by listening to the music, clapping the beat, and identifying the meter as $\frac{4}{4}$.

Activities: listening, moving, performing

Materials: o World of Folk Dances "Milanova Kolo" cassette tape
o Time Magazine of Olympics
o charts of "Sarajevo", "Milanova Kolo"

Procedure:
1. Discuss upcoming Olympics in Sarajevo, Yugoslavia. Show map and pictures from Time Magazine.

2. Discuss Kolo as a circle dance, Milanova as Milan's dance. Listen to music for accent grouping. Clap beat and determine $\frac{4}{4}$ meter.

3. Learn dance in two parts. Add music.

Summary: Try to watch the Olympics, paying attention to the music used at different times. Perform dance once more.

Running Time: Not Available
Objectives: The style of the music can dictate the type of movement response.

Students will explore fundamental movement by performing the directions of "Bone Song" and by mirroring the movement of one another in "Far East Blues."

Timbre contributes to the style of the music.

Students will listen to the music and verbally identify the Near East Indian sound through the timbre of the sitar.

Activities: moving, listening

Materials: o cassette tape of "Bone Song" and "Far East Blues"
  o picture of sitar
  o mirror

Procedures: 1. Explore some ways to move our bodies.

2. Listen to the "Bone Song" and move each part of the body in response to the directions.

3. Listen to the beginning of "Far East Blues" and try to identify the country; show picture of electric sitar.

4. Discuss what students see when looking in a mirror (show mirror); find a partner, select personal space.

5. Listen to "Far East Blues" and mirror each other's movements (mirror teacher's movement, partner's movement, choose student to act as mover).

Summary: Today we used different movements. What body parts did we move in the "Bone Song"? How did we move in "Far East Blues"? What Eastern Indian instrument was played in "Far East Blues"?

Running Time: Not Available
MOVEMENT 3: GRADE 2

Objectives: Music can be loud or soft. Dynamics can change during a composition.

Students will develop understanding of dynamics by discussing, clapping, listening, and moving to the two compositions.

Music can be divided into sections set off by change in dynamics.

Students will develop an understanding of the three-part form of "Berceuse" by listening and moving creatively in response to change in dynamics.

Activities: listening, moving, performing

Materials: o chart of terms "loud-soft" and "dynamics"  
o handdrum  
o cassette tape of "Soft and Loud" (Hap Palmer)  
and "Berceuse" (Stravinsky)

Procedure: 1. Echo clap loud and soft rhythm patterns.

2. Listen to loud and soft rhythm patterns played on handdrum. Discuss differences in dynamics. Listen to handdrum patterns; move in loud/soft movements.

3. Listen for dynamics in "Loud and Soft"; verbally describe what happens in the music. Discuss.


5. Listen for loud and soft sections in "Berceuse." Discuss. There are three sections: soft-loud-soft divided by the change in dynamics.

6. Listen again and show movements for the loud sections with different movement for the soft sections.
Summary: We call the loudness and softness in music "dynamics." (Show chart.) Your movement showed the different loud and soft sections in the music. Your movement to "Berceuse" had three sections to it: soft, loud, and soft. This is one way the composer helps us understand the form.

Running Time: 17:34
Objectives: Music moves in relation to an underlying pulse known as beat.

Students will develop an understanding of steady beat by moving their red wagons and their bodies to the beat and the words of the song "Riding Up and Down."

Activities: moving, singing.

Materials: o music for "Riding Up and Down"  
o a real red wagon  
o little red wagons (cutouts)  
o autoharp and pick

Procedures: 1. How many of you have a wagon at home? Take your brothers and sisters for rides in it? your pets for a ride?

2. I brought a red wagon to school today and also have some wagons for us to use in our lesson. (Show real wagon, pass out cutouts.)

3. Teach song "Riding Up and Down" by rote (phrases); sing and play with autoharp. Drill lines 2 and 3. Discuss words to verses.

4. Add movement on verses, corresponding to words; move wagons to beat on chorus.

Summary: What different ways were we moving wagons? Discuss. This song is called a singing game. Was our walking pattern even or uneven? We were walking to the beat.

Running Time: 12:05
LISTENING 1: GRADE 2

Objectives: A composition may be made up of same, varied, or contrasting sections.

Students will distinguish the sections of "Prince of Denmark March" by listening to the composition, by describing the sections as same or different, by referring to the visual chart, and by moving their arms in three different ways (one for each section heard).

Texture may be thick or thin depending on the number of instruments performing.

Students will verbally describe the texture as thick or thin after listening to the composition and referring to the visual chart.

Students will develop understanding of thick and thin texture by moving one arm for thin texture, two for thick texture while listening to the composition.

Activities: listening, moving, reading

Materials: o "Prince of Denmark March" (The Music Book; 2:115) cassette tape
          o visual chart based on suggestions in teacher's guide
          o chart: texture

Procedure: 1. Show chart with different widths of lines and colors. What do you see? Describe colors and shapes.

          2. Listen to "Prince of Denmark March" and see if the melodies match the colors and lines on the chart.

          3. How many different melodies did you hear? Compare with chart. Discuss.

          4. Listen again for many instruments and few instruments in the composition. What clues are in the width of the lines?

          5. How did the chart compare?

          6. Listen again for the texture (show chart). Move one or two arms to correspond to thick/thin texture. Point out that shapes do not correspond to shape of melody.
Summary: How many different melodies made up the form? Were any repeated? How many had thick texture? thin texture?

Running Time: 16:39
LISTENING 2: GRADE 4

Objectives: Musical style can be distinguished by type of instruments used.

Students will develop understanding of musical style by singing, performing with, and listening to two Mexican folk songs.

Activities: singing, listening, performing

Materials:
- Mexican mariachi player statue
- Ballet Folklorico album
- chart: Mariachi
- maracas, guiro, scrapers
- "La Jesusita" (The Music Book; 4:40); "Morning" (TMB; 4:204) cassette tape
- Ballet Folklorico recording
- pictures of violin, harp, real cornet

Procedure:
1. Show mariachi statue, Ballet Folklorico album.
2. Review song "La Jesusita."
3. Add maracas and guiro on accented beat; sing along. Discuss accompaniment.
4. Listen to recording for type of instruments used. Discuss. Explain origin of mariachi band. Show instrument and pictures.
5. Review song "Morning." Listen to recorded version. Discuss differences in instruments.

Summary: Various instruments made each version different in style. What kinds of instruments are typical of mariachi music?

Running Time: 20:12
LISTENING 3: GRADE 3

Objectives: Music moves in relation to a steady underlying beat.

Students will develop understanding of beat and style by tapping the beat of the piece with their kitchen utensils while listening and identifying each section as "marchlike" or "dancelike."

Marchlike and dancelike music can stimulate different moods and movement.

Students will develop understanding of style by listening to the music and verbally describing the mood of the music.

Music divided into three parts is known as ternary form (ABA).

Students will develop understanding of form by marching with their utensils to Part A and dancing with them to Part B.

Activities: listening, moving, creating

Materials: o kitchen utensils
 o chart: Marchlike; Dancelike
 o "March Past of the Kitchen Utensils" (Ralph Vaughn Williams. Adventures in Music 3:1) cassette tape

Procedure: 1. Show kitchen utensils. Where would these found in your home?

2. Listen to our composition and be ready to describe the mood of the music. Write down mood words on sheets of paper. Was the mood the same throughout? The piece is called "March Past of the Kitchen Utensils." It has three parts to it: marchlike/dancelike/marchlike.

3. Listen again and tap beat with utensils for marchlike section. Move like dancing utensils for dancelike section.

4. Listen again, marching for Part A and creating a dance for Part B.
Summary: Different sections can reveal different moods. We marched and danced to each of the three sections, keeping the beat with our different kitchen utensils.

Running Time: 21:18
LISTENING 4: GRADE 4

Objectives: The unique combination of musical elements can be used to express extramusical ideas (Expressiveness).

Melodies can be based on distinctive rhythmic patterns.

Students will develop understanding of expressiveness and rhythm by

- singing the theme of "In the Hall of the Mountain King" using rhythm syllables,
- naming the number of times that melodic pattern appears describing the mood after listening to the composition.

Activities: singing, listening, reading, performing

Materials:  
- "In the Hall of the Mountain King" (BOL #59)  
- Bowmar theme chart  
- elements of music charts: tempo, texture, melody, dynamics  
- rhythm sticks

Procedure:  
1. We are continuing with music of Scandinavian countries. Yesterday we were in Denmark. Today's music is from Norway. Listen to this (made-up) story about a little boy, walking quietly in a woods by a little stream.

2. Listen to the music and see if the music matches the story. Story and music did not match. Why? Discuss. What words describe the mood of the music?

3. Read, sing, and tap theme from theme charts. This was the rhythm of the melody. Listen and count the number of times this melody is played (18 + Coda).

4. How did dynamics and tempo vary? Describe the texture (refer to elements charts).

Summary: Sing theme again with rhythm syllables. Composers can use the same melody with different tempi, dynamics, and texture to make music more interesting.

Running Time: 13:48
SYNTHESIS: GRADE 2

Objectives: Melodies may move up, down, or stay the same.

Students will develop understanding of melody by
reading the notation chart and describing the melodic direction,
singing "The Barnyard Song,"
moving their arms on the body scale to show melodic direction,
listening to Copland's "I Bought Me a Cat" and verbally describing the differences.

Melodies may move by step or by skip.

Students will develop understanding of melody by

playing the animal melodies on the resonator bells and describing the melodies as moving by step or skip.

Activities: singing, listening, moving, reading, performing

Materials:
o The Great Big Farm Animal Book
o 3 melodic direction charts; chart of animal sounds and animal names
o resonator bells (C, D, E, G); mallets
o "Barnyard Song" (The Music Book; 2:120)
o "I Bought Me a Cat" (cassette tape)

Procedure: 1. In preparation for our field trip to the farm, let's talk about some animals found there. Show The Great Big Animal Book; point out different animals and animal babies.

2. In "The Barnyard Song" we have only three animals: cat, hen, and duck. What sound do cats usually make? This one says, "Fiddle-i-fee." Hen says, "Chimmy-chuck." Duck says, "Quack."

3. Which animal sound moves up? down? stays the same? (Show notation chart.) Which pattern matches the sound?
4. Listen to the song to see if the animals were matched with the correct chart. Did they match? Discuss.

5. Learn song by echoing animal sounds. Chime in on sounds in whole song. Explain "cumulative song."

6. Discuss word "yonder." Sing whole song.

7. Teach melodic direction using body scale. Sing song with body scale.

8. Pass out resonator bells. Who has resonator bells to match each animal sound? Play each animal pattern. What are the letter names for each animal? Which moved by step? by skip?

9. Sing song with piano using body scale and resonator bells. Sing again, new folks on resonator bells.

10. Listen to "I Bought Me a Cat" for differences between the two versions. What did he buy?

Summary: Review different animal sounds, melodic direction of sounds, steps, and skips in sounds.

Running Time: 24:51
Sources for Lesson Plan Materials


"March Past of the Kitchen Utensils" 3:1
"Berceuse" 1:1

Ballet Folklorico de Bellas Artes. Mexico: Musart.


"Prince of Denmark March" Bk. 2
"Barnyard Song" Bk. 2
"I Bought Me a Cat" Bk. 2
"La Jesusita" Bk. 4
"Morning" Bk. 4


"In the Hall of the Mountain King" BOL #59


"The Bone Song"


"Riding Up and Down"


"Noah's Ark"
"Ife's Castle"


"Colors"
"The Elephant"

"Far East Blues"


"Soft and Loud"


"Milanovo Kolo"
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DAILY PLAN: MUSIC 370

Winter 1984

January 4
Distribute syllabus and grading criteria.
Handout: Sources of music series and references.
Discuss musical concepts and activities.
Assign text reading: Planning for Teaching Music (pp. 1-13); Lesson Planning (pp. 211-212).

January 5
Discuss conceptual objectives, "Basic concepts of musical organization," and "A foundation of musical skills."
Refer to developmental charts; use song examples from text (pp. 34-41).
Assign: Choose a short song to sing without accompaniment for Monday, giving self only a starting pitch.

January 6
Discuss "Lesson Planning"; writing of conceptual and behavioral objectives; use song examples from text.
In-class written: Music Teaching Confidence Form (Pre-test); Music 370 Background Questionnaire.
Handout: How to Teach a Rote Song.
Assign text reading: Singing activities (pp. 200-202); Playing activities (pp. 202-205); Reading activities (pp. 208-210).

January 9
In-class individual singing.
Discussion/practice: Getting a Song Started—Pitch and Rhythm; examples from text.
Handout: Song Picture Books; Songs for Young Children; Library Books—bibliographies.

January 10
Getting a Song Started, con't.
Discuss instrument location and use.
Review text (pp. 202-203).
Assign: order for peer teaching #1.

January 11
Model film: Discovering Form in Music.
Discrimination training: Preliminary lesson.
Independent summary assignment.

January 12
Lesson Plan due.
Treatment Model Lesson #1: Teaching a Song by Rote.
Post-lesson discrimination training.
Treatment Model Lesson #2.
January 13  Treatment Model Lesson #3: Teaching a Song by Rote Using a Recording.  
Post-lesson discrimination training.  
Treatment Model Lesson #4.

January 16  No class.

January 17  Peer Teaching #1: Teaching a Song by Rote  
7-8 minute complete lesson.

January 18  Peer Teaching #1.

January 19  Peer Teaching #1.  
Assign: order for peer teaching #2.

January 20  Peer Teaching #1.

January 23  Complete Peer Teaching #1.

January 24  Peer Teaching #2: Teaching a Song by Rote  
8-10 minute lesson.

January 25  Peer Teaching #2.

January 26  Peer Teaching #2.

January 27  Peer Teaching #2.

January 30  Complete Peer Teaching #2.  
Assign: order for peer teaching #3  
Movement (pp. 205-206).

January 31  Lecture/discussion: Teaching a Movement Lesson.  
Handout: Sources for folk dances; Criteria for Textbook  
Evaluation; Criteria for Final Project.

February 1  Model Lesson #5: Teaching a Movement Lesson.  
Post-lesson discrimination training.  
Model Lesson #6.

February 2  Model Lesson #7.  
Post-lesson discrimination training.  
Model Lesson #8.

February 3  No class.
February 6  Peer Teaching #3: Teaching a Movement Lesson
         9-11 minute lesson.

February 7  Peer Teaching #3.

February 8  Peer Teaching #3.

February 9  Peer Teaching #3.

February 10 Peer Teaching #3.

February 13 Midterm Exam.
         Assign: order for peer teaching #4.

February 14 Handout: Sources of listening materials.
         Assign text reading: Listening activities (pp. 199-200).
         Lecture/discussion: How to teach a listening lesson.

February 15 Lecture/discussions, con't.

February 16 Model Lesson #9: Teaching a Listening Lesson.
         Post-lesson discrimination training.
         Model Lesson #10.

February 17 Model Lesson #11.
         Post-lesson discrimination training.
         Model Lesson #12.

February 20 Evaluation of a series due.
         Peer Teaching #4: Teaching a Listening Lesson
         10-12 minute lesson.
         Assign: order for peer teaching #5.

February 21 Peer Teaching #4.

February 22 Peer Teaching #4.

February 23 Peer Teaching #4.

February 24 Peer Teaching #4.

February 27 Peer Teaching #4.
         Review Midterm Exam.

February 28 Model Lesson #13: Synthesis Lesson.
         Post-lesson discrimination training.
         Written summary of teaching procedure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 29</td>
<td>Peer Teaching #5: Synthesis Lesson&lt;br&gt;12-14 minute lesson videotaped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Peer Teaching #5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>Peer Teaching #5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5</td>
<td>Peer Teaching #5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Exam for seniors; senior projects due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6</td>
<td>Peer Teaching #5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>Peer Teaching #5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>Peer Teaching #5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior grades due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>Peer Teaching #5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final projects due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET evaluation forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>Final Exam (12:00 section).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music Teaching Confidence Form (Posttest).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Release Forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14</td>
<td>Final Exam (1:00 section).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music Teaching Confidence Form (Posttest).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Release Forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MUSIC 370 BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE
Music 370 Background Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to help the music education division better meet the needs of the elementary education student in Music 370. Please answer the questions as honestly as you can. This is not a test. The answers have no bearing on your grade for the course.

Name_________________________ Local Phone Number___________

Social Security Number________________ Year in School__________

Level of Teaching Interest__________________________

1. Which professional education courses have you completed?  
   (Refer to attached sheet and list by course number)
   _______________ _______________ _______________
   _______________ _______________ _______________
   _______________ _______________ _______________

2. In which professional education courses are you currently enrolled?
   _______________ _______________ _______________
   _______________ _______________ _______________

3. Have you taken Music 270: Basic Experiences in Music - Fundamentals (or its equivalent)?
   Yes______ No_____ If yes, specify when and from which institution

4. Have you taken Music 271: Basic experiences in Music - Literature and Listening (or its equivalent)?
   Yes______ No_____ If yes, specify when and from which institution

5. Have you participated in a musical performing ensemble at Ohio State or any other college/university?
   Yes______ No_____ If yes, please specify:
   Ensemble __________ Number of quarters (semesters)
   Band _______________ _______________
   Orchestra ___________ _______________
   Chorus _______________ _______________
   Other _______________ _______________

6. Have you taken any other music courses at Ohio State or any other college/university?
   Yes______ No_____ If yes, please specify:
Music 370 Background Questionnaire, page 2

7. Do you play any musical instruments?
   Yes____ No____ If yes, please specify (including voice):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Self-Taught or Formal Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Did you participate in a vocal or instrumental performing group in junior or senior high school?
   Yes____ No____ If yes, please specify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior high band</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior high band</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior high orchestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior high chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Have you taken any other high school elective music courses?
   Yes____ No____ If yes, please specify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Theory</th>
<th>Music History/Appreciation</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Do you participate in community musical performing groups?
    Yes____ No____ If yes, please specify:

    | Organization        | Number of Years |
    |---------------------|-----------------|
    | Community Band      |                 |
    | Community Orchestra |                 |
    | Community Chorus    |                 |
    | Church Choir        |                 |
    | Other               |                 |

11. Did you have general music in the elementary school (grades 1-8)?
    Yes____ No____ If yes, for how many years? _________

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
### REQUIRED PROFESSIONAL COURSES - ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education 271</td>
<td>Seminar in Exploring Helping Relationships: Teaching/Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 289.01</td>
<td>Introductory Experience in a School System (FEEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 450</td>
<td>Professional Introduction I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 451</td>
<td>Professional Introduction II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 600</td>
<td>Basic Media Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 460</td>
<td>Elementary Education: Child Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 467</td>
<td>Introduction to Children's Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 289.02</td>
<td>Field Experience in a Community Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 502</td>
<td>Elementary Education: Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 507</td>
<td>Elementary Education: Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 508</td>
<td>Elementary Education: Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 511</td>
<td>Elementary Education: Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 513</td>
<td>Elementary Education: Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 650</td>
<td>Humanistic Foundations of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 585.10</td>
<td>Standard Elementary Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education 500</td>
<td>Art for Elementary Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education 300</td>
<td>Health Education for Elementary Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education 323</td>
<td>Creative Physical Education for Elementary Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 220</td>
<td>Sociology of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech &amp; Hearing Science 235</td>
<td>Speech Functions and Responsibilities of the Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology 202</td>
<td>Introduction to Cultural Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MUSIC TEACHING CONFIDENCE FORM

This questionnaire is designed to help us improve the Music 370 course. Please answer as honestly as you can. It is not necessary to put your name on this paper, and your responses in no way affect your grade. Circle the number which most closely corresponds to your perception.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At this point, I am able to do the following:</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>design a music lesson for an elementary class</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach a music lesson to an elementary class</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choose a variety of materials and references for use in an elementary music program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommend a music series to my principal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create a unit of study which would combine music with other subject areas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare a children's musical program or assembly for a PTA presentation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design and utilize visual aids to enhance a music lesson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide appropriate set induction (motivation) for a music lesson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>select appropriate musical activities to develop the children's understanding of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhythm</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melody</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmony</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive qualities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach a song by rote</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach a song with a recording</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide children in adding instrumental (pitched and non-pitched) accompaniments to a song</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide children to an understanding of musical concepts through a listening lesson</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach a folk dance, action song, singing game</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ELEMENTARY MUSIC TEACHING EVALUATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF COMPETENCE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES</th>
<th>RATING (circle one) Low effectiveness</th>
<th>High effectiveness</th>
<th>CHECK Unable to rate adequately</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructional materials</td>
<td>1a. Uses high quality and appropriate music literature</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. Uses appropriate music activities/experiences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c. Uses effective supporting teaching materials/ aids</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1d. Teaches music within a musical context</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sequencing</td>
<td>2a. Sequences lesson effectively</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pacing</td>
<td>3a. Allocates time effectively for different musical activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b. Keeps the lesson moving effectively</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher musicianship</td>
<td>4a. Shows an accurate understanding of musical concept being taught</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b. Provides an effective model for musical performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher explanations</td>
<td>5a. Explains academic content clearly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5b. Asks good quality questions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5c. Gives clear teacher directions for student responses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provision for pupil</td>
<td>6a. Supports and encourages the best efforts of students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal characteristics</td>
<td>7a. Maintains a sense of humor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7b. Modulates voice with inflections</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7c. Controls and varies speech speed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7d. Shows enthusiasm while teaching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7e. Speaks clearly and understandably</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7f. Uses standard English</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES

1a. Uses high quality music literature that is appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson, developmental level of the class, and teaching procedures.

1b. Uses musical activities/experiences that stimulate and maintain the interest of the learners and are appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson, developmental level of the class, and teaching procedures.

1c. Uses instructional materials and aids (visual aids, media equipment, etc.) that are appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson, developmental level of the class, and teaching procedures.

1d. The degree to which musical concepts are taught within, extracted from, and/or made relevant to a musical context.

2a. The well-arranged order of teaching events that unfolds during the lesson that is appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson and developmental level of the class.

3a. Time given to each activity that maintains the interest level of the learners and is appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson, developmental level of the class, and teaching procedures.

3b. The overall speed of the lesson that is appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson, developmental level of the class, and teaching procedures.

4a. An accurate understanding of musical concept being taught as reflected by verbalizations, activities, and musical examples.

4b. The correctness and expressiveness of teacher demonstration or modelings in musical performance that are exhibited during the lesson.

5a. Use of appropriate type of reasoning and vocabulary to explain/state academic content being taught that are appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson, developmental level of the class, and teaching procedures.

5b. Asks pertinent, useful questions which lead students toward a better understanding of the concept.

5c. Gives clear directions to students that can be easily followed.

6a. Supports and encourages the efforts of the learners through various teacher reinforcement (verbal) as well as providing opportunities for students to succeed.

7a. Maintains a sense of humor that creates a warm atmosphere.

7b. A well-modulated voice with a variety of speech inflections.

7c. A speed of speech that varies and would seem to promote attention.

7d. A synthesis of 7a through 7c.

7e. Speaks clearly and understandably.

7f. Uses standard English (good grammar) with an appropriate and proficient vocabulary.
APPENDIX H

MUSIC ACHIEVEMENT TEST
(Midterm, Final Exam)
Based on your textbook, class notes, and handouts, answer the following statements as TRUE or FALSE.

1. _______ Tones may move up or down, creating a melodic contour.

2. _______ When two or more prominent melodies are sounded simultaneously, the texture is said to be homophonic.

3. _______ Pacing concerns a logical ordering of activities from one to another.

4. _______ The use of academic approvals in a lesson is to be desired since it promotes more correct student response.

5. _______ Creative movement is primarily used to develop the concept of style.

6. _______ Motivation is a function of pacing more than approval feedback.

7. _______ In teaching a rote song, it is important to have the children hum the pitch in order to internalize the tone.

8. _______ Music teachers need to change activities frequently primarily to hold students’ attention.

9. _______ Song texts suggest appropriate movements in action songs.

10. _______ Visual aids are useful but not essential to music concept development in all children.

11. _______ According to music educators, music should be included in the schools primarily because it aids in understanding other subjects.

12. _______ Students need an explanation of the concept before being involved in the musical activity.

13. _______ It is important that students thoroughly understand a musical concept before moving to another concept.

14. _______ It is possible to introduce basic musical concepts in a meaningful manner to young children.

15. _______ Possible formations of folk dances include double line, square, and open circle.

16. _______ The learning of musical concepts is reflected in corresponding behavioral objectives.

17. _______ The singing of rounds should be introduced as early as first grade.

18. _______ Since reading musical notation is essential to musical understanding, it is necessary to include music theory in every lesson.

19. _______ Music is governed by a steady pattern known as rhythm.

20. _______ The ability to read music depends on an understanding of the musical concepts for which the notational symbols stand.
PART II. Short answer.

1. List three types of part-singing activities.

2. Name two pitched percussion instruments used in a music lesson.

3. Name two advantages to using a recording for teaching a rote song.

4. List five techniques that could be used for set induction in a music lesson.

5. Name three methods by which a rote song can be taught.

6. Name the five major sections of a music lesson plan.

7. Name two non-pitched percussion instruments used in a music lesson.

8. List six activities that are part of the elementary music curriculum.

9. Name two music series (title and publisher) that are currently in use in the elementary schools.
Based on your textbook, class discussion, and peer teachings, answer the following questions.

Part 1: True/False In the space provided, write true or false in response to the question.

1. It is considered appropriate to include popular music in music lessons as long as musical goals can be met effectively.

2. Choice of music literature depends as much on the developmental level of the class as on the lesson objectives and teaching procedures.

3. Timbre is another name for tone color.

4. It is important to include performing activities in the music lesson since they will help prepare the students for junior high band and orchestra.

5. Resonator bells can be used to add chordal accompaniment to songs.

6. Teachers reflect accurate understanding of musical concepts through activities, verbalizations, and musical examples.

7. Art music refers to songs which correlate with paintings or other art work.

8. It is best to schedule listening lessons during a time when the children need a break from other subjects.

9. The teaching of musical concepts involves a spiral approach to the curriculum.

10. Creative movement is probably the most effective supplementary activity to a listening lesson.

11. Pacing refers both to the time given to each activity that maintains the interest level of the student and to the overall speed of the lesson.

12. A criteria for choosing to teach a rote song is that the teacher be able to provide accompaniment on the piano or autoharp.

13. Since motivating children for listening lessons is difficult, it is good practice to consistently allow the students to choose the music for the lesson.

14. Children should experience the concept before learning the symbol.

15. An ostinato pattern may be melodic or rhythmic.

16. Listening lessons should not follow a chronological approach beginning with contemporary music progressing back to Baroque.
17. In nonlocomotor movement, the feet remain stationary while other parts of the body move.

18. In teaching a rote song, it is always appropriate to lower the key to match the children's range.

19. Young children respond primarily to the overall feeling of the music with large gross movements.

20. When setting the tempo of a rote song, it is important that the students know the time signature.

PART II: Short answer. In the space provided, answer the questions as briefly as possible.

1. List three major characteristics which compare and contrast the Bowmar Orchestral Library with Adventures in Music.

2. List six strategies for use in guided listening.

3. List five principles of conceptual learning based on knowledge of intellectual growth.

4. List three modes of representation ascribed to Jerome Bruner.

5. List three types of patterned movement.
PART III: Listening section. Listen to the following musical compositions. Place the letter which corresponds to the best answer on the space provided. (You may listen as many times as necessary.)

Listening Selection #1: (Fanfare for a Common Man, Copland)

1. Melodically, theme 1 is made up of
   a) wide leaps
   b) narrow range
   c) monophonic accompaniment
   d) none of the above

2. Instrument families used in this piece include
   a) woodwinds
   b) percussion
   c) brass
   d) a and b
   e) b and c

3. The meter is
   a) duple
   b) triple
   c) difficult to ascertain
   d) all of the above

4. The study of which concept would not be appropriate to the composition?
   a) dynamics
   b) texture
   c) form
   d) none of the above

Listening Selection #2 (Carillon, Bizet)

5. The three note pattern (G♯, E, F♯) is
   a) a descant
   b) theme B
   c) an ostinato

6. Theme A is played by the
   a) strings
   b) woodwinds
   c) brass

7. Contrast is provided in Theme A by varying
   a) tempo
   b) dynamics
   c) meter

8. The second theme is played by
   a) trumpets
   b) flutes and violins
   c) bassoons and oboes

9. The form of this piece is
   a) rondo
   b) ternary
   c) binary
Listening Selection #3  (Carry It On, Judy Collins)

10. **The instrument providing accompaniment is**  
   a) guitar  
   b) autoharp  
   c) dulcimer

11. **The meter is**  
   a) duple  
   b) triple  
   c) quadruple

12. **The instrumental music between verses is**  
   a) introduction  
   b) prelude  
   c) interlude

Listening Selection #4  (O Happy Day, Edwin Hawkins)

13. **This style of music is known as**  
   a) spiritual  
   b) jazz  
   c) rhythm and blues  
   d) gospel

14. **The instruments common to this style include**  
   a) piano  
   b) string bass  
   c) tambourine  
   d) all of the above

15. **After the introduction, the choir sings**  
   a) a call and response with the soloist  
   b) homophonically against the soloist  
   c) both a and b  
   d) neither a nor b

16. **During the time the choir repeats the words, "O happy day,"**  
   a) the soloist is improvising a melody  
   b) the instrumentalists are accompanying from a written score  
   c) both a and b  
   d) neither a nor b

17. **Which of the following is not a characteristic of this composition.**  
   a) syncopation  
   b) antiphonal singing  
   c) improvisation  
   d) pipe organ

18. **The words to this style of music can be derived from**  
   a) the lived experience of the people  
   b) other ethnic groups  
   c) the Bible  
   d) none of the above  
   e) all of the above
Listening Selection #5 (Dueling Banjos, "Deliverance")

19. Which instrument plays first?
   a) violin  
   b) banjo  
   c) piano  
   d) guitar

20. Which instrument follows in imitation?
   a) violin  
   b) banjo  
   c) piano  
   d) guitar

21. The guitar strums a chord pattern four times. It is imitated each time. Which of the following rhythm patterns is the correct one?
   a) \[ \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \]  
   b) \[ \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \]  
   c) \[ \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \]  
   d) \[ \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \frac{\text{J}}{\text{J}} \]

22. The guitar then plays a tune twice with the banjo imitating it each time. Which of the following melodies is the correct one?
   a) \[ \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \]  
   b) \[ \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \]

23. Then they both play a phrase that sounds like
   a) When Johnny Comes Marching Home  
   b) The Star Spangled Banner  
   c) America  
   d) Yankee Doodle

24. This is followed by the instruments playing a phrase five times. Which is the correct melody?
   a) \[ \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \]  
   b) \[ \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{S}}} \]

25. What is different with each playing of the preceding melody?
   a) each one is slower  
   b) each one starts on different pitches  
   c) each one is louder  
   d) each one is faster
APPENDIX I

STUDENT GRADE RELEASE FORM
March 1984

Dear Music 370 Students,

As you know, we as educators should be constantly evaluating the effectiveness of courses we teach, whether that be in the elementary, secondary, or college classroom. Activities in which you have been engaged during this quarter have been part of that evaluation process.

As part of that process, I am in need of some information from you. I am interested in relating your course grades from Music 270, Music 271, and your current grade point average (as of Winter Quarter) with various aspects of the evaluation. Therefore, I am asking that you sign this form which will allow the Registrar's Office to release to me the following:

- Music 270 grade
- Music 271 grade
- Winter Quarter grade point average.

In signing the release, it is understood that ONLY those grades requested will be released, that the names of individual students will remain confidential with me and will be released to no one else, and that this release will in no way affect your grade for Music 370.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sister Marge Kelly
Graduate Teaching Associate

I will permit the Office of the Registrar to release the Music 270, Music 271, and current grade point averages to Sister Marge Kelly.

I will NOT permit the Office of the Registrar to release the Music 270, Music 271, and current grade point averages to Sister Marge Kelly.

Signed ________________________________
Date ________________________________
Initial Letter to Experts

Dear

At the present time I am working on a doctoral dissertation concerning the effectiveness of various approaches in a music methods course for elementary education majors. Part of the dissertation involves the evaluation of videotapes of peer teaching lessons. Based on your background and experience with elementary music teacher education and instruction, I would ask you to serve as an evaluator of these teaching tapes.

Each evaluator will be asked to view and to evaluate 21 lessons of 14 minutes duration each. Thirteen of the total lessons will be used for establishing reliability. The remainder will then be distributed among three evaluators. Thus, it is expected that the total evaluation time will not exceed 11 hours for each evaluator.

All evaluators will receive the videotapes by March 26. The first 13 forms will need to be returned to me by April 18 (6 hours). The remainder need to be returned by April 30 (4 hours). It is necessary that you have convenient access to a "VHS monitor/playback unit.

In appreciation for your time and efforts, I would like to offer you a stipend of $125. I ask that you consider this request, and I will be contacting you by phone by March 16. If you desire further clarification, feel free to contact me at (614)764-8581 after 5:00 PM (EST), collect.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Signed, Sister Marge Kelly
APPENDIX K

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ESTABLISHING INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY OF PEER TEACHING LESSONS
Dear

I would like to thank you again for agreeing to serve as an evaluator of the teaching tapes for my dissertation. I truly appreciate the time and effort that is involved on your part.

Enclosed you will find 1) 30 copies of the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form, 2) a copy of the Operational Definitions of Specific Competencies, and 3) 2 return envelopes. In a separate mailing you will be receiving three boxed videotape cassettes of the peer teaching lessons.

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the extent of elementary education majors' music teaching skills, i.e., the degree to which these preservice students demonstrate the ability to teach an effective elementary level music lesson to their peers. These students were enrolled in Music for Elementary Teachers which is the third in a sequence of courses required by the College of Education for teacher certification in the State of Ohio. Students have taken a basic music fundamentals course and a literature and listening course prior to enrollment in methods and materials for elementary teachers. All students were juniors and seniors in the College of Education.

Students were asked to teach a lesson of 12-14 minutes duration in which they determined the topic, grade level, concepts to be taught, the musical materials and activities to be included, and the procedure to be followed. This lesson was the last of five peer teachings. The 14-minute limit was strictly enforced to the extent that the videotaping was stopped at 14 minutes. A few lessons lasted less than 12 minutes.

Tapes A and B are being evaluated as a reliability check among the three evaluators. Assuming that the reliability is high, you will have to evaluate only one additional tape included in this mailing. There are 13 music lessons on the two tapes (Tape A = 6 lessons, Tape B = 7 lessons). It is these evaluations which need to be in the mail by April 18. Therefore, I would ask that you begin with the these two tapes.

Please view each lesson of Tapes A and B and rate the peer teaching using the Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form according to the criteria described in the Operational Definitions of Specific Competencies. Each Elementary Music Teaching Evaluation Form is coded with the subject's number and grade level which corresponds to a visual code on the videotape. You may view the tapes in any order, however the number on your evaluation form must conform to the corresponding number of the videotape.

Again, since Tapes A and B are being used for reliability purposes, I would like your completed evaluation forms (1-13) in the mail by April 18. You may then continue to evaluate the remaining tape. I would like to receive the remainder of the evaluation forms and all three videotapes by April 30.

Thank you most sincerely for your time and efforts.

Sincerely,

Signed, Sister Marge Kelly
APPENDIX L

LIST OF EQUIPMENT FOR RECORDING PURPOSES
EQUIPMENT LIST

1 Panasonic WV 3400 color camera with 1:2 auto-zoom lens
1 Samson 2310 tripod modified with a Universal Fluid Head
2 Smith-Victor lights, model 740
2 Colortran light tripods
1 Panasonic NV-8410 videotape recorder
1 Sony MX-800 audio mixer
1 AKG microphone D 160E, omni-directional
1 Electro Coice microphone 635A, omni-directional
2 Atlas Sound microphone stands
1 19" Sony trinitron KV-1711D television receiver/monitor
2 XLR Cannon-XLR Cannon cables
1 XLR Cannon mini-phone cable
5 T-60 Sony VHS color videotapes
12 T-120 Sony VHS color videotapes
8 TDK D90 Normal Bias audio cassette tapes
1 Sony AMS Cassette Tape Recorder
APPENDIX M

CORRELATION MATRIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACH</th>
<th>TMTH</th>
<th>TMEN</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>LITER</th>
<th>PIANO</th>
<th>INSTR</th>
<th>ELGEN</th>
<th>JSPER</th>
<th>HSCRS</th>
<th>COLPER</th>
<th>COLCRS</th>
<th>COMPER</th>
<th>CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TMTH</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.303</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TMEN</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FUND</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LITER</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.507</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PIANO</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.232</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ELGEN</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>-0.332</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>JSPER</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HSCRS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>COLPER</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>COLCRS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>COMPER</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ACH: Music achievement
2. TMTH: number of professional education courses completed
3. TMEN: number of professional education courses, currently enrolled
4. GPA: cumulative grade point average
5. FUND: Music 270 grade (Music Fundamentals)
6. LITER: Music 271 grade (Literature and Listening)
7. PIANO: number of years of applied piano
8. INSTR: number of years of applied voice or instrument
9. ELGEN: number of years of elementary general music
10. JSPER: number of years of junior/senior high school performance experience
11. HSCRS: number of high school elective music courses
12. COLPER: number of years of college-level music performance experience
13. COLCRS: number of college-level music courses
14. COMPER: number of years of community music performance experience
15. CFA: level of music teaching confidence
APPENDIX N

INFORMAL EVALUATIONS OF MUSIC 370
INFORMAL EVALUATIONS OF MUSIC 370

"I feel much more confident in this area after having the opportunity to teach in this class."

"The class was good for me because it helped build some self-confidence about actually teaching."

"The course changed a few of my ill feelings toward music education."

"I think the demonstrations of lesson plans we were going to teach was one of the most useful items in the course."

"I felt that watching the lessons was very helpful in learning how to approach musical concepts in class and how to devise music lessons. One of the strong points of the class."

"I was in the group that viewed lessons on the video without discussion. I think this method was helpful; why not emulate someone who is teaching correctly? The videos were quality tapes and got the point across."

"I felt the evaluations were a waste of time because a lot of the time I was just searching for things to say to fill up time and space."

"I was in the discussion group, and I really don't feel that I got that much out of it. In education we are taught in every class to evaluate the teaching of others, so as I watch anyone teach, I evaluate their good and bad points. It's really not necessary for me to discuss it afterwards. I feel I would have benefited more by watching another lesson."

"The discussions of the model lessons were helpful in getting my critiquing skills in order."

"The discussion sessions were helpful, but at the same time, I felt left out of what was going on in class. The discussions would have been more beneficial if we had understood their purpose from the beginning; our focus changed dramatically when we finally did find out what they were for."

"I was in the discussion group. I had many questions as to why we, as a group, were the only ones who did this. I thought we were going to exchange. I did find it to be helpful because it made me think very deeply about each question. We compared/contrasted issues and gave positive/negative aspects of each issue. That involves a lot of critical deep thinking."