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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the practical adequacy of Duke’s (1994) rehearsal frame model as a “middle ground” perspective sequential outline of rehearsal events that lead to positive musical change. Observation and video recording of three accomplished high school band directors’ rehearsals generated data that allowed for a comparison between the model and actual practice. Results suggested that all parts of the original model need not be present, nor must they occur in the originally stated order for rehearsal frames to take place and direct students toward positive musical change. An amended model of the rehearsal frame was proposed, which included parts of Duke’s initial outline subdivided or re-defined to more accurately reflect the practice of accomplished music teachers. This model might be used by music teachers to help structure rehearsals, or by observers and evaluators to analyze “middle ground” details of rehearsals and thus see more clearly the interrelatedness of teacher and student behavior as they work together to produce positive performance change.
A Critical Examination of the Rehearsal Frame Model

In this study I examine the rehearsal frame concept of Duke (1994) as a theoretical model that has been meaningfully applied by pedagogues, conductors, and researchers in rehearsal observation and analysis and in rehearsal planning. The review of scholarly literature that follows examines these applications in the context of a model (Duke, 1994) that has remained unchanged since its introduction. First, however, I set some context for the presentation of rehearsal frames research by providing brief coverage of the connection between theory and practice and by reviewing research in the development of two other rehearsal “models”—sequential patterns in music and music teacher intensity.

Theory and Practice

There is often a dichotomy between theory and practice in education; many consider the “thinking” and “doing” of various techniques to be starkly different, and sometimes place them in opposition (Volpe, 1981). Historically, “advances along the lines of science, invention, and educational theory are always much more rapid than their general application to human welfare.” (Baker, 1937 p. 448). In order to examine the adequacy and utility of a model for music rehearsal (Duke, 1994), this study documented the rehearsal practices of accomplished music teachers and compared practice with the model’s design and theoretical underpinnings.

Generally speaking, music teachers often teach in a way similar to how they were taught. Having been in classrooms for the majority of their lives leading into their teaching careers, most retain many teaching habits and techniques they witnessed throughout their careers. In fact, Beattie (1938) believes, “A vast majority of us do things because we have always done them that way or because we have been indoctrinated in some educational institution. Ask a teacher why
he does something in a certain way and he may have no satisfactory answer beyond the statement that “the manual says to do it that way,” or “Professor So-and-So told us to do it this way” (p. 22). This way of thinking focuses only on the “doing” or practice half of the theory and practice dichotomy (Barrow, 1990).

Many believe that teachers are turned off by the idea of learning and implementing various theories because of the methods of presentation so often utilized. Nelson (2011) observed band directors who found many theoretical presentations to come across as negative or condescending to those working in a realistic, rather than an idealistic environment. Some are repelled by historically weak theories that misaligned with actual practice. Others believe “… theories… often obliterate a well-intentioned solution by cloudy terminology” (Young, 1985 p. 248). This likely rings true for busy teachers who do not feel that deciphering this ‘cloudy terminology’ found in many studies is helpful enough in practice to be worth their time. Many teachers were not properly trained in how to locate, comprehend, digest and utilize theory during their teacher training, and that gap in knowledge can lead to complacency in the classroom. If more ‘user friendly’ theories were presented in a simpler way, more teachers would likely buy into their ideas and put them into practice (Barrow, 1990; Young, 1985).

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines theory as: 1a. “The conceptual basis of a subject or area of study.” 2. “Abstract knowledge or principles, as opposed to practice experience or activity.” Theory is close in meaning to framework, that is, “An essential underlying structure; a provisional design, an outline; a conceptual scheme or system (OED, 2016). Duke (1994) describes the rehearsal frame concept as a model outline or framework. Volpe (1981) described theories as “systematic abstractions of various points of view on practice. When acted upon and transformed by the problem-solving aspects of practice these theories can foster a breadth of
perspective unobtainable in a lifetime of experience” (p. 41). He developed this idea further by stating that neither theory nor practice can or should stand alone when creating thoughtful, well-informed experiences. Ideally, each will inform the other, and as Stokes (2005) stated; “Given that a theory may bring about a range of different practices and that practices may be based upon a range of differing theories, one needs to be able to move easily between the two worlds” (p. 103). Without constant and intentional fluidity between the worlds of theory and practice, change cannot be adequately affected, particularly in education. Music teachers must make the conscious decision to constantly seek out that which they must understand in order to strike this vital balance between theory and practice. Once informed, they must use their judgment to determine which theories and practices are worth attempting and utilizing and which are best left for further development, so they may provide their students with the best experience possible at all times (Byo, 1991; Nelson, 2011; Volpe, 1981).

Music education has developed throughout history with both theoretical and practical assistance, and must to continue to evolve toward its most effective and lasting form. Two other models for music teaching – sequential patterns and teacher intensity – have developed from theoretical roots and through research and practical application. Barrow (1990) stated “… for theory to make sense and be worthy of the attention of teachers it must be based upon real experience” (p. 314). Duke’s (1994) frame model represents in outline form common practice rehearsal processes aimed at reaching musical goals. Accordingly, “the model outlines the course of action that takes place between a conductor and an ensemble engage in effecting changes in various aspects of performance (p. 84).
Sequential Patterns

Prior to the rehearsal frame outline, the sequential pattern was developed as a “tool” for observing and evaluating various teaching situations. The sequential pattern consists of three chronological steps: 1) task presentation, 2) student response, and 3) teacher reinforcement. This pattern originated in academic classroom teaching (Becker, Englemann & Thomas, 1971) and has been widely used as a naturally occurring or intentional teaching organizer since. Several studies (Maclin; 1993; Price, 1985; 1992; Price & Yarbrough, 1993/1994; Yarbrough & Hendel, 1993) have assessed the efficacy of teachers’ use of sequential patterns in teaching effectiveness and teaching evaluations, as well as whether the technique of sequential teaching could be learned. Others utilized the sequential pattern model to analyze rehearsals and other teaching scenarios to further examine various aspects of effective teaching (Hendel, 1995; Speer, 1994).

Occasionally, literature refers to the same three-step pattern by alternate names. Price (1983; 1985) outlined the same aforementioned sequence as the teaching unit, rather than as the sequential pattern. Price (1985) examined the effect of different levels of completion of the teaching unit. It was found that while the presence of the third step—teacher reinforcement—is not always necessary to perform a teaching unit, consistent use of feedback to students often allows for more effective teaching. Several advantages of completing the teaching unit were found after students were provided with both complete and incomplete teaching units in their rehearsals. When presented with consistent teacher feedback, students appeared to be more engaged, had a more positive attitude, and rated their teachers more favorably. This method of using complete teaching units also appeared to be the most efficient of three tested methods. Additionally, students had the greatest amount of musical gain when taught in this manner, indicating that utilizing the complete teaching unit is a viable path to effective teaching.
Yarbrough and Price (1989) endeavored to determine whether music teachers applied the technique of the sequential pattern in their classrooms. To do so, they observed and videotaped regular rehearsals taught by future music teachers as well as veteran teachers. From the video, they created transcripts of what occurred during the rehearsals; the scripts were then coded for each type of activity or speech found. Finally, the scripts were analyzed to determine whether music teachers commonly used complete sequential patterns in their rehearsals. It was found that many teachers did not consistently provide feedback to their students after they were given the opportunity to respond to initial task presentations, and therefore did not consistently complete sequential teaching patterns. When reinforcement was given, it was often deemed negative, inappropriately positive, or nonspecific and positive, contributing to what was considered “more structured practice than actual teaching” (p. 183) and did not always constitute a correct sequential pattern as defined by Yarbrough and Price. This lack of complete sequential patterns found in regular classrooms could indicate either a need for teachers to include more reinforcement in their teaching patterns, or that the reinforcement step of the sequence may not always be necessary for effective teaching.

In the same vein Price (1992), sought to determine the most effective way of teaching educators to use sequential patterns. After three experiments that presented the sequential pattern in different ways to teachers, one method, explained here, proved to be the most effective. This method did not simply present a list of steps in the pattern, but presented the teaching pattern in action. The participants were exposed to the technique before having the opportunity to execute the task. Once practiced, the subjects observed and evaluated videos of their own teaching. After participating in self-reflection, the educators were subject to a formal review of the steps and definitions of the sequential pattern, as well as the reasoning behind the technique. Following
this review, subjects were asked to put the pattern into use again, and were evaluated by the researcher and reliability observers. This method of learning the sequential pattern proved to be effective in this instance, and could likely be utilized to impart other teaching techniques in the future.

Similarly, Maclin (1993) used task analysis as a method for aspiring or novice teachers to learn and execute sequential patterns. Complete task analyses consist of a detailed list of activities to be completed in a rehearsal, as well as a “script” for the teacher to recite, read, or follow. Task analyses of varied levels of completion were required of the participants before the investigator observed and analyzed rehearsals in search of complete sequential patterns. It was determined that teachers who took the time to write a detailed task analysis of their lessons before teaching them most often followed through and performed complete three step sequential patterns. This method of learning to teach using sequential patterns also gave the subjects opportunity for mastery and success with the technique, rather than simply being exposed to it and asked to perform without explicit instructions.

Further research by Price and Yarbrough (1993/1994) has indicated that patterns that include all three steps of the sequential pattern ending with approval feedback are the most effective patterns, and as such, should be implemented much more frequently in music classrooms around the country. The one major inconsistency found in this study was in observers analyzing whether patterns were complete or incomplete. This arose from confusion about whether or not non-specific feedback counted as teacher reinforcement. Because of this discrepancy, mixed results were found, though it appeared overall that the presence of the third and final step of the pattern was preferred over non-presence.
After previous interest in observational parties’ abilities to recognize and label complete sequential patterns, some questioned the effect of the method of presentation on observers’ ability to identify complete sequential patterns. Yarbrough and Hendel (1993) sought to determine the presentation method most effective in demonstrating complete sequential patterns to third party observers. Experiments providing audio-video recordings as well as transcripts of music rehearsals, transcripts only, audio only, video only, and combinations of the three were tested. The lessons and patterns observed were all controlled, and the only variable given to evaluators was the method of presentation. It was determined that evaluators gave the highest ratings when given all three components of a rehearsal; audio recording, video recording, and a written script were present. Therefore, future researchers, as well as observing administrators or other evaluating parties should attempt to acquire as many of the aforementioned components as possible when evaluating any teaching scenario to ensure their opportunity to completely and fairly examine all aspects.

Multiple studies have utilized the sequential pattern as a tool with which to determine the rate or presence of various aspects of effective teaching. Speer (1994) employed the sequential pattern model to determine the amounts of different types of instructional feedback and approval that took place in piano lessons taught by expert teachers. Rather than qualifying and counting each piece of feedback given throughout a lesson without an organizing framework, he divided it up into sensible parts, or sequential patterns, before recording and coding each response. Additionally he sought to find whether the observed sequential patterns were found to be complete and correct as defined by the literature, and how often they deviated from the model. If a pattern contained all three parts as well as specific, musical teacher reinforcement, he considered it to be complete and correct. If a pattern contained all three parts, but lacked specific,
musical teacher reinforcement, it was deemed complete but incorrect; and if a pattern lacked reinforcement of any kind, it was labeled as incomplete. Overall, Speer found that 47% of the patterns he observed in expert piano teachers’ lessons were incomplete, 42% were complete but incorrect, and only 11% of his observed patterns were complete and correct. These results appear to show a lack of quality teaching, if it is assumed that quality teaching only occurs in complete and correct teaching patterns. However, his participants consisted of accomplished piano teachers and many successful students, so it seems that despite the low percentage of “complete and correct” sequential teaching patterns found in his study, there must have been quality teaching occurring in the observed studios. It may be that music teaching analysis according to the sequential patterns model provides a glimpse of music teaching that leaves some effective teaching undetected.

Hendel (1995) utilized sequential patterns in a similar way; in her attempt to identify factors of effective elementary music teaching, she applied the three-step model to the elementary school classes she observed. During this application, she realized that not all teaching situations fit the chronology of the original model. Rather than immediately label teaching patterns that she found as “incomplete” or “incorrect,” she analyzed each sequence to determine whether it “differed from, replicated, and/or expanded on” the previous research and the original model. She recorded the patterns that emerged from this investigation, and created a list of Complex Extended Patterns, Related Patterns, as well as Isolated Patterns. This list was far more inclusive than the original model, and gave quality teachers the chance to be evaluated in a more flexible way. Therefore, it seems as if a model other than the sequential pattern might be more appropriate and inclusive in evaluating these and other music lessons.
Since its inception in 1971 and its subsequent entry into music education, the sequential pattern model has been adapted based on the practices observed and analyzed in music teaching. Most evident in Hendel (1995), it has undergone several transformations dedicated to facilitating its viability and utility. The adaptation of this model based on practice is a prime example of how theory and practice can and should coexist in an inter-reliant relationship in music education.

Teacher Intensity

Standley and Madsen (1987) stated broadly that a connection appeared to occur between teaching intensity and teaching effectiveness. Since this study that helped highlight the vitality of teacher intensity in effective music teaching, many investigators have used observation and analysis to develop a practical definition of teacher intensity. Madsen, Standley, and Cassidy (1989) presented examples of high and low teacher intensity to participants, asked them to then demonstrate both high and low intensity themselves, and finally to define the term. Two major themes that were found among their collected definitions were “enthusiasm in live, positive student/teacher interactions” and a certain “sense of timing in relationship to classroom management and effective subject matter presentation and monitoring” (p. 92).

In a later study, teacher intensity was defined as “(1) sustained control of the student/teacher interaction with (2) efficient, accurate presentation of subject matter combined with (3) enthusiastic affect and pacing” (Madsen, 1990, p. 38). Madsen, Standley and Cassidy (1989) sought to make a distinction between traits of novice teachers and expert teachers, and to quickly teach the behaviors of experts to future teachers to help them perform at their highest level. In this study, high intensity was found in expert teachers and selected as a teachable trait for pre-service teachers. The concept of high teacher intensity was presented to pre-service
teachers through demonstrations and the presentation of information, such as characteristics and definitions. Afterward, participants individually taught lessons and were observed and evaluated for high and low teacher intensity levels. This process continued with different stated expectations before each lesson. For instance, some participants were asked to teach with higher intensity, and some with lower. After these attempts, each participant was evaluated to determine whether their lesson contained the requested level of intensity. Overall, it was found that intensity could be taught to pre-service teachers with relative ease. It is likely that other aspects of effective teaching, particularly those most closely related to intensity, such as pacing and attitude can be taught with similar ease.

Similarly, Madsen (1990) found that training educators to perform at a high intensity level was a relatively easy task. This was an important reaffirmation, as it was also found that teaching with a high level of intensity quite consistently helped to maintain student attentiveness and engagement in the classroom. Madsen says, “Maintaining student attentiveness is one of the challenges that face those of us who truly believe in music education for all students as opposed to only allowing for that small percentage who perform within our choral and instrumental ensembles” (p. 38). Cassidy (1990) found “(not surprisingly) that practice of an activity may lead to an improvement” (p.171). Sheer repetition and practice of teaching with high intensity led to greater use of high intensity as a tool for effective teaching.

Rehearsal conducting, though largely a nonverbal act, is a major component of rehearsal effectiveness. As such, conducting is significantly impacted by the intensity shown by the teacher doing the conducting. Byo (1990) sought to determine whether beginning conductors could perform with various levels of intensity, and if untrained observers could accurately identify varied levels of teacher intensity. He found that even untrained observers could fairly
easily deduce the level of intensity being shown by conductors. Observers ranged from those untrained in music to graduate music students, who most accurately determined the level of intensity. These results imply that one’s level of musical training likely affects the ability to properly identify music teacher intensity.

Many studies have contributed to the development of the concept of music teacher intensity. Throughout the development of this concept or “tool” to aid in effective teaching, several means of analysis have been utilized. In order to effectively examine small sections of various rehearsals to determine the level of teaching intensity, or any other aspects of effective teaching, the evolution of analysis needed a new framework.

**Rehearsal Frames**

Duke (1994) sought to expand upon previous research in music education, in which “fewer systematic investigations have attempted to document and analyze the skills of rehearsal conducting in particular.” (p. 79). During his investigation of effective rehearsal conducting, Duke shaped the model of the Rehearsal Frame (1994; 1999/2000), which he based on the amount of information he felt should be included in a rehearsal observation. In an attempt to avoid an overly magnified view of rehearsals that focuses on individual verbalizations or actions and often discounts the context in which they occur, his rehearsal frame model lies in the “middle ground.” While avoiding minute and decontextualized details, this view also allows for more specific observation of behaviors than would a global, or big-picture view of a rehearsal. Rather than either of these extreme perspectives, his “middle ground” framework focuses on the progression of events that bring about positive change, specifically change that helps students and ensembles accomplish musical goals.
Duke’s (1994; 1999/2000) Rehearsal Frame contains three main structural components divided into five sections: target identification (1A), limitation (1B), decontextualization/remediation (2A), demonstration of the target (2B), and recontextualization (3). These may be seen in Figure 1. Each of these may consist of multiple repetitions or multiple “performance episodes.” In the initial stage, Identify the Target, the conductor locates the target, or the area of music to be rehearsed, and verbalizes this to the musicians. Once it is identified, the conductor specifies which individual(s) should make up the rehearsal group that will participate in the subsequent performance episodes. During the second step of the Rehearsal Frame, Decontextualize/Remediate, the conductor works to create a positive change in the targeted area with the selected group of musicians. This often consists of some level of decontextualization, such as an altered tempo or partial practice. Theoretically, the target will be rehearsed out of context until it begins to improve, and will move gradually back toward its original form, until a successful performance of the target is complete, fulfilling the second half of the second step: Demonstrate the Target. The final step of the Rehearsal Frame is Recontextualize. Once the rehearsal group has successfully demonstrated the target, the entire ensemble will perform the segment of music in question in its original context, often beginning slightly before the targeted area.

This final step is vital in understanding the success of rehearsal frames. According to Duke (1994; 1999/2000) “Recontextualization of the target is the linchpin of the Rehearsal Frame . . . the work that takes place during the course of a Rehearsal Frame is meaningful only to the extent that the improvements made become a lasting part of the ensemble’s performance of the piece” (p. 91).
Rehearsal Frame Outline

Part 1A (conductor verbalization)—Identify the Target

- prioritize aspects of performance that require attention
tone/intonation
rhythm/articulation/precision
style/character
phrasing/dynamics
balance/blend

Part 1B (performance episode[s])—Limit

- reduce the magnitude and complexity of the stimulus
- locate individuals who require attention

Part 2A (performance episode[s])—Decontextualize/Remediate

- select rehearsal ensemble that facilitates remediation
- determine how far out of context to rehearse
  slow practice
  partial practice
  altered practice
  related exercise
- encourage transfer through successive approximations

Part 2B (performance episode[s])—Demonstrate the Target

- have the Rehearsal Group demonstrate that they can perform the Target successfully and independently

Part 3 (performance episode[s])—Recontextualize

- determine how much of the original context should be performed
- insist on maintenance of changes

Figure 1. Duke (1994) Rehearsal Frame Model

Multiple facets of effective music teaching exist, and many have been investigated through the lens of the rehearsal frame. Several of these studies have utilized the outline simply as a structural way to divide the rehearsal to view a specific aspect of teaching or learning within a rehearsal, rather than delving into the components of the rehearsal frame itself.

For instance, the use of rehearsal frames made it much easier to see individual instances of musical targets and teaching moments in Cavitt’s (2004) study on teaching and improving intonation in rehearsal settings. She divided the rehearsals she observed into rehearsal frames, and used these to analyze the different types of feedback given by teachers in response to student performance or verbalization. By looking from this “middle ground” perspective of rehearsals, she was able to see how each teacher response effected student growth and change in context, rather than simply tallying how many positive or negative responses were given throughout a given time period.

In Cavitt’s (2003) study, she followed a similar process, and used the context of the rehearsal frame to analyze how teachers go about correcting student errors in music rehearsals. She wanted to expand on the existing literature in this field, specifically on the effect of teachers’ decisions, actions and techniques on the achievement of classroom and musical objectives. As she was seeking to find the way that teachers accomplish goals (in this case, error correction) in the context of a music rehearsal, rather than simply quantifying teachers’ actions in a decontextualized manner, viewing these rehearsals with the lens of the rehearsal frame seemed an obvious choice. During her investigation, she found that the nature of the targeted error made a great impact on the process that took place to correct it. For instance, a rehearsal frame that focused on tone or intonation generally required fewer decontextualizations and less time to remediate than did a frame focused on technical facility. While multiple rehearsal structures
provide researchers and educators with different, and respectively valuable perspectives on teaching and rehearsing, it appears that one standard model may not adequately represent the multitude of rehearsals held by expert teachers.

Conducting is considered an important skill for band directors, and is often linked with rehearsing and error correction. Worthy (2003) used the rehearsal frame model to study conducting and the types of error correction that occurred in both collegiate and high school honor band rehearsal settings. He chose one conductor and one piece of music that were rehearsed and performed with the two diverse groups of musicians. Worthy sought to understand how the conductor brought about change (through conducting and error correction) in rehearsals with these two groups of musicians, with two different amounts of experience and skill levels. Again, Duke’s (1994) model was a useful frame of reference for observing these rehearsals. It allowed Worthy to see specific aspects of rehearsal in a consistent way, while maintaining the context of goal achievement.

A later study by Worthy (2006) was performed similarly. He wanted to “identify the most crucial rehearsal segments for further analysis,” (p. 54), and to capture the essence of effective teaching. While analyzing rehearsals and reviewing existing literature, he noted that the results of observations are often contingent on the method of observation used. With this in mind, he utilized the rehearsal frame as a means of observation and analysis, rather than the older sequential pattern model. Using this lens directed Worthy to see the observed rehearsals in their structural parts, rather than as larger, complete units. This demagnified view of rehearsals certainly helped in achieving his research goals.

Other studies observing music lessons outside of school band and other large ensembles have also utilized the rehearsal frame as a tool for analysis. Colprit (2000) observed and analyzed
individual Suzuki string lessons using this lens. She found that “timing and sequence of events may also influence teacher effectiveness,” (p. 207), implying that using rehearsal frames, or some type of chronological structure of events is often quite helpful. When looking specifically for a chronology of events and the relationship between consecutive rehearsal events, using a lens that focuses on sequence and structure can direct the observer to details that might otherwise go unobserved.

The results of rehearsal frame analyses across multiple studies (Cavitt, 2003; 2004; Worthy 2003; 2006) have unearthed recurring details found in rehearsal frames that were adopted as categories for measurement, such as types of musical targets. A future amended model might implement these recurring details found in practice, if in fact the intention of the model is to display the framework of rehearsals carried out by accomplished music teachers.

The purpose of this study was to identify rehearsal processes that replicate, differ from, and perhaps expand on the rehearsal frame model (Duke, 1994). Presented another way; what is the practical viability of this model to provide a complete, not partial, picture of the “middle ground” (p. 78) view of the rehearsal act? Duke proposes that this middle ground is where “…much of the art of rehearsal conducting may be seen” (p. 78). I examined the meaning encapsulated in the phrase “the art of rehearsal conducting” by analyzing the rehearsals of three accomplished high school band directors. Analysis focused on the extent to which the band directors consistently created and participated in rehearsal events that aligned with Duke’s model. A more in-depth analysis of the use of each individual part of Duke’s model might reveal the practical viability of each rehearsal event, but this study remained in the “middle ground” and looked at all parts of the model, as well as their sequencing and interaction to provide a complete picture of the rehearsal frame. If in fact behavioral analysis of rehearsals leads to a more
inclusive rehearsal frame model, future music teachers and researchers might use it to structure or analyze rehearsals to create quality musical experiences.
METHOD

Participants

Under advisement of the thesis committee, three accomplished high school band directors located near a mid-sized city in the southeastern United States were identified as viable candidates whose rehearsals could be observed and recorded. For this study, an accomplished band director was defined as one who has at least 5 years of teaching experience, has attained a reputation of excellence by receiving consistent superior ratings at district and state large ensemble festival, and who produces students who are selected for all-state band. In observing and recording the rehearsals of accomplished band directors, my goal was to obtain rehearsal video of effective teaching for use for rehearsal frame analysis. (Byo, 1994; Cavitt, 2003, 2004; Worthy, 2003).

As stated by Byo (1994), “One way to validate a rehearsal approach is to find evidence of its presence in the rehearsals of highly accomplished conductors” (p. 72). Many research studies that seek to determine the nature of effective rehearsing have used experts, or accomplished professionals in the field. Worthy (2003) enlisted a “nationally recognized” wind conductor who had 22 years of professional experience. Cavitt (2003; 2004) stated that all her participants “had received consistent superior ratings at band contests, and participants’ ensembles had won first place in large statewide concert band competition” (p. 220). The driving force in studying the behaviors and techniques of experts is access to consistent and credible data (Hendel, 1995, p. 188). The present study followed this pattern found in music education research and focused on the work of accomplished band directors.

Prior to school and participant recruitment, a request for exemption from institutional oversight was granted by the LSU Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A). Signed consent
forms from participating schools’ administration and band directors were collected (see Appendix B and Appendix C). After permissions were obtained, rehearsals were recorded from the back of the room with only the band director visible in the frame. The descriptive nature of this study posed no threat to its participants. No vulnerable populations participated, and there was no treatment administered at any point during the study. My only interaction with the participants consisted of contact to obtain permission and the observation and recording of three typical high school rehearsals per band director. Consenting adult participants were the only visible people in the video recording. Students were not visible in the recordings, although both teachers and students were heard in the recordings obtained.

**Procedures**

Three regular rehearsals with the most advanced ensemble taught by each of the three participant band directors were observed and recorded in the usual rehearsal room setting. In order to obtain as many teaching and learning moments as possible, only the middle portion of each band’s rehearsal cycle where concert repertoire was being rehearsed was selected for analysis. Rehearsals that consisted primarily of sight-reading new music or that contained many run-throughs of music were not included in this study. Additionally, the beginnings of rehearsals containing announcements, instructions, and warm up material rather than high levels of teacher and student rehearsal interaction were discounted from analysis (Cavitt, 2003).

Observation and analysis of these recordings helped reveal the sequence of rehearsal events inclusive of both teacher and student behaviors. Similar to the steps taken by Yarbrough and Price (1989) I first created a chronological “script” of all rehearsal events to be subjected to rehearsal frame analysis. The scripts comprised the verbalizations of the band directors, verbal
responses of students, and each rehearsal activity that occurred in the order that it transpired in order to provide a detailed description of all rehearsal events and interactions. At appropriate times, such as when targets were introduced or were performed, the time in the video was noted within the “script.”

This study was exploratory in the sense that its purpose was to examine the adequacy of the rehearsal frames model to provide comprehensive coverage of all “middle ground” rehearsal events. This purpose had not been addressed in previous research. In applying the model to actual rehearsals, the extent that it would provide a “place” for all events was not known. Therefore rehearsal analysis began by applying the model in its original form. Analysis of the first rehearsal served as a “pilot” of sorts and revealed several aspects of the original model that required adjustment such that rehearsal data could be accurately and consistently recorded. Once the initial rehearsal analysis was complete, subsequent analyses followed the then-finalized analytical procedures, which are explained below. To insure that I coded and analyzed all rehearsals in a consistent manner, I went back through each of the transcripts after completing the pilot analysis and checked over my work. Minor adjustments were made in coding in order to adhere to the definitions of all seven rehearsal frame steps and to maintain consistency throughout analysis.

For use in rehearsal analysis, the original model was adjusted as follows: Limit and Decontextualize/Remediate were separated to clearly distinguish between instances of reducing the size of the rehearsal group and reducing the magnitude of the musical stimulus. Rather than having multiple parts with similar definitions or included criteria, I chose to separate some elements of the rehearsal frame. As shown in Figure 1, “reduce the magnitude and complexity of the stimulus” is listed under 1B, and “determine how far out of context to rehearse” is listed
under 2A. These are quite similar in meaning, though the titles of each step are not synonymous. Similarly, “locate individuals who require attention” and “select rehearsal ensemble that facilitates remediation” are quite comparable, and are listed under both Parts 1B and 2A. These similar definitions caused confusion during analysis and contributed to the need for clarification.

Decontextualization tends to have a specifically intended purpose; somehow alter the music so students may improve upon the musical target. For example, a technical passage written for the clarinets might be isolated and performed at a slower tempo to allow the players an opportunity to master the fingering technique required for accurate performance. Performance repetition, however, does not necessarily alter any of the music being performed, nor does it necessarily invoke musical change. Often, band directors use performance repetitions to “buy time” so they may have an extra chance to more accurately assess what needs to be addressed in a rehearsal. Many allot performers extra opportunities to practice, self-assess, or improve individually through performance repetitions. Worthy (2003; 2004) also found high numbers of “performance trials” consistently among both high school and college rehearsals, suggesting that numerous performance repetitions are indeed common in quality band rehearsals. To continue the example cited above, the clarinet section might perform the assigned passage at the slower tempo multiple times before moving to the next logical step in the rehearsal frame.

Encouragement of transfer through successive approximations resembles performance repetition in that a performance does take place within this step. However, the vital component of a successive approximations is the increase in the difficulty and/or “realness” of a musical target. For instance, for those same clarinet players an increase in tempo or the addition to the texture of the matching flute line increases the challenge. Either option helps the clarinets approach the original context of the piece, but remains short of a fully recontextualized
performance with the entire ensemble. Because each of these three categories function as different, yet integral pieces of the rehearsal, they were considered separately for the purposes of this study and labeled as such during the coding process.

To assist in my analysis, I listed in order the elements of Duke’s (1994) rehearsal frame model and labeled each with corresponding numbers: (1) Identify Target, (2) Limit, (3) Decontextualize/Remediate, (4) Repetition, (5) Successive Approximations, (6) Demonstrate the Target, (7) Recontextualize. Duke’s model suggests a chronological order of rehearsal elements, though he acknowledges that it need not be followed in order.

For the present study, the following definitions of each element in the rehearsal frame model were used. They are largely based on Duke’s (1994) definitions, although as stated above, some adjustments were made for clarification: (1) Explicit or implicit indication of a musical target or targets that were addressed in the rehearsal events within the rehearsal frame, (2) reduction of the number of performers participating in the rehearsal group; this could include multiple instrumental sections, a group of individuals, or a single player; (3) isolation of music, such as a single note or excerpt of the piece being rehearsed; altered, slow, partial or related practice of the music being rehearsed; external stimuli that alter the context of the music being rehearsed, such as the audible presence of a metronome; other assistive musical instruction; (4) any performance or repetition that remained in a decontextualized state; (5) any partial recontextualization of the target, such as adding more players back to the limited rehearsal group or approaching performance of the musical excerpt as it was written; (6) an improved and successful performance of the musical target; (7) full ensemble performance of the musical target, often beginning earlier in the piece than the target’s location.
To begin rehearsal frame analysis, I found each introduction of a new musical target, which determined the beginning and often the end of each rehearsal frame, as shown in Appendix C. Some frames were found to contain multiple targets addressed simultaneously. Rehearsal frames ended at the point in the rehearsal when the band director switched gears, stopped focusing on the original target(s), and/or began a completely new activity. This was notated by brackets in red pencil in the left margin, parallel to the lines of the script which stated the starting and stopping times of each frame within each rehearsal video. Next, within each frame, I coded the “script” by labeling each of the seven parts defined above as frequently or infrequently as they occurred. This was notated by circling the appropriate number in blue above the corresponding text within the script. To complete the script labeling process, all statements coded (1) (Identify Target) were found, and the targets identified were written within their corresponding rehearsal frame brackets in red in the left margin.

For each rehearsal, a spreadsheet was created that included the starting and stopping times of all rehearsal frames, as well as any observed and recorded time that was not part of a rehearsal frame. Appendix D presents an excerpt of one of those spreadsheets. The length of time per frame was noted, as well as the type of target(s), whether the target was identified or implied, the limitation of the rehearsal group, the nature of decontextualization and remediation techniques used, whether the target was demonstrated successfully, whether the target was recontextualized, and the chronology of steps taken within the frame.

A comprehensive spreadsheet containing data from all nine hours and twenty-seven minutes of rehearsals that were observed, recorded and analyzed was then created. The following data were collected: Total number of rehearsal frames, duration of frames, presence of target identification, number of frames with one target only, number of frames with multiple targets,
number of frames whose step chronology began with target identification, presence of limitation,
number of frames whose step chronology began with limitation, presence of successful target
demonstration, presence of recontextualization, and the number of performance repetitions.

This method of analysis appeared to provide clear and consistent categories for nearly all
observed rehearsal events. To allow for consistency of observation and analysis of future
rehearsals, the categories used in this study were proposed in an amended model presented in
Figure 2.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to document the sequence and content of rehearsal frames that take place in the rehearsals of accomplished conductors, I observed and recorded three accomplished band directors during three of their typical rehearsals. The quantitative data collected from all rehearsals was combined into one data set; there was no reason, given the purpose of this study, to differentiate among the band directors. Nine observation periods resulted in nine hours and twenty-seven minutes of video. Due to warm up time and regular classroom interruptions, two hours and fifty-three minutes of video was discounted, leaving six hours and thirty-four minutes of video that was used in rehearsal frame content analysis.

I transcribed all conductor verbalizations in the scripts of the nine rehearsals, resulting in 103 pages of double spaced text. I coded each rehearsal event based on which part of Duke’s (1994) rehearsal frame model it most closely resembled, similar to Cavitt’s (2003) study that sought to find the rates and durations of various aspects of the rehearsal frame for analysis. Across the nine observed rehearsals, 161 rehearsal frames were identified and analyzed. On average, rehearsal frames lasted approximately 2.37 minutes. The length of the frames analyzed ranged from 2 seconds to 9 minutes. These data were consistent with previous findings on rehearsal frames (Cavitt, 2003).

The Model Applied to Real Rehearsal: Decisions That Clarified

Close scrutiny of the rehearsal frames model in the context of real rehearsal revealed the need to lend clarity to model components—Limit, Decontextualize/Remediate, Performance Repetition and Successive Approximation. Because the conductor/teacher behaviors in each of these parts serve different purposes, they were divided into separate parts and re-defined slightly
in an amended model. This clarification allowed observed rehearsal events to “fit” distinctly into just one part of the rehearsal frame, rather than possibly belonging in multiple parts, making it easier to compare actual events to the model. In addition, frame coverage was expanded to allow space for rehearsal events that seemed to have no place in the original model. The amended model is presented and explained more fully below in Figure 2.

The Occurrence and Distribution of Rehearsal Frame Parts

Most rehearsal frames analyzed in this study did not contain all seven sequentially-presented parts of Duke’s (1994) model; Target Identification, Limitation, Decontextualization, Performance Repetition, Successive Approximations, Successful Demonstration, and Recontextualization. Only three frames, 1.9% of the 161 total frames analyzed, were found to contain all seven parts of the model. In these three instances, the parts did not occur in the original order listed in the model.

As shown in Table 1, some of the seven parts were found in abundance, while others were scarcely seen in the observed frames. Roughly two-thirds (66.5%) of recorded frames evidenced limitation of the rehearsal group during attempts to remediate toward an improved musical target. During the remaining 33.5% of frames, the entire ensemble performed during remediation of the selected target. Less than one-quarter (21.2%) of frames included successive approximations. Just 22.4% of the frames included a successful demonstration of musical targets. Additionally, just over one-third (37.3%) of frames contained a true recontextualization of their targets, during which the entire ensemble performed the targeted music beginning at or before
the start of the isolated musical excerpt. Table 1 includes the total number and percentage of occurrences of each of the seven rehearsal frame parts across all nine rehearsals and their 161 rehearsal frames.

Table 1. Number and Percentage of Frames Comprising the Various Frame Parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehearsal Frame Part</th>
<th>Total Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Target Identification</td>
<td>151 (93.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Limitation</td>
<td>107 (66.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Decontextualization</td>
<td>140 (87.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Performance Repetition</td>
<td>153 (95.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Successive Approximation</td>
<td>34 (21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Successful Demonstration</td>
<td>36 (22.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Recontextualization</td>
<td>60 (37.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, some of the parts found in the original model (Duke, 1994) were observed quite consistently in the recorded rehearsals. Target identification, whether implicit or explicit, occurred in 93.8% of the analyzed frames, leaving only 10 frames with unidentified targets. Performance repetitions were also found in abundance throughout the study; only 5 total frames existed without a performance repetition.

The results of this analysis of rehearsals run by accomplished band directors align with Duke’s sentiment that rehearsals divide sensibly among frames, and “substantive change certainly may occur without the appearance of all parts in the model” (Duke, 1994 p. 84). In other words, Duke’s statement acknowledges that the presence of every part of his frame model is not always necessary for positive musical change to occur. In this study, the majority of the analyzed rehearsal frames (77.6%) concluded before allowing a successfully demonstrated performance of the musical target. Also, most frames (62.7%) did not include a full
recontextualization of the musical target with the entire ensemble. These results are contrary to those found by Worthy (2006), who reported that most rehearsal frames he observed conducted renown band directors “typically concluded with a performance of the corrected music in full context” after the observed conductors “were persistent and waited for student mastery and independence when correcting errors” (p. 56). To determine more accurately whether these final two parts of the model are indeed vital to the rehearsal frame, further research might use longitudinal studies, rather than simply analyzing a number of single rehearsals to delve into frames with and without these steps and test the effects on improvement of musical targets. Often in band rehearsals, musical targets are identified and remediation begins, but targets do not reach the final state of successful demonstration, as the intent of the band director is to return to the same targets in subsequent rehearsals and resume remediation. A longitudinal study across several chronological rehearsals might provide more insight to the vitality of these seemingly “missing” parts of frames.

Starting the Rehearsal Frame

In a rehearsal analysis or conceptualization according to frames, that which signals the beginning of a frame is a crucial element. In Duke’s (1994) model, the idealized rehearsal frame begins with musical target identification, whether implicit or explicit. Contrary to this outline, the accomplished band directors of the present study did not always start rehearsal frames in this manner. Fifty-one of the 161 existing frames (31.7%) began with the identification of musical target, while sixty-nine frames (42.9%) began with the limitation of the rehearsal group. Limitation of the rehearsal group was the most frequently utilized means of signaling the
beginning of a frame, with 30 (43.5%) of those frames being followed by target identification. The remaining 25.5% of analyzed frames started with either a performance repetition or decontextualization.

The inconsistency discovered in each frame’s first-occurring part is notable, particularly because the model focused on the sequence of events that occurred in an idealized rehearsal frame, a sequence that begins with target identification. Identifying the target of the frame is certainly a logical first step on paper, but in actual practice, the accomplished band directors of the present study “realized” the model more flexibly and less prescriptively. These accomplished band directors tended to gravitate toward performing these same rehearsal frame parts in a different order than the model suggests, a tendency that may be explained by simple preference or by a sense that one order “works better” than another. In order to determine the efficacy of the order of steps taken in a rehearsal frame, future research might focus on the relationship of the sequence of steps taken by band directors and improvement/quality of musical output reciprocated by student performers.

**Number of Targets per Frame**

In Duke’s (1994) model, targets are selected through a process of prioritization, and tend to be singular musical goals. Frame content analysis in this study showed that accomplished band directors identified single targets 80 times and multiple targets 81 times. This nearly even split between single and multiple targets is inconsistent with the single target language in the model.

Because of the multifaceted nature of band, numerous opportunities for musical improvement often present themselves simultaneously during rehearsals. Analyses of rehearsals
by Cavitt (2003) and Worthy (2003) both resulted in many of the same types of targets that were found in the present study: technical facility, rhythm, articulation, dynamics, tempo, pitch accuracy, and intonation/tone. In an attempt to rehearse efficiently, many band directors, such as those observed in this study, address multiple musical targets between performance episodes, rather than just one. Cavitt (2003) and Worthy (2003) even categorized “multiple targets” separately from the other types of musical targets found in their studies due to the high proportion of frames discovered to contain multiple targets.

One example of a fairly typical rehearsal frame analyzed in this study targeted not only the entrance points of various instrumental sections, but also balance across the entire ensemble. These targets were not directly related, yet were addressed in quick succession within one rehearsal frame so that the entire rehearsal would continue to forward efficiently. Because multiple targets were addressed at the same time, and their processes of remediation continued simultaneously, these two targets were considered to take place in only one frame. Other times, rehearsal frames began with one target, and during the progression of that frame, another target presented itself and was also addressed. These were considered instances of frames with multiple targets when the original target’s progression continued simultaneously with the progression of the second target.

Theoretically, the rehearsal frame model can be used to guide future teachers’ rehearsal planning, or to direct observers’ attention to certain aspects of effective rehearsing, based on the practical use of the rehearsal frame by experts in the field. In order to align more precisely with the practice of accomplished band directors, an amended version of the model might expand to include the option of incorporating multiple targets if necessitated by the rehearsal or desired by
the rehearsal. Additionally, the inclusion of multiple targets as an option for rehearsal frames may encourage novice teachers to conceptualize rehearsals in the same way as these accomplished teachers and include multiple targets in a frame.

**Decontextualization and Remediation**

During analysis, 140 instances of decontextualization/remediation were found. Each of these instances altered in some way the context of the music being performed from the original intent of the composer, and/or was musically assistive in nature. Other general instruction found in rehearsal frames, such as repetitions of previous instruction and reminders of instruction or musical facts were not characterized as instances of remediation or decontextualization. When determining whether rehearsal events should be categorized as instances of decontextualization/remediation, it became clear that the two terms were not synonymous, and various instances of each often served different purposes while working toward a musical goal. The decontextualization techniques found most frequently in the observed rehearsals were: singing, clapping, isolation of notes, use of a metronome, use of a tuner, snapping, counting, slowed tempo. These common rehearsal practices all fit in Duke’s (1994) original model, where categories of decontextualization techniques are listed as “slow practice, partial practice, altered practice, related exercise,” (p. 85) and all somehow alter the musical performance from its original context. This list of techniques is consistent with Duke’s model and is included in the proposed amended model presented in Figure 2. Decontextualizations occur in all music rehearsals that are truly focused on remediating musical targets to bring about positive musical
change. Isolation, or partial practice is the most common example of this, as rehearsals (as opposed to “run-throughs” that primarily focus on performing entire pieces) nearly always include the isolation of excerpts of music in order to maintain even a minimal level of efficiency.
Figure 2. Proposed Amended Rehearsal Frame Model
Note: Changes to the original model are presented in italics
Similarly, the techniques of questioning and providing musical instruction were also observed in numerous rehearsal frames, and can be seen under the heading labeled Remediate in Figure 2. Expert teachers undoubtedly utilize these two methods quite regularly to enhance rehearsals and remediate toward positive musical change, yet questioning and musical instruction do not generally alter the context of musical targets being rehearsed and performed by students. For example, asking a student to pinpoint the climax of a phrase will certainly cause her to consider her options and will increase the likelihood of her providing a more musical performance of that crescendo in the future, but will not remove the performance of that crescendo from the context of the piece. Similarly, a band director informing a student that his pitch is sharp and he should pull the tuning slide is certainly helpful information coupled with a useful instruction that will cause immediate musical change, but that instruction does not induce the student to perform music outside of the original context of the piece. These techniques of questioning and providing musical instruction are vital to musical remediation and occur frequently in rehearsals and rehearsal frames, but should not be considered decontextualization techniques.

Remediation is arguably the cornerstone of the rehearsal frame. Without it, musical targets would not be achieved, and performance quality would remain stagnant. Because decontextualization is not synonymous with, but is a major component of remediation in the rehearsal frame, I propose the amended model of the rehearsal frame as shown in Figure 2 rename this part in the rehearsal frame sequence “Remediate,” which should then split into three categories: “Decontextualize,” which should remain as-is with the categorized list of decontextualization techniques, “Questioning” and “Musical Instruction.” This inclusion of
additional techniques will expand the definition of this vital component of the rehearsal frame to include more practical types of musical remediation that commonly occur in music rehearsals.

Conclusions

As a model for observation, analysis, and rehearsal planning, rehearsal frames have provided a useful lens through which to view the rehearsal in its “middle ground” elements (Cavitt, 2003, 2004; Colprit, 2000; Worthy, 2003, 2006). In fact “useful” seems an understatement. Just the basic idea that any one rehearsal divides into perhaps many smaller “rehearsals” each with well defined beginnings and ends—the ends being points of closure relative to the target of the moment—is a boon for seeing with clarity the relationships between conductor behavior and ensemble member response. My interest in studying rehearsal frames stemmed from a hunch that the model, though very useful in a broad sense, may not provide a precise one-to-one correspondence between its component parts and the component parts of actual rehearsals. I thought that there might be rehearsal elements that were not represented in the frames model.

The results of this study verified that hunch and led to small-scale but meaningful revisions to elements of the model. The revisions involved a re-thinking of element order, more specific definitions for elements, and a re-defining of the decontextualization category. These changes made it possible for me to find analysis “homes” for all rehearsal components. Moving forward, the amended model appears to be optimally useful for rehearsal observation, analysis, and planning.

This study was a content analysis of the rehearsal frame model based on a small N of 3 accomplished music teachers. The observation and analysis of other accomplished music
teachers, as well as teachers with varied levels of experience might yield different results. The content analysis comprised just under 10 hours of frame-oriented rehearsal time. Analysis of more rehearsal time might also yield different results than those indicated in this study. No one research study represents truth; it is the collection of studies, each replicating some or all of previous research and indicating reliability among results, that establishes a body of evidence indicating truth.

Future research pertaining to rehearsal frame analysis might replicate this study utilizing more participant band directors over a greater number of rehearsals. As such, rehearsal frame research might follow its predecessor, the sequential pattern, and continue to adapt over time through observation and analysis of actual practice. This will provide teachers and observers an ideal, yet realistic model upon which to base their rehearsals.
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7. **Study Procedures:** Three regular rehearsals for each of the three chosen band directors will be observed and recorded. From the recordings, a ‘script’ of all rehearsal activities will be created and analyzed to determine the adequacy of the existing rehearsal frame in daily practice of accomplished high school band directors. If any structural patterns emerge from the observed rehearsals that differ from the original outline, they will become part of the amended outline.

8. **Benefits:** Results may yield a more inclusive rehearsal frame model that might help directors to plan future rehearsals in an efficient and effective manner.
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APPENDIX C
EXCERPT FROM REHEARSAL TRANSCRIPTIONS

Denham Springs Visit 1

- 16:08 – start at last chord of the first movement – First Suite- Holst. Remember don’t let that monster come out – bring it down
  - play
  - again
  - play
- 16:19 Okay, Let’s do the exercise that we looked at yesterday as far as balancing this out. If you’re playing a really high Bb Concert, take it down an octave, a high Eb concert, take it down an octave – lets hear it with that. We’re gonna move by our groups. Our G group moves first, Eb group moves second, and Bb group moves third.
- Play– points at each group (and changes notes of a scale to get down to tonic) – (Gives visual cues to play out or less)
- Mikayla – play stronger, I need more of that bottom end
- John – you’re sticking out of the sound, but your bell is sticking out, so just try to play a little below there. But you’re one of two people with that note, so that’s good.
- Back to the Eb please. Play that last note as written- as written- let’s keep that same dark sound – on the page- same dark sound
- Again- lets all see if we can do it together. Some of us are coming in before the band or vice versa, lets make sure we all hit at the same time.
  - play
  - again
  - Play – again – make sure we nail that trumpets- here we go, again
  - play
- 18:03 Let’s approach that- so now lets start at the maestoso, remember as we approach that last note, its got to grow into that- so that its not all of a sudden a loud nasty last note- we have to grow into it – okay, let’s go – pick up into the Maestoso
- 18:23 Play
- Yeah but we’re struggling with our high C’s today right? Yeah, let’s try to nail it.
- 18:44 Here we go, maestoso. Think about your breathing- don’t breathe every two bars.
- Play
19:10 Two things, first of all – I stopped us a little bit early. Because, we did a good job of slowing down together, but did you guys feel right before the ritardando, it kind of dies. Like the horns are growing, they’re building up these 6 quarter notes, but all of the sudden everyone else is playing something but it dies – but we just try to get enough air to sustain through. Remember that this whole phrase from maestoso to the end is one connected thought, and it needs to grow to that last note. Let’s try it again. Pick up to maestoso. Um, Things like the high c’s in the trumpets, high notes in the clarinets & flutes we want to make sure that we don’t just pop them out of the sound- but that they’re part of the sound.

20:19 Play – ‘listen’ over them ‘now push, here we go’ over them – shows crescendo throughout phrase.

20:31 And we hit on that last note early (points at percussion), and trombones we’re going to listen at that in just a moment, cause we’ve gotta make sure that’s not just a... here’s the thing - we’ve gotta make sure we don’t just hit those notes, but that we hit those notes with a great sound. Okay? I would rather not hit those notes than to try and play them with a bad sound. Right? So we have to keep that in mind.

20:49 So yesterday- I want you to think about how we developed this, cause we didn’t do such a good job today of doing it. Couple of things to remember. On the ritardando- you have dotted half notes, there’s a great opportunity to crescendo each of those (sings them and snaps/conducts), building, building, building from the bottom up... now when we hit those hits... raise your hand if you have those accent. Those are another great opportunity to provide great crescendo support through that. Each one gets bigger and then we get to that last final note. Remember, especially Jerrilyn on snare drum, and all of us, don’t share your parts too soon. And if you come in a little bit soft, you have room to grow and develop that phrase.

Let’s try it again. At the maestoso. Don’t give it all away. Here’s the maestoso.

22:23- okay and here’s the thing, trumpets especially... if you miss that partial up there on the top, just try to get it out of the sound and then come back in later.

22:30 okay trombones – right after slowly trombones, I’ll give you the pickup.. 1,3,1

22:40 1, 2 – trombone plays
Okay cool. Can you see me? Cool. Great. Let's move a little bit more together...

You're beating me into count 3 (sings and conducts the part), we're gonna stretch this out. Okay, let's try it again.

Okay, there's a couple of intervals, like that C to that G — that's a big interval. Other than that, by yourself you sound pretty good. But when we put it together with everyone else we'll have to make sure you tune it. Okay, so there was one note that didn't speak, what note was that? ... and did it not speak because you weren't sure whether it was an A-flat or an A-natural? No? It just didn't speak? Okay, will you play an A for me?

nice ah. okay, now play an A natural for me.

Okay awesome very good ... let's put that in with everyone now

24:09 Everyone's in measure 112. Pickups to 112, pickups to 112, remember that trombone section is just nick right over on that soli section is what we've got in here. Nick, I want you to focus on making sure your notes are in tune with all these dotted half notes over here. Okay everybody, pick ups to measure 122... pick ups to 122... "is it 122 or 112? excuse me, I meant 112. Okay, 1.2.

Okay but remember. We need to listen.

Okay that was good nick. But that g. that high g. play it for me.

Okay, do it again.

What scale did we work yesterday in class? (g) why do you think we did that? Trying to help you out, right? That's why scales are important. If you understand the two octave scales and you can play your two octave scales and you can apply it to music. But it's gonna take some time. The biggest thing I want you to focus on right now is to make sure you don't spread that tone. "waaaa" just keep it really tall. If it speaks great, if it doesn't
that's fine too right now, but I don't wanna hear it and it go wahl. So if it speaks great, but if not, don't worry about it. But a great quality sound

25:41. Okay great, let's back it up a little bit guys. Let's go at d. d as in delta.
- play “no breath here” (as they play)

26:51 yeah that other key. who has the variation, who has the melody? If you have the melody, raise your hand. Let me ask the melody folks. does that sound anything like the beginning of the piece? Play the melody, focus on the D. Here we go. this will cornets 1,2, euphonium who's not here right now.. let's go.

- play

- Good. Now. We have two separate releases there, we've gotta make sure we watch that. Now then it heats up in the trombones. Trombones let me hear you guys where you pick up the melody please. I'll give you two.. 1, 2 –

- Play

- Good. We have a tendency to let that really high interval spread -- sing (extreme wahl) -- remember the rule is this: sing (show a 'tall note') keep it tall. Okay try it again, 1,2
- play... As they're playing - "better" "no breath"

- good. And make sure you have plenty of breath support to get all the way through that
- 28:45: everyone's in at d. we're listening to that inverted melody that's taking place. Those folks who we have to hear -- everything else has to get down. Everyone lets try it at letter d. push to the last note
- play (as they're playing "trombones! Everyone else is less"... "tall!" - okay now come in -
- 29:23 good. At letter c- who has the variation melody? Yes. You guys do. You've got to bring it out. And one of the reasons that I'm asking all these questions is one of the biggest comments that we usually get at district- some of you have heard the tapes -- he's like hey those parts with the variations get lost... you know, we have all these extra things -- like the WY eighth notes that occur or all of these nice inner lines that take place... but the biggest thing about this piece is that we hear clearly those variation melodies... its getting completely covered up at e, let's start at e, everybody needs to be a little sneaky in the first cornet... here's letter c --
- play - cut off immediately.
On the downbeat.. the downbeat so I can hear the melody

- Play

really loud. We’re really really loud right now. We need to keep it soft. Before we move on. Everybody look at measure 133. Everybody play your first note in m. 133.. that’s 1,2,3,4,5,6, the 7th bar of E. play that downbeat- your first note at 133 play that first note,

Sustain. Trombones, you’ve got that e-flat. Here we go:

- Play

sings the note w/ a tuner – ‘ahhh play that note trombone’

- Play

“its thirty cents sharrmp!”

- Plays MUCH lower- points up while he plays –

- Now. THAT’s it. I want you to hear what that sounds like with everybody. Everybody play the downbeat please. Downbeat

- Plays. – stares at him –

- ‘that blended so much better, you hear that? K. what are you going to write in you music right now to remind you to bring that pitch down? ……. do you have a pencil? … great – if you didn’t I was going to let you borrow mine *holds up pink pencil- somebody gave to to me, I didn’t buy it, its not mine

- 31:31: Okay, Letter E everybody, listening to the cornet melody at letter e – and tuning that note when we get to 133. Okay, everybody in, letter E

- Play

sings ‘e-flat’ – trombones play it ,

- Play

- play it again

- Play – (looks at tuner) - ..

- that’s an F - look at it. Play it again –

- Play (he walks back and shows tuner, points down) – Eb – Bingo. So what are you doing?

Slightly longer slide position?

- 32:30 – alright, lets try it again – letter E everybody, here we go:

- Play
## APPENDIX D
### CONTENT ANALYSIS DATA EXCERPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start-Stop</th>
<th>Total Time (sec)</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Target Identified?</th>
<th>Decontextualization/Remediation Type</th>
<th>Demonstrate Target Successfully?</th>
<th>Recontextualize?</th>
<th>Steps Taken (Oude Steps 1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:10:06</td>
<td>16:08</td>
<td>Warm up</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:08:18</td>
<td>1:55</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>Balance yes</td>
<td>Balance exercise w/ 1 chord - each chord member came out of texture and took in - individuals and sections were given direction</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1 2 3 1 2 1 5 4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:03:20</td>
<td>2:28</td>
<td>1:48</td>
<td>Dynamic/Phrasing yes</td>
<td>Call shots mentioned - all played reminder, explanation, hand sitting (to self identify limited group)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1 7 1 4 1 1 2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:31:20</td>
<td>0:18</td>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:49:22</td>
<td>1:24</td>
<td>1:44</td>
<td>Dynamic/Phrasing yes</td>
<td>People w/ accents reminder, explanation, hand sitting (to self identify limited group)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:29:21</td>
<td>0:07</td>
<td>1:17</td>
<td>Trumpet sound yes</td>
<td>Trumpet reminder, move on</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:30:21</td>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>1:33</td>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>Interpretation of notes and intervals, explanation of major scale importance, play individual notes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 4 3 4 3 4 1 3 4 6 7 3 4 4 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:41:26</td>
<td>1:38</td>
<td>2:02</td>
<td>Percussion dynamic yes</td>
<td>People w/ each melody or variation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:51:03</td>
<td>3:38</td>
<td>3:56</td>
<td>Balance yes</td>
<td>People w/ each melody or variation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:29:15</td>
<td>2:47</td>
<td>3:23</td>
<td>Trombone interaction yes</td>
<td>Explain importance of each line and to listen for it</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1 2 4 3 6 5 7 3 2 4 4 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:16:14</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>Cymbals yes</td>
<td>Reminder to be louder, visual demonstration</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 1 1 3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:36:24</td>
<td>0:23</td>
<td>1:06</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:41:35</td>
<td>1:24</td>
<td>1:49</td>
<td>Phrasing/Dynamics no</td>
<td>People with 5 quarter notes explain</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:08:37</td>
<td>1:26</td>
<td>1:53</td>
<td>low brass no</td>
<td>Low brass play, sing note for students, explain, encourage to take risks</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 4 3 4 3 4 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 37:30:49   | 2:32             | 3:22   | Interaction/Decision Making yes| All, woodwinds explain, substitute for students | yes                 | no              | 2 1 4 1 3 3 6 5 4 
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