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ABSTRACT

Goal orientation theory (Ames, 1992; Blumenfeld, 1992) is a cognitive theory that identifies how goals affect motivation in students. The benefits of mastery goal orientation — aspects of instruction which support the connection between effort and achievement — on student motivation and participation have been well-documented. Researchers (Ames & Archer, 1988; Patrick, et al., 2001) found students can pick up on goal cues and identify traits of each theory apparent in their classroom. Teachers communicate their values through goal structures, and student motivation can be improved by consistent goal structures, or negatively affected by misaligned goal structures (Ames & Archer, 1988). The performance-based nature of large ensemble instrumental music education doubtless influences the perception of goal theory in these learning environments. The purpose of this study was to observe teacher and student perceptions of goal orientation theory occurring in the secondary instrumental music classroom.

Teachers and students in two secondary instrumental music programs were interviewed and observed regarding goal orientation theory and its presence within their classrooms. Major questions guiding this inquiry were: 1a. In what ways are teachers’ stated perceptions of their goal orientation consistent with observable characteristics of goal orientation theory? 1b. In what ways are teachers’ stated perceptions of their goal orientation inconsistent with observable characteristics of goal orientation theory? 2. What are students’ perceptions of the goal structures present in their secondary instrumental classrooms? Implications suggest that more specified positive feedback could improve student motivation. Additionally, an awareness of the performance-leaning nature of large ensemble music classrooms could help teachers implement more mastery-traits into their instruction.
CHAPTER 1. GOAL ORIENTATION THEORY

This study was conducted to examine goal orientation theory perceptions in large ensemble instrumental music classrooms. I interviewed and observed teachers and students in two secondary instrumental music classrooms to understand their alignment within goal orientation theory. To help contextualize the document that follows, the first chapter will be an overview of goal orientation theory definitions.

Definitions

Goal orientation theory served as the theoretical framework for my study. Goal orientation theory is a cognitive theory that identifies how goals affect motivation in students (Ames, 1992). Teachers communicate their values to students through the goals they select for learning, and how they set out to help students achieve those goals in their instruction. Students can infer meaning from aspects of teachers’ instruction, including attitudes about learning, and beliefs about success and failure (Ames & Archer, 1988). Goal orientation theory represents different views on success and ability in classrooms, as well as how students are taught to view success and ability.

There are two main goal structures identified under goal theory: mastery goals and performance goals. Mastery goal structures are defined by the connection between effort and outcomes, the focus upon developing skills, and mastery through a true understanding of learning materials. Mastery goals are focused on the process of learning itself over the outcome of learning, value challenges, are linked to intrinsic student motivation, and support a healthy relationship with mistakes as part of the learning process. Performance goal structures are defined by individual self-worth, achieving by out-performing others, and learning as a means to
achievement. Performance goals value outperforming others, high ability displayed without failure, are linked to extrinsic student motivation, and focus on the end product of learning.

**Goal Orientation Theory Models**

Various models of goal orientation theory have been developed over the last two decades. Goal orientation theory began as a binary model: mastery goal orientation and performance goal orientation (Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984). This model has been expanded to include a subcategory: approach or avoidance. Approach goals indicate the desire to pursue goals and achievements, whereas avoidance goals attempt to avoid negative results. A trichotomous model (Figure 1) has been used in previous studies in music, as cited by Köksoy and Uygun (2018). In this model, mastery remains a main category, but performance is further bifurcated to performance-approach and performance-avoidance. Another model that could be interesting for future studies to employ is the 2 x 2 model (Figure 2) proposed by Elliot & McGregor (2001). This model also bifurcates mastery orientation into mastery-approach and mastery-avoidance orientation. The model I used for this particular study was the original binary model of mastery

---

Figure 1. Trichotomous model of goal orientation theory. *Source: Köksoy & Uygun (2018); some terms changed for consistency*
orientation and performance orientation (Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984; as cited by Köksoy & Uygun, 2018).

Figure 2. 2 x 2 model of goal orientation theory. Source: Elliot & McGregor (2001); as cited by Köksoy & Uygun (2018); some terms changed for consistency

**Identifying Goal Orientation Theory Traits**

Goal orientation permeates nearly all aspects of classroom structures. Patrick et al. (2001)’s study observed the following traits of participating classrooms: task, authority, autonomy, recognition, grouping, evaluation, time, social, and help-seeking. For the purposes of my study, I more closely followed Ames’s (1992) framework, focusing on the categories task, autonomy, and recognition and evaluation (see Table 1). Ames’s framework included authority instead of autonomy. I chose to substitute authority for autonomy because I was curious how much autonomy students have in large ensemble settings, but these categories are closely linked.

I used this table of traits to develop interview questions for teachers and students (see Appendix G), as well as an observation guide for student participants to use during the talk-aloud portion of data collection (see Appendix H). Additionally, I derived the following questions from Patrick et al. (2001)’s observation protocol to guide the formation of interview questions: (a)
What is the content of the task, expected product, and reasons the teacher provides for doing the task, its value, or difficulty? (b) What level of student autonomy exists in the classroom? (c) What types of recognition exist in the classroom: Praise and criticism in public or private, whether it is attributed to conduct, participation, achievement, effort, ability, luck? (d) What is the criteria for evaluation? Do students evaluate their own or one another’s work? What types of statements are made regarding success and failure?

Table 1. Observable Traits of Goal Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task-Setting</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Recognition &amp; Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mastery Goals</strong></td>
<td>• Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>• Effort leads to progress which leads to performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote individual student growth</td>
<td>• Mistakes are part of the learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purpose of task is understood</td>
<td>• Students evaluate themselves and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Goals</strong></td>
<td>• Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>• Ability leads to performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote group growth</td>
<td>• Mistakes should be avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purpose of task is not explained or understood</td>
<td>• Student input is rarely asked for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ames (1992); Patrick et al. (2001)

In the next chapter, I will share my personal educational experiences that led to my interest in goal orientation theory. This will lead to a review of literature in goal orientation theory, as well as the statement of need for the present study.
CHAPTER 2. PERSONAL VIGNETTE

In 2006, the late Sir Ken Robinson gave a Ted Talk on education and creativity (Robinson, 2006). He posed a hypothetical scenario of an alien visiting Earth and inquiring as to the purpose of public education. Sir Robinson proceeded to posit that to answer the alien’s question, one had to look at the output of education, or who succeeded due to education. This hypothetical scenario has stuck with me ever since I first heard it, and I tasked myself to apply it to music education. I could say confidently that a majority of music educators would excitedly inform our alien guest of the numerous reasons for music education: its intellectual, emotional, physical, interpersonal, and intrinsic benefits, among so many others. However, if our friendly alien guest encountered music education students, I would be less sure of my hypothesis. Would the students of music education be able to tell this being — entirely new to our world and humanity — the goals of music education?

If students would not be able to help our friendly alien with his rather odd question, I believe that it would be due to their teachers. Our educational tactics, especially in large ensemble instrumental music education, can send mixed messages about what our goals really are for our students. Even with the contemporary practice of posting daily, weekly, or long term goals for students to see clearly in the classroom, teachers may indeed communicate the immediate task to accomplish; but even clearly stated goals can be viewed through the different lenses of goal theory and communicate different values to students.

These claims are not made lightly, nor are they made without my own fault. My interest in this topic stems from my own experience as a young teacher, feeling as though I were sending mixed signals to my students in my instruction. I surveyed my students often about many various topics, from outside-of-program experiences, to how they felt about performances, among others.
However, I neglected to ask them about their perceptions of the one experience they encounter the most in their secondary music education: daily classroom instruction. I felt as though my long-term instructional goal for students became lost in the routine of daily classroom instruction, almost as though the two were not linked. This document was constructed intentionally as a letter to my future self on how to discover and implement improved teaching strategies that accurately and consistently communicate my values to my students through the connection of long-term instructional goals and daily classroom instruction. The literature review that follows will summarize how goals and goal structures are applied and perceived in general and music classrooms, and highlight the need for the present study.
CHAPTER 3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this review of literature, I have chosen to organize the studies into three groups. I will first review the studies covering the fundamentals of goal orientation theory and studying goal orientation theory in the field (Blumenfeld, 1992; Ames, 1992; Ames & Archer, 1988; Patrick et al., 2001; Shim, Cho, & Cassidy, 2013). Then, I will examine two studies on student perceptions of music classrooms (Scheib, 2006; Stamer, 2004). Finally, I will give an overview of articles that observe goal orientation theory in the music classroom (West, 2013; Sandene, 1997; Hruska, 2011; Matthews & Kitsantas, 2012). I will conclude with an explanation of how these studies, combined, offer an understanding of goal orientation theory in music education, yet still leave several questions unanswered, and the need for the current study.

Fundamentals of Goal Orientation Theory

Blumenfeld (1992) provided information about common goal orientation theory traits and how they present themselves in the classroom. The author established the many variables that affect student perceptions of classroom goal orientation: variety, diversity, challenge, control, and meaningfulness. With this framework, the author recommended how to observe student perceptions of goal orientation theory at work in the classroom, as research on that topic was in its infancy at the time of publication. Blumenfeld posited that student perception of goal orientation may vary among subjects, and called for more research on the topic.

Ames (1992) began by establishing a few key definitions for goal orientation theory. There are two main types of goal structures that have been observed and referred to as: (a) learning, task-involvement, and mastery goals; and (b) performance, and ego-involvement goals. These goal structures represent different approaches to the notions of success, task outcomes, and ability. Mastery goal structures are the notion that effort and outcome are variables that work
together and predict one another; the focus is on intrinsic knowledge and student effort. Performance goals are focused on an individual’s ability and self-worth; it is focused on surpassing competitors and achievement using little to no work. The outcome of these foci is that learning is a means to the end of achievement. These goal structures are applied in the classroom through task and learning activities, evaluation practices and use of rewards, and distribution of authority or responsibility (among other factors). Ames suggested that goal structures should be aligned across these classroom entities, otherwise motivation outcomes become confused.

Ames & Archer (1988) found that students’ perception of goal orientation theory likely affected their learning strategies, preference for challenging tasks, attitude towards the class, and beliefs about the causes of success and failure. Students that perceived mastery goal structures tended to view learning practices in a healthier way; these students were more likely to use effective learning strategies, embrace challenges, enjoy class, and believe that effort is linked to success. The researchers also found a relationship between students’ perceptions of goal orientation theory in their classrooms and their perceptions of their own abilities. Students’ perceptions of goal orientation also affected what tasks students chose to perform. Findings suggested that when mastery cues are present, performance cues may not inhibit aspects of achievement. However, when performance goals were the most apparent to students, they tended to perceive their own ability as low, and thought that assigned work was too difficult.

Patrick et al. (2001) pointed out several traits consistent in classrooms with high mastery and low mastery as well as high performance and low performance goal structures. This research team gathered student perceptions of four fifth-grade classrooms. Students contributed to the goal orientation identification via use of the Perceived Classroom Goal Structures survey from the Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey. The findings of this study were mostly consistent with
previous research about goal orientation theory, in that the way high-mastery teachers described learning was reflected in their instruction.

Shim, Cho, and Cassidy (2013) hypothesized that teachers who seek to learn more and improve their teaching skills are likely to create mastery goals in their classrooms, while teachers who try to demonstrate their superior ability or mask inferior ability are likely to create performance goal structures. Their research observed goal theory in primary and secondary schools, and inquired about teachers’ perceptions of student intelligence. Teachers who believe student intelligence is incremental are more likely to promote student learning and progress (mastery structure). Inversely, teachers who believe student intelligence is predetermined and inherent are more likely to direct instructional resources to individuals with high ability and create a more competitive classroom environment (performance structure). Their findings agreed with most prior research: mastery goals positively predicted classroom mastery goal structures, and performance-approach goals positively predicted classroom performance goal structures.

Student Perceptions of Music Classrooms

Scheib (2006) observed an ‘average’ band student in a middle school band class enrolled in a small rural town in the Midwest, where the enrollment for each grade was about 80-100 students. Lindy was described by her teacher as “average in all ways,” has participated in band since 6th grade and planned to continue into high school band. Scheib set out to look closely at Lindy’s experience and perspective of her middle school band program to try to see this program from her point of view. This study was conducted through qualitative methods — data were collected through interviews, participant observations, and analysis of documents and other materials.
Lindy’s band experience seemed to be defined by competition and achievement: she saw competing for chair assignments as the focus of school band, and practicing aided in serving that goal. Success in band, according to Lindy, was defined as doing well on tests and handing in practice reports. Motivations for Lindy to be in band did not seem to include music or musical emotion, feelings, or aesthetic qualities, as Lindy never mentioned “music” in her interviews. Scheib noted the strong possibility that these middle school students would grow up to become stakeholders and policy-makers with skewed beliefs in the purposes of school music instruction.

The research conducted by Stamer (2004) aimed to determine choral student perceptions of the music contest experience. 268 high school choral music students from three senior high schools were surveyed using Likert-type surveys and the data were analyzed using univariate ANOVA. Analysis of the findings showed that sophomores attached a great deal more importance to music contests than other grade levels in terms of motivating students to practice, work together, and pay more attention to musicianship. Further, sophomores may have been more motivated by external rewards rather than internal rewards. Juniors and seniors seemed to place more value and significance on music making rather than achieving a high rating.

**Goal Orientation Theory in Music Education**

West’s literature review (2014) covered achievement goal theory, attribution theory, and intrinsic motivation theory. Specifically, the summary of achievement goal theory identified many articles that defined goal theory in general education classrooms, and also identified in detail many articles that covered the topic in the music classroom. Most research on this topic has been quantitative in design, many using Likert-style survey questions. A large conclusion the author drew from the literature in goal theory was that students tend to be motivated to participate deeply with learning material when they have choice or agency in the classroom. The
The author also offered several practical applications teachers can use to increase student motivation, such as allowing students a say in the literature selected for class and musical decisions about the literature, and recognizing and awarding student growth rather than achievement.

In a doctoral dissertation, Sandene (1997) found that student motivation in instrumental music declined over the course of an academic year, and declined across multiple grade levels. Videotapes recorded in the classrooms of the participants showed that positive feedback was less frequent than negative feedback. The author suggested for classroom teachers to record themselves frequently to develop an awareness of the amount of negative feedback they use in their classrooms. The study also found that beginning-level classroom teachers were generally more flexible in their instruction plans, which possibly helped facilitate higher student motivation. In contrast, advanced-level classroom teachers generally stopped only for errors in performance, and spent less rehearsal time praising efforts and achievements of students. Higher ratios of positive feedback in classrooms was associated with higher rates of motivation, self-esteem, personal task goals, and affected attributions for success in instrumental music, as well as yielded higher task goal perceptions of classrooms.

Hruska (2011) concisely presented information about goal orientation theory and offered practical applications and examples of these structures in the music classroom. The author directly connected student achievement with student motivation and classroom goals. Students who are more intrinsically motivated tend to enjoy the learning process while students that are more extrinsically motivated understand they will receive something they desire if they do what is asked of them. These differing motivations have parallels with mastery goals and performance goals. The author pointed out the positive learning outcomes that are achievable with mastery
goal setting in the classroom, and further, discussed the importance of clearly identifying goals so that students may take the necessary steps to achieving these goals.

A study by Matthews and Kitsantas (2012) observed the effect of instrumental conductors’ goal orientation combined with conducting expression cues on their students’ self-efficacy, collective efficacy, attributions, and performance. The researchers surveyed 81 instrumentalists who participated in one of six experimental conditions: basic performance cues with performance goal orientation, basic performance cues with mastery goal orientation, interpretive performance cues with performance goal orientation, interpretive performance cues with mastery goal orientation, expressive performance cues with performance goal orientation, and expressive performance cues with mastery goal orientation. Findings suggested that goal orientation affected the instrumentalists’ self-efficacy and their collective efficacy, but not their performance. Furthermore, combining mastery goal orientation with expressive performance cues could improve learning and motivation in large ensemble instrumental learning settings.

Need for the Study

Based on the research I summarized above, we know that students can pick up on goal orientation cues and identify traits of each theory apparent in their classroom. Mastery goal orientation has been found to help students feel more motivated and foster more positive learning habits in students. Researchers have also found that teachers’ values are communicated through goal structures, and student motivation can become confused when goal structures are misaligned across activities.

Even in the early days of goal orientation theory literature, Ames (1992) saw the need for research on this topic in music education:

The consequences of this emphasis on performance are especially evident in the field of music education. Music educators decry the evolution of music programs that stress
production and performance outcomes. In such programs the learning of different kinds of music and appreciation of complex arrangements is subordinate to achieving a public-ready production. As a consequence, the study of music becomes synonymous with musical performance. (p. 264)

The performance-based structure of large ensemble instrumental music classes must influence the goals teachers establish for their students. This, in turn, could influence goal theory perceptions in these classrooms. Long-term goals teachers set for their students should be connected to daily classroom instruction to effectively communicate values to students. The goal theory framework has not yet been used in large ensemble instrumental music classrooms to identify student perceptions of goals present in their teachers’ instruction. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine students’ and teachers’ perceptions of goal orientation theory in two secondary instrumental music classrooms. My major questions guiding this inquiry were: 1.a. In what ways are teachers’ stated perceptions of their goal orientation consistent with observable characteristics of goal orientation theory? 1.b. In what ways are teachers’ stated perceptions of their goal orientation inconsistent with observable characteristics of goal orientation theory? 2. What are students’ perceptions of the goal structures present in their secondary instrumental classrooms?

In this review of literature, I summarized the fundamentals of goal orientation theory, identified literature that has observed this in the classroom, as well as highlighted studies observing these structures in music education. This information lead to the need for the present study. In the next section, I will depict the method employed for my research.
CHAPTER 4. METHOD

This was a qualitative inquiry in which my goal was to examine the perceptions of goal orientation theory in large ensemble instrumental classrooms. Band ensemble teachers and three students in their classes (N = 10) were interviewed and asked questions regarding goals present in their classrooms. I then observed these classrooms to identify characteristics of goal theory. During observations, students were invited to observe and comment on teacher instruction as it was occurring. In this section, I will detail the sampling strategy, types of data and data collection methods, and analysis. I will also discuss measures of trustworthiness, and review limitations to the present study.

I employed a collective case study methodology for this inquiry. According to Baxter and Jack (2008), a qualitative case study explores phenomena within a certain context through multiple data sources, and according to Yin (2003), should be considered when research is asking “how” or “why” questions, when participant behavior will not be manipulated, when context is relevant to the course of study, and when boundaries are unclear between the phenomenon and context. This study examined the goal orientation theory phenomenon occurring within the large ensemble instrumental music classroom context. Participant behavior was not manipulated for this research, and the context was relevant to the course of study. Additionally, a collective case study “will allow the researcher to analyze within each setting and across settings” (Baxter & Jack, 2008; p. 550). I chose this methodology for my research to observe two classroom settings and draw conclusions across these environments. The case in my inquiry is still the same: student and teacher perceptions of secondary instrumental music classrooms; the case is being observed across two settings, hence a collective case study.
**Sampling Strategy**

I contacted local schools with instrumental large ensembles to ask if they would be willing to participate in this research. I used convenience sampling (Patton, 2015) to select two schools because they are within close proximity, I have an established rapport with the instrumental large ensemble teachers at these schools, and these schools have well-established instrumental large ensemble programs featuring similar program offerings. I collaborated with teachers to select three students at each school to participate in interviews. These students were selected based on their perceived level of motivation in band classes, because goal theory is a cognitive theory about motivation in students.

Table 2. Teacher Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teaching Experience (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sullivan</td>
<td>Greenville High School</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hall</td>
<td>Greenville High School</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Shannon</td>
<td>Southview High School</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Bradley</td>
<td>Southview High School</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All names are pseudonyms.

Teachers recommended one highly-motivated student, one moderately-motivated student, and one minimally-motivated student. For the purposes of this study, the following descriptors were created as a guide to help teachers identify potential participants. Highly-motivated students are commonly enrolled in more advanced music classes, serve in a leadership position within the music program, take private lessons, offer assistance to other students within their instrumental section or program, and audition and participate in honor ensembles or other opportunities offered outside of school. These students have considered participating in music beyond secondary education, perhaps even select music as a major or minor area of study.
Moderately-motivated students participate in music classes and fulfill all expectations but do not explore additional opportunities outside of class. These students are involved and engaged during classes, but likely have other priorities outside of music class. Minimally-motivated students often participate in music to fulfill a course requirement or at the recommendation of family members or friends. They do not practice on their own often or at all, are sometimes disengaged from instruction, and likely do not consider their participation in music class a priority.

Table 3. Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Perceived Motivation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Greenville High School</td>
<td>Highly-motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>Greenville High School</td>
<td>Minimally-motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran</td>
<td>Greenville High School</td>
<td>Moderately-motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Southview High School</td>
<td>Highly-motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Southview High School</td>
<td>Moderately-motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady</td>
<td>Southview High School</td>
<td>Minimally-motivated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All names are pseudonyms.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Data collection occurred in two main phases: an interview phase, and an observation phase. First, I conducted interviews with teachers that I used to identify what type of goal structure they believed their classroom is structured within (see Appendix G). I interviewed teachers at each school as a teaching pair that shared goals for their programs, but only focused the majority of observations on one teacher in each pair. I also interviewed students to identify what type of goal structure they perceived in their classroom. In this phase of data collection, I asked teachers and students to answer questions regarding goal theory traits present in their classroom. Participants were not given mastery and performance goal definitions; rather, I asked participants open-ended questions that would encourage them to describe their classroom.
structures. Later, during data analysis, I identified traits they discussed as mastery or performance based on existing definitions of goal orientation theory. I intended to uncover the participants’ perceptions of goal theory traits in their classroom, instead of asking participants to guess which way their traits leaned without prior knowledge of goal theory definitions.

Following the collection of all interview data, I observed classroom instruction twice at each participating school for ninety minutes each. During these observations, I invited students to participate in a think-aloud experience (Jones, 2016). Students were equipped with a microphone and instructed to speak into the microphone for 20 minutes during a class period. They talked through what was occurring in the classroom in real time. They were each given an observation guide sheet to help prompt them if they needed assistance commenting on what was occurring (see appendix H). An app called “Public Panic” (Magdy, 2017) gave students a visual prompt every four minutes to remind them to comment on something, even if it was surface-level commentary.

Once all data were collected, data were analyzed in two main phases (see Appendix I). During phase one of analysis, data were coded to identify mastery traits and performance traits within instruction in all three aspects: tasks, autonomy, and recognition and evaluation. Mastery or performance traits were identified using descriptors, examples, and definitions from existing goal theory research. Throughout this phase of data collection, feedback within the recognition and evaluation category emerged as a topic of interest that could yield more information from further analysis. I created a second round of coding, and thus a second phase of analysis. In this second phase, observation data were coded to identify the polarity of feedback, or if it was
positive, negative or neutral; feedback were also coded to determine the focus of the feedback, if it was on student effort, progress, or performance (or outcomes).

**Trustworthiness**

To establish trustworthiness, I triangulated data through multiple sources (Patton, 2002), including interviews with teachers, interviews with students, my own observation of instruction, and student observation of instruction. If a response was unclear during interviews, I would rephrase the response and ask for the participant to correct me if I had incorrectly understood what they were trying to explain. As I conducted my research, I made efforts to remain aware of any of my own implicit biases about goal orientation theory, and attempted to remain objective while observing colleagues. Participants identities were kept confidential, and pseudonyms were used for all participants. Consent and assent forms were signed by all participants and principals of participating schools, and this research was approved by the Louisiana State University Institutional Review Board (see appendix A). An additional measure of triangulation was added after formal data collection were complete, with an observation of a university group using the theoretical framework. For more information on this, see the discussion section.

**Limitations**

Mainly, time limited many variables of this research. Completing this study within less than one year caused me to limit my research to local schools, as classroom observation was an important aspect of data collection. Also, due to time constraints, I interviewed participants during October, peak marching season, and observed their classrooms during November and December, when the classrooms were involved in concert ensemble activities. This may have caused some of the discrepancies between what participants described in interviews and what
they implemented in instructional practices. With a longer time frame, I could have conducted more observations and invited the students to do more talk-aloud sessions, which could have helped them understand the process more effectively and yielded more data. I did not have time to review interview responses with students prior to their observations, which could have helped contextualize the observation process for them.

**Positionality**

I must acknowledge that some amount of bias may have existed in my research due to my previous teaching experience as a high school band director. I taught high school band for six years in the local area before beginning work on this project, and participants are all colleagues I know from the field. The goals of the teachers I interviewed may have been similar or different to that of my own goals for music education. My research questions were guided by previous experiences I encountered in the field, which may have navigated the answers I sought. Although bias is not uncommon to qualitative methods, I attempted to remain aware of this bias throughout this project, although it cannot be fully eliminated from my research.

In this chapter, I described my sampling procedure, data collection and analysis methods, and discussed trustworthiness and limitations. In the sections that follow, I will depict my findings, as well as implications of these findings, limitations of the present study, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 5. FINDINGS

Overview

In this section, I will review my research findings organized by case. First, I will describe each school, band program, and participants; all school and participant names are pseudonyms. Next, I will summarize how participants discussed each aspect of goal theory in their interviews. Following this, I will depict how these aspects were demonstrated during classroom observations. I will then compare and contrast stated perceptions with practical examples. Finally, I will summarize my findings.

School 1. Greenville High School

School Description & Participants

Greenville High School is a public high school in a suburban area of the southeastern United States. Approximately 2,000 students are enrolled across grades 9-12. At the time of this study, there were approximately 150 students participating in the band program at Greenville High School. The band program encompassed three concert ensembles, a marching band, a jazz band, music theory class, and a basketball pep band.

Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall are the band directors at Greenville High School. Mr. Sullivan has been teaching for 25 years, 20 of them at Greenville High School. Mr. Hall has been teaching for 20 years, 8 of them at Greenville. Three of their students participated in this study: Alexis (highly-motivated), Liberty (moderately-motivated), and Kieran (minimally-motivated). All three students were upperclassmen in their junior or senior year of high school. Alexis was a section leader for the drumline during marching season, a member of Mr. Sullivan’s band class, and participated in the percussion class lead by Mr. Sullivan which happened simultaneous to the
concert ensemble Mr. Hall taught. Liberty and Kieran both played in the marching band, and were members of Mr. Hall’s concert ensemble.

**Teacher and Student Perceptions of Goal Theory**

*Aspect 1, Task-Setting.* Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall accredited student engagement to transparent task-setting. They explained to students the purpose for doing tasks effectively and often, and included applicable context or comparisons to already existing knowledge. This goal — for students to transfer and apply knowledge — extended beyond the music classroom. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall hoped the tasks they established for their students, and the expectations to which they held their students, would apply to other life experiences.

Alexis identified the applicative nature of tasks assigned by her teachers. She explained that when students would be struggling musically with a part, Mr. Sullivan gave them corresponding exercises and encouraged the students to remember the learned skill when applying it in the music. Tasks associated with Alexis’s leadership position applied to life skills beyond band class; she felt they have improved her confidence and communication skills. Liberty recognized the meaning in classroom tasks as necessary steps towards accomplishing goals. Even if she did not understand the purpose behind a task right away, she did understand its’ important role in helping her improve. This realization, however, took some time and personal reflection for Liberty. She felt her teachers explained tasks thoroughly, but it took her own personal maturation to connect the dots and find deeper understanding of the purpose behind tasks. Kieran had a surface-level understanding of tasks, but did state that the teachers assign meaningful tasks because they were all aimed at helping students improve.

*Aspect 2, Autonomy.* Student autonomy took form in two main ways in Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall’s program. From a practical sense, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall have asked for student
input on programming choices. They described scenarios of playing musical selections for students and asking for their opinions, as well as making playlists for students to access at home to listen to individually. More broadly, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall viewed student performance as a way of encouraging student autonomy. The student performers in marching band had full ability to control the performance. “There’s a lot of trust and responsibility put on them.” (Mr. Sullivan)

Alexis and Liberty defined student autonomy from the perspective of student leadership, whether they were in a position of leadership or not. For Alexis, leadership was an opportunity for her to offer instruction and feedback to her peers from the perspective of a fellow student. She recalled her teachers explaining how leaders should operate at their annual summer leadership training camp. Alexis explained,

We’re always told to be a thermostat because it sets the tone and it sets the temperature for the whole house…you’re showing others what it should be like.

She also felt the percussion section had a lot of autonomy and input because they were often in a smaller group. Being one-on-one with the teacher provided more opportunities to ask for student input. Although she did not have a leadership role, Liberty noticed how student leaders were able to offer more input. Students who did not have leadership roles were asked their opinions at times, but she did not feel their input lead to as much change as input from the leadership team. Kieran did not feel that students had a great deal of autonomy in their classroom, but were offered chances to voice opinions sometimes.

Aspect 3, Recognition & Evaluation. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall agreed that mistakes were a crucial part of the learning process, and felt it important to point out with their students when they themselves made mistakes. Encouraging students to take risks in rehearsals and performances was integral to both students’ musical growth and personal growth; this related
back to their desire to teach life skills to support students beyond their high school music classroom. Mr. Hall elaborated,

   Every year, it’s almost like a broken record. Like, “Hey, you got to play. Like, if you miss, you miss.” I joke, “Hey, rules number one through 100 on sight reading are don’t stop, get it get it.” Play. Doesn’t matter. Something’s got to come out of the horn. So I think that’s huge. And back to Life 101, you have to be willing to take a risk, and it could go poorly.

Recognizing student successes both inside and outside of their classroom was important to Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall. They identified personal interactions as an important component of giving feedback. The teachers noted how these personal interactions helps their students realize their teachers care.

   As for the nature of their feedback, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall felt they discussed effort the most with their students. They defined it as the start to the chain reaction of effort to progress to performance, and thus the element they deemed most important. However, when the teachers were asked how they recognized student effort, they discussed ways of acknowledging progress and performance. Mr. Sullivan discussed the importance of recognizing small victories with the students. Mr. Hall depicted scenarios where he would recognize students for their progress over several years, noting where they started in the program and how they’ve grown through their time in the program. The well-understood connection between effort, progress, and performance may have caused these teachers to reference other items when asked about one. A clear definition of these three traits prior to this question could have prevented this mixup.

Alexis, Liberty, and Kieran all identified mistakes as part of the learning process. Liberty noted that Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall wanted the students to be risk-takers, that they would rather mistakes over playing timidly. “If you’re going to mess up, then mess up loud instead of being scared about it.” (Liberty) Prior to asking questions about effort, progress, and performance, the
students were given definitions of each term. Similarly to their teachers, Alexis and Liberty discussed progress and performance respectively when asked how their teachers acknowledge student effort. On the topic of progress, Kieran explained that students would watch video footage of their Friday night marching band performances. This practice of watching their performance helped him see for himself the improvements that were happening within the ensemble. Alexis and Liberty brought up the same scenario Mr. Hall depicted of acknowledging students’ improvements over the course of several years in the program. They both spoke about this with a tone that communicated its significance. This scenario even caused Alexis to think that progress was the most important element to Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall; she also identified performance as being a possible winner. She recalled Mr. Sullivan praising her solo performance; even in this story, comments about her progress were depicted. Kieran also felt that student performance was most important to his teachers, but when he elaborated on the reason why, it was because a great performance relied upon the progress that it took to get there. Liberty felt student effort was most important to her teachers, because effort is the catalyst to the effort, progress, performance cycle. Effort was the starting place to achieving goals.

Analysis. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall depicted their classroom as mastery oriented, with occasional performance leaning traits. Mastery-focused elements included their transparency in task-setting, individual long-term benefits of program goals, emphasis of mistakes as part of the learning process and worth taking risks, and the role of effort as a foundation to student progress and performance. The teachers did not depict many performance-leaning classroom traits, but a few performance-leaning comments were made in our discussion about student performance. Occasionally, Mr. Sullivan referenced using upcoming performance events and discussions of
results as extrinsic motivators, but these comments were always paired with commentary that was mastery-oriented.

Alexis, Liberty, and Kieran depicted a largely mastery oriented classroom, but described a few more performance leaning qualities than their teachers did. The meaningful nature they recognized in tasks leaned towards mastery, as did the goals they described applying to life skills beyond the music classroom. Autonomy was ascribed to leadership roles within the program, and seemed non-existent for other band students, which suggested performance orientation. In our conversation about recognition and evaluation, Alexis, Liberty, and Kieran all depicted mistakes being integral to the learning process, a high-mastery trait, but two out of the three students felt performance could be what their teachers valued the most, a performance trait.

**Goal Theory Applied in the Classroom**

During this phase of data collection, I observed Mr. Hall’s classroom twice for ninety minutes each, and Mr. Sullivan’s classroom once for forty-five minutes. Alexis, Liberty, and Kieran all observed Mr. Hall’s instruction, but only Alexis observed Mr. Sullivan.

**Aspect 1, Task-Setting.** Mr. Hall frequently shared reasons for doing tasks with his students. He took time especially during warm-ups to explain the purpose of each exercise for students to retain and apply to other music they would play. Some of the tasks he assigned involved breaking down components of music into smaller goals, and each time he would discuss the goal of the exercise. When the class moved into preparing musical selections for performance, Mr. Hall assigned tasks for the sake of error detection. He instructed students to play in individual sections to better hear what was occurring and suggest how the students could improve the passage. Mr. Hall filled his instruction with jokes, humor, and unique analogies to connect with the students.
When Alexis observed Mr. Hall teaching warm up exercises, she heard thorough explanations of the reason behind each task. She felt that the warm up exercises supported the overall goals of the class, which then supported the activities they do as a school band. Liberty felt confident that she and her fellow students understood the purpose behind tasks during the warm-up. After the warm-up portion of class, she and Kieran both observed the surface-level tasks set by Mr. Hall, noting that they were working on a piece of music and employing tasks for the sake of improving that piece of music.

**Aspect 2, Autonomy.** There were minimal examples of student autonomy during Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall’s teaching demonstrations, but some examples did stand out. During Mr. Sullivan’s small group teaching demonstration, he encouraged the student leaders — one of whom was Alexis — to lead the warm-up for the class, and asked Alexis for input on a passage the students were playing. A few times during Mr. Hall’s classes, he gave the students a minute to work on something on their own, allowing them the chance to choose their learning approach. After one passage, Mr. Hall asked his class which aspect of their playing they felt needed the most improvement. One student made a comment about tone, which Mr. Hall acknowledged and then moved into discussing the timing of their performance. Otherwise, students were instructed what to do and how to do it throughout class time.

Alexis was the only student to comment on autonomy during observations. In Mr. Hall’s large ensemble class, she noticed a student step out of the classroom, presumably to use the restroom. She appreciated this class structure and the lack of disruption caused by the student and teacher when this occurred. She also pointed out when Mr. Hall allowed the students an opportunity to work on something on their own, but acknowledged the time period they received was shorter than how much time Mr. Hall said he would give them.
Aspect 3, Recognition & Evaluation. Mr. Hall reminded students throughout class that mistakes were acceptable, but often exclaimed if he perceived students were not making an honest attempt: “Take a breath!” “Sing out!” He did encourage students, as he mentioned in interviews, with his sight reading rule: “Don’t stop, get it get it.” As one might anticipate in a large ensemble music class, Mr. Hall issued feedback on student playing throughout class. Feedback was connected to task-setting, as often his comments would lead to an exercise or determine the next playing excerpt. In the second round of coding, I examined the topic being addressed during feedback and the polarity of feedback. Mr. Hall’s feedback spanned all three categories we discussed during interviews, and most often was performance-focused. Often negative feedback (or ways in which students could improve) was very specific, and positive feedback (or items students were doing effectively) was vague or generalized.

Alexis felt that Mr. Hall’s feedback was in the neutral to positive range. She also noticed Mr. Hall giving feedback through his facial expressions, but did not specify what feedback was implied. Liberty agreed that Mr. Hall tended to compliment the group often, but thought the compliments may not always have been warranted. Liberty pointed out how mistakes were accepted as long as students made an effort to attempt the task at hand. Liberty said,

   Even if you mess up, he doesn’t care as long as you’re just playing and you’re trying your best to actually do what he’s asking you to do.

Analysis. The transparent task-setting Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall described in their interviews was evident in Mr. Hall’s instruction, but mostly focused during one portion of class. During the warm-up, he shared reasons for tasks so that students would know what goal the task was serving, a high-mastery trait. During the remainder of class, tasks seemingly only benefited the improvement of the music, a performance trait. Liberty and Alexis exhibited a clear understanding for why tasks were set; if the task was not well-understood, they trusted in their
teachers enough to know that the task in question was important for some purpose. Kieran’s observations were minimal, and solely reflected a surface-level understanding of what task was being set at the time.

While there were brief moments of student autonomy, the classroom was largely dictated by teachers assigning tasks and setting the expectation for how the tasks should be completed. This was partially consistent with student autonomy tactics the teachers described in interviews. Programming only occurs a few times each year for a band program, so it was unlikely I would observe it during my two visits to the classroom. However, the music-making opportunities the teachers described were not employed during the class periods I observed. Potential reasons for this are explored further in the discussion section. Student participants’ comments on autonomy in the classroom were minimal or non-existent. Again, this is consistent with their stated perceptions of autonomy from their interviews, as they equated student autonomy with student leadership and the opportunities those positions provide. The leadership positions they described were mostly from a marching band context, which is why it would not apply to the observation of this concert band classroom. Alexis found other small examples of student autonomy in the classroom. The lack of autonomy integrated into the classroom itself suggests performance orientation.

Recognition and evaluation was incongruent between what Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall stated in interviews and what they demonstrated in their teaching. Effort was established as the foundation to progress and ultimately performance. While they addressed all three throughout classes, most of their commentary was about student performance. There were particular moments when the teachers addressed effort with the students, specifically when they perceived a lack of effort from the students. The three student participants had conflicting opinions about
what was most important to their teacher out of effort, progress, and performance. Alexis and Liberty both pointed out positive feedback from Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hall, and these comments followed specified feedback, or feedback that was pointed at a particular aspect of the students’ playing.

There were consistencies and inconsistencies between how participants described this classroom and how this classroom was presented during observations. Task-setting was well explained, but often limited to benefiting group goals or class goals. Student autonomy was very limited, but did exist in small ways. Recognition and evaluation were fundamental to task-setting, but mostly focused on student performance. Students were able to identify some aspects of goal orientation in their classrooms, and some used this framework to infer a deeper understanding of their teachers’ instruction.

School 2. Southview High School

School Description & Participants

Southview High School is a public high school in a suburban area of the southeastern United States. Approximately 2,100 students are enrolled across grades 9-12. At the time of this study, there were approximately 170 students participating in the band program at Southview High School. The band program encompassed three concert ensembles, a marching band, a jazz band, music theory class, instrumental techniques class, indoor percussion and winter guard programs, and an after-school peer mentoring program.

Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley are the band directors at Southview High School. Mr. Shannon has been teaching for nine years, two of them at Southview High School. Mrs. Bradley has been teaching for nine years, three and a half of them at Southview. Three of their students participated in this study: Chester (highly-motivated), Cory (moderately-motivated), and Grady
All three students were upperclassmen in their junior or senior year of high school. Chester was band captain during marching season, and was enrolled in multiple band classes, including Mr. Shannon’s band class, Mrs. Bradley’s band class, and instrumental techniques. Cory and Grady both played in the marching band, and were members of Mrs. Bradley’s concert ensemble.

**Teacher and Student Perceptions of Goal Theory**

*Aspect 1, Task-Setting.* Within the first minutes of our discussion, Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley established progress as an important theme. The tasks they assigned to students were designed to help students improve and develop a healthy relationship with progress over results. Mr. Shannon gave several opportunities for self-analysis and reflection, and expected students to use this time to develop individual improvement plans. He mentioned a phrase he used many times with his students: “The next time is better than the previous time.” Other goals included learning collaboration skills, and employing high standards to everything that students do. Mrs. Bradley defined her tasks more as expectations, and felt that she established high expectations for her students and made certain that they were clearly communicated. For her, high and clear expectations were the path toward student progress and achievement.

Chester understood that Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley wanted to instill in him self-improvement skills and techniques. Chester pointed out the same task Mr. Shannon described, when students would listen back to themselves and self-analyze to make improvement or replicate aspects of their performance they had done well. Grady also identified improvement as their teachers’ overall goal, but the purpose of this improvement was to get better at one’s own instrument for the sake of the performance. Cory perceived that his teachers wanted band to be a place where students could explore their interests and develop an interest in music. He attributed
this to enjoyable music selections his teachers would pick for the group to play. All students felt tasks were clearly communicated, or they were easy enough to infer the purpose. Chester elaborated that this understanding came through a combination of teacher explanation and self-reflection, and felt that further explanation from his teachers could potentially help other students’ own understanding.

Aspect 2, Autonomy. Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley described ways in which students could offer input or direct their own learning, but clarified that these opportunities existed in other course offerings within their program. “Those opportunities exist, but it’s not in our large ensemble classes.” (Mr. Shannon) Students in the Southview High School band program had many courses to choose from, including instrumental techniques and AP music theory. The program also provided after school opportunities. Autonomy was present in their large ensemble classes in the form of musical decision-making, voicing opinions on programming choices, and equipment selection.

Chester noted many of the same forms of student autonomy as his teachers. He was enrolled in two band classes and instrumental techniques, and was a student leader. For Chester, the combination of being a student leader and being enrolled in instrumental techniques afforded him the time to talk with his teachers and share his perspective of the program. He believed any student had the opportunity to voice their opinion about something, but this process occurred outside of rehearsals and class-time. Cory related student autonomy to leadership positions. As an upperclassman trombone player in his class, he felt responsibility to help the younger trombone players, and pointed this out as his chance to be a decision-maker. He did not feel that he was offered a chance to voice his opinion about what to learn or what music to play, and would enjoy the chance to do so. In Grady’s opinion, autonomy was the conscious choice each
student made on a daily basis whether to participate in class or not. He did not feel that he had much of a say in choosing learning materials or directions, rather, the errors occurring in the music dictated the direction of each class period.

**Aspect 3, Recognition & Evaluation.** With their current group, Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley have repeatedly expressed that perfection is not the goal, with Mr. Shannon stating plainly, “It doesn’t need to be perfect to be a good performance.” Phrases such as “one thing better” and “wrong and strong” were mantras the teachers mentioned several times. The teachers discussed the large role mistakes had in the learning process, with the caveat that mistake awareness was mandatory to then form a plan for correction. Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley shared their concern for their students’ perspective on mistakes. “First thing out of their mouth is the error that sticks out the most in their performance.” (Mr. Shannon) Mrs. Bradley described students acting hesitant to change anything about their performance for fear of making mistakes, hence the mantras “one thing better” and “wrong and strong.”

The feedback process in Mr. Shannon’s class was student-centered and focused on critical reflecting. The students were invited to reflect on what they had just heard, and either offer verbal recommendations for improvement, or make their adjustments through the next playing opportunity. The teachers felt they acknowledged progress with their students the most out of effort and performance. When I asked the teachers how they recognized their students’ efforts, they commented on all three items by complimenting the students or criticizing them for output below the teachers’ standards. The connection between all three was evident. Mr. Shannon summarized their recognition of these three modes of student achievement in this way: “We acknowledge effort, we recognize and reflect on progress, we celebrate performance.” During this discussion, Mrs. Bradley noted that she did not hand out compliments when they were not
earned. She agreed with her colleague that offering positive feedback was important and necessary, but was firmly against praising students for efforts, progress, or performances that were not to her expected standards.

Chester and Grady described a very similar perspective on mistakes to their teachers. They detailed that mistakes were important to the learning process with awareness of mistakes as key. Cory agreed that mistakes could be both a positive and negative thing, and defined mistakes as an opportunity for improvement. All three students discussed the importance of progress to their teachers, although they did not all identify it as the most important trait to their teachers. Chester found that his teachers’ discussion of student progress was especially helpful because it was often paired with an explanation of why they thought the improvement occurred, mostly connecting it to student effort. “It’s rare they don’t talk about those two things hand-in-hand.” (Chester) Although progress was clearly important to his teachers, he felt that effort was more important for them to see in students. He attributed this to the appreciation Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley exhibited for students’ work ethic, even if progress was less evident. Grady saw progress as most important to Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley, commenting on its integral role as the connection between effort and progress. Cory was confident that his teachers acknowledged his effort, progress, and performance, but struggled to come up with any specific examples of what this looked like. He felt that performance was the most important aspect to his teachers, due to the nature of their feedback after their marching band show performances.

**Analysis.** Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley depicted a mastery-oriented class with a few performance-leaning traits. Mastery-oriented instructional habits included student-centered feedback practices such as self-reflection, discussing the connection between effort, progress, and performance with students, and encouraging students to try something new or different, even
at the risk of mistakes. The teachers acknowledged the lack of student autonomy in their large ensemble classes, a performance-leaning trait. Generally, more performance-oriented comments came through discussions about marching band as opposed to concert band or other program offerings. Some examples included questioning the meaningfulness of tasks associated with marching band, and equating poor performance with a lack of effort.

Chester, Cory, and Grady all identified similar traits to Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley, and depicted a mostly mastery-oriented class with occasional performance-oriented aspects. They all identified mastery-based classroom goals — self-improvement skills and individual interest development — and linked these traits to specific tasks or learning materials assigned by their teachers. Their various definitions of student autonomy ranged from mastery to performance. The opportunity students had to voice opinions to their teachers was mastery-oriented, but disconnecting this process from in-class instruction leaned performance-oriented. They spoke of the important role mistakes had in the learning process, a high-mastery trait. The connection between effort, progress, and performance, was also well-established, and the high importance placed on progress suggested mastery-orientation.

**Goal Theory Applied in the Classroom**

During this phase of data collection, I observed Mrs. Bradley’s classroom twice for ninety minutes each. Chester, Cory, and Grady all observed Mrs. Bradley.

**Aspect 1, Task-Setting.** Mrs. Bradley questioned her students often throughout class as a check for clarity and understanding. Her question-asking techniques kept students involved and engaged, but questions were often designed to seek one correct answer. Several tasks Mrs. Bradley assigned involved instructing students to think about their part in the larger context of the piece. Many tasks involved playing a segment several times and shaping it progressively,
according to what Mrs. Bradley heard from the students. In other words, tasks were set according to the feedback the teacher gave to students. If the students missed an instruction, Mrs. Bradley would immediately address it as an issue of students not listening or paying attention to the task. Clarity in her tasks was of the utmost importance. She maintained a friendly classroom atmosphere by speaking with her students about other topics as they were changing music, and filling her class with humor.

Throughout observations, student participants consistently and accurately identified the task, but not always the purpose. Chester was able to identify some exercise goals, but only after a few repetitions of the exercise and after feedback from Mrs. Bradley, which gave hints of the purpose for the exercise. Cory described Mrs. Bradley’s questioning tactic as a method of correcting students who were off-task. Cory stated what task was occurring throughout his observation, but left his commentary at that. Grady’s task identification was accurate throughout, and mostly focused on error-correction, which he then perceived to support musical improvement as the overall class goal.

**Aspect 2, Autonomy.** Often students were told what to do and in what way, but there were occasional moments where students were guided toward discovering their own answer, or instructed to collaborate toward an agreed-upon solution. As an example, Mrs. Bradley gave the following instruction to the flute, clarinet, and alto saxophone sections,

> Listen to each other and choose the same length of notes. Yeah? Some people are longer right now and shorter, just listen and match your neighbors.

Here, Mrs. Bradley assigned the students to work together towards the solution without specifying what the solution was, giving students the agency to work towards the answer themselves.
Student commentary on autonomy was sparse. Cory — who made an effort to comment on all questions asked in the observation prompt guide (see appendix D) — suggested that students made decisions by the mere choice to participate in class or not. Grady pointed out that the students were able to practice on their own for a short time; this was not a task assigned by Mrs. Bradley, rather students playing on their own as they were changing over their sheet music to the next piece. Chester noted many tasks Mrs. Bradley assigned in which she specified what was to be done and how it should be accomplished, and described no instances of student autonomy.

**Aspect 3, Recognition and Evaluation.** Mrs. Bradley’s feedback was connected to the tasks she set in a cycle common to large ensemble rehearsals. Her feedback covered student effort, progress, and performance, with most feedback directed at student performance. She did give positive feedback often, but it was frequently short, vague phrases or single-words such as “good.” Her feedback on what students needed to work on or adjust was often specified down to the measure.

Chester noticed a moment when Mrs. Bradley was especially excited about the progress of a particular passage. He noted the positive feedback tied to improvement and that students were asked if they also thought the passage had gotten better. Cory commented on feedback when Mrs. Bradley asked the class what strategies they could use to prevent the piece from rushing, which is more closely related to task-setting. This questioning came from implied feedback that the ensemble was rushing, so it’s not entirely out of place. He also was very eager to report when Mrs. Bradley preferred how the brass was articulating a passage more than the woodwinds. He felt like Mrs. Bradley’s feedback was mostly positive. Grady did not describe feedback during his observation. He commented twice that Mrs. Bradley praised the effort of the
class, however, one comment was vaguely about effort, and the other comment had no mention of effort recorded in the transcript.

**Analysis.** In interviews, Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Bradley depicted clearly-communicated student-oriented tasks in their classroom. Mrs. Bradley’s habit of closed-questioning leaned more performance orientation than mastery, but these questions supported her stated priority of clear task-setting, which is a mastery-leaning trait. Mrs. Bradley’s tasks looked much like she described them in her interview: tasks as expectations. She expected her students to listen to one another and respond, to know what was going on at any given time of the class, and to play the passages according to the notated music. While it was always made clear who should play and what they were playing, clarity was often lacking in terms of goals for the passage. Student participants were often able to correctly state what the task was throughout their observations, but goals were not always perceived or perceived accurately. Grady perceiving the broader class goal of musical improvement was accurate in the context of the class itself, so in a sense was accurate. However, the cues Mrs. Bradley would provide during those moments either suggested a different goal, or did not suggest a particular goal.

In interviews, Mrs. Bradley acknowledged the little autonomy students had in her large ensemble classroom. This was consistent with observations, and suggested performance orientation. The instruction Mrs. Bradley gave to the flute, clarinet, and alto saxophone sections to listen to each other was a moment of mastery orientation, and there were occasional similar instructions. With student choice so limited in the classroom, it is understandable why there was so little student commentary on this topic. Cory pointed out student choice in a literal manner, that each student had the choice to participate and decide to perform well or not. He did not speak, as he had in his interviews, on his role in helping the younger trombone students. Grady,
who did see student choice literally in interviews, mentioned one instance of getting to work out something individually, even though it was not an opportunity guided by the teacher.

I returned to Mr. Shannon’s summary of their recognition and evaluation practices: “We acknowledge effort, we recognize and reflect on progress, we celebrate performance.” In Mrs. Bradley’s classroom, it seemed to be handled differently. She appeared to recognize effort, celebrate progress, and acknowledge performance, which highlighted her favor towards progress, a mastery trait. Her feedback toward students was mostly on performance, but she depicted more excitement when expressing how students had improved. On a few occasions, she covered effort, progress, and performance in one or two sentences with varied polarity across them.

Each student commented on feedback in some manner. Students commented on moments when Mrs. Bradley gave positive feedback on student effort or progress, although Grady’s mentions of this were not quite accurate reflections. Chester identified a particular example of the scenario he described in his interview, when Mrs. Bradley paired positive feedback on progress with a discussion of why progress occurred. Cory described a task-setting example as feedback; he struggled to come up with feedback examples in his interviews, and in this classroom, feedback and task-setting were strongly connected.

There were consistencies and inconsistencies between how participants described this classroom and how this classroom was presented during observations. Task-setting was connected to high expectations, but the purpose behind tasks was not always explained or understood. Student autonomy was very limited, but brief opportunities to make decisions occurred. Recognition and evaluation were directly connected to and often overlapped with task-setting, but mostly focused on student performance. Student participants mostly commented on
task-setting in this classroom, but made some efforts to look beyond the task itself into the meaning behind it or the goal it supported.

**Summary**

During interviews, teachers identified several mastery traits that were consistent with their classroom instruction with only occasional performance traits. In their instruction, teachers demonstrated both mastery and performance traits. Task-setting had elements of both mastery and performance orientation, autonomy was mostly performance oriented, and recognition and evaluation also had both mastery and performance traits. Aspects of their instruction that were consistent with what they described in their interviews were mastery oriented. In interviews, students defined some aspects similarly to their teachers, sometimes citing the same examples teachers had described. During observations, however, students often had to find different examples to cite, as the examples they had described mostly applied to program infrastructures. Highly-motivated students tried to infer deeper meanings from classroom instruction they observed. Moderately-motivated students made some deeper-level observations as well as some surface-level observations. Minimally-motivated students either solely noted surface-level observations, or made some incorrect classroom assessments. In the next section, I will discuss possibilities for and implications of these findings, and suggest future research.
CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION

In this section, I will discuss findings from my research. First, I will describe an observation I conducted of a university classroom with a mastery oriented teacher to contextualize the discussion and implications. Then, I will describe themes I came across through analysis of findings. Finally, I will discuss limitations of this study, recommendations for future research, and close with final thoughts.

Mastery Orientation Applied

After coding data and writing the findings portion of this document, I asked Dr. Halliday, an esteemed university conductor well known for his rehearsal techniques and musical performances, if I could observe his classroom with goal orientation theory as a framework. He agreed, so I took notes on the rehearsal I observed, and asked the conductor and three volunteer students a few questions. The classroom I observed was a university-level concert ensemble made up of several music majors, music minors, as well as many students studying in several other fields. Several challenges were present on the particular day I observed the classroom: this was the first rehearsal after being apart for a week, the group was beginning to read new music for the first time, and there were at least two entire sections absent from rehearsal. Despite this atypical rehearsal, the conductor taught as I anticipate he teaches each day. Within approximately 50 minutes of observation, I was able to guess fairly accurately as to his overarching goal for his students.

After observing this conductor’s instruction, using my goal theory framework, I guessed that his broad instructional goal was to develop musical intuition: for his students to be equipped with the skills and inquiry tools with which they could ask questions, and from those questions make musical decisions. My evidence for this hypothesis was the constant questioning tactic Dr.
Halliday used with his students. Examples included: “What do you know about this composer?” “How do you feel about volume?” “What does [the music] need?” Usually after these questions, students responded with multiple possibilities for answers. On the rare occasion students did not know enough to attempt a guess, the conductor would encourage the students to seek out answers before the next class.

During a rehearsal break, I asked Dr. Halliday what his goal for his students was by the time they leave his ensemble. He wanted them to walk away more curious, asking questions about the music they played. This was clearly evidenced and supported by his instructional tactics. As another example, when he asked the students what they were hearing, he would encourage them to go deeper and be more specific with their responses. When the responses remained broad, he would have the students play the same passage so they could listen more intently and respond. This goal, and the implementation of the goal in all aspects of instruction, is evidence of high mastery orientation. Additional mastery traits included fostering student autonomy by giving students responsibility to make musical decisions, as well as assigning tasks by giving the students control over deciding how to bring about change.

After the rehearsal, I asked if a few students had a moment to talk to me about their perceptions and experiences. Three students volunteered to speak with me. Their perceptions of Dr. Halliday’s goals were also incredibly close to his classroom goal. One student said that Dr. Halliday wanted them to have an in-depth knowledge of the music and to understand why it goes a particular way by asking questions. Another student said they were meant to think about music on a deeper level, and the third student agreed with this assessment. They all cited particular examples of Dr. Halliday’s rehearsals during which he would ask them questions about the music, or discuss the historical context or composer’s background for the piece. They felt class
had a good balance of autonomy; while recognizing that some amount of authority must come from the podium, they felt able to contribute to the musical decisions that led a performance. They did feel they had less of a say in the musical expression of a piece of music if the composer were still alive, which is a topic that should be explored in future research.

With this rehearsal observation and brief participant questioning, it was evident that well-aligned goals across all aspects of classroom instruction could result in clearly-communicated values and goals. Dr. Halliday and his students seemed to understand the intent and purpose of the class, simply through the tactics the conductor used in his instruction. As suggested by Ames (1992), misalignment across goal structures can cause some goal confusion to occur. While some of the responses from participants in my study were close, they were not quite consistent to the goals teachers had stated in interviews (see Table 4).

Table 4. Broad Classroom Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
<th>Student 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenville High School</strong></td>
<td>Develop life skills through music,</td>
<td>Foster leadership skills</td>
<td>Responsibility, love of music,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>musical skills to continue music in</td>
<td></td>
<td>collaboration skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>any form</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve musically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southview High School</strong></td>
<td>Appreciation for music, grow as</td>
<td>Skills to improve musically</td>
<td>Develop musical interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people, collaboration skills,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve on chosen instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop life skills through music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Group</strong></td>
<td>Develop musical curiosity</td>
<td>In-depth knowledge of why the music is the</td>
<td>Understand more about the music,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>way it is</td>
<td>where it came from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Think about music on a deeper level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Interview data*

This additional case, while not a part of my official inquiry, suggested that goal orientation theory works as a theoretical framework for instrumental large ensemble classrooms.
In these settings, teachers can use an understanding of goal theory to improve the ways they communicate their goals and values to students. Notes from this observation and discussions with the teacher and students supported my findings and helped contextualize implications for instruction.

Implications for Teaching

“Better Musicians, Better People”

Among other program goals, both teaching pairs emphasized the importance of helping their students grow into better people through their participation in band. Students who picked up on this goal supported this with touching testimonies of the ways that participating in band and learning from their teachers had changed their lives. Liberty shared, “They’ve taught me a lot of the things that I ground myself on.” These overarching goals seemed disconnected from the daily class experience, and were more tied into leadership experiences, participation in marching band, or the amount of time students spent in the band program. There were small ways that the teachers made daily connections to these long term goals, as Mr. Hall and Mrs. Bradley pointed out. Their attention to detail, work ethic, and high standards all apply to important life skills students should develop.

Wiseman & Hunt (2008), as cited by Hruska (2011), articulated the importance for teachers to clearly express goals and expectations of learning with their students, so that the students and teachers work as collaborators towards these goals. Further, Hruska suggested a practice he employed in his high school band rehearsals: writing the order of music — which was a practice both participating schools employed — as well as the goal for improvement for each piece. Over time, these goals collectively would communicate long-term goals and values to students, and lead to higher motivation and achievement. Teachers should also ensure that
each daily goal aligns with long-term goals for students, as in Dr. Halliday’s teaching. Scheib (2006) suggested a list of questions music educators could ask themselves to reflect on their own instruction, and what their students might be gaining from it. These questions intended to guide teachers to check for congruence between their instructional values and their instructional procedures: “How do my practices as a teacher affect my students’ perceptions of school music? What deeper or ‘hidden’ meanings do they convey?” (p. 35). Reflection such as this could help music educators to shape their classroom instruction to match their long term goals.

“Harder, Better, Faster, Stronger”

The lyrics from the 2001 Daft Punk song (sampled by Kanye West in 2007) rolled around in my head as I read observation transcriptions. I felt like “harder, better, faster, stronger” could fit in with most tasks set in the classroom. Teachers mostly instructed their students to perform the musical selections ‘shorter, longer, slower, faster, louder, softer,’ and other various descriptors. These tasks do support positive mastery-based program goals, including improved musicianship and development of musical skills, as well as foster collaboration as students have to work together to achieve the overall musical effect. It is when this becomes the sole or even primary mode of task-setting in the music classroom that the other wonderful goals teachers set become lost. Variety in task-setting could also help improve student autonomy in the classroom. This type of task-setting is fairly common to the large ensemble rehearsal construction, as pointed out by Hruska (2011):

Bands, choirs, and orchestras by their very nature are task-involved, requiring each member of the ensemble to actively work through musical mistakes and challenges to achieve the final product of a fine performance. (p. 7)

One of Dr. Halliday’s goals was indeed to play the music more effectively over time, but it occurred in service of his primary mode of task-setting, discovering more about the music
throughout rehearsal. He asked questions to lead to musical understanding or a desire to dive
deeper into the music, which cased an intrinsic motivation for the students to make musical
improvements. With this in mind, I recommend teachers take a look at their program goals for
their students, and find methods to implement these goals as tasks throughout their classroom
instruction.

**Autonomy as Extra-Curricular**

Student autonomy was lacking in the classrooms I observed. This could be because the
groups I observed were the more formative groups, and possibly because these groups were in
varying early learning stages of the music they were rehearsing. Both teacher pairs mentioned
student ability to make musical decisions in their classroom, but examples of this were few or
not present. Autonomy did exist in both programs in other ways outside of daily classroom
instruction, such as in leadership positions or in other more individualized-curriculum class
offerings. Both highly-motivated student participants noted that they felt they had autonomy
through their leadership opportunities, additional music classes, and more opportunities to speak
one-on-one with their teachers. This may have also been why they depicted certain aspects of the
classroom similarly to their teachers. These are certainly great ways of promoting and fostering
student autonomy, especially, as Hruska (2011) points out, student leadership. West (2013)
advised that teachers work toward giving students a say in musical decisions to increase student
motivation.

One way Dr. Halliday accomplished this was by asking the students what their thoughts
were on particular aspects of the music, such as the volume, balance, and other items. He then
guided the students toward making tangible changes in their approach, rather than telling them
what to do and how to do it. Students that talked to me afterward felt that these opportunities
were evidence of their influence on the performance. These tactics are mastery oriented forms of autonomy that then lead into mastery oriented forms of task-setting. This approach could help facilitate consistency across aspects of the classroom, communicate goals to students more clearly, and increase student motivation.

**Specific Positive Feedback**

Teachers used feedback often to not only acknowledge what their students were doing, but also used feedback to connect to task-setting. One trend I noticed with teacher participants was that feedback about what the students could improve upon was very specific, often identifying notes and rhythms that were incorrect in specific measures or sections. In contrast, and although it happened often, teacher feedback about positive aspects of student performance were often vague, short descriptors such as “good.”

A study by Bandura and Cervone (2000; as cited by Hruska, 2011) suggested that specific performance feedback from teachers could increase performance efforts of their students. Research has also found higher motivation levels (Sandene, 1997), and improved ensemble concentration, attitudes, and performance (Price, 1989) in students when higher rates of positive feedback were present. While Duke and Henninger’s (1998) research found that constructive negative feedback yielded positive performance and student attitudes, they specified that the results should be considered carefully, and perhaps the more important takeaway was that student attitudes may have been more impacted by perceptions of self-efficacy and accomplishment than by the positive/negative feedback ratio.

**“Wrong and Strong”**

The teachers described reminding their students to take risks in classes in a positive, encouraging manner, using such phrases as “wrong and strong” and “don’t stop, get it get it.”
Following the rehearsal of a piece at each school, each teacher commended the students for taking risks.

Yeah, hey, not bad reading there guys, I appreciate that we went for stuff, and if we missed we missed while continuing to play… Thank you, that’s how we want to do stuff when we play something new. (Mr. Hall)

During the rest of his class, Mr. Hall’s attempts to encourage students playing new music were more akin to brief, exclamatory reminders for the students to play out, or to avoid playing timidly. There were also a few moments when Mr. Hall would point out a simple mistake the band made as something they should have gotten correct: “Oh come on, you gotta count that.” Mrs. Bradley also reminded the students, “Don’t be scared!” Like Mr. Hall, she praised her students for their musical bravery:

So what I really appreciate about that piece today was just that you were going for it. You weren’t afraid to just play and be wrong.

These comments were reminders of their high mastery belief that mistakes are worth taking risks, but sometimes the method by which this was communicated was presented as a critique on student effort.

Dr. Halliday’s ensemble was reading new music for the first time when I observed, and at times the students played timidly. When this happened, Dr. Halliday commented, “Can you read with much more volume?” Later in class, Dr. Halliday asked the students to characterize the music. They responded with descriptive words such as ‘happy,’ ‘elated,’ and ‘joyful.’ He agreed that these were characteristic of the music, but the music sounded concerned, and encouraged them to find a way to make a change.

I do not point these examples from Dr. Halliday’s class to compare a university ensemble to two high school ensembles. Instead, I hope to take these examples from Dr. Halliday’s ensemble and use them as a template for possible ways to encourage young students that may be
approaching music timidly. These comments were directed at student effort, but connected it to supporting the musical goals of the class. Making these verbal connections with students could help motivate them to make attempts at the music, even at the risk of mistakes.

Timidly approaching music — or music performance anxiety — is a common problem for many musicians, including young musicians (Ryan, 2005). Even though music performance anxiety levels were reported higher for a concert, university students still reported considerably high anxiety for rehearsals (Robinson & Kenny, 2017). This gets into a bifurcated area of goal orientation theory known as performance-avoidance orientation, one part of the 2 x 2 achievement goal framework (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Elliot, 2005, as cited by Shim, Cho, & Cassady, 2013). Performance-avoidance orientation is, as the name suggests, when an individual avoids performing so they avoid displaying a lack of competence or to avoid negative judgement from others. Shim, Cho, and Cassady (2013) cited research that suggested classrooms with high performance structures have been found to foster performance-avoidance behaviors. This particular area of goal theory was outside of the scope of this particular study, and would be a helpful topic for future research to explore.

**Mastery as a Program Framework**

Teacher and student participants in my study often identified mastery oriented aspects of their whole band programs. These broad aspects depicted mastery oriented traits within structural entities of the program, such as leadership positions and other course offerings. While these entities do indeed contribute to students’ experiences and are well worth observation, they were not within the scope of the present study. It is possible that this conflict could have been avoided if I had given more specific examples of what I was inquiring about. If students identified these structures in interviews, they did not comment on them during observations, and sometimes
struggled to redirect their perceptions toward the instruction at hand. This resulted in a
dichotomy between broad program goals, and the application of these goals in daily classroom
instruction.

Many of the performance oriented traits I observed or participants discussed were
connected to structures consistent with large ensemble music classrooms. Traditionally, these
ensembles have one instructor at the front of the classroom and many students that listen to
instruction from this pedagogue. This traditional design often has little opportunity for student
autonomy, a trait consistent in participating schools, although these schools did have emergent
moments or opportunities for autonomy. Goals of large ensemble band classes also traditionally
are meant to serve the goals of the group, rather than goals of individuals. While there are
problems inherent with the large ensemble paradigm (Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Kratus, 2019b),
an awareness of these issues could lead music educators to improved models for their
classrooms.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Future research should replicate this study, with more time spent on collecting
observational data, both from the researcher and the students. Students themselves can also have
goal orientation, thus goal orientation frameworks should be observed from both a mastery
oriented student’s perspective and a performance oriented student’s perspective. Further research
into performance-avoidance traits in students and causes of these traits should be studied;
additionally, researchers should explore methodologies using the 2 x 2 achievement goal
framework. A study observing goal perceptions during marching band season compared with
goal perceptions during concert band season could be a fascinating research avenue. Also, an
inquiry into student autonomy perceptions while working on music written by contemporary still-living composers was an interesting and unexpected research path suggested by findings.

**Conclusion**

Reflecting on one’s own teaching, and asking for student input on one’s teaching, is a challenging and brave journey to embark upon. Goal orientation theory could be a helpful compass to teachers which can help identify areas of congruence and lack-thereof. Zooming out to take a big-picture look at program goals, and zooming back in to see those goals applied in the classroom, can help teachers facilitate instructional practices that grow student motivation, as well as foster positive learning habits. Students are the direct benefactors of our work, so teachers should ask for their perspective as another way towards a deeper understanding of their teaching practices.

I feel the importance to clarify that performance-oriented teaching is not inherently wrong, nor is it to be avoided at all times. Hruska (2011) perhaps put it best:

> Although I do not believe all performance-centered learning situations are negative, we must be careful to craft these experiences so they do not have a damaging impact on student learning. (p. 6)

An awareness of mastery and performance traits that exist in our classroom is key to understanding how our classrooms are perceived by our students. While I may encourage working toward — and I myself may strive for — more mastery-based instruction, performance orientation does have a role in the classroom. Ultimately, goal orientation theory as a framework can assist music educators towards clearly communicated goals, and thus improved experiences for our students.
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V. Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal: Participation in research is voluntary. You and your teachers do not need to participate in this study. If participants decide to be in the study and change their mind, participants have the right to drop out at any time. Participants may skip questions or stop participating at any time. Whatever the participant decides, they will not lose any benefits to which the participants are otherwise entitled.

VI. Confidentiality: We will keep your records private to the extent allowed by law. Carlye Latas McGregor and Ann Marie Stanley have access to the information participants provide. This information will be stored within a firewall-protected computer file. Participants’ names and other factors that may point to participants will not appear when we present this study or publish its results. You and your students will not be identified personally.

VII. Contact Persons: Contact Carlye Latas McGregor at clatas4@lsu.edu or Ann Marie Stanley at astanley1@lsu.edu if you have questions, concerns, or complaints about this study.

VIII. Copy of Consent Form to Subject: We will give you a copy of this consent form to keep.

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. For injury or illness, call your physician, or the Student Health Center if you are an LSU student. If I have questions about subject’s rights or other concerns, I can contact Alex Cohes, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, or www.lsu.edu/research. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the researcher’s obligation to provide me with a copy of this consent form if signed by me.

Participant Signature ____________________________ Date __________

Participant Printed ______________________________ Date __________

Researcher ________________________________ Date __________
APPENDIX G. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Teacher Interview Questions

TASK
1. Could you describe your long-term goals for your students (what is it you want your students to accomplish or gain before leaving this program)?
2. What short-term tasks do you set to attain those goals?
3. Do you ever discuss with your students why they are doing a particular task? If so, could you describe an example?
4. Which do you believe is more important: improving over time or being right at the start? How do you feel you convey this priority?
5. What role do mistakes have in the learning process? How do you want your students to perceive mistakes?
6. Do you feel the tasks you have your students perform are reasonably challenging?
7. Do you feel the tasks you have your students perform are meaningful? How do you feel you convey that?

AUTHORITY & AUTONOMY
8. What role do students have in decision-making in your classroom?
9. How often do students get to choose or voice an opinion about what to learn?
10. Do you feel you foster and help develop student responsibility and independence? How?

RECOGNITION & EVALUATION
11. In what ways do you recognize the effort of your students?
12. In what ways do you recognize the progress of your students?
13. In what ways do you recognize the outcomes (or performance) of your students?
14. Out of effort, progress, and outcomes, which do you feel you recognize the most?
15. In what ways do you give your students feedback?

Student Interview Questions

TASK
1. What do you think your teacher’s goal is for you by the time you leave the program?
2. What daily or weekly class tasks support this goal?
3. Do you understand why you do certain tasks in the classroom? If so, could you describe an example?
4. Which do you think your teacher believes is more important: improving over time or being right at the start? What in your teacher’s actions causes you to think that?
5. What role do mistakes have in the learning process? How do your teachers feel about mistakes?
6. Do you feel the tasks your teacher asks you to do are reasonably challenging?
7. Do you think your teacher believes what you do in the classroom is meaningful? What in your teacher’s actions causes you to think that?
AUTHORITY & AUTONOMY
8. What role do you have in decision-making in the classroom?
9. How often do you get to choose or voice an opinion about what to learn?
10. Do you feel your teacher helps you learn how to be more responsible and independent? How?

RECOGNITION & EVALUATION
11. Do you feel like your effort (or the effort of other students) is recognized? How?
12. Do you feel like your progress (or the progress of other students) is recognized? How?
13. Do you feel like your outcome/performance (or the outcome/performance of other students) is recognized? How?
14. Which do you feel your teacher recognizes the most: effort, progress, or outcomes?
15. In what ways does your teacher give you feedback?
APPENDIX H. STUDENT OBSERVATION GUIDE

- What task are you (or other students) doing?
  - Did your teacher explain why you’re doing this task?
  - How do the tasks support the overall goal of this class?

- How does your teacher maintain the learning environment?
  - If students are off-task, how are they addressed?
  - Are students recognized for modeling correct behavior?

- How are students invited to make decisions?

- How is your teacher delivering feedback?
  - Is the teacher’s feedback focused on effort, progress, or outcomes/performance?
  - Is the teacher’s feedback mostly positive, negative, or neutral?
  - Does your teacher invite students to give feedback to themselves/each other?
APPENDIX I. CODING SAMPLE

Coding Round 1

[students play]

Teacher 2

Much million-hundred-thousand times better at 86. Did it feel better to you? [mild student responses] I'm genuinely asking. [students affirm] Sounded way better from up here, just letting you know in case it did not feel better to you. 86, much better, my one thing — flutes, clarinets, I told the percussion I want them to come way down but that I could hear you better, so you don't get softer. (Student: Sorry.) No, don't be sorry, I'm just letting you know, maybe I was not clear. Okay? So, you guys can still play out 86, just not the percussion. Good, 92. Good job, remember if you have the long notes and they're just tied, even faster than it says to, just kind of back off. Trumpets, all you guys, [sings part] lovely job, I just think more. Just a little bit. And then 100 is that part we worked on last class, yeah? Could I hear 100? Everybody's in at 100, watch for a cutoff. [counts students off]

Student 1

She gave positive feedback on improvement and then asked if students thought it was better.

She followed it with negative feedback towards the woodwinds.

Coding Round 2

[students play]

Teacher 2

Much million-hundred-thousand times better at 86. Did it feel better to you? [mild student responses] I'm genuinely asking. [students affirm] Sounded way better from up here, just letting you know in case it did not feel better to you. 86, much better, my one thing — flutes, clarinets, I told the percussion I want them to come way down but that I could hear you better, so you don't get softer. (Student: Sorry.) No, don't be sorry, I'm just letting you know, maybe I was not clear. Okay? So, you guys can still play out 86, just not the percussion. Good, 92. Good job, remember if you have the long notes and they're just tied, even faster than it says to, just kind of back off. Trumpets, all you guys, [sings part] lovely job, I just think more. Just a little bit. And then 100 is that part we worked on last class, yeah? Could I hear 100? Everybody's in at 100, watch for a cutoff. [counts students off]

Student 1

She gave positive feedback on improvement and then asked if students thought it was better.

She followed it with negative feedback towards the woodwinds.
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