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ABSTRACT

Despite an abundance of evidence-based research pointing to the effectiveness of long-term teacher professional development (PD) (Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017; Desimone, 2009), instrumental music teachers who seek to improve their teaching practices are limited to and often prefer short-term PD opportunities (Bauer, 2007; West, 2020). In recent years, a growing knowledge base focused on music teacher PD has given attention to long-term, content-based and collaborative music PD (Conway, 2015; Kastner, 2014; Stanley, Snell & Edgar, 2014) while a dearth of evidence-based research exists on short-term music PD (Bauer, 2007; West, 2020). The purpose of this collective case study was to examine short-term professional development through participants’ experiences at a professional development workshop designed to introduce and guide implementation of an approach to teaching beginning band, unfamiliar to the participants. Three short-term professional development learning contexts (self-study through reading, self-study through observation, and group collaboration) anchored the study and served as single case studies. Nine preservice instrumental music teachers—three in each cohort—attended a one-day workshop designed to deliver instruction through one of the three learning contexts.

Each cohort demonstrated the ability to apply aspects of the PD content to teaching practice and expressed positive beliefs about the PD encounter. By the end of the workshop, the reading and collaboration cohorts were positioned to begin applying the approach to teaching practice while the observation cohort was still developing their understanding of the approach. Analysis revealed seven themes centered around—instructional goals, engaging learners, pedagogical shift, misunderstandings, self-efficacy, interest/value and attitude. Considered
collectively, they show participants exhibiting aspects of pedagogical content knowledge and shared beliefs about their PD experience.

This study brings forth a more nuanced understanding of short-term PD. Findings, herein, contribute to the knowledge base by suggesting the potential for effective short-term PD formats and offering recommendations for improvement. It is imperative that music education continue to build an evidence-based foundation related to the professional growth of music teachers. Future research on short-term music teacher PD should involve in-service teachers, include learner outcomes, and examine teachers as self-regulated learners beyond the PD encounter.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Opening Vignette

Jason sits quietly with ear buds in while listening to music at a professional development workshop. He and his fellow cohort members, Maria and Brian, are independently reading about teaching musical expression to beginning band students. Jason “hates reading sometimes.” He makes himself do it or at least tries to. He reads about keeping musical communication at the forefront of the learning process. Based on the reading, he considers that when students practice with the intention of communicating something, “their experimentation becomes more about refinement and expressive reflection rather than correct notes and rhythm.” In his afternoon workshop tasks, he embraces this concept as he plans a rehearsal on a simple melody.

At a separate workshop, Lindsey, Ian and Josh are viewing videos of a middle school band director leading her 7th grade woodwinds in rehearsal of a syncopated rhythm. She provides an instructional model of the beginning band approach at the center of the workshop. The cohort watches as the teacher asks her students questions, such as “Is this a happy chord or an upset chord?” and “What do we need to do better?” She is committed to involving the students in the learning process. In her reflective response, Lindsey notices how the teacher “incorporates a lot of questioning into her teaching” covering rhythm, musical mood, tuning and encouraging student investment. She reasons that because the teacher asks the students “what they can do better after they finish playing together” she guides them to “evaluate their [own] playing.”

In a third workshop, Marsha, Allan and Sarah sit in a circle facing one another with primary instrument in hand. On their music stands are music scores to simple, five-part unison melodies and prompts for collaborative discussion. The workshop facilitator listens as they discuss their ideas on guiding students to develop the concept of musical communication as they
improve their technical skills. She directs them to apply their discussion as they rehearse *Give it Up for Two Notes*, Byo (2011), a simple melody using two notes.

**Marsha:** I feel like it’s more challenging to consider, like, musical expression with, like, beginner band pieces, because, like, I can think about it with, like, our level but it’s really hard to think what do I want to convey with these students.

**Facilitator:** What if this was not a beginning piece, just a flute part and Dr. Schultz (Marsha’s flute professor) said, ‘Marsha, this is a solo I want you to play…and just play it as beautifully as possible.’ Would that change a little bit of how you look at the piece?

**Allan:** Yes, definitely, I’ve immediately started thinking bigger phrases…

With a new outlook on the melody, the cohort continue to discuss and rehearse the melody. After the activity, the cohort wrote a reflective response. Marsha shared her realization that music she may consider “easy” as a college level musician can still be taught and learned with musical expression. Sarah wrote that she “realized” she sets low expectations for younger students due to her “preconceived notion that younger students will struggle with things such as expression and musicality” (see complete vignettes in Appendix G).

**Explanation**

The purpose of this study was to conduct exploratory research into short-term professional development experiences of instrumental music teachers as they encountered an unfamiliar approach to teaching beginning band. Three short-term professional development (PD) learning contexts (self-study through reading, self-study through observation, and group collaboration) were at the center of the study and served as separate, single case studies. From a purposeful sample of nine preservice instrumental music teachers, three teacher cohorts were formed and each cohort attended a workshop designed to deliver instruction through one of the three learning contexts (reading, observation, or collaboration.) As they practiced applying the approach during score analysis and rehearsal planning, analysis revealed how participants’ lived
experiences might inform practice. This examination utilized the instrumental collective case study as the method of inquiry.

**Background**

Despite the effectiveness of content-based, long-term, and collaborative professional development (PD) experiences, instrumental music teachers who seek to improve their teaching practices are limited to and often prefer short-term professional development opportunities (Bauer, 2007; West, 2020). Both mandated and optional school- or district-based offerings rarely focus on music-related topics, thereby increasing the desire for content-based professional development opportunities among music teachers (Bauer, 2007; Conway & Christensen, 2006; Eros, 2012). This dilemma leaves the in-service music teacher to their own devices, in most cases. Typically, experienced music teachers, in search of PD opportunities, will attend off-campus conferences or workshops and observe rehearsals or guest clinicians, attend conference sessions, or engage in collaborative discussions with peers to encounter professional learning experiences that they perceive to be beneficial (Draves, 2017; Pulling, 2019; West, 2018). However, drawbacks to engaging in this type of professional development experience come mainly in two forms: (a) time and cost and (b) the potential for an ineffective teacher learning experience.

Regarding time and cost, travel to professional development destinations is not commonly funded by the music teacher’s school district. Likewise, release time or excused absence is not always granted (West, 2019). These circumstances require music teachers to schedule professional development in the evenings or weekends, and/or leave school to attend. Factor in the cost of travel and hotel stays and participation in such professional development opportunities can quickly become an expensive endeavor (Odden, Archibald, Fermanich &
Gallagher, 2002). Add to this the consensus among professional development researchers that short-term PD learning formats, which are most accessible to music teachers, are perceived as an unlikely means of acquiring effective PD (Gallo, 2018; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman & Yoon, 2001; Patton, Parker & Tannenhill, 2015; Stanley, Snell & Edgar, 2014).

While attention to improving short-term PD design may prove to be advantageous, it should not be neglected that long-term PD experiences, sustained in duration, have proven to be most effective (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017). Long-term PD not only provides time for teachers to innovative instructional strategies, but it also fosters the implementation of innovative instructional strategies on-site. Whereas short-term PD is unlikely to promote instructional changes (Gallo, 2018), it would be beneficial to identify characteristics that make long-term PD effective and, if possible, adapt them to short-term PD experiences. Doing so may enhance the short-term PD experience and increase its potential for instructional change.

Positioning teachers to use content gained through professional development into their teaching is the underlying goal of professional development thus enabling teachers to meet the ever-changing needs of learners (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2017; Desimone, 2011).

Successful professional development experiences manifest themselves as a change in teaching practice where teachers “acquire new knowledge and utilize it to foster increased student learning” (Patton, Parker & Tannehill, 2015, p.32). Providing the opportunity for teachers to practice that change is an essential component of effective long-term PD (Patton et al., 2015). Suffice it to say that practicing content experienced during a short-term PD experience may also produce beneficial results. While the delivery of instruction is one form of teaching practice, applying PD content to preparatory music teacher activities such as score analysis and rehearsal planning may also reflect instructional changes.
Applying Music Teacher PD to Teaching Practice

Previous research on lesson planning for the music classroom demonstrates that lesson plans uncover the teacher’s intentions, usually accompanied by some form of a sequential approach to instruction (Brittin, 2005; de Frece 2010; Lane & Talbert, 2015). In the field of music education, preparatory activities such as score analysis and rehearsal planning may provide insight into how teachers synthesize unfamiliar content as they create lessons and construct knowledge intended for the application process. Score analysis is an invaluable tool in the rehearsal planning process (Lane, 2006; Silvey, Montemayor & Baumgartner, 2017). Other areas of rehearsal preparation that may prove valuable in the planning process are teacher modeling activities (Brittin, 2005; Haston 2007), concept teaching techniques (Blocher, Greenwood, & Shellohamer, 1997; Garofalo, 1983; Misenhalter, 2000; Noble, 1971) and expressive performance (Byo, 2014; Karlsson & Juslin, 2008; Tan, Diaz, & Miksza, 2018). Since rehearsal of the musical score is the primary vehicle for preparing a performance of the work, an exploration into how instrumental music teachers approach score analysis and rehearsal planning, as informed by professional development experiences, may guide the design of short-term PD to encourage instructional changes in teaching practice.

Be it a short-term or long-term PD program, teacher self-efficacy is typically a reliable predictor of a teacher’s ability and motivation to incorporate an instructional change in teaching practice (Bandura, 1997). For instance, in an elementary music setting, Battersby and Cave (2014) report that “teachers’ self-efficacy toward teaching music and their personal level of music appreciation play a significant role in what can be accomplished in their classroom” (p. 54). Teachers who believe strongly in their teaching abilities tend to “create mastery learning environments for their students” while those teachers who are filled with self-doubt are likely to
construct learning experiences which inhibit functional student progress (Bandura, p. 241). It is therefore essential for instrumental teachers who wish to develop their teaching skills through professional learning to also possess a strong belief in their ability to carry out unfamiliar approaches in their music classrooms.

This sense of self-efficacy informs the teacher’s instructional readiness. In the context of the present study, *instructional readiness* refers to teachers’ ability to at least begin applying PD content into teaching practice in an appropriate manner. Teachers typically require a sense of preparedness or readiness to teach when using new approaches or strategies (Marzano & Toth, 2014; Ronfeldt, Matsko, Greene Nolan, & Reininger, 2018). Participants’ instructional readiness to begin applying what they are learning through PD may be present in both their teaching practice and their demonstrated and communicated attitudes and beliefs. Instructional readiness, along with instrumental music teachers’ approach to score analysis and rehearsal planning, may provide insight on how they make sense of the content they encounter during a short-term PD experience.

**Definitions**

**Short-Term vs. Long-Term PD**

There exists no definitive allotted time frame that distinguishes short-term PD from long-term PD. The duration of the PD activity itself (e.g., one day or one semester) and total participation hours in the activity do not seem to be the sole determinant of short- or long-term PD. Desimone (2009) remarks that researchers have not specified an exact time frame that constitutes effective PD but support is apparent for sustained or long-term “activities that are spread over a semester (or intense summer institutes with follow-up during the semester) and include 20 hours or more of contact time” (p.184). Long-term PD forms, also identified as
sustained or ongoing, nearly always include collaborative and job-embedded characteristics that offer follow-up support (Desimone, 2009; Garet et al., 2001). In practice, long-term music teacher PD may take the form of learning communities (Stanley et al., 2014), mentorships (Conway, 2015) or extended time devoted to improving practice, such as conducting (Gallo, 2008).

For several decades, short-term learning experiences, in the form of workshops, conferences, seminars or college/university courses (Mizell, 2010) have been the dominant form of teacher PD and likewise are considered traditional PD formats (Anderson, 1951; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey, 1986). Traditional PD formats are usually isolated from the teacher’s daily practice at school and are short in duration. Although, short-term PD formats do not have a specified time duration, Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) suggests that short-term forms typically spend “less than eight hours on a topic” (p. 1). While short-term forms, such as workshops, may be embedded within a sustained PD experience, on their own they are short in duration, take place isolated from the teachers’ school setting, and do not typically offer follow-up support (Garet et al., 2001). In practice, short-term PD formats may take the form of workshops, conferences, seminars or college/university courses (Garet et al.; Mizell, 2010).

PD Workshop Content

The workshop experience was designed to introduce and guide implementation of an approach to teaching beginning band. I chose an approach that was likely unfamiliar to the participants and one that I could adapt for instructional delivery in each learning context—*The Habits of Musicianship: A Radical Approach to Beginning Band* (Duke & Byo, 2011). The approach is grounded in foundational ways of thinking that shift pedagogical priorities away from what might be labeled the beginning band status quo (Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Duke &
Byo, 2011; Wall, 2018). In score study, the teacher applies an expressive performance lens *along with* a technical skill development lens in learning and conceptualizing the music. In planning for teaching, the teacher strategizes to optimize students’ cognitive engagement, designing experiences that place students in roles as listeners, analysts, decision-makers, feedback-providers, and idea-generators. In teaching, the teacher prioritizes musical communication *along with* technical skill development. The approach is based on one overarching message: From Day 1, teachers treat beginning instrumentalists, typically 10-12 years of age, like actual musicians rather than musical blank states.

Each cohort attended a workshop designed to cover three integral concepts of the teaching approach: (a) musical communication at the forefront of the learning process, (b) score study based on student’s role in expressive performance, and (c) designing effective learning experiences. The reading cohort encountered these concepts as they read excerpts from published works written by the authors of the teaching approach. The observation cohort viewed videos showing a teacher, well-versed and experienced in the approach, demonstrating selected aspects of it in rehearsal with middle school students. For the collaboration cohort, prompts related to each concept served as thought starters in discussions about concepts and melodies written by the authors of the approach. A detailed description of each cohort experience is provided Chapter 3 under the heading titled Cohorts.

**Musical Communication vs. Musical Expression**

For context, it is important to distinguish between the terms “musical communication” and “musical expression” and their use when discussing the participants’ workshop experience. One should not assume these two terms possess interchangeable meanings. The approach at the center of the PD workshop encourages the teacher to keep musical communication at the
forefront of learning experiences. This implies that expressive musical decisions are connected to an intended goal of communicating an idea, mood, or an emotion to listeners, real or imagined, thus giving reason for the technical skills necessary for an expressive performance (Duke & Byo, 2012; Hargreaves et al., 2005). Musical expression, on the other hand, encompasses the technical skills and know-how necessary for expressive performance (Brenner & Strand, 2013) but for which communication goals are absent or at best vague. In this sense, use of the term “musical communication” refers to what message the performer is sharing through the performance (e. g. musical effect, interpretation, mood) while “musical expression” refers to how to musically convey a thought or mood (e. g. style, articulation, dynamics).

Discussion v. Collaboration

In the present study, the collaboration cohort experienced PD content by generating ideas and new knowledge through discussion and rehearsal in response to prompts related to the PD content. They discussed and exchanged ideas which guided their understanding of the PD content. Although they did not create a physical project or artifact together through collaboration, they worked together to form a shared understanding of the PD content.

Collaborate, as defined by Merriam Webster (n.d.), is “to work jointly with others or together especially in an intellectual endeavor.” In this sense, the collaboration cohort used discussion and rehearsal to develop a shared understanding of the PD content in a collaborative learning setting.

Rationale

The conceptual framework on which this study was built measures value in professional development according to teacher change and growth as opposed to time spent or credits earned (Desimone, 2009; Guskey, 1986; Loeb, Miller & Strunk, 2009; West, 2020). It subscribes to PD as an agent of or incubator for pedagogical content knowledge (Schulman, 1986). Shulman
distinguished among three categories of teachers’ content knowledge—subject matter, pedagogical, and curricular. An advantageous combination of subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge would yield pedagogical content knowledge, this is “subject matter for teaching” (p. 9). Schulman wrote:

Within the category of pedagogical content knowledge I include, for the most regularly taught topics in one’s subject area, the most useful forms of representation of those ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations—in a word, the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others. Since there are no single most powerful forms of representation, the teacher must have at hand a veritable armamentarium of alternative forms of representation, some of which derive from research whereas others originate in the wisdom of practice (p. 9).

The present study is bound by this depiction of the teacher’s role as one who is charged with the responsibility of developing expertise in pedagogical content knowledge and of PD’s potential to be a generator of such knowledge.

Owing to the exploratory nature of the present study, it will remain an open question as to whether this investigation might be conceptualized according to the situativity of knowing and learning (Greeno, 1998). Situative theorists view learning as “changes in participation in socially organized activities, and individuals’ use of knowledge as an aspect of their participation in social practice” (Borko, 2004, p. 4). The learning situation (the “context” in the present study) is fundamental (Putnam & Borko, 2000). A socially-situated experience necessarily implies engagement with people, but also engagement with environment and raw materials (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Writing about situative theory and math education, Adler (2000) casts a wide net with the statement: teacher learning “is usefully understood as a process of increasing participation in the practice of teaching, and through this participation, a process of becoming knowledgeable in and about teaching” (p. 37).
From a situative perspective on teacher learning and professional development, the “multifocal lens” allows the researcher “to explore the connections among professional development activities and processes on the one hand, and individual teachers’ knowledge and instructional practices on the other” (Borko, 2004, p. 8). This ability to allow multiple angles and distances to be viewed allows the researcher to “collect and analyze data on questions such as how a teacher constructs new knowledge and instructional practice” (p. 8). Segments within the workshop included opportunities for each cohort to apply the workshop approach to teaching practice through score analysis and rehearsal planning. This experimentation with the PD content allowed pre-service teachers to practice using the content learned in the workshop, an experience essential to effective PD (Patton et al., 2015). For the investigator, the workshop setting provided the opportunity to examine each cohort’s lived experience as they developed pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986), as well as beliefs and attitudes in the initial stages of teacher change (Clarke and Hollingsworth, 2002; Guskey, 1986).

The short-term professional development experience was chosen as the learning situation for the present study. There is a paucity of coverage in the extant literature focused on the potential for instrumental music teachers to glean meaningful knowledge from specific short-term music PD experiences (Bauer, 2007; West, 2020). This is concerning as most content-based PD experiences geared to instrumental music teachers are short in duration yet perceived by researchers to be ineffective (Desimone, 2009; Gallo, 2018; Garet et al., 2001). Considering that music teachers often have few options other than short-term PD, an investigation into participants lived experiences as they encounter PD may prove beneficial. Rather than focusing on only one short-term PD learning context, a selection of multiple, learning formats may provide “more compelling” and “robust” evidence (Yin, 2009 p. 53). Yin suggests that studying
two (or more) cases, rather than one, may provide substantial analytic benefit. To uncover different understandings of short-term PD learning, I chose a purposeful sampling of three contrasting learning contexts to serve as cases for the present study.

In selecting PD learning contexts to investigate, I felt it was important to consider three factors related to music teacher PD: (a) teacher interest, (b) accessibility, and (c) cost. PD encounters that support the professional needs and interests of music teachers are likely to invigorate learning and promote instructional changes (Burkett, 2011; Gallo, 2008). Discovering accessible PD opportunities can be an obstacle for music teachers as they often have to leave campus to participate in content-based PD. Hence, an investigation that spotlights learning contexts that music teachers typically have access to may likely translate to authentic music teacher PD learning. Funding for PD is rarely provided by school districts leaving many music teachers to use personal expenses (West, 2019). The cost of PD may quickly become an expensive endeavor (Odden, Archibald, Fermanich & Gallagher, 2002) making cost-effective options attractive. The following PD learning contexts were selected as the cases for the present study as they aptly fit the considerations described above: self-study through reading, self-study through observation, and collaboration (Bauer, 2007; Koner & Eros, 2019; Mizell, 2010, Pulling, 2019; Stanley et al., 2014; West, 2020).

Short-term music teacher professional development was the phenomenon being investigated. The PD workshop was chosen as the setting for the present study since its format provides the opportunity for me to introduce and, to the extent possible, develop three workshops each designed to deliver instructional content through one of three learning contexts. A purposive criterion sample of nine pre-service instrumental music teachers was evenly split into three teacher cohorts. Using a “multifocal research lens” (Borko, 2004, p.8), I was able to
examine each cohort’s situational experience at a PD workshop delivered through one of the three contrasting learning contexts.

**Purpose Statement and Research Questions**

The short-term professional development workshop was the setting for this study. An examination into the lived PD experiences of each preservice teacher cohort may reflect initial teacher change through factors associated with music teacher effectiveness (score analysis and rehearsal planning, and instructional readiness associated with each). The ways in which preservice music teachers construct teaching strategies as informed by an unfamiliar teaching approach may prove beneficial to music education research. Therefore, the purpose of this collective case study was to examine three short-term learning contexts (self-study through reading, self-study through observation, and group collaboration) through participants’ experiences at a professional development workshop designed to introduce and guide implementation of an approach to teaching beginning band, unfamiliar to the participants.

Research questions were:

- In score analysis, what is the nature of participants’ thinking as derived from each learning context, and what might it suggest about instructional readiness?
- In rehearsal planning, what is the nature of participants’ thinking as derived from each learning context, and what might it suggest about instructional readiness?
- How are responses to each learning context similar or different in cross-case analysis?
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Across nearly all professional fields, professional development (PD) experiences provide a necessary pathway to improve productivity by introducing more efficient and effective practices (Hofmann & Vermunt, 2021; Mizell, 2010; Webster-Wright, 2009). In education, the complex process of designing mastery learning experiences combined with meeting the ever-changing needs of learners necessitates ongoing teacher development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Over time, learners’ needs change “within the context of a rapidly changing society” as do the needs of professionals (Webster-Wright, 2009, p. 702). Professional learning can potentially influence teacher development and learner outcomes. To many, “adaptation and change characterize a core tenet of effective teaching” (West, 2018, p. 14). It stands to reason, that expert teachers, who may already be effective teachers, may benefit from engaging in professional learning to adapt and adjust their teaching to meet the needs of learners.

Noonan (2019) defines professional development as “activities or relationships intended to support and develop teachers’ instructional practice” (p. 526). Further, Noonan relays that PD designs may vary and include local or out-of-district workshops, academic courses, formal or informal mentoring relationships, collaborative teacher groups, or peer observations. Teachers use the knowledge and skills they gain through PD programs to impact student achievement outcomes (Lester, 2003). Facilitators of PD make connections between influential factors that teacher-learners gained during PD experiences, and student outcomes as they attempt to develop effective professional development programs.

Professional Development in Educational Settings

According to Darling-Hammond et al. (2009), effective PD designs guide teachers to “master content, hone teaching skills, evaluate their own and their students’ performance, and
address changes needed in teaching and learning in their schools” (p. 7). To maintain teacher
effectiveness, it is beneficial that expert teachers continue to learn as professionals. Professional
development is deemed “essential” as teachers work to deepen their content knowledge and
incorporate instructional changes (Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002, p. 81). In an
empirical comparison of the effects of different professional development characteristics on
teachers’ learning, Garet et al. (2001) investigated what makes professional development
effective by using a national probability sample of 1,027 mathematics and science teachers who
participated in the Eisenhower Professional Development Program. In a survey, researchers
asked attendees to share details regarding the specific PD activities in which they participated.
The responses they collected were self-reports of teacher experiences and behavior (p. 919).
Results demonstrated that despite the type of PD activity experienced, those PD programs that
were longer in duration tended to produce favorable outcomes. According to Garet et al., “it is
more important to focus on the duration, collective participation, and the core features (i.e.,
content, active learning, and coherence) than type” (p. 936).

Since 2001, the previous claim remains well supported. Empirical research and
practitioner-based journals featuring most effective PD designs demonstrate conclusive support
of PD experiences that are long in duration, content-based and encountered within a supportive
peer learning community (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos., 2009;
Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017; Desimone, 2011; Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Wayne,
Yoon, Zhu, Cronen, & Garet, 2008). Wayne et al. reinforces this sentiment by stating “it is
generally accepted that intensive, sustained, job-embedded PD focused on the content of the
subject that teachers teach is more likely to improve teacher knowledge, classroom instruction,
and student achievement” (p. 470). It is apparent that long-term PD not only exposes teachers to
innovative instructional strategies, but it also fosters the implementation of innovative instructional strategies.

While the advantages of long-term PD are well-documented, disadvantages are apparent in the form of time and cost. In many cases, school systems dedicated to furnishing “high-quality professional development experiences” must direct theses resources to a small number of teachers or choose to adequately fund PD such that they enable more teachers to participate (Garet et al., 2001, p. 937). This likely contributes to discrepancies in high quality PD offerings between and among schools within a school district and across states depending on the availability of funds and if the district chooses to invest in high-quality PD. In a paper published in the *Journal of Education Finance*, Odden, Archibald, Fermanich and Gallagher (2002) created a cost framework designed to aid the assessment of PD cost. Considerable expenses are evident as Odden et al. identified six cost elements: a) teacher time, b) training and coaching, 3) administration, d) materials, equipment and facilities, e) travel and transportation, and f) tuition and conference fees (p. 64). While these cost elements convey how expensive funding for effective PD may potentially be, Odden et al. point out that awareness of potential costs may encourage school districts to focus their budgeting efforts on effective PD programs rather than funding multiple “unfocused and ineffective professional development programs” (p. 52). Exhausting funds on a variety of PD programs, both short and long in duration, thereby financially limits the ability to fund more effective PD in schools.

An alternative to costly, long-term PD are more traditional designs (Desimone et al., 2002) that are short in duration, such as workshops, conferences and courses. Short-term PD experiences have provided a path to professional learning for teachers since as far back as the 1930’s (Anderson, 1951). In relation to time and cost, short-term PD is the more feasible option
(West, 2019). Its feasibility is likely the reason that most school systems invest in various short-term PD programs (Desimone, 2009; Garet et al., 2001; Odden et al. 2002) which, in turn, is likely the reason that most teachers participate in some type of short-term PD. In 2003-2004, teacher-and school- survey data indicated that 92% of U.S. teachers attend workshops, conferences, training sessions and other traditional forms of short-term PD (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p.19). PD experiences such as workshops, conferences or courses are intended as continuing education experiences centered on a single focus, typically short in duration (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2017). They may last anywhere from an hour to two full days. A PD workshop, for instance, may involve a variety of activities such as small-group work, reading, discussion, group collaboration, presentation or a combination thereof. Short-term PD experiences generally do not provide follow-up training. They can easily be adapted to conveniently take place on-site or reach a larger target of teachers at an off-campus site.

Despite the prevalence and feasibility of short-term PD, it is widely regarded as an ineffective route to successful professional learning (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Patton, Parker & Tannehill, 2015; Wayne et al., 2008). In a professional journal for educators, Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (2011) offer that teaching for understanding is dependent on the teacher’s ability to make sense of complex subject matter from the learner’s perspective. To develop this ability, teachers must learn to “reflect critically on their practice and to fashion new knowledge and beliefs about content, pedagogy, and learners” (p.82). Ongoing, intensive and sustained experiences offer the time needed for teachers to encounter and, also, practice innovation discovered during PD. Garet et al. (2001) explain that with limited time and, in many cases, no opportunities for follow up activities, short-term PD is often considered ineffective at “fostering meaningful change” in teachers’ classrooms (p. 920).
And although teachers may glean valuable information from short-term PD, it is unlikely that the experience will serve as a stimulus for teachers to deepen their knowledge and understanding in such a way that it encourages teacher change (Darling-Hammond, 2011; Desimone et al., 2002).

Still, the case can be made that short-term PD can bring about positive outcomes. In a practitioner journal, Guskey and Yoon (2009) acknowledge the negative outlook experts share toward short-term PD, stating that PD designs, such as the workshop, are often “criticized as the epitome of ineffective practice” (p. 496). And while they agree that “one-shot” workshops, and similar PD designs that do not provide on-going support or follow-up, are not beneficial, they contend that the content and focus of the workshop may attribute to the perceived ineffectiveness of this model. Guskey and Yoon (2009) extend this standpoint by stating:

But ironically, all of the studies that showed a positive relationship between professional development and improvements in student learning involved workshops or summer institutes. These workshops focused on the implementation of research-based instructional practices, involved active-learning experiences for participants, and provided teachers with opportunities to adapt the practices to their unique classroom situations. So, while undoubtedly many workshops are poorly organized and focus on unproven ideas and strategies, as a form of professional development, they are not the poster child of ineffective practice that they are often made out to be (p. 496).

Guskey and Yoon make a valid point by imparting that what may appear to be ineffectiveness due to the form of PD may be more influenced by the focus and organization of the PD experience rather than its short-term nature. While it remains, that short-term PD is considered ineffective and experts recommend the long-term PD options (Desimone et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001; Wayne et al., 2007), Guskey and Yoon give pause to consider how developers might design more effective short-term PD programs.

**Professional Development for Instrumental Music Teachers**

Short-term professional development is the type of professional learning in which most music teachers engage. Music teachers are often required to attend professional development
focused on core academic subjects (math, ELA, science) at their school site yet express the desire to participate in content-based workshops, conferences and seminars that are music-related (Bauer, 2007; Conway & Christensen, 2006; Eros, 2012; Madsen & Hancock, 2002; Schneckenburger, 2014). In many cases, the PD provided for music teachers at their school does not pertain to them and they have few alternatives or no district or school approved PD activities to attend that are related to their content area. Though long-term PD is considered more effective, instrumental music teachers who seek to improve their teaching practices are often limited to short-term, content-based PD opportunities outside of their school or district (West, 2019).

Typically, experienced music teachers, in search of PD opportunities, will attend off-campus conferences or workshops to encounter professional learning experiences that they perceive to be beneficial, such as observing rehearsals or guest clinicians, attending presentations, or engaging in group collaboration (Draves, 2016; Jones, 2016; Pulling, 2019; Schneckenburger, 2014; West, 2018). With the aid of technology, music teachers can even engage in “personal learning networks” online as a form of PD (Bauer, 2010, p. 37). In more collaborative PD designs, music teachers may engage in mentoring practices (Conway, 2015) or professional learning communities (Kastner, 2014; Stanley, Snell, & Edgar, 2014). However, engaging in these types of PD experiences requires time and/or substantial cost. For instance, travel to PD destinations is not commonly funded by the music teacher’s school district. Likewise, release time or excused absence is not always granted (West, 2019) leaving proactive music teacher-learners to schedule PD in the evenings or weekends, and/or leave school to attend. The cost of travel and hotel stays can quickly become an expensive endeavor. A cost-effective alternative for music teachers is reading as professional development. Reading
practitioner journals or books and scholarly articles provides a feasible, short-term option for music teachers with limited PD opportunities. There is little evidence, beyond anecdote, that reading is an effective means of PD for music teachers. But considering how reading, observing clinicians and collaborating lead teachers to develop knowledge and skills as well as deepen teachers’ understandings of the content they teach, may be a worthy venture that could inform the short-term PD designs most accessible to instrumental music teachers.

**Effective Professional Development**

Successful professional development experiences manifest themselves as a change in teaching practice where teachers “acquire new knowledge and utilize it to foster increased student learning” (Patton et al., 2015, p. 32). Providing the opportunity for teachers to practice that change is an essential component of effective long-term PD. In the past two decades, researchers have reached common ground regarding what characteristics of professional development are critical to effective learning experiences for teachers (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Desimone, 2009; Garet et al, 2001; Patton et al., 2015; Wayne et al., 2008; Wilson & Berne, 1999). Based on empirical research on effective professional development, Desimone (2009) identifies five characteristics of effective PD: “(a) content focus, (b) active learning, (c) coherence, (d) duration, and (e) collective participation” (p. 182). For the purpose of describing each, *content focus* indicates that PD activities should not only be content-related but should also focus on how student learning improves as the teacher acquires knowledge and skills related to that content (p. 183). *Active learning* offers a more constructive learning experience than passive learning activities, such as listening to a guest speaker. It is preferable to engage in an activity, such as observing an expert teacher, and then participate in interactive feedback following observation (p. 183). *Coherence* refers to the notion that the PD content should be
related to and derived from teachers’ experiences in their classroom. It should also align with the teachers’ understandings and opinions (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Desimone, 2009). *Duration* refers to the amount of time dedicated to professional development. There is not a set amount of time that is known to be enough, but PD activities spanning over a summer that provide follow-up mentoring of some kind are generally regarded as the more beneficial, long-term designs. And finally, *collective participation*, features opportunities for the sharing of knowledge and experience among teachers through teacher communities as opposed to individual learning.

As Desimone explains, each of these core characteristics of effective professional development work together to deepen the learning experience for teachers and place teachers in a better position to stimulate positive learner outcomes following a PD experience. Figure 1 displays how the interaction between the five critical characteristics (core features of professional development) discussed above, increased teacher knowledge and skills, and

![Figure 1. Conceptual framework for studying the effects of professional development on teachers and students. (Desimone, 2009)](image-url)
improved student outcomes work together to promote instructional change in teaching practices. The interaction of these factors is influenced by the teaching context as well. That is to say that the atmosphere of the school setting, teacher and student characteristics, administration, and curriculum all play an influential role in the teacher’s ability to implement approaches learned through PD. For example, factors, such as changes in teacher knowledge, skills and beliefs, are likely affected by core features experienced during PD, thus impacting student outcomes. This is indicative of the potential influence the core features may have on the effectiveness of a PD experience. Nevertheless, one can surmise that effective PD is not simply only long-term, but is, itself, a complex interweaving of factors that resemble the authentic teaching context, all of which set the goal toward teacher change.

**Professional Development Needs of Music Teachers**

The literature reflects extensive research on professional development in teaching (Anderson, 1951; Borko, 2004; Garet et al., 2001; Desimone, 2011; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Hill, Beisiegel & Jacob, 2013; Little, 1993; Shulman, 1986). Within the past two decades, research on the professional development of music educators has emerged in a substantial manner (Bauer, 2007; Conway, 2007; Henry, 2001; Hookey, 2002; Koner & Eros, 2019; Lind, 2007; Stanley, 2011). The literature pertaining to music-related PD reflects that music teachers use PD for developing knowledge and skills in several areas, such as methodology (Draves, 2012; Junda, 1994), conducting (Bush 2007), technology (Bauer, 2010; Bowles, 2002), and assessment (Bauer & Berg, 2001). When determining the self-expressed needs of music teachers, content-based PD, especially in the form of conferences and workshops, is considered most beneficial (Bauer, 2007; Burkett, 2011; Conway & Christensen, 2006; Eros, 2012; Hookey, 2002; West, 2018).
According to Burkett (2011), instrumental music teachers believe that subject-specific professional development experiences are valuable. Burkett found that instrumental music teachers self-report that using content related to their own, music-related course objectives and using materials from their classrooms in a collaborative setting have a positive influence on their professional learning. The introduction of on-site music-related PD appeared to invigorate the music teachers’ interest in improving their music and teaching skills, which, in turn, positively affected their attitudes toward teaching. Burkett concluded that relevant and purposeful PD activities spark curiosity among teachers and attracts them to the notion of professional learning.

There exists abundant support of Burkett’s claim among music education scholars (Bauer, 2007; Bowles, 2003; Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Gallo, 2018; Koner & Eros, 2018; Stanley et al., 2014). Likewise, educational scholars assert that effective professional development should be content-specific (Desimone et al. 2002; Garet et al., 2001).

The focus of Burkett’s study was on music teachers in rural settings who are often isolated from networking opportunities with colleagues and are usually located at a discouraging distance from university settings offering support for music teacher development. This circumstance, as Burkett finds, unfortunately encourages a sense of complacency in the music teacher who then resolves to maintain the status quo. Apart from Burkett’s study, most music teachers, whether in a rural setting or not, experience isolation since they are often the only music teacher on staff (Sindberg, 2011). It is likely that this sense of complacency emerges among music teachers in a variety of school settings due to isolation.

Given that on-site PD, required by schools or districts, is typically geared to academic subjects, such as reading and math, access to on-site, content-based PD for music teachers is not typical (Gallo, 2018; West, 2019). Instrumental music teachers who wish to successfully develop
their teaching, then, are left to seek music-related PD elsewhere. In this sense, music teachers often determine and participate in PD related to their own needs. In a summary of extant articles on experienced music teachers’ beliefs about professional development, Bauer (2007) investigated music teachers’ PD experiences and preferences. Aside from preferring music-related PD, Bauer found that most music teachers attend conferences or workshops (Bowles, 2003), educational sessions (Price & Orman, 1999), or graduate courses (Junda, 1994) to attain professional development. Bauer concluded that it is important that researchers continue to gauge the PD needs of experienced music teachers, as well as teachers at different career stages, and he urged the need for more generalizable studies, covering all aspects of professional development, to be conducted. Bauer pointed out the dearth in research related to the relationship of music PD and student achievement outcomes. This is likely due to the short-term nature of the PD experienced by music teachers in these studies. Few opportunities for follow-up support were present and no mention or focus on instructional changes in music teaching was apparent in the studies Bauer reviewed.

Following Bauer’s (2007) study, a growing body of research literature on music-related PD is apparent in recent years suggesting enhancements that are needed to increase the effectiveness of music teachers’ PD experiences (Koner & Eros, 2019). These enhancements resemble the “reform” PD designs, mentioned by Desimone et al. (2002, p. 83), as opposed to the more “traditional” PD formats, such as conferences, workshops and courses (p. 83). Examples of PD enhancements suggested in the literature include PD involving music-making (Pellegrino, 2011), action or teacher research (Conway, 2007; Wanzel, 2009), and collaborative learning communities (Stanley et al., 2014), among others.
In a literature review on music-related professional development present between 2007-2017, Koner & Eros (2019) identify two emergent themes related to the literature: (a) PD needs of music teachers change throughout their career cycle and therefore PD designs should meet these changing needs, and (b) informal interactions between music educators are viewed as a valuable form of PD. According to Koner & Eros, the “professional development needs of music educators may change throughout their careers” (p. 17). The “one size fits all” format of most workshops or clinics may be limited in meeting the needs of teachers at various stages in their teaching careers. For instance, as new teachers move into the “second stage” of teaching, their focus tends to shift from their own needs to the needs of their students (Eros, 2012, p. 22). They may no longer need PD instruction on the basics but have more interest in engaging learners, for instance. Providing professional learning opportunities aimed at various stages of teaching may enhance and stimulate interest in professional development programs for beginning, second stage and veteran teachers alike.

The second theme that Koner & Eros identified was ongoing, informal collaboration as impactful PD for music teachers. Informal collaboration may come in the form of dialogue between music teachers constituting “informal interactions, such as conversation with colleagues” and can be viewed as learning from students or co-workers, informal conversations with colleagues at school or elsewhere, including social media, and meetings or conferences (Koner & Eros, p. 17). An advantage of this route to PD is its accessibility and its embedded presence in the teaching context.

Aside from informal interactions with other music teachers, most suggested forms of effective PD are, unfortunately, not readily accessible to most music teachers (Barrett, 2006; Eros, 2012; West, 2019). This may contribute to the fact that instrumental music teachers, who
seek PD activities, tend to prefer attending conferences and workshops or clinics (Bowles, 2002; Madsen & Hancock, 2002; West, 2018). Specifically, instrumental music teachers seem most interested in engaging in PD activities that feature a guest clinician or professional educators/artists who are reputable experts in the field (Bauer 2007; Jones, 2016). Instrumental music teachers find value in observing guest clinicians or teachers as they lead rehearsals, attending lecture presentations or concerts, and participating in conducting or methods workshops as PD activities.

While it has been established that traditional, short-term forms of PD are the preference among instrumental music teachers, these experiences do not necessarily translate to successful PD in the sense that teacher change and increased student achievement occur as a result. Evidence of the effectiveness of short-term PD activities accessible to instrumental music teachers is not readily apparent in the extant literature. This is likely due to the lack of ongoing, follow-up support; one of the factors attributed to the ineffectiveness of short-term PD design. With limited time and no support mechanism in place for intentional interactive feedback, it is difficult to ascertain what change, if any, has occurred in teaching practice following these PD experiences.

In contrast to this notion, West’s (2018) dissertation on large scale conference PD implementation reveals the potential for positive impact among music teachers who attain PD through the large-scale conference experience. West investigated how the conference experience may jump-start the initial phases of teacher change in music teachers who attend. He developed a grounded theory centered on K-12 music teachers ($n = 32$) who attended one of three reputable, large-scale, practitioner-oriented conferences (National Association for Music Education, The Midwest Clinic, Texas Music Educators Association). West conducted semi-structured
interviews regarding participant attitudes toward PD and their intentions to implement different approaches inspired by the conference experience into their teaching. Follow-up interviews were also conducted with several of the participants to determine whether they were actively implementing changes into their instruction 3-6 weeks following the conference. West’s focus was on “proximate change” experienced by participants “at the point of PD delivery and in its immediate aftermath” (p. 32). He found the conference experience stimulated reflection in the participants as they assessed their needs, made changes and evaluated the outcomes of those changes. Additionally, participants found value in social interactions that helped them process the content they encountered through the conference. This hints at the benefits of informal dialogue (Conway, 2008) and community learning (Stanley et al., 2014) discovered in recent studies.

It is evident from West’s study that music teachers are likely to encounter conference experiences that initiate what may become a permanent instructional change. Aside from West’s contributions, research literature reflecting the effectiveness of conferences, and other forms of short-term PD, are seemingly missing from the extant literature. This is a concern since so many instrumental music teachers have few alternatives but to encounter PD through short-term programs away from their school-site. To magnify this area of concern, instrumental music teachers who do attend PD events typically do so once per year (Madsen & Hancock, 2002; Gallo, 2018). As Gallo explains, most music teachers engage in PD activities at an off-campus workshop or conference once per year, which is likely not enough time to promote instructional changes. Even though Burkett’s (2011) two-year study displayed positive changes as a result of PD activities, Burkett cautioned that: “a more longitudinal study with assessments and data gathering directed at observing teachers for several months after the PD activities would be
needed to determine more definitively whether the changes in teaching and conducting strategies were the results of the PD activities” (p. 62-63). The quality of short-term PD options is worth exploration. Since the goal of successful PD reflects a teacher change that positively influences student outcomes, studies focused on the effectiveness of short-term PD are warranted.

**Three Learning Contexts**

Given variety among short-term PD designs (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, courses), identifying common and/or effective learning contexts through which instrumental music teachers attain PD may best ensure a learning experience that translates to authentic PD settings. Researchers have identified considerations that address music teachers’ PD needs—teacher interest, accessibility and cost (Burkett, 2011; Bush, 2007; Conway et al., 2005; Conway, 2008; Eros, 2012; Gallo, 2008; Odden et al., 2002; West, 2019 and 2020). PD encounters that support the professional developments needs and interests of music teachers are likely to invigorate learning and promote instructional changes (Burkett, 2011; Gallo, 2018). For instance, Eros (2012) points out that music teachers have varying PD needs and interests depending on their career stage. In his qualitative study on second-stage music teachers, Eros found that second-stage music teacher prefer attending conferences and informal interactions with colleagues as forms of PD. On the point of accessibility, most music teachers have no option but to leave campus to attain PD opportunities (West, 2019). Travel and entrance fees, among other things, quickly adds up making cost-effective options appealing. In most cases, school districts do not cover the cost for music-related PD (Odden et al., 2002).

An investigation into teachers’ professional learning through contexts that address these instrumental music teacher PD considerations may serve as a platform from which to determine the impact of these avenues to PD. Thereafter, attention on recognizing potential advantages of
each learning context within a short-term PD setting may inform best practices. Information garnered may be used to maximize short-term professional learning experiences such that they positively influence instrumental music teaching practices and student outcomes (Bauer, 2007). Three common and/or effective short-term professional learning contexts that align with these considerations are self-study through reading, self-study through observation and group collaboration (Bauer, 2007; Koner & Eros, 2019; Mizell, 2010, Pulling, 2019; Stanley et al., 2014; West, 2020). An exploratory investigation into each may reveal potential qualities hidden from view. Organizing short-term PD such that its inherent qualities are highlighted, alongside introducing elements of effective long-term PD, may provide a path to increase effectiveness of short-term PD design for instrumental music teachers.

**Self-study through reading**

In many educational settings, reading is considered an integral part of the learning process (Brost & Bradley, 2006). In a publication by Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association, a national education advocacy group, Mizell (2010) identifies independent reading and reading for research as a typical route to PD. However, reading as professional development has little presence in the PD literature beyond anecdote. For music teachers dedicated to professional learning, reading provides a cost-effective PD alternative that does not require hotel or travel expenses. Instrumental music teachers have expressed that they often engage in reading to stimulate ideas on teaching practices (Jones, 2016; Pulling, 2019). Reading may provide a feasible, short-term option for music teachers with limited PD opportunities. Self-study through reading as PD is often readily accessible. Since it is an individual endeavor, teachers can set their own pace in addition to diminishing the cost of travel and hotel expenses.
incurred by attending large-scale conferences (Odden, et al., 2002; West, 2018). For these reasons, reading is arguably an ideal form of PD.

Reading articles and studies in peer-reviewed print sources (e.g., practitioner journal, academic journal, book excerpt) is a readily available form of professional development for teachers from all fields. In the teaching fields, reading is arguably the best form of PD on the bases of its (a) widespread in-print or electronic availability, (b) user-friendliness (reading can happen at many self-selected times or in many self-selected places; there is no need to pay for hotel and travel to a conference), and (c) its nature as a self-paced activity. In a case study on band directors’ experiences with PD (Pulling, 2019), participants shared they usually seek books or practitioner journals by individuals they deem as accomplished in the field of instrumental music education and give little attention to research-related offerings. Winch, Oancea, & Orchard (2015) claim that it is widely regarded that educational research does not have a meaningful connection to practice or is simply irrelevant, even when it produces informative results. Despite this standpoint, Winch et al. encourages researchers to consider how teachers make decisions and “the role that educational research does or does not play in their decision-making” (p. 7). In contrast, Abukari and Kuyina (2018) assert that reading essentially translates to using research to inform practice.

So valued are the results of systemic inquiry and empirical research in music education that professional organizations consistently make research findings available to members. For instance, the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) declares its commitment to making evidence-based research accessible to stakeholders and creating partnerships between researchers and practitioners. NAfME highlights research as one of four directions in its strategic plan to “promote and disseminate sound data to advance music teaching and learning and
influence educational policy (NAfME, 2015).” NAfME makes research available through scholarly publications, such as the *Journal of Research in Music Education* and the *Journal for Music Teacher Education*, as well as publishing a “middle ground” journal called *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education* intended for people to better understand scholarly research. In the past, access to scholarly research through NAfME required additional subscription fees, but recently, the organization has lifted those fees and made the journals accessible to all members. These actions indicate a desire to reach people through reading for the betterment of music learning and teaching. Other publications that instrumental music teachers may likely encounter are the *Journal of Band Research*, available through active membership in the World Association of Bands and Ensembles, and practitioner-based magazine subscriptions, at times complimentary for teachers, such as *The Instrumentalist* or *School Band and Orchestra*.

The assumption is that organizations publish these journals and magazines to share information that may aid music teaching and learning. Subscription metrics would not reflect the number of people actually reading the articles or how they are using the research or other content within the publications in their teaching practice. More succinctly, the extent to which engagement in reading practitioner and peer-reviewed journals or books impacts an individual’s teaching practice, although a worthy query, seemingly lacks attention in the field of music education research. How music teachers apply what they read into practice using the content within the reading source as a stimulus is an investigation that may be beneficial to music education research, especially since reading as PD is so readily accessible to music teachers.

To this point, the relationship between reading practitioner and peer-reviewed journals and instrumental music teachers’ practice is unknown. There is also little evidence concerning how teachers use scholarly or practitioner research, presumably gained through reading, to inform
their teaching practices (Abukari & Kuyini, 2018; van Ingen, Alvarez McHatten, & Vomvoridi-Ivanovic, 2016). To further exacerbate this gap in literature, it is widely regarded that educational research does not have a meaningful connection to practice or is simply irrelevant, even when it produces informative results (Winch, Oancea, & Orchard, 2015). How music teachers apply what they read into practice is a question that may have a worthy place in music education research.

**Self-study through observation**

According to Hesterman (2012), “the true character of the teacher is discovered through observing him or her in action in the classroom” (p. 38). For the instrumental music teacher, self-study through observing is another avenue for professional learning in a variety of classroom settings (Krueger, 1999; Worthy, 2006; Worthy & Thompson, 2009). Both pre-service and in-service teachers observe other music teachers, guest clinicians or conductors as they rehearse various music groups at PD events, such as honor band clinics or rehearsal demonstrations (Napoles & MacLeod, 2016; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999). Typically, these types of opportunities exist at state music conferences or large-scale national music conferences (i.e. Midwest, NAfME, TMEA). Observations of this type typically provide a model of teaching strategies in action from which teachers can learn. When observing, teachers identify pedagogical models or rehearsal strategies and make decisions on whether they desire to incorporate observed practices into their teaching (Bauer, 2007; Duke, 1994; Haston, 2007). Research studies have centered on focus of attention in the music classroom (Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Napoles & MacLeod, 2016; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999) by exploring the observation behaviors of pre-service and/or in-service teachers and their focus of attention during observation. In most instances, observation focus was directed toward teacher behavior rather than student behavior. Other aspects that may
draw observer attention are how the students are sitting, their engagement level or even non-rehearsal aspects, such as the acoustic treatment in the room or instrument storage organization. Although seemingly off-task, non-rehearsal aspects observed may serve as a stimulus for classroom management and program administration ideas which also contribute to professional development. Ultimately, observation of a learning environment should initiate thoughts on how the teacher will implement new techniques that have been observed and/or stimulate new ideas that the teacher may attempt in their own classroom.

**Group collaboration**

Group collaboration presents opportunities for hands-on work and discussion that may enable instrumental music teachers to practice unfamiliar teaching approaches through social learning activities. Group collaboration has a presence in music professional development, particularly in association with elementary methods, such as Orff-Schulwerk workshops (Burkett, 2011), learning communities (Stanley et al., 2014) and even informal interactions among music educators (Conway, 2008; Eros, 2012). Due to what is often an isolating feeling often being the only music teacher on staff (Sindberg, 2011), many music teachers desire to collaborate in meaningful ways with other music educators (Stanley et al., 2014). Collaborative workshops provide needed interaction and connect for music teachers to network and sharing experiences and ideas. A more recently developed collaborative design, learning communities afford teachers the opportunity to “co-construct knowledge about teaching and learning” through meaningful collaborative activities (Musanti & Pence, 2010, p.73). Spurred by the notion that professional growth does not happen in isolation, teacher-learner collaborative communities “help teachers work together to unpack teaching techniques, analyze results, and codify their expertise into translatable and sharable forms” (Stanley et al., 2014, p. 77). The opportunity to
problem-solve and utilize critical thinking skills through social learning is just as important to teachers as it is to students engaged in group collaboration. However, opportunities for formal or structured collaboration as PD are not common for instrumental music teachers. Nevertheless, teacher collaboration is often touted as one of the most effective forms of PD in sustained, content-based forms (Garet et al., 2001; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2017). Since formal collaborative PD opportunities are not prevalent in the instrumental music world, investigating how music teachers process PD content through this learning context would likely give insight into its potential effectiveness and suitability as a short-term design.

**Paths to Teacher Change**

Considering that it is unlikely for short-term PD to initiate instructional changes in teaching practice (Gallo, 2008), an examination into instrumental music teachers’ experiences with each of these short-term PD learning contexts may shed light on how to tailor the design of short-term PD to increase effectiveness. Additionally, gaining insight into how learners process content introduced through a short-term PD experience, as well as probing their attitudes toward music-related professional development may provide clarity on factors effecting band directors’ ability to implement short-term PD into their teaching. Successful professional development experiences manifest themselves as a change in teaching practice where teachers “acquire new knowledge and utilize it to foster increased student learning” (Patton, Parker & Tannehill, 2015, p. 32). Providing the opportunity for teachers to practice that change is an essential component of effective long-term PD (Patton, et al.). Suffice it to say that practicing content experienced during a short-term PD experience may also produce beneficial results. While the delivery of instruction is one form of teaching practice that demonstrates changes inspired by PD,
preparatory activities such as planning, and preparation are components that will likely reflect instructional changes.

**Score Analysis and Rehearsal Planning**

Previous research on lesson planning for the music classroom demonstrates that lesson plans uncover the teacher’s intentions, usually accompanied by some form of a sequential approach to instruction (Brittin, 2005; de Frece, 2010; Lane & Talbert, 2015). In the field of music education, preparatory activities such as score analysis and rehearsal planning behaviors may provide insight into how teachers are synthesizing unfamiliar content as they create lessons and construct knowledge intended for the application process. Score analysis is an invaluable tool in the rehearsal planning process (Lane, 2006; Silvey, Montemayor & Baumgartner, 2017). Other areas of rehearsal preparation that may prove valuable in the planning process are teacher modeling activities (Brittin, 2005; Haston, 2002), concept teaching techniques (Blocher, Greenwood, Shellahamer, 1997; Garofalo, 1983; Misenhalter, 2000; Noble, 1971) and expressive performance (Byo, 2014; Karlsson & Justlin, 2008; Tan, Diaz, Miksza, 2018).

Since rehearsal of the music score is the primary vehicle for preparing a performance of the work, an exploration into the score analysis and rehearsal planning behaviors of instrumental music teachers, as influenced by professional development experiences, may inform short-term PD designs to instrumental music teachers to effective instructional changes in teaching practice.

**Instructional Readiness**

Participants’ instructional readiness to apply what they are learning through PD into teacher practice may be present in both their demonstrated and communicated confidence, attitudes, motivation and self-perceived abilities. Teacher self-efficacy is often associated with the likelihood that teachers may successfully carry out new approaches to teaching along with
their willingness and/or attitude toward such ventures (Bandura, 1997). Teachers who believe strongly in their teaching abilities tend to “create mastery learning environments for their students” while those teachers who are filled with self-doubt are likely to construct learning experiences which inhibit functional student progress (Bandura, p. 241). Once the teacher, informed by the PD experience, has competently and confidently constructed innovative instructional practices, then they will likely possess the skills and knowledge to adapt their pedagogy. Their comfort level with how they will go about implementing these this newfound knowledge strategies into their teaching relates to their instructional readiness (Marzano, 2014, p.12).

A substantial contributor to teachers’ self-perceived preparedness (Ronfeldt et al., 2018) is their self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the belief, held by an individual, that a specific goal is achievable (Bandura, 1997). As the learner improves with each task, a sense of confidence is established. If the learner encounters vast amounts of struggle, the learner will become displeased with their abilities and likely lose motivation to put full effort into the task (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001). Be it a short-term or long-term PD program, teacher self-efficacy is typically a reliable predictor of a teacher’s ability and motivation to incorporate an instructional change in teaching practice. For instance, in an elementary music setting, Battersby and Cave (2014) relay that “teachers’ self-efficacy toward teaching music and their personal level of music appreciation play a significant role in what can be accomplished in their classroom” (p. 54). Teachers who believe strongly in their teaching abilities tend to “create mastery learning environments for their students” while those teachers who are filled with self-doubt are likely to construct learning experiences which inhibit functional student progress (Bandura, p. 241). It is therefore essential for instrumental teachers who wish to develop their
teaching skills through professional learning to also possess a strong belief in their ability to carry out unfamiliar approaches in their music classrooms.

**Qualitative Studies on Music Teacher Professional Development**

The field of music education is still fairly new to music teacher PD research. Only since 2000 have researchers begun to focus on music teacher professional development. Although various research methods have been employed, several have used case study design to gain a more in-depth understanding.

In a study on second-stage music teachers’ professional identities, Draves (2012) focused on those who have 4-10 years of teaching experience and examined how their identities were sustained or neglected. She selected two participants for the study who primarily taught middle school band, grades 6-8. She collected data in the form of individual formal interviews and on a password protected blog online between October to December 2009. Her study was based on the theory of occupational identity. Through this lens, she examined participants’ elements related to professional identity, such as occupational title, commitment to task, organizational position and social position. She found that students were a prominent identity-reinforcing source for the participants. Both students and their parents played roles in reinforcing the teaches’ identities as professionals. As part of their identity formation, professional development played a role. The participants’ PD experiences reflected a combination of informal/formal, choice/mandatory, subject-specific/subject-neutral, among other dichotomies. Both participants preferred informal, personalized PD.

In a similar case study, Eros (2012) also studied second-stage music teachers but he specifically focused on their professional development. The purpose of his case study was to investigate the PD needs of second stage music teachers. He wanted to know how these teachers
describe PD experiences and how they perceive their PD needs. He used multiple descriptive case study design (Merriam, 1998). Data were collected through a survey, a journal, and interviews. He found that participants had PD needs at specific times in their career. One participant identified not receiving feedback from administration as an obstacle to PD. Findings revealed that each participant identified a variety of PD formats as valuable.

In a recent study more centered on the experience of professional growth through PD, Shaw (2019) conducted a collective case study on the perceived impact of a context-specific PD program, titled Urban Music Education Institute, on urban music teachers’ professional growth. Her study followed a theoretical framework based on Clarke and Hollingsworth’s (2002) interconnected model of professional growth. The model categorized types of teacher change in four domains—external, personal, practice and consequence. She acknowledged that urban music teachers’ professional growth is “multifaceted and contextually situated” (p. 67). She examined five individual teacher cases within in a context-specific PD program to gain insight into urban music teachers’ professional growth. She used a criterion-based sampling. Her study was conducted over a 9-month period. She incorporated semi-structured interviews, 60- to 120-minutes. One interview occurred within the first month of the program, the other took place at the conclusion of the program. Other data came from recordings of collaborative teacher study group meetings, material culture and audiovisual materials.

Her coding process involved linking the codes to the four domains in the Clarke and Hollingsworth model (2002). Three primary themes emerged from cross-case analysis: teachers’ desire for permission to enact culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP), socio-political dimensions of teaching in urban contexts, and issues related to teachers’ evolving understanding and practice of CRP.
Situating professional development in the context of learning experiences is appropriate given the complex and multifaceted process of teacher change and growth. It is not merely an individual process but is informed by social practice that is present in the learning situation (Borko, 2004). Even when engaged in independent teacher learning, the process of knowing and learning for teachers is rooted in social practice. Exploratory, qualitative research designs offer a light to a dimly lit road. To explore short-term PD is to closely examine how and what teachers are learning as they attempt to find ways of “representing and formulating subject matter to make it comprehensible to others” (Schulman, 1986, p. 9). For an investigator, the development of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) during the learning experience is a helpful lens through which to examine teacher growth through instructional practice.

Through his research on teacher knowledge and understanding, Shulman (1987) gained insight into the interaction between content knowledge and pedagogical strategies in teacher thinking. He discussed sources that might comprise the knowledge base for teaching. He identified categories, such as content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, thought to be essential parts of this knowledge base. He specifically highlighted pedagogical content knowledge as it represents a mixture of content and pedagogical knowledge that functions as teachers’ “own special form of professional understanding” (Shulman, 1987, p. 8), shown in Figure 2 below. In recent years, Shulman’s PCK framework has had a noticeable presence and influence on research in music education (Haston & Lean-Guerrero, 2008; Millican, 2013; Teachout & Raiber, 2014). Researchers have found PCK to provide a beneficial framework through which to examine the delivery of instruction (Millican, 2013). Teacher
growth may be noticeable in instructional delivery but is also reflected in teacher’s beliefs and attitudes. Both Guskey (1986) and Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) include teachers’ beliefs and attitude in their models for teacher growth and change. Self-efficacy, interest, self-perceived abilities and attitude all play a role in establishing a successful PD experience (Bandura, 1997; Ronfeldt et al., 2018).

**Summary**

The work necessary for learners to master complex problem-solving skills and critical thinking skills is centered on learning experiences which promote productive group collaboration and learner independence. Expert and effective instruction plays an essential role in guiding learners to meet these challenges (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017). Professional development (PD) experiences provide a means for in-service teachers to continue to meet the needs of learners and encounter the tools and resources necessary to advance learning. As Desimone (2011) explains, it is through effective professional development experiences that teachers “can increase their knowledge and skills, improve their teaching practice, and contribute to their personal, social, and emotional growth” (p. 68). Opportunities for professional
development exist in formal, structured activities such as seminars, workshops and conferences, as well as more informal activities, such as teacher reflection or daily discussions with other teachers in the hallway or lounge (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2011; Patton, Parker & Tannehill, 2015).

When professional development occurs for a sustained duration, it effectively provides teachers with the time necessary to learn and implement new strategies (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2017). Aside from being time-consuming, implementation of this type of long-term PD usually involves a considerable amount of resources and is often costly (Odden, Archibald, Fermanich & Gallagher, 2002). For these reasons, school administrators tend to focus long-term PD efforts on academic content areas that are addressed in high-stakes assessment such as mathematics and English language arts (West, 2019). School-wide professional development, in turn, directs its attention to the school’s needs which largely lie in improving test scores in math, English, science and social studies.

Music teachers are often required to attend general education professional development at their school site yet express the desire to participate in content-based workshops, conferences and seminars that are music-related (Bauer, 2007; Conway & Christensen, 2006; Eros, 2012). In these instances, music teachers are left to seek music-related PD on their own and in most cases, short-term PD is the more feasible option (West, 2019). Though long-term PD is considered more effective, most music teachers engage in PD activities at an off-campus music-related workshop or conference, once per year (Gallo, 2018). As Gallo explains, attending a short-term PD experience once a year is not likely enough time to promote instructional changes. Since music teachers often have no option but to attend a short-term PD, West (2019) suggests that if music teachers devise a plan for change before they attend a conference, make thoughtful
choices on sessions they will attend during that conference and take time to draft an implementation plan following the conference, the potential for the conference experience to encourage teacher growth will likely increase.

The short-term professional development workshop is the setting for this study. In this research context, it provides the opportunity for the investigator to introduce and, to the extent possible, develop instructional content with a target audience of pre-service instrumental music teachers. Segments within the workshop that include opportunities for rehearsal planning and implementation will allow pre-service teachers to practice using the content experienced through the workshop experience. This setting may light the path for new teachers to embrace the incorporation of new approaches into their future teaching. For the investigator, the workshop setting will provide the opportunity to examine participants’ lived experiences in these learning contexts. These contexts—self-study through reading, self-study through observation, and group collaboration—are common professional development activities (Crafton & Kaiser, 2011; Kerr & Frese, 2017; Napoles & MacLeod, 2016). The knowledge and perspective gained by workshop participants may lead to behavioral outcomes in the domains of score analysis and rehearsal planning, and self-efficacy outcomes associated with both score analysis and rehearsal planning (Bandura, 1997; Lane, 2006; Lane & Talbert, 2015); hence responses generated in these domains constitute the dependent variables for this study.

Music teachers express a need for content-based professional development relevant to their area of expertise (Bauer, 2007; Conway & Christensen, 2006; Eros, 2012). We know that music teachers are most likely to attend practitioner-based conferences or workshops that provide content aligned with performance-oriented lesson objectives (Gallo, 2018; West, 2018). Further, music teachers regard reading about music education topics or observing clinicians or
conductors lead rehearsals as beneficial professional development experiences (Pulling, 2019). Whether these experiences inform their teaching over time, however, is not readily apparent. In contrast, collaboration has been deemed an effective avenue to experience professional development (Musanti & Pence, 2010) yet meaningful, collaborative music-related PD has been given little attention in the field of music education research (Stanley, 2012; Stanley, Snell, Edgar, 2014). To magnify this area of concern, many instrumental music teachers have limited experience with formal, collaborative music PD opportunities (Pulling, 2019). Regardless of their previous experience with each, it is likely that short-term PD activities in the form of self-study through reading, self-study through observing and group collaboration are potentially effective routes for instrumental music teachers to utilize professional learning. Discovering the ways teachers construct understanding of instructional approaches that purport to stimulate engaged learning and foster independent musicianship (Duke & Byo, 2011), dependent on how they experienced professional development, may inform best practices for short-term PD. To further this, an examination into how each learning context may influence factors associated with music teacher effectiveness (score analysis and rehearsal planning, and instructional readiness outcomes associated with each) as preservice music teachers construct teaching strategies inspired by a new teaching approach may prove beneficial to music education research.

Qualitative research designs have been used in recent studies on music teacher PD, especially case study design (Draves, 2012; Eros, 2012; Shaw, 2019). This approach is applicable given that it provides in-depth understanding of phenomenon relatively unknown. Given the paucity on short-term PD yet overwhelming interest in this format among instrumental music teachers, an exploratory investigation into short-term PD that provides a reconnaissance mission of sorts would be appropriate. It has been established previously that teacher
professional development experiences are situated in the context of learning experiences. Situative theory may form a solid foundation on which to being exploring this phenomenon (Borko, 2004; Clarke & Hollingsworth; 2002). Through the lenses of pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986) and teacher change and growth (Guskey, 1986) a starting point for uncovering the potential for short-term PD may begin.
CHAPTER 3. METHOD

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this collective case study was to examine three short-term learning contexts (self-study through reading, self-study through observation, and group collaboration) through participants’ experiences at a professional development workshop designed to introduce and guide implementation of an approach to teaching beginning band, unfamiliar to the participants. Research questions were:

- In score analysis, what is the nature of participants’ thinking as derived from each learning context, and what might it suggest about instructional readiness?
- In rehearsal planning, what is the nature of participants’ thinking as derived from each learning context, and what might it suggest about instructional readiness?
- How are responses to each learning context similar or different in cross-case analysis?

Research Design

Professional development is contextually situated in the process of learning and knowing guided by the goal of teacher change or growth (Borko, 2004; Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Guskey, 1986). It is a learning situation that is shaped by its instructional design. With scant empirical research on short-term music teacher PD in the extant literature, it was appropriate for me to conduct a qualitative, exploratory investigation into this phenomenon or quintain (Stake, 2006) to gain a more in-depth understanding (Creswell & Poth, 2018). I chose case study research as the method because it allows the investigator to explore “a real-life, contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 96). It was instrumental because the purpose of the study was to understand the phenomenon. The purpose was not to understand the case itself,
as in an intrinsic study (Stake, 1995). A variety of PD learning formats, such as teacher observation, independent reading, learning communities, and teacher observation, are practiced in K-12 education (Bauer, 2007; Garet et al., 2001; Koner & Eros, 2018; West, 2020). Rather than focusing on only one short-term PD learning context, I selected multiple learning formats to study as they would likely provide “more compelling” and “robust” evidence (Yin, 2009 p. 53). Yin suggests that studying two (or more) cases, rather than one, may provide substantial analytic benefit. As the sole investigator, three cases were an appropriate number for the purposes of my investigation since a larger number would likely require multiple investigators (Stake, 2006).

In the present study, the quintain was short-term music teacher PD, the three cases were preservice teacher cohorts and the situation was a PD learning experience at a workshop. Through a collective or multiple case study design (Stake, 2006; Yin, 2003), I investigated three preservice teacher cohorts as they were situated in their own respective short-term PD learning experiences. Three teachers comprised each cohort making this a multiple-case embedded design with each teacher serving as a subunit of analysis within one case (Yin, 2009). Each cohort (case) attended a beginning band workshop with content delivered through a specific short-term PD learning context. Three contrasting learning contexts were targeted for this study because of their ubiquity in practice and/or perceived effectiveness (Conway, 2008; Hesterman, 2012; Pulling, 2019; Stanley et al., 2014; Worthy & Thompson, 2009)—self-study through reading, self-study through observation and group collaboration. Three workshops were designed so that each would deliver PD content through a specific learning context. The workshops provided a real-life encounter with PD learning for each cohort. By studying the cohorts’ workshop experiences, I was able to gain a better understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of the
short-term PD learning context they experienced at the workshop. Conclusions were drawn from individual case reports and cross-case analysis (Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009).

Data were collected over the course of a 3-week time frame during October and November of 2019. This time frame covered the entire “life cycle” of the entity being investigated (Yin, 2009, p. 32). Although the majority of data collection points took place during the workshop experience itself, data were collected beginning one week prior to the workshop and ending two weeks after. Multiple data collection points throughout the 3-week period were proportionate with the overall time frame and allowed sufficient time for the cohorts to have a lived experience with short-term PD learning. As facilitator of each workshop, I spent the entirety of the study “in the field” with the participants which gave me ample opportunity to observe and interact with each cohort before, during and after the workshop over the course of three weeks. A detailed rationale for the method can be found in Chapter 1.

Each cohort participated in an interview one week prior to the workshop, attended a 5-hour teachers’ professional development workshop and were given an opportunity for reflection two weeks following the workshop.

**Participants**

During the time of the study, all participants were currently enrolled in or had previously taken instrumental conducting. This essential criterion ensured that all participants who attended the workshop were familiar with a process of score analysis and understood the basics of rehearsal planning. Potential participants who fit this criterion were sent an invitation via email to participate in the study (Appendix H). Purposeful and criterion sampling techniques (Creswell & Poth, 2018) yielded nine participants who were junior and senior level instrumental music education majors at a large, public, Research Intensive-university in the southern U.S. I chose to
have three participants in each cohort rather than one, as workshops are teacher learning experiences situated in a social context. I did not exceed three to ensure I was able to attend to details during analysis. The sample size of each cohort and sample criterion were more likely to bring forth a richer description of each case (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The large group of nine participants was split into three preservice teacher cohorts to provide three subunits of analysis within each case (Yin, 2009).

The present study was situated in a learning experience with the aim of exploring how participants learn in various short-term learning formats. I used criterion sampling to ensure each cohort represented balance in terms of academic motivation and learning skills. For instance, if the reading cohort were composed of participants who were unmotivated students while the collaboration cohort were composed of high-achievers as students, it may unfairly portray each cohort’s interaction with the learning context. As the quintain in the present study is short-term music teacher PD, I wanted to ensure quality and richness in data related to each learning context. I devised criteria to select samples for each case. I assigned students to each cohort intent on balancing the make-up of each cohort and creating relative equivalence across cohorts. Assignments were based on class standing, major musical instrument, and mindset factors. For mindset, it was important that all participants were on a similar level in relation to their ability to process new information. I asked a panel of three professors, familiar with the participants’ learning skills and academic performance, to assign potential participants a “mindset rating” using a 4-point scale (1 = lowest; 4 = highest) based on inclination toward a growth mindset (Dweck, 2008). The professor panel was informed that an individual with a high rating would appreciate the learning process, enjoy a challenge, and value what they learn from overcoming obstacles. An individual with a lower rating would tend to focus on the product of their grade.
avoid challenges, and put forth minimal effort toward mastering obstacles. An even distribution of students with a mindset rating of 2.5, or more, was assigned to each cohort; two participants with a higher mindset rating, one with a lower rating but no one rated below 1.5.

Exemption from institutional oversight was requested and granted. Documentation is presented in Appendix A. Participation was voluntary. To account for the time and effort put forth in this investigation, participants were compensated.

**Workshop Focus**

The workshop experience was designed to introduce and guide implementation of an approach to teaching beginning band. I chose an approach that was unfamiliar to the participants and one that I could adapt for instructional delivery in each learning context—*The Habits of Musicianship: A Radical Approach to Beginning Band*, Duke & Byo, 2011. The approach is grounded in foundational ways of thinking that shift pedagogical priorities away from what might be labeled the beginning band status quo (Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Duke & Byo, 2011; Wall, 2018). In score study, the teacher applies an expressive performance lens *along with* a technical skill development lens in learning and conceptualizing the music. In planning for teaching, the teacher strategizes to optimize students’ cognitive engagement, designing experiences that place students in roles as listeners, analysts, decision-makers, feedback-providers, and idea-generators. In teaching, the teacher prioritizes musical communication *along with* technical skill development. The approach is based on one overarching message: From Day 1, teachers treat beginning instrumentalists, typically 10-12 years of age, like the critical thinkers and aurally aware individuals they are rather than musical blank states (Duke & Byo, 2011).
**Musical Communication vs. Musical Expression**

For the purposes of further understanding the aims of the Habits of Musicianship approach, it is important to distinguish between the terms “musical communication” and “musical expression” and their use when discussing the participants’ workshop experience. One should not assume these two terms possess interchangeable meanings. In linguistic terms, communication serves a social function through intention. One intends to share a thought with another individual in such a way that it is understood and can be responded to by that individual or repeated to yet another individual (Williams, 1993). Expression, on the other hand, precedes communication since “a thought has to be expressed verbally before it can be verbally communicated” (p. 92). Expression, alone, is the individual’s use of language per se. The PD content featured in the workshop, transfers these understandings to the music-making setting.

The approach at the center of the PD workshop encourages the teacher to keep musical communication at the forefront of learning experiences. This implies that expressive musical decisions are connected to an intended goal of communicating an idea, mood, or an emotion to listeners, real or imagined, thus giving reason for the technical skills necessary for an expressive performance (Duke & Byo, 2012; Hargreaves et al., 2005). Musical expression, on the other hand, encompasses the technical skills and know-how necessary for expressive performance (Brenner & Strand, 2013) but for which communication goals are absent or at best vague. In this sense, use of the term “musical communication” refers to what message the performer is sharing through the performance (e.g. musical effect, interpretation, mood) while “musical expression” refers to how to musically convey a thought or mood (e.g. style, articulation, dynamics).
Summary of the Workshop Focus

Each cohort attended a workshop designed to cover three integral concepts of the Habits of Musicianship teaching approach: (a) musical communication at the forefront of the learning process, (b) score study based on student’s role in expressive performance, and (c) designing effective learning experiences. The reading cohort encountered these concepts as they read excerpts from published works written by the authors of the teaching approach. The observing cohort viewed videos showing a teacher, well-versed and experienced in the approach, demonstrating selected aspects of it in rehearsal with middle school students. For the collaborating cohort, prompts related to each concept served as thought starters in discussions about concepts and melodies written by the authors of the approach. A detailed description of each cohort experience is provided below under the heading titled Cohorts.

Professional Development Workshop Schedule

Each cohort experienced “professional development” in the following general format: (1) Orientation, (2) Workshop Session I, (3) Workshop Session II, and (4) Post Workshop. A complete timetable of workshop events is presented in Table 1.

Orientation began one week prior to the start of the workshop. In school-based PD, it is not typical for there to be organized pre-PD preparation or orientation for teachers. Since the participants in the present study were not yet teachers and therefore did not enter the PD experience loaded with hands-on teaching experience, I chose to orient participants to the workshop activities of the single-day PD. In orientation, I hoped to capture their attention, communicate a sense of purpose, and inspire a motivation to persist. As such, Part 1 (Interview 1) was intended to gain insight into participants’ thinking regarding score analysis, rehearsal
planning, and instructional readiness for beginning band classroom settings prior to the workshop experience.

Table 1. Professional Development Workshop Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation (1 week prior)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interview 1 (individual)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Score Analysis Task 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Musical Expression Task 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading Assignment: Habits Essay</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Session I: 3 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Workshop Introduction</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Workshop Activities</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rehearsal Planning Assignment</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Session II: 2 hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Interview 2 (individual)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Score Analysis Task 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Musical Expression Task 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rehearsal Planning Time</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pre-Rehearsal Briefing (individual)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Participant-led Rehearsal</td>
<td>10 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Focus Group interview</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Workshop (2 weeks later)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reflection (written)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All times are approximate. Interviews, for example were not stopped at 20 minutes.

I met individually with each participant for a time dedicated to collecting data for Interview 1 (Part 1) during which participants completed Part 2 (Score Analysis Task 1) and Part 3 (Musical Expression Task 1). At the end of Part 1, I directed participants to read the “Introductory Text for Teachers” by Duke & Byo (2011). This 14-page essay provided an overview of the workshop focus. The reading assignment was intended to both inform and acclimate participants to the PD content prior to attending the workshop. In addition, participants were informed that, during the workshop, they would create a detailed lesson plan and lead a 10-minute rehearsal using this teaching approach. For this reason, they were encouraged to be fully engaged during Workshop Session I (e.g., take notes during and generally invest themselves in what the professional development experience had to offer).
Following Orientation, the workshop events were an alternation of presentation, application and/or data collection activities. *Workshop Session I* was primarily dedicated to the presentation of the teaching approach in a manner specific to each group. At the beginning of Workshop Session I, I gave a brief explanation of the major components of the approach as described in an essay by its authors, Part 5 (Workshop Introduction). Afterwards, participants experienced the presentation of the teaching approach during Part 6 (Workshop Activities). These activities are described below in Tables 2, 3 and 4 under the Cohorts sub-heading. During Part 6, participants provided written responses after each activity, which were collected as data. At the close of Workshop Session I, the investigator explained the guidelines of Part 7 (Rehearsal Planning Assignment) to the participants after which participants were allotted one hour for lunch.

While Workshop Session I was dedicated to the presentation of the teaching approach, *Workshop Session II* was an opportunity for the participants to apply the approach. Upon arrival at Session II, participants undertook Part 8 (Interview 2), Part 9 (Score Analysis Task 2), and Part 10 (Musical Expression Task 2) using a simple, unison, 5-part melody on which they planned their 10-minute rehearsal. Time was then granted during Part 11 (Rehearsal Planning Time) for participants to work through their rehearsal planning assignment. During Part 12 (Pre-Rehearsal Interview), I conducted 2-minute, individual interviews with each participant for them to talk through their rehearsal plan. This allowed me to collect data on how the participants organized their thinking as they planned a rehearsal based on their understanding of the teaching approach at this point and offered insight into participants’ instructional readiness regarding score analysis tasks, rehearsal planning and the teaching approach.
During Part 13 (Participant-led Rehearsal), a small group of non-participant musicians served as the peer teaching ensemble that each participant led in a 10-minute rehearsal. The rehearsal provided a tangible goal for the participants and an opportunity to practice their rehearsal plan. It was not a source of data collection. At the end of Workshop Session II, each learning context group participated in Part 14 (Focus Group Interview), led by the investigator, to debrief about their PD experience.

Part 15 was Post Workshop. One week following the workshop, participants were sent a data collection activity via email. They were instructed to complete a written reflection prompted by open-ended questions directed to their overall PD experience. This marked the conclusion of all workshop and data collection activities.

Cohorts

Reading Cohort

In the Reading cohort, the content of the professional development session was imparted to participants through readings selected by the investigator. Table 2 shows the reading group’s schedule during Part 6 of the PD workshop including investigator-selected readings from peer-reviewed print sources (practitioner journal, academic journal, book excerpt), which served as assigned reading. The reading excerpts were selected based on the potential that the content within each invigorated ideas on how to construct teaching strategies appropriate for using the Habits approach. Table 2 provides a synopsis of each reading.

Readings 1 and 3

The Duke & Byo (2012) chapter, which was split into Readings 1 and 3, focuses on the concept of using musical communication to guide development of musical expression during the beginning stages of learning wind or stringed instruments in group settings. Essential
components of effective teaching and learning experiences are contextualized in: (a) Student self-evaluation as a major feature of music making, (b) the teacher’s own musical modeling as a major feature of effective pedagogy, and (c) thoughtful attention to sequencing as a major feature in curriculum development. Detailed description of each component is provided.

Table 2. Schedule of Workshop Activities for the Reading Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Duke &amp; Byo (2012), pp. 712-719</td>
<td>Musical communication as the primary goal of music learning in conjunction with the development of technical skills</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written response</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Byo (2014), pp.76-82.</td>
<td>Score analysis and rehearsal application centered on expressive performance and understanding.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written response</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written response</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All times are approximate. Readers were free to read at their own pace.

**Reading 2**

Byo (2014), which functioned as Reading 3, challenges music teachers to infuse their planning for teaching with answers to the question, what do I (the teacher) want students to be thinking? Once uncovered, how does the teacher shape the experience so that students are thinking in ways that direct their musical performance? The focus on the students’ cognitive engagement in rehearsal, with the roots of this engagement being informed by the musical score, fits well with the workshop approach. Research indicates that experienced and new music teachers alike often lack the ability to effectively apply score analysis to the rehearsal (Blocher et al., 1997; Lane, 2006). The author provides a style analysis of a Grade 2 score for concert band as an example of focusing rehearsal planning on musically expressive performance and understanding. Rehearsal planning, then, involves the conductor in making decisions about
bringing musical elements in the score to students’ attention in such a way that they commit themselves to their role in an expressive performance of the piece.

**Observation Cohort**

In the Observation cohort, the content of the professional development session was imparted to participants through video excerpts selected by the investigator. In the present study, while in the act of free observation, the observation cohort viewed an instructional model of the workshop approach. Findings related to their focus of attention during observation may indicate which factors of the observation gave participants the sense that they could carry out this teaching approach on their own as well as develop their own teaching strategies based on this observation.

The selected video excerpts, as shown in Table 3, provided content which aligned with the three integral concepts of the approach: (a) musical communication in conjunction with technical development as the goal of music learning, (b) score analysis centered on musical expression and understanding, and (c) designing effective learning experiences. The video observation opens with a musical child prodigy performing and describing the musical story he is attempting to tell. Subsequent video excerpts feature a successful middle school band director, a beta tester of the workshop approach during its development, and a clinician. Her bands have consistently received first division ratings as well as superior ratings at the state level accompanied by distinct honors such as Best in Class and Overall Outstanding Band. At the time of the present study, she was in her 16th year of teaching and serving as head director of a successful band program of over 300 students. Participants took notes while observing and provided written responses to question prompts following each video viewing activity.
Table 3. Selected Video Excerpts for the Observation Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Young cellist performs and discusses <em>The Swan</em> by Saint-Saëns.</td>
<td>2:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodwinds preparing for rehearsal then rehearsing a concert piece.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Response to Activity 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Woodwinds rehearsing a concert piece.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Band rehearsing a concert piece.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Response to Activity 2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beginning flute players practicing technical skills.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beginning flute players learn an unfamiliar rhythm.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Response to Activity 3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All times are approximate.

**Video 1: Nathan Chan performs and speaks**

This video features a young musician discussing music in ways that align with the present study’s definition of musical communication and expression (see Workshop Focus above). An 11-year-old, accomplished cellist, Nathan Chan performs *The Swan* by Camille Saint-Saëns (Nathan Chan, cellist, plays The Swan by Camille Saint-Saëns, 2009). Nathan’s narration of the story he is intending to convey overlays his performance. Although a musical prodigy, he is, in the context of the workshop approach, an example of the ideal student outcome.

**Video 2: Woodwinds preparing for rehearsal then rehearsing a concert piece**

Students independently warm up for rehearsals in a mature manner, for example, engaged in playing sustained pitches and brief finger exercises. The teacher enthusiastically greets the students and they discuss their home activities over the weekend. The teacher leads the students in tuning sustained concert pitches. The teacher leads the group in a sequenced learning activity aimed at improving a syncopated rhythm found in their concert music.
Video 3: Woodwinds rehearsing a concert piece

Students self-evaluate their performance, and multiple students are given an opportunity to make decisions about how to improve their performance of the syncopated rhythm featured in Video 2. The teacher assists as students give feedback before and after the group performs the rhythm. She directs student attention of the musical effect of their performance drawing their attention to how their performance will sound to an audience. Through a student-centered approach that includes several instances for student input, the teacher focuses student attention on musical communication alongside technical skills.

Video 4: Band rehearses a concert piece

Before playing through the piece, the teacher makes students aware of specific areas in the score in need of their attention for improved performance. The teacher refers to the score, in this instance, pointing out the importance of specific notes and guiding students to be aware of the role they play throughout the piece. She uses analogies to encourage students to perform expressively.

Video 5: Beginning flute players practice technical skills

The teacher leads the beginning flute class through basic technical skills while soliciting student feedback and input as they self-evaluate their performance. Rehearsal of a concert piece begins with discussion of style and what needs to be done to establish good tone and articulation. Her instructional model exhibits attention on small piece work which is reinforced with full instrument work while reinforcing fundamentals. These beginners exhibit thoughtful attention to tone and technique. Students are able to interact with the teacher by calling attention to troublesome areas and offering appropriate solutions.
Video 6: Beginning flute players learn an unfamiliar rhythm

The teacher introduces the quarter-note triplet rhythm through a sequenced learning activity. Once introduced, the class performs the quarter-note triplet rhythm in various ways (clapping, counting) to reinforce the new concept. The teacher models the rhythm as it exists in a familiar melody (Star Wars theme) and then directs the students to write out the counts in a written exercise that emphasizes the new rhythm. The teacher moves throughout the room to assist students as they work individually on this task. Once students complete this task, they use their flute headjoints and perform the rhythm as they also focus on establishing a focused, fundamental tone.

Collaboration Cohort

In the Collaboration cohort, the content of the professional development session was imparted to participants through prompts selected by the investigator, each serving to stimulate group discussion as well as rehearsal of simple, five-part unison music scores. Collaboration centered around decision-making and discussion regarding the performance of simple, five-part, unison melodies that are void of dynamic and articulation markings. College musicians regularly encounter chamber music in small group settings. It was thought that within the collaborative cohort setting it would be a challenge for these advanced musicians to think through how to perform a simple melody written for beginning band in the same expressive manner as they would professional-level music. If the participants can think through the music in those terms, then they will likely be more successful teaching it that way.

During the Part 6 (Workshop Activities), I played the role of facilitator to initiate and guide group interaction as needed. Participants in this cohort had their primary instrument and sat in a circle as they performed, rehearsed and discussed selected melodies written for beginning
level instruments. During each session, I facilitated discussion initiated by selected prompts which aligned with the three integral concepts of the teaching approach: (a) musical communication in conjunction with technical development as the goal of music learning, (b) score analysis centered on musical expression and understanding, and (c) designing effective learning experiences.

After I introduced a discussion topic (prompts are listed below), participants considered how to approach rehearsing the assigned simple, five-part unison melody and discussed their opinion both on how to perform it and how to teach it. They rehearsed and discussed music interchangeably. As shown in Table 4, the cohort participated in three group discussion/rehearsal activities. All music scores were selected from the Habits of Musicianship (Duke & Byo, 2011) method book which accompanies the approach. Throughout the session, I facilitated discussion and interjected as needed but ultimately allowed participants to work on their own as a collective, group-led ensemble. As the cohort became familiar with their expected tasks, I exited the room at times and left participants to their own devices. In between activities, participants provided written responses regarding their idea development throughout these tasks. Collaborating cohort workshop activity segments were audio- and video-recorded and the recorded data was used for triangulation purposes.

**Prompt 1: Musical Communication**

Prompt 1 was designed to illicit group discussion on how teachers might focus on musical communication in conjunction with technical development as the goal of music learning.

Discussion prompts were:

- What is musical expression and music communication?
• Describe ways you can guide students to develop the concept of music communication while guiding beginners to develop their technical skills when learning a new instrument?

• Explain how teachers may encourage expressive playing when learners are only able to perform two or three stepwise notes while producing a characteristic tone.

Following this discussion, participants rehearsed *Give It Up for Two Notes*, (Byo, 2011) a simple, five-part unison melody that uses two, stepwise pitches and they discussed how to keep musical communication at the forefront of planning and instruction when rehearsing this piece.

Table 4. Activities for the Collaboration Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rehearsal Scores</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Music Communication</td>
<td>“Give It Up for Two Notes”</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accomplished Musicians</td>
<td>“Smooth Moves”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Response to Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Score Analysis</td>
<td>“Catch Me If You Can”</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Doo Bah Doo Bah”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Response to Activity 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self-Evaluation and Modeling</td>
<td>Group will select two from</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sequenced Learning Experiences</td>
<td>the previous four melodies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Response to Activity 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All times are approximate.

**Prompt 2: A Vision of Accomplished Musicians**

Prompt 2 was designed for participants to generate ideas on ways that beginning instrumental students can be envisioned as accomplished musicians. The following quote from *Building Musicianship in the Music Classroom* (Duke & Byo, 2012) served as an introductory text prior to discussion:

“A novice in a beginning instrument class is a musician, and it’s easier for her to learn music by behaving like a musician than by doing something else. The challenge for teachers of beginning instrumentalists is to create experiences in which learners behave like accomplished musicians every day in class.” (p. 712)

With this concept in mind, discussion prompts were:

• what are common behaviors of accomplished musicians?
• identify three or more of these behaviors and explain how beginning instrumentalists may be encouraged to exhibit these behaviors

• how can we design rehearsal such that students have a “professional” experience?

Following this discussion, participants rehearsed *Smooth Moves*, (Byo, 2011) a simple, five-part unison melody that uses three, stepwise pitches and they identified and discussed professional behaviors that learners can be encouraged to develop.

**Prompt 3: Music Expression as the Goal of Score Analysis**

Prompt 3 guided the participants to explore score analysis centered on musical expression and understanding. Discussion prompts were:

• when connecting style analysis to rehearsal planning, how will you shape the learning experience so that students are thinking of things that direct their playing?

• how can we use score analysis to focus student attention such that they commit themselves to their role in an expressive performance of the piece?

After discussion, participants rehearsed and discussed this topic while applying it to *Doo Bah Doo Bah*, (Byo, 2011) a swing-style piece using only two, stepwise pitches, as well as *Catch Me If You Can*, (Byo, 2011) a piece in 6/8 time utilizing notes within one octave of the B-flat concert scale.

**Prompt 4: Modeling and Self-Evaluation**

Prompt 4 was intended to stimulate conversation on how teachers can encourage self-evaluation during the music learning process. Discussion prompts were:

• discuss the important of modeling on various instruments for students

• describe how teachers can prepare themselves to model on secondary instruments

• what opportunities can teachers create for students to become increasingly discriminate about tone, intonation, timing, and expression?
• within a large ensemble setting, how may individual and small group work be included over time?

Following the discussion, participants were instructed to think of a musical way to perform one of the selected pieces and model it for the others. Then think of a contrasting way to play it musically and model it. All participants took turns modeling and the others attempted to replicate the leader’s model.

**Prompt 5: Sequenced Learning Activities**

Prompt 5 was designed to guide participants to uncover ways that sequenced learning activities can enhance the learning experience and performance of beginners. Discussion prompts were:

• explain what a sequenced learning activity is

• explain how sequenced learning activities are used to develop musical skills in beginning instrumentalists

After discussion, participants selected a melody and considered a sequenced learning experience that would aid students in performing it. Participants played through the suggested learning sequences and rehearsed the piece. As time allowed, they repeated the procedure on another selected piece.

**Data Collection**

I collected data over the course of three weeks in the Fall of 2020 using audio- and video-recorded interviews, participants’ musical expression performances and participants’ written material as the data sources. For each participant, two score analysis tasks, two musical expression tasks, four interviews, one written rehearsal plan, along with written reflections and workshop notes, served as data sources for this study. Participant interviews, musical performances, and collaborative discussions were video-and audio-recorded for repeated review.
Written notes, reflections and rehearsal plans were read and re-read. Video-and audio-recorded data was transcribed, coded and analyzed. Below, I describe my data collection procedures in the order they were collected. See Table 1.

**Interview 1 (Part 1) - One Week Prior to Workshop**

One week prior to the workshop, I met with participants one-on-one for a semi-structured interview. I followed an interview protocol of 6 question items (Appendix C). The purpose of the interview was for me to build a rapport with the participant before the upcoming workshop and also gain insight into their knowledge, abilities, beliefs and attitudes related to beginning band instruction. It also provided the opportunity determine their prior knowledge specific to the PD content and discover their comfort level with teaching musical expression to beginning band students. Embedded within the interview were teaching tasks that supported the interview’s purpose. These tasks would be repeated at the workshop itself for the participants to practice teaching the PD content. Participants were expected to bring their primary instrument to the interview. Upon arrival to the interview, I directed the participant to sit in a chair across from me. On the music stand in front of the participant was a music score turned face down. After introductory conversation, we began the first teacher task.

**Score Analysis Task 1 (Part 2)**

The Score Analysis Tasks (Parts 2 and 9), adapted from score study activities used in a study by Lane (2006), were completed during both individual meetings with the investigator. I asked the participant to turn over the sheet so they may see the music score to *Thinking of You Makes Me Smile* (Appendix I), a simple, 5-part unison melody written for five instruments (flute, clarinet, saxophone, trumpet, trombone) without precise tempo, dynamic, or articulation
markings. Title and character indicator were present. The participant was asked to study the score as if getting ready to lead a first rehearsal of the melody with a group of young musicians. Each participant was given silent study time (approximately 3 minutes) during which they were asked to devise a target list of priorities that they wanted to accomplish during a first rehearsal of the work. Participants were encouraged to mark their score and/or take notes on a separate piece of paper during the silent study time. I kept time using a silent timer and once 3 minutes passed, participants were asked to finish up their final thoughts.

Following silent score study, I prompted participants to talk through their thoughts about score analysis and rehearsal planning. Each participant was instructed to refer to their notes and score markings as he or she “thought aloud” (Merriam, 2002) to convey the approach taken to analyze the score during silent study. This provided insight into what aspects of performance, such as musical expression or technical skills, were the participants initially drawn to. Following the silent study portion of the task, each participant talked through the score from beginning to end, highlighting areas within the score considered priorities and were encouraged to explain each choice.

**Musical Expression Task 1 (Part 3)**

Expressive modeling is a necessary component for teaching beginning band students how to perform musically themselves. For the teacher, the ability to discern and perform expressive musical interpretation within a simple, 5-part unison melody are skills not only needed for teacher modeling during instruction but also for rehearsal planning (Haston, 2007; Sheldon, 2004; Woody, 2000). The ability to discern and perform in a musically expressive manner on simple melodies may inform the teacher’s rehearsal planning decisions to focus on guiding students to discover and problem-solve in their individual music-making. This type of planning
and instruction may be a vital component of guiding the development of independent musicians (Duke & Byo, 2011; Wiggins, 2001).

Following Score Analysis Task 1 (Part 2), each participant performed the Musical Expression Task 1 (Part 3). I provided a printed copy of the simple melody from the previous Score Analysis Task 1 written for the participant’s primary instrument. I instructed the participant to perform the melody in a musically expressive manner of their choice with the intention of modeling an example of musical expression for a beginning student to replicate. The melody was void of dynamic, articulation or tempo markings. Title and character indicator were present. Upon seeing the music, the participant was given approximately 30 seconds to silently preview the melody before performing it. I, along with two informed listeners, evaluated the audio-recorded performance of Musical Expression Tasks 1 and 2 (completed during Interview 2) by describing each performance in reference to criteria used in Tan, Diaz, Miksza’s (2018) study assessing emotional expression in vocal performance: (a) tempo and tempo variation (rubato), (b) intensity and dynamics, (c) timbre, (d) rate of vibrato, and (e) articulation. I coded and analyzed the performance descriptions to identify emergent themes and look for similarities and differences between each participant’s Task 1 and Task 2 performance.

Written Reflective Responses (Part 6)

I created a written reflective response survey and used Qualtrics to distribute the survey to participants during the Workshop Activities (Appendix E). After each activity session, I instructed participants to highlight, underline and/or take notes on any topics or concepts that resonated with them and refer to these notes as they wrote brief reflections in response to the PD content they experienced after each activity. Participants were instructed to access the Workshop Activity Written Reflection Task via the Qualtrics link on their electronic device. They followed
the instructions for written responses which provided step-by-step guidelines urging them to think reflectively on the material presented during the activity. Written instructions for the reflective responses are available in Appendix D.

**Rehearsal Planning Assignment (Part 7)**

In a study on the lesson planning behaviors of preservice music teachers by Parker, Bond & Powell (2017), researchers highlight common perceptions among preservice music teachers regarding lesson planning including the beliefs that lesson planning is “unimportant, confusing and unnecessary” (p. 288). When preservice teachers are required to design lesson plans in courses “without the intention of actually teaching the plan” (p. 288), lesson planning seemingly becomes disconnected from the teaching act in their understanding. Although students initially doubted that planning would enhance their teaching, results show that preservice teachers ultimately gained appreciation for the ways that lesson planning guided their teaching when given multiple teaching opportunities to connect planning and teaching performance. In the current study, a likely strength is that the rehearsal planning assignment was followed by the opportunity to apply it to leading a 10-minute rehearsal. The reasoning is that the tangible goal provided by an actual rehearsal would be an impetus for participants to engage in quality rehearsal planning.

At the end of Workshop Session I, the investigator introduced the Rehearsal Planning Assignment (Part 7). Participants were instructed to use the material they encountered during the Workshop Activities (Part 6) as they designed a plan for a 10-minute rehearsal of a unison beginning band melody that they led at the end of Workshop Session II. They were allowed to incorporate any aspects of the PD content that resonated with them into their plan. Following a 1-hour lunch break, Workshop Session II began with Interview 2 (Part 8) during which they were
given the music score to the melody they would use for their rehearsal planning assignment: _Little Bird_. Approximately 60 minutes was then allotted to Rehearsal Planning Time (Part 10). Participants completed their rehearsal plans individually. They were instructed to provide the steps of their plan, along with detailed explanation for their chosen steps. Essentially, participants attempted to plan, and lead the rehearsal using their own understanding of the teaching approach to this point.

**Interview 2 (Part 8)**

After the one-hour lunch break, I met with participants for another one-on-one semi-structured interview. I followed an interview protocol of 6 question items (Appendix C). The purpose of the interview was for me to understand how their knowledge, abilities, beliefs and attitudes related to beginning band instruction might be changing related to their PD encounter. Embedded tasks within the interview provided an opportunity for participants to apply PD content to teacher practice and provided me the opportunity to gain insight on how they might be growing during their PD learning experience. Participants were expected to bring their primary instrument to the interview. Upon arrival to the interview, I directed the participant to sit in a chair across from me. On the music stand in front of the participant was a music score turned face down. After introductory conversation, we began the first teacher task.

**Score Analysis Task 2 (Part 9)**

I asked the participant to turn over the sheet on the music stand so they may see the music score to _Little Bird_ (Appendix J) a simple, 5-part unison melody written for five instruments (flute, clarinet, saxophone, trumpet, trombone) without precise tempo, dynamic, or articulation markings. Score Analysis Task 2 followed the same procedures as Score Analysis Task 1 (see Interview 1 above).


**Musical Expression Task 2 (Part 10)**

Following Score Analysis Task 2 (Part 9), each participant performed the Musical Expression Task 2 (Part 10). I provided a printed copy of the simple melody used in Score Analysis Task 2 notated for the participant’s primary instrument. Musical Expression Task 2 followed the same procedures as Score Analysis Task 1 (see Interview 1 above).

**Pre-Rehearsal Briefing (Part 12)**

Just before participants led their 10-minute rehearsal, I met with them one-on-one to allow them to briefly talk through their rehearsal plan. This supplied additional descriptive data to support their written lesson plan and allowed them to explain their choices. I also asked them questions related to their confidence with teaching the approach. Briefing questions were:

1. Give me a rundown of your rehearsal plan.

2. Describe your confidence level going into this rehearsal.

**Participant-led rehearsal (Part 13)**

Though not the central focus of data collection for the current study, each participant’s rehearsal leading performance (Part 13) was video recorded for triangulation purposes. Participants led a 10-minute rehearsal with three experienced musicians (non-participants) who served as the students. Though these musicians were advanced, the rehearsal afforded the participant an opportunity to practice their rehearsal ideas and offered insight into how participants made sense of the information they encountered during the PD and their ability to implement it. Since the ensemble musicians were experienced musicians, the investigator instructed them to begin performing the piece plainly, without expressivity, and to respond naturally (without their own informed musical choices) to the participant leading rehearsal. The
participant-led rehearsal was intended to provide a tangible goal for the rehearsal planning process and did not serve as a point of data in this study.

**Focus Group Interview (Part 14)**

At the end of the workshop day, I conducted a focus group interview with the three members of the cohort together. Interview topics gave them an opportunity to reflect on their rehearsal leading and their rehearsal plan choices. We also discussed their beliefs and attitudes toward the PD content and their learning experience. Following the interview, I collected all written material from the participants including written notes, score markings or highlights and used them for triangulation purposes. Interview questions were:

1. Tell me about your rehearsal. How do you feel about it?
2. If you had the opportunity to do it again, what might you do differently?
3. What did you think about reading/collaborating/observing to learn the PD content? Did you like it? Did you find it beneficial?
4. Describe your confidence using this approach in your future teaching.
5. Can you envision yourself using this in the future?

**Post Workshop Reflection (Part 15) – Two weeks later**

For Part 15 (Post-Workshop Reflection), I sent a separate Qualtrics survey link to participants via email one week following the workshop to provide a written reflection on their PD experience asking them to complete in a week. The written reflection provided a “snapshot” of how the participants were initially making sense of the PD material. Instructions for Written Reflections (Appendix E) can be found in the Appendices.
Data Analysis

This collective case study made use of standard multiple case study data collection strategies (Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009) employed over a two-week period. Nine participants were divided into three cohorts and experienced one of three learning contexts (reading, observing, or collaborating) during a workshop that was preceded by a pre-workshop interview and followed by a post-workshop online reflection. Data were generated from audio-recorded interviews, participant music performances and written material.

I spent an unknown number (but large number) of hours preparing to “deliver” three contrasting-format PD workshops and, as shown in Table 5, 15 hours facilitating PD workshops for the three participating cohorts. I conducted 18 semi-structured interviews each roughly 20 minutes in duration: nine structured pre-rehearsal briefings, each roughly 2 minutes in duration, and three focus group interviews, each roughly 20 minutes in duration. I audio-recorded 18 one-minute music performances and, from two additional informed listeners, collected expressive performance evaluations for each recording. I collected nine rehearsal plans, 18 score study target lists, nine reflective responses and seven post-workshop reflections. All interviews were

Table 5. Coverage of Collected Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of PD workshops</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>18 (x 20 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured briefing</td>
<td>9 (X 2 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group interviews</td>
<td>3 (X 20 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recordings</td>
<td>18 (X 1 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer rehearsals</td>
<td>9 (X 10 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score study target lists</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective responses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post workshop reflections</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis. Audio-recordings of expressive performances were placed into a secure online drive accessible to the expert panel (the investigator and two additional informed listeners) for review. For confidentiality purposes, I created pseudonyms for each participant shown in Table 6. Examples of my data analysis processes are located in Appendices K, L, and M.

Table 6. Pseudonyms by Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Allan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Marsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Lindsey</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full data set was read, listened to, and viewed repeatedly. Following preliminary reviews, I conducted cycles of coding (Saldaña, 2016). During the first cycle, I used open coding to directly represent the participants through a mixture of open coding and in vivo coding. I read all transcribed data line by line for the interviews and the collaboration workshop activities. I assigned single codes to words and phrases. I noted verbatim (In Vivo) words that seemed to directly represent participants’ voices. During the second cycle, I used closed coding that represented the participants’ thinking and decision-making related to the research questions and learning context. Through this process I was able to link codes to categories through cross case analysis. Open and closed coding as well as categorical aggregation aided in the process of identifying salient themes relating to the research questions. I organized and prepared the audio-recorded musical performances for two informed listeners to review. I then listened repeatedly to the audio recordings and prepared my own descriptive evaluation for each (Appendix F).

I returned to the database to review written documents (reflective responses, written rehearsal plan) and viewed video recordings to crosscheck my interpretations of the interview
transcriptions. I reviewed the database repeatedly to confirm my codes and began to connect themes to the research questions.

I was able to achieve a detailed description of each participant that thereby informed a thick description of each case and its context needed for thematic interpretation (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Stake, 2006). I created analysis charts (Yin, 2003) during within case and cross-case analysis as I looked for similarities and differences among the cases. I was able to develop naturalistic generalizations as data analysis revealed emergent themes related to participants’ thinking and decision-making during score analysis and rehearsal planning, participants’ instructional readiness and similarities related to each learning context (reading, observing, collaborating).

**Positionality**

As an experienced instrumental music teacher, I have encountered professional development in various forms throughout my 15-year public-school teaching career. Like many music teachers covered in the literature, I have attended school-based PD that was mandated but rarely applicable to my content area. I have attended music-related PD at the district-wide level that provided pertinent information, experienced largely through guest presentations or informal collaboration. At the state-level and regional-level, I have attended conferences and honor band clinics where I attended presentations and observed guest clinicians. I found the experiences to be invigorating and inspiring. I am aware that this aspect of my identity both validates my place in this formal study of PD; it also potentially biases my understanding.

As a seasoned instrumental music teacher, I now question the extent to which these experiences truly inform my teaching? Though I may have been struck by a new concept or learned about new repertoire, what facets of these PD experiences truly initiated an instructional
change in my teaching to increase teaching effectiveness? For a brief period later in my teaching career, I maintained a routine approach to teaching while giving little attention to trying new approaches to teaching instrumental music. Looking back, I can clearly see that this stagnation paralleled a period when I did not actively seek out music-related PD. I believe this led to feelings of disenchantment with my career and, at times, a negative attitude toward professional development. I reached a point where I became dissatisfied. In response, I chose to engage in reading materials related to music teacher PD, attend the Midwest Clinic (I had never attended), and connect or reconnect with other music teachers. With my mindset shifted into a more open space, I embraced the PD experiences, and it stimulated my growth as an educator. I perceived student outcomes to have improved as I left my teaching “plateau” and recommitted to ongoing professional learning.

Now, in a music teacher education setting in higher education, I am continually convinced of the importance of effective PD experiences. My goal is to shed light on the importance of regularly engaging in PD as music teachers and contributing to effective designs through research.

**Trustworthiness**

To increase trustworthiness, I followed qualitative research practices known to adhere to standards of validation (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The entire “life cycle” (Yin, 2009) of the quintain in the present study was a three-week period for which I was present throughout. This served as a form of credibility in line with prolonged engagement in the field. In proportion with the time frame of the quintain (a three-week, short-term PD experience), sufficient time and opportunity were available for me to give “voice” to the participants through multiple interviews and written reflection responses throughout the study to establish authenticity. For member
checking, I shared excerpts of transcripts along with my interpretation to participants to ensure that my interpretations were accurate. In certain instances, I reached out to participants when I encountered data that was difficult to understand or that I questioned and they responded with explanation that guided my understanding of their lived experience. Triangulation was achieved through use of multiple data sources (interviews, written material, musical expression tasks).
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

Three Workshop Glimpses

Following are three brief “glimpses” that illustrate the learning experience during the workshop activities.

Glimpse into the Reading Workshop

Maria has “always been pretty big into reading.” She sips coffee as she annotates and takes notes while reading about why children enroll in beginning band. She shares that what resonates with her the most is “students decide to start learning an instrument because they are inspired to play music.” She reasons that “they do not necessarily want to learn how to play scales or count rhythms correctly…fundamentals are important” but their purpose is to “beautifully convey a musical idea.” In the afternoon, she thinks through how she might guide students to consider “mood” or “colors” they want to convey through the melody and the “physical changes” they will execute to make their ideas come to life.

Glimpse into the Observation Workshop

Josh, Ian and Lindsey are watching a video in progress. Nathan Chan is performing The Swan by Camille Saint-Saëns. The music continues in the background as Nathan, age 11, describes what he thinks the music is about. Josh and Lindsey take notes as they observe. Ian simply watches.

Nathan: I think Saint-Saëns was trying to put a whole bunch of feelings together. Sad and happy at the same time. In some parts, the swan is doing something not so sad, like gliding through the water. Then all of a sudden, it’s starting to cry….”

The participants reflect through written responses. Ian writes, “I noticed how convinced he was of the decisions he had made…He seemed convinced that his decisions were the only way, perhaps because he came up with them himself…”
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Glimpse into the Collaboration Cohort

The collaboration cohort is discussing musical communication while also teaching technical skills to beginners:

**Sarah:** I think musical communication is like, digging into the music and seeing what lines, like, feed off of each other and kind of like, go back and forth creating a story with it, something like that. Just rather than just looking at it and saying, “Okay, these are just two notes I’m doing [playing] back and forth between G and A.” That’s just two things, but thinking about, okay, how can this convey something to me? How can this, how can I apply it to my personal life? Something like that just kind of get ideas flowing and, like, the creativity.

*Later in the discussion...*

**Allan:** So, I think actually focusing on musical communication when they’re only learning two notes will make them think less about the difficulty of learning new notes. ...So, I feel like the technique would just kind of come.

**Marsha:** Yeah, I agree. I think you can teach musical expression and the technique will come but you can’t teach technique and the musical expression will come.

Following discussion, the participants attempted to apply their ideas in rehearsal of the melody...

**Research Questions**

The purpose of this collective case study was to examine three short-term learning contexts (self-study through reading, self-study through observing, and group collaborating) through participants’ experiences at a professional development workshop designed to introduce and guide implementation of an approach to teaching beginning band, unfamiliar to the participants. I sought to answer the following research questions:

- In score analysis, what is the nature of participants’ thinking as derived from each learning context, and what might it suggest about instructional readiness?
- In rehearsal planning, what is the nature of participants’ thinking as derived from each learning context, and what might it suggest about instructional readiness?
- How are responses to each learning context similar or different in cross-case analysis?
The research questions in the present study addressed score analysis and rehearsal planning separately. To that end, I asked participants about each, either score analysis or rehearsal planning, in separate interview questions during the workshop. Participants’ interview responses, as well as written responses or rehearsal plans, tended to blend each topic with the other. When I asked participants to describe their approach to score analysis, they tended to mention aspects of rehearsal planning. Inevitably, when I asked participants to describe their plan for rehearsal, they would naturally refer to the score. Because there was consistent overlap between the two topics, score analysis and rehearsal planning are presented together throughout this report. An interest in participants’ readiness to teach using the approach—instructional readiness—as derived from each learning context was embedded in the research questions. Therefore, I chose to report findings in a manner that reflected how the participants responded verbally and in written form during the workshop experience.

Limitations

There are three primary limitations of this study. (a) Due to a qualitative research design, the present study may be generalizable in a theoretical sense only. The most optimal outcome of a collective case study is theory development which can be analytically generalized, not statistically generalized, to the population (Yin, 2009). As such, the potential in replication is promising. (b) This research utilizes the teaching experiences of preservice teachers to develop theories about each learning context case rather than utilizing in-service teachers who possess more experience with score analysis and rehearsal planning activities and who are the typical targets of professional development activities. Preservice teachers’ lived experiences in the learning contexts may not approximate the lived experiences of in-service teachers. Although this may be perceived as a concern it does not mean that valuable results are not achievable.
exploratory nature of the current study was aimed specifically at the quality of the learning contexts, not the preservice teachers themselves. (c) Despite my best efforts to create equitable workshops, there was a possibility that there was not equal opportunity for the PD content to be grasped in each workshop.

**Themes Related to the Research Questions**

As participants planned for instruction, two themes related to the research questions emerged during score analysis and rehearsal planning tasks: (a) instructional goals, comprising two sub-themes, musical communication and musical expression and (b) engaging learners.

**Instructional Goals**

**Musical Communication.** The *reading* and *collaborating* cohorts allowed musical communication to guide their score analysis and rehearsal planning goals. In their planning, they prioritized interpretive ideas, such as the development of a musical story, mood, imagery or emotion. In most instances, interpretive ideas would inform decisions on expressive technique. This finding revealed that participants in the reading and collaborating cohorts approached score analysis and rehearsal planning in a manner that aligned with the PD content presented in the workshop.

*Reading* cohort participants, during Interview 2 (Part 10), explained how they would develop a musical story or mood by relating the title and/or character indicator to musical ideas in the melody during a beginning band rehearsal of *Little Bird.* Brian described how he would promote the idea of a little bird being the central character in a musical story by combining musical ideas in the melody with imagery. He proposed how this process might evolve through class discussion:

Um, so I thought okay, Little Bird is the name of the piece. I'm probably going to work with students to figure out what does that little new section at [measure] 9 have to do
with a little bird? I think like, fluttering in the wings or things and then toward the end, why doesn't it resolve to the tonic? What's the story of this little bird? What's happening?

Similarly, Jason valued the development of a musical story as he described his approach to score analysis. He aimed to get the students to “relate the title and the word gracefully” to each other and then discuss “what kind of story we’re telling.” For Maria, conveying a musical mood and considering how they can use expressive technique to convey mood were her primary goals. She shared that she would ask students what kind of “mood” or “colors” come to mind when hearing the melody which she anticipated would lead to discussion about interpreting the phrases.

The *collaborating* cohort planned to allow the development of musical imagery or emotion to guide decision-making on expressive elements (tempo, style, dynamics). Allan focused on conveying a musical mood or emotion by devising multiple interpretations of the melody. He initially noticed repeated motifs (shown in Figure 3) in the musical score for *Little Bird*, then considered how he may have the students approach expressive decisions and musical interpretations on those four measures. He felt these motifs were “where they can be most expressive.” His thinking was centered on guiding students to think about what the music was trying to say and what emotions might be expressed. Allan planned to encourage students to think of “at least two distinct interpretations” of this four-measure section of the melody. He suggested that instrument timbre may conjure a different feeling in the mind of the students: “And then students can apply expressive terms to each other’s playing of it, that like, they can tell if saxophone is playing, it’s like, ‘this sounds happy.’ It’s, like, the clarinet is playing it. That is not the same happiness, maybe it sounds sad.” Allan committed to developing musical imagery related to different emotions and planned to have students consider dynamics and articulation that would match various emotions. He gave little attention to technical elements such as keeping a steady pulse, key signature or rhythmic accuracy.
Both Marsha and Sarah, of the \textit{collaborating} cohort, focused on musical communication by planning to develop musical imagery. Marsha explained that she would use musical ideas that she and the students discussed to inform expressive decisions on style and articulation. In some instances, Marsha suggested that musical ideas in the melody may evoke images of bird actions or emotion: “And then there’s on the second line (Figure 3), …We would like to have a discussion on ‘is this kind of like the bird is tweeting at you? Would you play that delicately or would the bird be angry?’” Sarah also planned to develop musical imagery related to bird actions by “envisioning” bird actions that came to mind as she read the melody. She planned to guide students to think in a similar manner then allow these musical ideas to inform expressive decisions related to tempo variation and dynamics.

\textbf{Musical Expression.} The \textit{observation} cohort allowed musical expression to guide their decision-making during score analysis and rehearsal planning. In doing so, they tended to focus more on expressive technique rather than musical effect or interpretation; concepts which align with musical communication. At times, participants tended to prioritize technical elements, such as finger issues or pitch accuracy, rather than expressive elements. There were limited instances of musical communication guiding the planning process. This suggested that \textit{observation} participants were unable to apply an integral concept of the approach presented in the workshop, that is, keeping musical communication at the forefront of the learning process.
This finding implied that the observation cohort applied what they learned during the workshop in a way that did not align precisely with the PD content presented in the workshop.

In the observation cohort, there was variation in how each participant set instructional goals. During Interview 2 (Part 10), Ian seemed to prioritize technical elements and aimed his instructional goals on musical expression. “I think basically, I would start out with making sure that they can all play all the right notes and rhythms.” He later said, “I think my second priority would be style and length.” Here, Ian clearly stated that expressive elements were his “second priority.” Throughout his response, he focused on expressive technique, such as phrasing and dynamics. He did, however, focus on musical communication in a few instances. Josh heavily focused on technical elements. Despite stating, in his rehearsal plan, that his objective was “to play the melody, Little Bird, more musically by the end of rehearsal,” his thoughts were fixated on technical elements and expressive technique related to phrasing and dynamics. He wanted “to see everybody play the right notes” and then address “slurring versus articulation.” He made it clear that expressive decisions were not given priority by stating, “and then, finally, in the end, we can talk about musicality.”

Unlike her fellow observation cohort members, Lindsey focused most of her attention on expressive technique with the instructional goal of musical expression. She shared detailed thoughts related to phrasing and dynamics. She stated, “Okay, so there's some very clear phrases in here … I want the students to be able to make music out of it is like main priority number one.” Despite wanting to “make music” in the rehearsal, she only briefly considered conveying the style of graceful before returning to expressive aspects during score analysis and rehearsal planning. Most of her talk focused on expressive technique.
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Engaging Learners

Across all three cases, participants planned to stimulate learner cognition as they designed engaging experiences based on the rehearsal of a simple, five-part unison melody. The reading and collaborating cohorts planned to engage learners through at least two or more student-centered learning activities as part of their rehearsal plan. They consistently mentioned using activities, such as discussion, student input and peer feedback, among others, to engage students to think about musical communication. In the reading cohort, Jason thought through how he would devise a rehearsal plan that encouraged student input and independent thinking by allowing students to create their own musical ideas based on an assigned phrase. During Interview 2, he explained:

I was just going to give each student a different one of those three phrases, and I was going to kind of let them come up with a story for their specific phrase and, and kind of explain what's happening. And then share, like, with the class, what, what that story was that they came up with it. It doesn't have to be an elaborate story, just something very simple.

Jason was seemingly immersed in the goal of communicating a musical story as he designed an engaging rehearsal through discussion, student choice, and peer sharing. Reading cohort participants Maria and Brian planned to engage their students in a manner similar to Jason.

In the collaborating cohort, Allan’s responses during Interview 2 made apparent that he intended to create multiple opportunities—discussion, student input, peer feedback—to engage students in decision-making related to developing musical moods and ideas as part of a collective interpretation of the melody. Much of his rehearsal plan was aimed at getting the students to communicate an emotion through musical mood. He planned to set the stage for this by having them try different moods at the start:

So, I’m gonna start with the first four measures, I want them to play as bland as possible to just hear what like bland sound sounds like. And then I want them to play with like a
lot of aggression, like the ‘aggressive little bird’ and then the ‘sad little bird.’ And ask them, like, ‘what do you think about the speed of this?’ Like, ‘show me with your posture and breath,’ like, how this is gonna go.’

He shared that he would assign each student a four-bar phrase to play through on their own and give them time to think of their own expressive interpretation. His rehearsal goal depended on student input thereby demonstrating a commitment to engaging learners and valuing their input. Both Marsha and Sarah also included multiple opportunities for student engagement in their rehearsal plans as well.

Unlike the reading and collaboration cohorts, the observation cohort planned to engage learners primarily through teacher questioning designed to prompt discussion on musical expression or in response to an expressive model performed by the teacher. Ian planned to model expression for the students and considered how he would engage the students in thinking about where the peak of the phrase was in his model: “And then I'm gonna kind of see what they get from that. You know, what they hear, what they, what they pick up, you know? …And then I'm going to try and get them to replicate it.” Afterwards, he planned to ask them “why don’t we try something different? So, now you try something different” which would provide opportunities for students to interpret the phrase.

In his rehearsal plan, Josh included questions that aligned with aspects of expressive technique that he wanted to address. He intended to ask questions, such as, “talk about how phrases are shaped” then ask “where else do you see this [decrescendo]?” When adjusting dynamics to balance sound, he planned to ask, “what instrument should stand out the most?” He extended this to “what instrument makes us think about a little bird?” These questions would likely promote student investment in the learning process. Lindsey took a similar approach to engaging learners. She planned to heavily rely on teacher questioning to accomplish her
rehearsal goals. She said, “I’m going to have them play the first four measures and then ask, ‘what can you do to make that a little more interesting? How do you want that to sound?’ And play that and then, like, all try it.” She planned to repeat this process throughout her rehearsal.

It was evident, within the observation cohort, that participants chose to engage learners by using activities that represented aspects of the approach introduced in the workshop yet came short of aligning with the PD content due to the absence of musical communication goals. The observation cohort participants, in some instances, seemed as if they were attempting to replicate or incorporate a style of questioning or teacher modeling they observed in the videos. While this was a valuable learning experience, it seemed to limit their approach to stimulating learner engagement. This finding suggested that observation, as a PD learning context, offered a valuable teacher model to replicate yet seemed to limit the participant’s ability to incorporate larger concepts of the approach into their teaching.

**Themes Related to Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Two themes emerged related to each cohort’s initial development of pedagogical content knowledge: (a) pedagogical shift and (b) misunderstandings.

The Workshop Focus in Chapter 3 provides an explanation of how the approach introduced in the workshop “is grounded in foundational ways of thinking that shift pedagogical priorities away from what might be labeled the beginning band status quo” (Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Duke & Byo, 2011; Wall, 2018). The approach promotes the idea of teaching musical expression alongside technical skills in the beginning stages of learning an instrument. As I examined how the PD content may have influenced participants’ thinking related to score analysis and rehearsal planning, I noticed that what they understood about the approach and how they applied it
reflected aspects of Shulman’s (1987) PCK framework. Concepts of the PD content, summarized in Table 7, were reflected in the participants’ thinking at varying degrees. Cohorts who were apparently developing PCK that aligned with the PD content may reflect positively on the learning context through which participants acquired PD.

Table 7. Summary of Workshop PD Content

| Overarching Theme of the Approach | Treating beginners as professional musicians rather than assuming they have limited potential. |
| Integrated Concepts of the Approach | Keeping musical communication at the forefront of the learning process. |
| | Basing score study on the student’s role in expressive performance. |
| | Designing effective learning experiences. |
| Applying the Approach | Teaching musical expression alongside technical skills rather than separately or only teaching technical skills. |

Pedagogical Shift

Over the course of the workshop, a pedagogical shift was noticeable across all cohorts as participants attempted to implement the approach into their score analysis and rehearsal planning. Through examination of their responses to Interview 1 (Part 1), I was able to gain a sense of the participants’ prior knowledge and skills related to planning for beginning band instruction and their incoming PCK related to the PD content. Following interview, data analysis revealed a noticeable shift in participants’ PCK as they thought through beginning band score analysis and rehearsal planning following the workshop activities. The reading and collaboration cohorts each exhibited a pedagogical shift toward the development of PCK that aligned with the PD content. The observation cohort demonstrated a slight pedagogical shift in PCK accompanied by a limited understanding of the approach, especially when compared to their cohort.
counterparts. Initial development of PCK in each cohort revealed itself in two parts: (a) pedagogical knowledge and (b) content knowledge.

**Pedagogical Knowledge.** The reading and collaborating cohorts shifted their instructional goals from technical skills to musical communication. During Interview 1, they prioritized technical aspects such as pitch and rhythm accuracy, balance and tuning. Following the Workshop Activities (Part 6), they prioritized musical communication. Interpretive decisions then informed expressive technique. In delivering instruction, they seemed to shift from a more teacher-centered, direct instruction approach to a more student-centered approach committed to engaging learners. They planned to engage learners in multiple ways: discussion, student input and peer feedback, among others. A shift in how they set learner expectations was also apparent. During Interview 1, they tended to assume students would have trouble playing through the melody or planned to write in markings for the students and consequently set low learner expectations. For example, Allan, of the collaboration cohort, even suggested that the students might find sightreading “scary” and intended to give them multiple opportunities to preview the music before they attempted to perform it. Following the workshop activities, they set higher learner expectations by aiming instructional goals on musical communication instead of planning around potential student mistakes. Selected statements from Marsha’s PD experience, shown in Table 8, are an example of this pedagogical shift in thinking present in the reading and collaboration cohorts.
Table 8. Pedagogical Shift in Marsha of the Collaboration Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 1 Selected Quotes</th>
<th>Workshop Activities Selected Reflective Responses</th>
<th>Interview 2 Selected Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The first thing I noticed was that it’s in the key of F, which is not usually typical for beginning bands…So, I would make sure that they knew to play E-natural throughout.”</td>
<td>The main takeaway that I got from our first activity is that even things that I may consider “easy” as a college level musician can still be taught and learned with musical expression. We talked a lot about treating kids as professional and having high expectations for them from the beginning. We discussed how kids will meet whatever expectations we have for them, so it is better to set high expectations than to set low ones.</td>
<td>“Something that I focused on a lot was just really connecting the notes to the title. So, whenever I saw the title, a Little Bird, I thought of ‘gracefully.’ I kind of thought of a bird like gracefully flying past.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…And then I would do, probably, a little bit of a slower read through with your beginner band. They might need to have like, a couple of tries just to get the notes under their fingers.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Then if we're having a discussion on the bird like flying past at the end, we would have a discussion on when a bird flies past you and it goes the other way, does it get softer as it goes away? Or would it get louder?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reading and collaboration cohorts exhibited only a slight shift in Musical Expression Tasks 1 and 2 (melodies for each shown in Figures 4 and 5). These tasks, explained in Chapter 3, were designed for the participants to perform the melody in an expressive manner to model expression for students. Following the first of two performances, the interview item was: “Explain your approach to teaching musical expression in a rehearsal of this melody.” It was an opportunity for participants to think through expressive performance of the melody by performing it on their primary instrument. Most of the reading and collaboration cohort participants displayed little change between their two performances. One exception was Sarah of the collaborating cohort whose pedagogical thinking related to modeling expression shifted significantly.

On Sarah’s first performance, the listening panel commented that her performance was “not very expressive,” offered “little contrast” and had a static tempo. After the workshop
activities, her performance was found to display “great dynamic contrast” and “strong intensity” at times. There was fluctuation of the tempo and some variation in style as well. Her second

![Thinking of You Makes Me Smile](image1)

**Figure 4. Trumpet part for Musical Expression Task 1**

![Little Bird](image2)

**Figure 5. Trumpet part for Musical Expression Task 2**

performance was “very expressive” and “bolder than her first.” During the Workshop Activities, she had an experience that may have fundamentally changed her approach to modeling expression for students. In her reflective response, Sarah wrote:

> When I was modeling my interpretation on Smooth Moves, I felt like I was doing a lot of dynamic contrasts but in reality, it was not drastic enough. So, when the other participants modeled back [attempted to replicate her model], it was not as drastic as I was hoping for. Being very explicit and dramatic in the way that one models for student is needed to get your ideas across.
The magnitude of this experience may explain why her second performance was much more expressive. Regardless of the impetus, it was clear that Sarah was thinking about her musical model of expression in a much more intentional manner after her PD encounter. Due to the collaborative nature of her PD experience, as well as time constraints, Sarah was the only participant in the study who had the opportunity to perform a model for others during Workshop Activities (Part 6).

The observation cohort shifted their instructional goals from technical skills to musical expression. During Interview 1, they prioritized technical aspects such as pitch and rhythm accuracy, potential technical issues and tuning. Following the workshop activities, most observation cohort participants still prioritized technical skills even though they focused more on musical expression. They tended to address technical aspects first then focused on expressive technique through phrasing, style and dynamics. There were a few instances of attention on musical communication. In delivering instruction, they seemed to shift from a more teacher-centered, direct instruction approach to a more student-centered approach that included engaging learners. They planned to engage learners through discussion prompted by teacher questioning or teacher modeling. Just as the other cohorts did, the observation cohort set low learner expectations, during Interview 1. They planned around potential technical issues with performing the melody. After the workshop activities, they set only slightly higher expectations. Selected statements from Josh, shown in Table 9, served as an example of his slight pedagogical shift exhibited during his workshop experience.

The observation cohort collectively exhibited a noticeable shift in their Musical Expression Tasks 1 and 2, melodies for which are pictured in Figures 3 and 4 above. All three observation cohort participants gave a “more expressive” or “more engaging” performance
Table 9. Pedagogical Shift in Josh of the Observation Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 1 Selected Quotes</th>
<th>Workshop Activities</th>
<th>Interview 2 Selected Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first thing I’d be concerned about was probably the fact that they were starting on an A, which I guess is kind of high for beginning brass. I’d make sure they can find that partial. The first rehearsal, I probably hoped that we could just get on the notes and be able to play it through.</td>
<td>The biggest points I am pulling from these videos are the importance of student-centered learning. In the 7th grade band video, the teacher rarely said what she wanted, but guided the student to improvement through questioning. Another idea was ‘play beautifully, not carefully.’ This says a lot about tone quality, which even deeper can just boil down to playing confidently.</td>
<td>I looked at that there was 8th notes later in the piece and they are slurs. So, we probably have to talk about slurring and our approach to articulation. I’d like to see everybody play the right notes…And then I’d probably go to …how the brass has to jump between the same fingering or different partials…And then finally, in the end, we can talk about musicality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

following the workshop activities. This finding reflected well on observation as a PD learning context but since there were no explicit statements from participants explaining this change, it was not possible to discern the relationship of their PD experience and their musical expression performance.

**Content Knowledge.** The *reading* and *collaborating* cohorts demonstrated evidence of an increase in their PD content knowledge over the course of their experience. They entered the PD experience unfamiliar or somewhat familiar with the approach taught during the workshop and exited with an informed understanding of the PD content that aligned with integral concepts of the approach or its overarching themes shown in Table 7.

Following Workshop Activities (Part 6), the *reading* cohort was evidently developing a more thorough understanding of the PD content during the workshop. Their PCK began to align with integral concepts of the PD content shown in Table 7. During Interview 2, Brian described how getting the information that he discovered during score study to the students in an engaging manner was an essential part of the approach. He stated, “It’s not just, ‘I’ve studied the score,’
but rather, ‘I’ve studied the score and now I’m going to get the students to understand what I’ve learned from this score as well,’ which I feel like is an element I hadn’t considered before.’” Brian’s statement represents how integral concepts of the PD content were beginning to resonate with him. Similar findings related to content knowledge were apparent in across the reading cohort.

The collaboration cohort developed more thorough understanding of the PD content in similar fashion to the reading cohort. For example, following the workshop activities, Sarah wrote in her post workshop reflection, “the thing that stands out to me the most is not limiting students to what I think they know. All students can be musical from the beginning.” Essentially, Sarah acknowledged that she should not assume that developing musicians have limits on what they can learn. With this realization in mind, she would likely feel more inclined to set higher learner expectations. Similar development of content knowledge was apparent in Allan, who made realizations about how the approach encourages the development of independent musicianship, and Marsha, who recognized that in time she could integrate teaching musical expression alongside technical skills. An example of how the collaboration cohort was developing their thinking during workshop activities can be found in Appendix G, Vignette 1.

The observation cohort demonstrated evidence of a shift in their content knowledge related to beginning band instruction yet exhibited a limited understanding of the PD content over the course of their experience. They seemed to reach a surface-level understanding of the approach and were more informed about the approach upon leaving the workshop. However, they were unaware of the limits of their PD content understanding. This did not reflect well on observing as a PD learning context.
Instances in which the *observation* cohort appeared to be developing an understanding of the PD content seemed to take place mostly during the Workshop Activities (Part 6). Findings revealed that during the workshop activities, each member of the *observation* cohort pointed out scenarios or thoughts that were connected to integral concepts of the PD content (see Appendix G, Vignette 2). In his reflective response to the Nathan video, Ian wrote, “He seemed convinced that his decisions were the only way, perhaps because he came up with them. He wasn’t fed them by a teacher.” Here, Ian is alluding to Nathan’s confidence in his own interpretation of the music and connected this to the concept of independent musicianship. Josh also made connections to independent musicianship as well as the effectiveness of the learning approach through his observation. He wrote, “The biggest point I am pulling from these videos is the importance of student-centered learning.” He noted that the types of questions the teacher asked elicited a learner response that “guides the students to making decisions about playing expressively themselves and will probably make a huge impact on their ability to retain what they learned in the lesson.” Lindsey mentioned specific questions the teacher asked and reflected on how the questions in tandem with rehearsing “forces the students to evaluate their playing as well as recall what they have learned previously rather than the teacher telling them the same thing every class.”

The *observation* cohort’s valuable reflective responses during the Workshop Activities (Part 6) were aligned with integral concepts of the approach. Yet, during activities that followed, such as Interview 2, participant responses revealed that their understanding of the approach was limited. At times, they seemed unable to connect insight gained from the observation to their application of the approach during score analysis and rehearsal planning. Throughout Workshop Session II, their descriptions of the approach tended to hover on the student-centered learning
activities used they observed instead of musical communication and other integral concepts of the approach summarized in Table 7. For instance, during the Focus Group Interview at the end of the workshop, Ian described his understanding of the approach by stating, “it can really be as simple as just thinking about how you approach questioning.” He thought “asking the right questions” and building that questioning culture “over time with your kids” was an essential component of the approach. Beyond this response, he gave no further description of the approach. Certainly, effective instruction is necessary to deliver the approach, but this comment alone does not indicate a full grasp of the approach. Similar to Ian, Josh’s response also indicated an incomplete understanding of the approach: “the one thing that stands out, the student-centered aspect, I think is most significant. Where you ask students questions and see what they want to do with it.” Lindsey’s responses indicated that she was developing an appropriate understanding of the PD content yet reached only the surface-level by the end of the workshop. This was evidenced by her inability to share specific details or verbally articulate concepts that aligned with the approach.

**Misunderstandings**

At times, misunderstandings occurred as the cohorts were encountering the PD content. These misunderstandings either contributed to an overall limited understanding of the approach, as in the observation cohort, or served as basis for a participant’s negative opinion on a topic or idea presented in the workshop, as in the reading and collaboration cohorts. I discovered that misunderstandings nearly always occurred when participants were learning on their own.

Findings revealed that the observation cohort seemed to have the general sense that the approach introduced in the workshop mostly encouraged student centered learning through an engaging style of questioning. While student-centered learning and engaging questioning are
elements of effective teaching, they do not nearly cover the scope of the approach. Video excerpts were selected that demonstrated instructional models of these concepts. However, while observing in self-study mode, the participants’ focus of attention was on a variety of classroom activity. At times, they were drawn to observations that aligned with PD content, as evidenced in their reflective responses but what seemed to resonate with them were things such as how attentive the class was or how advanced the students’ musical vocabulary was. For instance, in a video that demonstrated a sequenced learning activity designed to introduce compound triplets, most of the participants were more drawn to how complex they thought that rhythm was rather than noticing how skillfully the teacher designed the lesson to introduce and reinforce the new rhythm. This type of misdirection in focus of attention was prevalent throughout the workshop activities and likely contributed to the observation cohort having limited understanding of what the approach was about.

The reading cohort also experienced a self-study mode of learning during the workshop activities. At the end of the day, when I asked participants what they thought about what they read, I encouraged them to share positive and negative opinions. Maria shared a topic with which she seemed to strongly disagree. In a reading about designing learning experiences, there was a suggestion that clarinet players should be guided to learn low G as a beginning note rather than open G. The low G is more difficult to reach at first. This point stood out to Maria and she felt it was “not necessary” to start students on a difficult note when they can learn many new skills on the easier note. She was felt strongly enough about this point to also comment on it in her reflective response. However, it was a misunderstanding of the reading. The authors were suggesting that the open G is easier to produce so much so that the student can do many things wrong with their embouchure and still perform the note successfully, whereas, the student has to
do many things correctly to reach the low G successfully. Also, the authors do not expect
students to be able to start on that low G straight away. This is an example of a misunderstanding
that would go uncorrected in the self-study mode of reading.

The collaboration cohort experienced a group learning mode with a workshop facilitator
present. However, there were a few instances when I left the room so that the cohort could work
on its own, as would happen in a typical workshop setting. Interestingly, it was during those
instances when the group struggled with some of the discussion topics. There was more than one
instance when their discussion lumbered as they unknowingly misunderstood the point of the
topic. Nearly all of instances of misunderstandings or misconceptions could be corrected by the
presence of an expert and/or via a learning intervention of some kind.

**Themes Related to Self-Expressed Beliefs**

Throughout the workshop, the cohorts were asked to describe their beliefs about the PD
encounter. Three themes emerged related to self-expressed beliefs during the course of the PD
experience: (a) self-efficacy; (b) interest/value; and (c) attitude.

**Self-Efficacy**

The reading, observing and collaborating cohorts all demonstrated an increase in
confidence using the approach over the course of the PD experience. In most cases, their self-
expressed confidence accompanied their comfort level in applying the approach. During
Interviews 1 and 2, the cohorts were asked, “What is your comfort level in teaching musical
expression alongside technical skills to beginning band students?” This question prompted the
participants to envision applying the approach to their prior knowledge and teaching abilities. In
most instances, all cohorts entered the workshop uncomfortable or somewhat comfortable
applying the approach. Following their PD encounter during the Workshop Activities, they were more comfortable but most were not fully comfortable during Interview 2:

**Jason (Reading):** I feel like after reading the excerpts, I have a little bit of a better direction of where, how I could go and how I could do it. But just because I have such lack of experience, I would definitely have a lot of rough patches.

**Brian (Reading):** I'd say that I’m more or less confident in teaching it.

**Lindsey (Observation):** Seven, seven out of 10 being the highest.

**Sarah (Collaboration):** I definitely feel more comfortable. I still feel like not necessarily nervous, but just kind of uncertain a little bit, because, I mean, obviously, it's gonna take time, right? But I think this is a good starting point of changing my thinking.

They worked out ideas and created a rehearsal plan for the melody *Little Bird*. Prior to leading a 10-minute rehearsal of the melody, they talked through their rehearsal plan during the Pre-Rehearsal Briefing and were asked how confident they feel about what they plan to teach going into rehearsal. Both cohorts shared responses that indicated they were maintaining the increase in confidence they attained since prior to the workshop and were aware of areas that felt new or aspects of the rehearsal that made them nervous:

**Allan (Collaboration):** I feel a lot better than if I would have read for the entire workshop today. I feel like I wouldn't have known what to focus on. And this [collaborating], like, I have goals. Even if I don't get to everything I know, like, what I want to do at least. And, like, what's the most important is like getting them to play expressive, even if we don't get to like the whole run through that, they've at least thought about what they want out of it. And that's what I want.

**Ian (Observation):** I feel fairly comfortable that I guess I always get a little nervous going into a group have never been in front of before. All right. But in terms of what I'm teaching, I think it should be fine.

**Maria (Reading):** I mean, I feel, I feel okay, about it. It is definitely different than what I'm used to doing. And I feel like it also makes it like, harder to anticipate what's going to happen to because it's kind of different.
In most instances, their self-reported confidence level remained the same in the Post-Workshop Reflection. In most instances, they were realistic in their comfort and confidence with the approach:

**Josh (Observation):** I am certainly more confident than I was before this workshop.

Jason added that he would like to learn about it through other learning experiences:

**Jason (Reading):** Overall, my confidence level is moderate. I have a decent understanding in what it is, but would feel more comfortable if I could see it in action or talk with peers about how they would teach it.

Although they did not develop complete confidence, over the course of the short-term PD experience each cohort indicated an increase in comfort and confidence with applying the approach that may suggest potential for a sense of self-efficacy to develop. Meaning, additional opportunities to practice the approach may likely lead to the mastery experiences needed for participants to attain a strong sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

All cohorts alluded to areas of uncertainty in using the approach and, as such, were likely obstacles to attaining high self-efficacy. Across cohorts, participants felt they needed more time and experience or additional information if they were to successfully use the approach in the future. In the reading cohort, during Interview 1, Brian said he was confident about using a vocal model to teach expression but was not comfortable introducing new concepts to beginners. During Interview 2, he described how comfortable he felt teaching musical expression alongside technical skills. He replied, “I’d say that I’m more or less confident in teaching it.” He explained, “I’m not scared of it but I also feel I don’t have enough experience with it.” Before leading his rehearsal, he rated his confidence level “on a scale of one to ten, I’ll say like a seven.” Jason also experienced a similar growth in confidence and comfort using the approach, while Maria
demonstrated minimal growth in these areas. This was likely due to the fact that she was never uncomfortable with using the approach at any point during her PD experience.

In the observing cohort, during Interview 1, Ian was uncomfortable with the concept of teaching musical expression alongside technical skills to beginning band students. Ian stated, “I would definitely say I’m not as comfortable teaching that [musical expression] as I am just skills, executive skills with playing instruments, especially when it’s such a subjective type thing.” During Interview 2, Ian said he felt better about teaching musical expression alongside technical skills. He stated, “we already teach technique, but let’s make sure that we’re, you know, teaching all these expression things all along.” When asked to describe his comfort level before going in to teach his rehearsal he stated, “I feel fairly comfortable but I guess I always get a little nervous going into a group I have never been in front of before.” He continued, “But in terms of what I’m teaching, I think it should be fine.” Josh experienced a similar growth in confidence and comfort using the approach while Lindsey exhibited limited growth. Lindsey was never uncomfortable with using the approach at any point during the PD experience.

The observation cohort shared, during the Focus Group Interview, that although they could envision themselves using the approach in the future, there were areas they felt were not addressed through observing. Collectively, they desired more explanation of the approach, more instructional models and examples of how to apply the approach to score analysis and planning. This finding suggested that these areas may negatively influence their confidence and comfort in using the approach. If addressed, improvements in these areas might increase self-efficacy.

In the collaboration cohort, during Interview 1, Marsha described her comfort level teaching musical expression alongside technical elements with beginning band: “I usually tend to focus on, like, the technical skills whenever I’m, like, planning.” She added, “usually whenever
I’m rehearsing college aged people, they know all the technical skills. And, so, then I have to think …I guess I need to talk about expression now.” She concluded with “usually, I’m not super comfortable, but I’m trying.” Marsha stated, during Interview 2, “I feel more comfortable. Like, last time, I was like a one or two and I feel like maybe I’m at a five or six. But I think after more than just seeing it one day, I think I feel a lot better.” In this instance, Marsha shared that her comfort increased, but also alluded to the notion that more time and/or experience would improve her comfort in using it. Both Allan and Sarah demonstrated similar increase in confidence and comfort with using the approach and, like Marsha, shared that more time and experience would be helpful.

**Interest/Value**

The reading, observing and collaborating cohorts all expressed interest in the PC content and interest in using it in future teaching. They seemed to value the PD content. This finding reflected well on reading, observing and collaborating as PD learning contexts. The cohorts shared thoughts on their interest in using the PD content in the future during the Focus Group Interview (Part 14).

The reading cohort was interested in using the approach in the future. For instance, Jason shared that in his work as a college musician he has had to work to become a more independent thinking musician. He recognized how the PD content encourages this type of thinking early on and for that reason he said, “I will definitely use this [approach] and try to apply it the best way I can.” Brian also shared interest in using the approach as it aligned with his natural tendency to use a student-centered approach. Maria was more reserved in her response in that she felt drawn to some aspects of the approach more than others, stating she “would definitely use some of the ideas.”
In the *observation* cohort, participants explained the value they saw in the approach and shared their interest in using the approach in the future. Josh was particularly struck by “how attentive her class was” and he reasoned that this is because they are “genuinely” enthusiastic about music “because they get input on it.” The aspects of student investment and engagement in the learning process that he observed in the videos was something he wanted to replicate in his own teaching. He was interested in using this type of approach “more” for those reasons. Lindsey envisions herself teaching high school in the future and felt that for some lessons” she “would use it (the approach) a lot” although she “might not use it all the time.” Ian seemed very interested in using it in the future: “Yeah, I like it a lot. And I could see myself using it daily.”

In the *collaboration* cohort, participants shared an interest in using the approach in the future or applying it to different music teaching settings. Sarah stated, “I will definitely implement it because, I mean, being musical from the beginning is very important.” Allan liked several features of the approach. For instance, he found the absence of expressive markings on the music challenging yet beneficial for beginning band students. He found value in how this encourages “students to express themselves more” and offers the opportunity for student input into the learning process. Marsha shared her desire to teach elementary music in the future and how she might incorporate the approach. She proclaimed, “it’s important to teach musicians from the very beginning [even before beginning band] how to express themselves through music.” She explained, “I think I would definitely have to adapt it for elementary, but I think it would be interesting to start using it from the very beginning.”

**Attitude**

In the *observation* and *collaboration* cohorts, all participants displayed a positive attitude toward the learning context through which they acquired PD while most participants in the
The reading cohort shared that they had a negative attitude toward it. This reflected well on observing and collaborating as learning contexts and gave reason to examine attitudes toward reading more closely.

In the reading cohort, during the Focus Group interview (Part 14), Jason and Brian both shared that they had a negative attitude toward reading. It seemed that Jason was not drawn to reading in general. He said, “I hate reading sometimes. I just make myself do it. Or at least try to.” Brian said, “I’m also not a fan of reading just because I’m a slow reader and I have trouble with reading comprehension just because I zone out a lot.” However, despite both Jason and Brian’s negative outlook on reading, they recognized it was beneficial. “I found it was like the most direct way to get the information on how to do it [use the approach],” said Jason. He felt there was “no questioning reading” since it was “there in black and white.” In this sense, he seemed to trust the integrity of the reading. Brian shared that even if “a single line just sparks an idea in your head, that’s beneficial because that helps shape your thinking.” He felt the ideas that come to mind from the reading might be an “idea that you would never consider.” He liked reading for those reasons. Upon closer examination, those reading cohort participants who held a negative attitude toward reading still had a positive experience with reading during the workshop as they found the assigned readings beneficial and thought-provoking. See Appendix G, Vignette 3.

In the observation cohort, participants expressed a positive attitude toward observing and felt there were many benefits to observing as a means to acquire the PD content. Lindsey especially appreciated having an instructional model that she could follow. She said:

I feel like I’ve gained a lot more watching, like, watching somebody actually incorporate all these concepts, because I feel like I read about, not specifically how to use it like this exactly, but I’ve read a lot of concepts [in the past] …and it’s a lot easier for me to apply things to my own teaching when I see somebody do it.
Observing the teacher prompted Ian to reevaluate how he questions and models for students. He stated that he already uses modeling and questioning, but said, “I don’t exactly do it in the same way she did.” He felt that the way she asked questions “made them (the students) actually think” instead of attempting to guide them to the answer the teacher wanted.

In the collaboration cohort, all participants shared a positive attitude toward collaborating as a learning context. During the Focus Group Interview, Marsha described how they shared ideas during discussion, and she seemed to value learning from other cohort members: “I felt like I had my own ideas, but then I heard other people’s ideas and that, I don’t know. I felt like I’ve learned more from this than I would have just having my own ideas in my head about it.” Allan agreed with Marsha, “I thought it was a lot of, like, ‘I didn’t even think of that. I didn’t even think to think of that. Kind of just, like, very different ideas. That was nice.” To which Sarah added, “I agree.”
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

This exploratory study was situated in the learning experience of short-term music teacher PD. Through the cohort’s workshop experience I gained insight into the initial stirrings of change or growth in their knowing and learning. In reflection, participants shared their beliefs and attitudes related to the experience. Their learning experience was exhibited in their teacher practice through score analysis and rehearsal planning. Participants’ ability to aptly apply and describe the PD content uncovered their developing pedagogical content knowledge and instructional readiness. Through a multi-focus lens, I moved back and forth between participant and case, zooming in on reflections, rehearsal plans, interviews and listening to musical performances. The investigation offers a vivid “snapshot” of the cohorts’ experiences with short-term professional development. An in-depth look into this phenomenon does not offer the luxury of time; a stumbling block that often casts this PD learning format to the back of the line. The findings of this study suggest that it was worth the effort and may be worth digging deeper in future study.

Major findings over the course of the study were that each cohort was able to apply some aspects of the PD content into their teaching and each cohort expressed positive beliefs toward their learning experience and the PD content itself. These findings indicate a developing readiness to teach the approach and offer incentive to continue exploring short-term music teacher PD as it shows potential. A major finding that reflected differences between the cohorts was that the reading and collaboration cohorts were ready to apply the approach by the end of the workshop whereas the observation cohort was developing their understanding. This finding suggests we look more closely at the advantages the reading and collaborating learning contexts may have offered the workshop experience and signals reason to probe more deeply into the
observation cohort to discover what aspects of their workshop inhibited their growth. Themes centered on—instructional goals, engaging learners, pedagogical shift, misunderstandings, self-efficacy, interest/value and attitude. In this chapter, I discuss my findings related to each theme area as I connect them to research literature.

**Findings Related to the Research Questions**

Previous research on planning for music learning activities has demonstrated that lesson plans uncover the teacher’s intentions and are usually accompanied by some form of sequenced approach to instruction (Brittin, 2005; de Frece, 2010; Lane & Talbert, 2015). In the present study, the cohorts planned a first rehearsal of a simple, 5-part unison melody as they attempted to apply an unfamiliar teaching approach encountered during the PD Workshop Activities (Part 6).

As they set instructional goals, the *reading* and *collaborating* cohorts allowed musical communication to guide their score analysis and rehearsal planning. They prioritized interpretive ideas, such as the development of a musical story or mood, and allowed these ideas to inform expressive decisions. These goals are consistent with existing research on teaching strategies that prepare students for expressive performance (Byo, 2014; Karlsson & Juslin, 2008; Tan et al., 2018) and, as such, reflected aspects of the approach introduced in the PD workshop. To reach these goals, they planned to stimulate cognitive learning through various engaging activities. By planning activities, such as, discussion, student input, and peer feedback, the *reading* and *collaboration* cohorts intended to create an active learning setting (Scott, 2011) in which students may connect their own interpretive ideas to decisions on expressive technique. Rehearsal planning choices such as these aligned with the PD content as they were likely to foster student investment in the learning process and the development of independent *thinking* musicians (Duke & Byo, 2011; Scott, 2011; Wiggins, 2001).
In contrast, the observation cohort allowed musical expression to guide their expressive decisions during score analysis and rehearsal planning. In doing so, they tended to focus more on expressive technique and technical skills rather than musical effect or interpretation as they set instructional goals. Researchers have found this to be a typical approach to teaching expressive performance used by instrumental music teachers and students (Karlsson & Juslin, 2008; Woody, 2006). In most instances, observation cohort participants prioritized technical skills thus supporting a belief, common among instrumental music teachers and musicians, that accurate technical skills precede attention to musical expression when learning music (Goolsby, 1997; Reid, 2001). They planned to stimulate learner cognition through discussion prompted by teacher questioning or by an expressive model performed by the teacher.

All three cohorts used questioning and discussion as a means to stimulate learner cognition as they focused student attention on rehearsal goals. Meissner (2017) found that teacher questioning and class discussion can provide a starting point for students “to consider the meaning of their music, enabling them to develop an interpretation” (p. 131). Meissner’s point further supports the value of this approach in teaching expression. However, most observation cohort thinking did not include a consistent and explicit approach to teaching musical expression or musical communication, whereas, the reading and collaboration cohorts planned to center class discussion on musical communication goals and included interactive, student-centered activities to immerse students in developing their interpretive ideas. Karlsson and Juslin (2008) suggest that “lack of explicit goals” and meaning teaching plans related to musical expression sets learners up to form a vague impression of what it is and how to approach it in performance (p. 329). The observation cohort did not indicate a commitment to engaging learners in meaningful interpretations of the melody.
Well-planned teacher questioning (Allsup & Baxter, 2004; Haston, 2013) and teacher modeling (Brenner & Strand, 2013; Haston, 2007) are effective ways to deliver instruction in the music classroom. The observation cohort’s focus on questioning and modeling indicated that influence of the PD content. The teacher they observed used these techniques and the observation cohort attempted to replicate her teaching style. However, they seemed rarely seemed to step beyond these teaching strategies or exhibit innovation in using the approach in their own unique. They expressed during the workshop activities that they noticed how captivated her students were and noted their high quality playing and investment in the learning process. In general, it seemed they did not know how to get to the learner outcomes they observed. The observation cohort was apparently developing an understanding of the approach rather than possessing a full grasp of it. This may explain why they were unable to fully use the approach by the end of the workshop. They did not consistently prioritize musical communication goals during score analysis and rehearsal planning. Pedagogically, they were not ready to use the approach.

This may be explained by the observation cohort’s focus of attention while watching the videos during the workshop activities. Yarborough and Henley (1999) uncovered that when viewing videos of music teaching, “observers’ reactions may vary greatly” (p. 308). It has been well-documented that observers often focus their attention on teacher behavior, even when instructed to give attention to both student and teacher (Yarborough & Henley, 1999) or when viewing class lessons with the camera focused on the students (Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Napoles & MacLeod, 2015). A major drawback of this tendency is that focusing on the teacher while envisioning oneself replicating her strategies “predisposes the observer to focus on elements of self-concerns rather than student impact concerns” (Napoles & MacLeod, p. 61).
This tendency for observers to focus on various aspects of classroom activity or focus mostly on teacher behavior rather than the full context of what is happening in the teaching and learning experience is concerning given that many music teachers rely on observing rehearsals or other teachers as a means to gain professional development (Bauer, 2007; West, 2020).

In the present study, the observation cohort’s attention was drawn to the teacher’s unusual (to the observation cohort) but effective style of engaging students through questioning. Still, most of the observation cohort participants were unable to recognize the teacher’s highly organized manner of sequenced instruction and/or how the nuances of what she and her students were doing addressed goals beyond expressive technique. They viewed the teacher through free observation in a self-study mode, as music teachers often do when observing rehearsals. Beyond the Workshop Introduction (Part 5), which provided an overview of the PD content at the start of the workshop, the observation cohort viewed video excerpts on their own without discussion or explanation. The video excerpts featured similar content to the other cohort workshops highlighting integral concepts of the PD content (Table 7). Yet, integral concepts of the PD content exemplified in the video excerpts seemed to go unnoticed by the observation cohort.

**Findings Related to Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Findings suggested that the reading and collaborating cohorts were ready to at least begin using the approach after a one-day workshop as they had developed PCK that aligned with the PD content. As for the observation cohort, it was evident that they were beginning to develop appropriate PCK but were not likely ready to begin using the approach at the end of the day.

In comparing data collected over the course of the study, a pedagogical shift in each cohort’s PCK emerged revealing the influence of the PD content on participants’ thinking during score analysis and rehearsal planning. These shifts in pedagogical thinking in each cohort were
indicative of the inception and potential for teacher change within the participants, namely instructional change. Previous research has shown that successful PD experiences promote a change in teacher practice with goals set on improving student outcomes (Patton, Parker, & Tannehill, 2015). Researchers have developed models of long-term PD (Guskey, 2002; Desimone, 2009) and short-term PD (West, 2018) which emphasize the role of instructional change in effective PD experiences. Even the slightest indication of instructional change in a short-term learning setting may signal potential effectiveness of the PD learning context provided the change aligned.

All three cohorts displayed a similar shift in pedagogical knowledge that appropriately reflected the PD content. It was evident that the reading, observation and collaboration cohorts set higher learner expectations, included more student engagement activities and gravitated focus on musical expression after their PD encounter. However, the reading and collaboration cohorts seemed to have had a more effective PD experience as they exhibited a more noticeable shift in PCK and committed to pedagogy that aligned with the PD content—musical communication goals and active learning activities. Comparatively, the observation cohort displayed a slight pedagogical shift and did not display pedagogical knowledge of how musical communication is applied in the approach. They instead increased attention on musical expression.

A noticeable and appropriate shift in content knowledge was apparent in both the reading and collaboration cohorts. Both cohorts were developing more thorough understanding of the PD content. Their approach to beginning band instruction seemingly transformed over the course of the workshop in a way that reflected well on these learning contexts. Still, it was in the area of PCK that the observation cohort differed from the other cohorts most by exhibiting an incomplete or limited understanding of the PD content. This is likely due to observation cohort
participants developing a misunderstanding based on what they perceived the approach to be when viewing videos. This may be related to focus of attention during the observation (discussed above). Research has established that focus of attention during teacher observation or watching videos may vary but often tends to center on teacher actions (Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Napoles & MacLeod, 2015; Yarborough & Henley, 1999). Further, in the self-study mode of observation, the observer is not provided expert guidance or opportunity for collaborative discussion during observations. As Josh shared, “I wish there was more explanation of how what she was doing was connected to the approach.” These missing elements placed the observation cohort at a disadvantage. Other misunderstandings that developed in other cohorts would likely also be resolved through expert guidance and/or collaborative discussion. In most instances, misunderstanding emerged when participants were learning on their own.

**Findings Related to Self-Expressed Beliefs**

Self-expressed beliefs play an essential role in establishing a foundation on which teachers may form new teaching strategies and successfully innovate teaching practice to incorporate a new approach (Bandura, 1997; Ronfeldt et al., 2018; Zimmerman 2000). In the present study, teacher self-efficacy, interest/value and attitude emerged as self-perceived abilities or beliefs expressed by cohort participants. The cohorts were processing new knowledge and attempting to incorporate into teaching practice. Their self-perceived abilities and beliefs will likely influence their motivation to continue to learn and innovate teaching strategies on their own, thereby clearing the path to successful implementation of the approach into teaching practice (Ronfeldt et al., 2018; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1998). The reading, observation and collaboration cohorts demonstrated mostly positive self-expressed beliefs. All cohorts exhibited
an increase in self-efficacy, were interested in the PD content while also finding value in it and held a positive attitude toward the learning context they experienced.

Across all cohorts, the potential for developing a strong sense of self-efficacy was noticeable. Correspondingly, each cohort’s self-expressed comfort level in using the approach often matched fluctuations in their confidence. Having successful “mastery experiences” is a main source needed to develop a strong sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997, p. 80). Bandura explains, “enactive mastery experiences are the most influential source of efficacy because they provide the most authentic evidence of whether one can muster whatever it takes to succeed” (p. 80). The opportunity to apply the approach to rehearsal planning and teaching practice provided at least one mastery experience for participants. After this experience, most participants reported that their confidence had not decreased which was a good indication. Opportunities to repeat these experiences would provide a better understanding of their developing sense of self-efficacy.

Although each cohort experienced an increase in confidence and comfort with using the approach, no cohort, as a whole, expressed very high confidence in their ability to carry out the approach. Cohorts alluded to areas of uncertainty in using the approach that would likely be obstacles to attaining high self-efficacy. Participants felt they needed more time and experience or additional information to feel highly confident using the approach. The reading and collaboration cohorts mentioned that more time and/or experience would be necessary for them to be more comfortable and confident with using the approach. Interestingly, the observation cohort, as a whole, did not mention needing more time or experience to feel more comfortable or confident with the approach. This may indicate that the observation cohort was unaware that their understanding of the approach was limited or inaccurate in some areas. Vicarious
experiences, such as watching a teacher model, are another main source that influences the
development of self-efficacy. Bandura found when individuals see others complete a task
successfully, they often come to believe they may have success with it also. Yet, positive trends
in confidence within the observation cohort may be misleading since they misunderstood main
concepts of the approach they were using. It will be beneficial to harness the confidence learners
seemingly develop when following a model and make adjustments in other areas to improve
observation as a PD learning context.

Other areas of self-expressed beliefs included interest/value in PD content and attitude
toward learning context. All cohorts expressed positive opinions in these areas. They were
interested in the PD content and expressed interest in using it in future teaching. They seemed to
value musical expression as a performance concept and its importance to developing musicians.
Additionally, all cohorts displayed a positive attitude toward the learning context through which
they encountered PD. The combination of their interest and value in the PD content seemed to
motivate them to face obstacles in their own thinking related to teaching beginners. Research
shows that confidence, interest and positive attitude are strong indicators of motivation (Bandura,
1997; Zimmerman, 2000). Self-expressed beliefs that emerged in the present study suggested
potential for these short-term PD learning contexts to foster the development of the self-
motivation needed for participants to persist in learning and practicing the approach beyond the
workshop.
CHAPTER 6. IMPLICATIONS

Evidence-based research on effective professional development in the field of education is abundant (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey, 1986; Guskey & Huberman, 1995; Desimone, 2011; Parker et al., 2015; Wayne et al., 2008). Within the extant literature, there is a consensus among researchers that more favorable outcomes are produced when PD formats are long in duration, content-based and collaborative (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone, 2009; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey & Yoon, 2009). Indeed, researchers claim that alternative forms of PD, short in duration, are ineffective or not conducive to engendering teacher change (Darling-Hammond, 2011; Desimone et al., 2002; Opfer & Pedder, 2011; Garet et al., 2001). In music education, recent literature on teacher PD further amplifies the notion that long-term, content-based and collaborative PD experiences are more beneficial (Burkett, 2011; Gallo, 2008). However, due to issues such as accessibility (Burkett, 2011; Sindberg, 2011), release time (West, 2019); and cost (Odden et al., 2002), music teachers are often limited to and/or prefer to attend content-based, short-term workshop, conferences and seminars that are music-related (Bauer, 2007; Eros, 2012; Madsen & Hancock, 2002; Schneckenberger, 2014).

An investigation that probes more deeply into short-term PD formats rather than look past potential benefits that may be hidden from view may be warranted. Recent research related to music teacher PD has focused on effective PD forms that are long in duration, such as mentorships (Conway, 2015) and learning communities (Stanley et al., 2014). There is little presence of short-term PD in the extant literature. West (2018, 2020) recommends that we should look into improving short-term PD formats since they are accessible and continue to be in popular demand.
It is imperative that research in music education continue to build an evidence-based foundation related to the professional growth of music teachers. As an exploratory investigation, the present study contributes to the knowledge base of music teacher PD research by examining the experiences of pre-service teachers in three “models” of short-term PD; a topic that has received little attention in the extant literature. The study gives definition and nuance to what constitutes short-term PD for instrumental music teachers. It elucidates distinguishing characteristics among short-term PD methodologies and lends perspective to a view of PD not as long- and short-term binary forms, but as points on a continuum allowing flexible sliding left and right so that attractive design features of one might be used to enhance the other.

**Improving Three Short-Term PD Learning Contexts**

Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) reviewed 35 studies in the extant literature on PD models that produced positive results in relation to student outcomes. Researchers coded each study as they sought to discover essential features of effective PD models. Through this process, they identified seven characteristics of effective PD:

1. Is *content focused*
2. Incorporates *active learning*
3. Supports *collaboration*
4. Uses *models* and *modeling* of effective practice
5. Provides *coaching* and *expert support*
6. Offers opportunities for *feedback* and *reflection*
7. Is of *sustained duration*

(Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p. 4)

Findings in the present study indicated apparent advantages and disadvantages of each short-term PD learning context. I identified advantages as being aspects of each learning context that seemingly placed the cohort in a position to appropriately begin using the PD content in teacher practice as well as build a firm foundation on which to continue learning about the approach. I identified disadvantages as ways in which the learning context inhibited the cohort’s
ability to appropriately use the approach. I then used the Darling-Hammond et al.’s (2017) seven characteristics of effective PD model, pictured in Figure 6, to consider the potential success of each learning context as a short-term PD format. Using this information, I generated recommendations on improving each learning context.

![Figure 6. Seven Characteristics of Effective PD (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017)](image)

In the following section, I will discuss each learning context in three parts: (a) advantages and disadvantages, (b) comparison to effective PD, and (c) recommendations for improvement.

**Advantages and Disadvantages of Three Learning Contexts**

**Reading**

As shown in Table 10, self-study through reading presented multiple advantages as a PD learning context. Verbal and written responses from the reading cohort throughout the workshop indicated they were having a meaningful PD encounter and likely reaching a thorough
understanding of the PD content. As they reflected on the readings, cohort members were connecting what they read to integral PD concepts likely influencing their score analysis and rehearsal planning. The instructional goals and delivery of instruction they chose reflected teacher thinking that aligned with the PD content. The ways in which PCK was developing positioned the reading cohort to appropriately use the approach by the end of the workshop. Reading provided a path to confidence, interest and value in PD. Suffice it to say these areas likely promoted reassurance in the reading cohort’s self-perceived ability to apply the PD content to teacher practice. They mentioned aspects of the learning context they found to be beneficial as being you may self-pace when reading, you may mark and annotate notes, reread portions as needed and, in some cases, follow it as a guide or for idea inspiration. Reading participants mentioned that even one sentence can “spark an idea.”

A few noticeable disadvantages were also present. While demonstrating more thorough understanding, there also were specific misunderstandings that occurred at times when they would misinterpret what they read. Brian and Maria. each took issue with a topic covered in the readings but were, themselves, unaware that they misunderstood the authors’ point. But left to one’s own devices, the nature of personal reading exposes the potential for misunderstandings to develop and persist absent opportunity for discussion or expert support. Participants in the reading cohort alluded to the need for more time and experience being a negative factor. They acknowledged that more time learning and more experience using the approach would increase their confidence. Lastly, Brian and Jason admitted they were not avid or enthusiastic readers. It is possible that this negative view of reading could have hindered their ability to have a successful PD experience. Instead, they reported that they found the readings engaging, interesting and informative which reflected positively on the PD learning context.
Table 10. Advantages and Disadvantages of Three Learning Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Context</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Self-study through Reading</em></td>
<td>Use approach appropriately</td>
<td>Self-study mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain thorough understanding</td>
<td>Poor attitude could hinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Made connections</td>
<td>Limited time and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulate confidence</td>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulate interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convey value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take notes and reread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read at your own pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Self-study through Observation</em></td>
<td>Made connections</td>
<td>Self-study mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulate confidence</td>
<td>Limited use of approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulated interest</td>
<td>Limited understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convey value</td>
<td>Knowledge transfer inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observed only one teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No guidance on score study or planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Group Collaboration</em></td>
<td>Use approach appropriately</td>
<td>Misunderstanding w/o expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deeper understanding</td>
<td>Limited time and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Made connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulate confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulate interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convey value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn from each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing Self Study Through Reading to Effective PD

When compared to the Darling-Hammond (2017) model, shown in Table 11, self-study through reading was wholly or partially grounded in four effective PD characteristics—*content-focused, active learning, models/modeling* and *reflection*. The reading cohort experienced PD that was content-focused, as it was music-related PD. Active learning was present as the participants were able to practice what they learned through writing a rehearsal plan and leading a 10-minute rehearsal at the end of the day. Multiple opportunities for reflection were provided for the design of the present study’s workshop as written reflections served as a point of data collection. In authentic reading settings, those who read for PD do not necessarily pause to
complete a written reflection or reflect through discussion with others. Still, it is likely that some type of implicit reflection takes place within any reader. The workshop reading excerpts included examples and explanations of how to apply the approach to score analysis and rehearsal planning which served as instructional models.

Characteristics of effective PD not experienced by the reading cohort—coaching/expert support, collaborative, feedback and sustained duration—make clear the potential disadvantages of this learning context. Without these effective PD characteristics present, the reader has no guidance on making connections or learning transfers or opportunities to develop ideas through discussion or a period of reflection. However, adapting each missing characteristic to a reading setting may strengthen this learning context as id discussed further below.

**Suggestions for Improving PD Through Reading**

Since self-study through reading is a learning experience that takes alone, it is difficult to know what music teachers learn unless they choose to discuss the content with others. Those who pursue this route to PD should be diligent and proactive in the PD learning process and reach out for guidance and advice related to topics they read. Indeed, having a successful PD encounter through reading places great responsibility on the reader.

In a more formal “PD through reading” setting, PD designers could create an online workshop that is self-paced and delivered in a reading format. PD designers may select and assign engaging readings that are music-related for a content-based PD experience. Reading alone is a passive learning experience. However, if the PD designer included checkpoints requiring written reflection or journal entries, reading can become a more active learning experience. Through a virtual format, participants may be given access to the reading material and complete checkpoints along the way that offer reflection and the PD instructor may provide
feedback and expert support in response. The PD may be designed to instruct teacher to practice writing a rehearsal plan and/or practice applying a new concept in the classroom setting which will allow the reader to experience using the PD content. Readers may record their experience in a journal entry to which the PD instructor may offer feedback. These online exchanges between reader and instructor would offer moments for collaboration and discussion.

To include models and modeling for music teachers who read for PD, PD designers may ensure instructional models in the form of sample lesson activities or rehearsal plans, curriculum and guidance on applying a teaching approach to score study are included in the readings. Teacher modeling is intended to offer teachers a “vision of practice” through demonstration of teaching strategies (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017, p.11). To address this missing characteristic, written vignettes that depict various exemplary teaching scenarios may be included in the assigned readings.

Reading offers the convenience of being flexible time-wise. To address sustained duration, self-study through reading may be completed in short, or long, intervals over a period of time. This would allow music teachers to have brief encounters with PD that fits into their schedules and enable them to partake in PD over a sustained duration. These experiences may also be included collaborative feedback and reflection via a virtual learning format. When reading outside of a formal PD context, music teachers may create a reading schedule to ensure they consistently encounter PD material. Above all, those who read for PD must use the effective PD characteristics and the advantages of reading reported here as a reference to ensure they are maximizing the potential of this short-term learning context.
Table 11.
Comparison of Workshop Learning Contexts to the Darling-Hammond et al. 2017 Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Characteristic</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content-focused</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active learning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Models</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching/Expert support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X denotes the characteristic is present
- denotes the characteristic is partially present

**Observation**

Advantages of the observation learning context were mostly present in the observation cohort’s self-expressed beliefs. Observation provided a path to confidence, interest in PD and positive attitude toward the PD learning context. Another advantage was present during the workshop activities. Their written responses on what they observed indicated they were having a meaningful PD encounter and developing some understanding of the PD content albeit not a thorough one. As they reflected on their observations, they made connections between what they viewed in the videos and integral PD concepts.

As shown in Table 10, self-study through observation presented multiple disadvantages as a short-term PD learning context. The connections they made between what they observed and integral PD concepts did not seem to translate into their score analysis and rehearsal planning. The instructional goals set by the observation cohort did not align with the PD content. Learning activities chosen by the observation cohort were intended to stimulate cognitive learning, reflecting some aspects of the intended approach, but did not represent a full understanding. The
way in which the observation cohort was developing PCK indicated that their PD experience inhibited their ability to use the approach by the end of the workshop.

An additional detriment was that the observation cohort participants were unaware the extent to which they had formed a misunderstanding of the approach. As mentioned in Ch. 4, previous research has established that focus of attention during teacher observation or watching videos may vary but often tends to center on teacher actions (Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Napoles & MacLeod, 2015; Yarborough & Henley, 1999). The observation cohort experienced a self-study mode as they viewed the videos without explanation of how the approach was being used. As in the reading cohort, when observers are left to their own “devices”, the nature of free observation exposes potential for misunderstandings to develop and persist absent opportunity for discussion or expert support. Another disadvantage was that the observation cohort had one teacher model to observe and the learning context did not provide examples of rehearsal plans or instruction on how to use the approach during score analysis.

**Comparing Self Study Through Observation to Effective PD**

When comparing the observation cohort’s PD encounter to the Darling-Hammond (2017) model shown in Table 11, self-study through reading was wholly or partially grounded in four effective PD characteristics—*content-focused, active learning, modeling* and *reflection*. The observation cohort’s PD experience was content-focused in that they observed music-related content in videos of a music teacher using the approach and of a young musician considered to be an ideal outcome of the approach. Active learning was present as the participants were able to practice what they learned through writing a rehearsal plan and leading a 10-minute rehearsal at the end of the day. Reflections, embedded throughout the workshop, were included as a point of data collection but coincidentally served an important role in the delivery of effective PD. In
authentic observation settings, those who observe for PD do not necessarily pause to complete a written reflection or reflect through discussion with others. Still, it is likely that some type of implicit reflection takes place within any observer. Teacher modeling was heavily present in this learning context and was a strength considering how positive participants were about the videos they observed.

Characteristics of effective PD not experienced by the reading cohort—collaboration, coaching/expert support, feedback and sustained duration—make clear the potential disadvantages of this learning context. Without these effective PD characteristics present, the observer has no guidance on making connections or learning transfers or opportunities to develop ideas through discussion or a period of reflection. However, adapting each missing characteristic to an observation setting may strengthen this learning context as discussed below.

Suggestions for Improving PD Through Observation

Observers tend to focus on a variety of actions to varying degrees (Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Napoles & MacLeod, 2015; Yaborough & Henley, 1999). This compounded with its delivery in a self-study mode seemingly contributed to the observation cohort developing a limited understanding of the PD content in the present study. As the observation cohort workshop was designed as a free observation experience, those who observe teachers or rehearsals to gain PD should be made aware of these detrimental tendencies are likely if one observes without a PD plan or goal to focus their attention. On the whole, the observation cohort seemed to have the most ineffective of the three PD experience, but with slight adjustments, this learning contexts could be improved.

In a more formal “PD through observation” setting, PD designers may create a workshop experience that uses teacher observation as learning context and allows multiple music teachers
to attend together with an instructor providing expert support or coaching. Observing music teachers rehearse honor ensembles or their own school ensembles in a short-term learning context brings forth a multitude of logistical concerns for in-person rehearsals. PD designers may solve this obstacle by selecting content-focused teacher video excerpts of more than one teacher demonstrating how music PD concepts may be applied to instruction. To provide further examples of teacher modeling, PD designers may create and include written or digital vignettes of teaching scenarios related to points being highlighted in the videos. Written material in the form of rehearsal plans, scores, or curriculum may be provided and serve as instructional models to support the teaching videos or vignettes.

In a workshop setting, a small to large group would be in attendance. Including moments for reflection and feedback would encourage participants to develop their thinking related to the PD content. With an instructor facilitating the workshop, group work or discussion may be included to include elements of collaboration throughout the workshop. Opportunities to write rehearsal plans or practice teaching would an active learning component that may help participants gain understanding through experience.

Music teachers often observe other teachers or rehearsals, usually at conferences that take place one a year (Bauer, 2007; West, 2020). This suggests that music teachers might use observation as PD once or twice per year. Adapting the typical observation format, as suggested above, into a short-time workshop setting using a mixture of videos, written vignettes and, at times, in-person teacher demonstrations, could increase the likelihood that observations could take place closer to the school site and possibly occur more frequently throughout the year. Certainly, multiple teachers may be observed in this workshop design greatly improving the effectiveness of this learning context. Lastly, the option to have more than one local observation
workshop, such as this, may create possibilities for more *sustained* encounters with observation as PD.

**Collaboration**

As shown in Table 8, group collaboration presented multiple advantages as a PD learning context. Verbal and written responses from the collaboration cohort throughout the workshop indicated they were having a meaningful PD encounter and likely reaching a thorough understanding of the PD content. As they reflected on their group discussions, cohort members were connecting what they discovered during discussions to integral PD concepts likely influencing their score analysis and rehearsal planning. The instructional goals and deliver of instruction they chose reflected teacher thinking that aligned with the PD content. The ways in which PCK was developing positioned the reading cohort to appropriately use the approach by the end of the workshop. Group collaboration provided a path to confidence, interest and value in PD. The collaboration cohort pointed out aspects of the learning context that they found to be beneficial. Each member felt that they learned from each other’s ideas and were certain they learned more than they would have on their own. This cohort had the added advantage of not only discussing topics but also putting ideas into practice as they played through music on their primary instruments. This also led to more discussion and discovery related to the PD content. The collaboration cohort had a cohesive learning experience in that the content learned was similar across participants.

There were not many negatives with collaboration but a few minor issues did arise. There were moments during their discussions when I left the room to allow the cohort to work on their own. During some of these instances, their conversations drifted away from the intended topic or a discussion prompt was misunderstood. Usually, there seemed unaware of this. This point
reinforces the importance of having an expert present to guide ongoing conversation and clarify points as needed. Also, the collaboration cohort’s confidence and comfort in using the approach grew over time yet they had a realistic understanding of their limitations. They recognized that they needed more time and experience to feel fully confident. The collaboration cohort acknowledged that it may be a challenge to incorporate the approach, especially as a new teacher, but felt that it could be developed over time. More time, even within the workshop itself, and more guidance would be beneficial for this learning context.

Comparing Group Collaboration to Effective PD

When compared to the Darling-Hammond (2017) model shown in Table 11, group collaboration was wholly or partially grounded in five effective PD characteristics—content-focused, active learning, collaboration, models/modeling, coaching/expert support, and feedback/reflection. Since the cohort was discussing ideas and concepts related to a beginning and teaching approach, their learning experience was content-focused. Active learning activities bound as they worked collaboratively to understand topics, practiced rehearsal ideas, wrote a rehearsal plan and practiced teaching by leading a rehearsal during the workshop. As the other cohort did, the collaboration cohort wrote reflections in response to what they learned during group discussions. I was present for most of their discussions to stimulate or guide conversation. In this sense, I provided expert support.

Two characteristics of effective PD missing from the collaboration cohort’s PD experience were models/modelling and, of course, sustained duration. The were no teachers modeling instruction during the workshop nor were there explicit instructional models. Some participants, however, used ideas discussed in the workshop activities as templates to design their rehearsal plan. For instance, one of the discussions led to the cohort discussing how different
emotions could be conveyed on the same melody by adjusting tempo, articulation or dynamics. This activity sparked an idea in Allan and the basis for his rehearsal plan was to guide students in exploring different emotions on the same melody. The activity wasn’t intended to be an instructional model, but Allan easily incorporated it into his rehearsal. This scenario may be benefit PD designers. Discussion prompts can be designed to guide participants to think through and/or construct instructional models.

**Suggestions for Improving PD Through Collaboration**

Researchers in the fields of education (Desimone, 2009; Garet et al., 2001; Guskey & Yoon, 2009) and music education (Koner & Eros, 2018; Stanley et al., 2014; West, 2020) have established that collaboration, especially when long in duration, is a highly effective PD format. In the present study, collaboration proved to have a positive impact on the PD experience of participants. Challenges improving collaboration mostly arise due to the short-term nature of one-day workshop. Choosing an appropriate amount of discussion topics—not too many—could be a solution. It may be beneficial to extend the workshop to a 2- or 3-day experience to allow for more discussion and teacher practice. *Sustained duration* in a workshop is not a possibility. This is again an instance where the music teacher must be diligent and proactive about their PD goals and perhaps, make an intentional plan to incorporate ideas learned in a workshop into their own teaching beyond the workshop. *Models* and *modeling* can easily be included in the form of written vignettes of teacher modeling or instructional models that may serve as group discussion topics.

Many of the present study’s workshop activities would meet the other characteristics of effective PD not yet mentioned and would likely not need adjustment. PD designers, will of course, ensure that the workshop topic is *content-focus*. Including a musical performance
element where the group practices or demonstrates ideas on their primary instrument or even a secondary instrument would be beneficial. This along with opportunities to practice PD content through writing rehearsal plans, curriculum, or leading rehearsals would all provide active learning experiences for participants. Having a workshop facilitator who can guide discussion and offer feedback would provide expert support. Having the expert play be more active during teaching practice (planning, leading rehearsal) would expand the support role into a coaching role. In workshop settings where a larger group is in attendance, having several experts on hand, trained in the given PD topic would ensure that expert support is available even when many small groups form for collaborative work. Lastly, PD designers should include opportunities for reflection through discussion and/or to be completed individually through written material. Taking moments away from the group may help participants process their own thoughts.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

This was an exploratory study examining short-term music teacher PD. Situated in the context of a learning experience, three preservice instrumental music teacher cohorts encountered PD in one of three instructional formats: self-study through reading, self-study through observation, and group collaboration. Future research should replicate the present study with in-service instrumental music teachers to discover the realities and struggles professional teachers might face when learning a new approach through a specific short-term PD learning context. In continuing to discover ways to improve short-term PD formats, it may be beneficial to replicate the three-workshop design using recommendations for each learning context based on findings of the current study. Inceptions of this workshop design may also include a combination of the three learning contexts to maximize the learning experience.
Other topics or music teacher populations may be explored through the short-term PD workshop lens as well. The workshops in this study introduced an unfamiliar approach to teaching beginning band. The workshops may be replicated to explore how participants attempt to apply other teaching approaches, such as teaching jazz improvisation or composition. Areas of interest in music education research may inform choices on PD design as well. For instance, research suggests that music teachers have different PD needs throughout their career (Bauer, 2007; Eros, 2012). Through the three-workshop design used in this study, researchers could examine the PD needs of new, second stage and experienced music teachers. Participants may be assigned to cohorts based on teacher cycle stage and encounter the same PD content. This could be used as a way to gauge the needs of music teachers at different stages in their career cycle.

In the present study, several participants indicated they would need more time and experience to feel comfortable with the PD content. In a short-term format, sustained duration needed to provide ample time to incorporate new strategies on-site is not possible. However, it is possible to extend the one-day workshop to span two or even three days. This would allow more time for participants to encounter PD and practice teacher application.

**Learner Outcomes and Continued Rigor**

Although, exploratory study on short-term PD may provide valuable insight into the needs and experiences of music teachers, we must remind ourselves that PD is not only centered on what the teacher gains but more-so how improvement to teaching practice benefits learners. It is imperative that music-related PD research be extended to include learner outcomes. Guskey and Yoon (2009) urge “those responsible for planning and implementing professional development must learn how to critically assess and evaluate the effectiveness of what they do.” It is essential that we continue to increase rigor (Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Desimone, 2011) in
future research on short-term PD learning contexts by designing and employing a variety of research methods. Extending the study to include learner outcomes will enable application of theoretical or conceptual frameworks, such as the Clarke & Hollingsworth Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002) which may increase the rigor of this type of study and better support the situative theories on which it currently sits.

The three-week time frame used in this study could include points for repeated measure tests, for example. Or the time-frame could be extended to a longer period and include checkpoints or measurements of the in-class impacts of PD beyond the workshop. Music teacher and PD designers should create tools to assess learners, whether through quantitative or qualitative means, before and after short-term music teacher PD takes place. Ongoing student assessment after PD may provide feedback on the extent to which PD is impacting the learners. Music teachers who are seeking PD should be mindful that improved student outcomes are the guiding purpose of teacher PD and, as such, learner outcomes should be prioritized.

**Teachers as Self-Regulated Learners**

In seeking an effective short-term PD format, it is crucial that teachers leave a short-term PD experience with the potential to continue learning and using the approach on their own. Music teachers’ ability to self-regulate their learning related to using a new teaching approach may be a strong indicator of a successful PD encounter. Whether through descriptive or experimental methods, the inclusion of designated checkpoints throughout the workshop would provide windows into examining teacher learning through the three cyclical phases of self-regulation (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1998; Zimmerman, 2000). This may provide a conceptual model through which to examine participants’ thinking as they plan, teach and reflect when incorporating new knowledge into their teaching practice. With more workshop time—two or
three days, rather than one—participants could have more than one opportunity to practice teaching. More time will also provide the repetition needed to more accurately observe development of self-efficacy and other motivational factors that may indicate a successful PD encounter. Since there is little opportunity to examine learner outcomes in a short-term setting, closely examining developments in the teachers’ learning process through self-regulated learning processes may be beneficial.

Closing Vignette

After collecting items from the peer ensemble, I headed back to the workshop classroom to lead the focus group interview at the end of the day. As I got near, I could hear enthusiastic conversation. I re-enter the workshop classroom to find the observation cohort discussing their rehearsals. They were telling each other about their experiences and sharing ideas as they awaited my return. A sense of relief and accomplishment was apparent in their demeanor. After they processed their rehearsal experience, I asked them what they thought of their workshop experience:

**Josh:** I really liked her. The obvious part is that it was very question oriented. And I really enjoyed that... It’s nice to get the students’ input and see what they do.

**Lindsey:** I feel like I’ve gained a lot more watching, like watching somebody actually incorporate all these concepts, because I feel like I read about, not specifically how to use it like this exactly. But I’ve read a lot of concepts and its’s a lot easier for me to apply things to my own teaching that I see somebody do.

**Ian:** I already do a lot of questioning and the modeling side of things. But I don’t exactly do it the same way she did. I feel like hers was, um, gets them engaged better. I think maybe, like, made them actually think instead of, like...prompting a response.

**JP:** Can you see yourself using the Habits of Musicianship approach in the future?

**Josh:** I lean towards wanting to study it more and use it more. But the main selling point was because of how attentive her class was. I think it boils down to getting them genuinely excited about it.
**Lindsey:** I want to learn more about it. I’d like to look at and see how other people apply it.

**Ian:** I like it a lot and I could see myself using it daily. I would also like to learn more about it. Maybe on like the planning side of things.

After closing announcements, the workshop ended. The observation cohort’s enthusiasm and interest in the PD content was apparent. They did not seem aware they lacked understanding of the PD content. They left the workshop inspired by their experience. A valuable experience, yes. But, how often do music teachers leave short-term PD in such a state as the observation cohort did? Inspired by new ideas with a small chance of using them. Even more important, what can be done about it?
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Study Title:
Three Learning Contexts as Paths to Preservice Instrumental Music Teachers’ Score Analysis, Rehearsal Planning, and Instructional Readiness: An Exploratory Study in Professional Development

Purpose of the Study:
The purpose of this collective case study is to explore preservice instrumental music teachers’ experiences as they interact alternatively with reading-, observation-, and collaboration-focused content in short-term professional development (PD) workshops.

Study Procedures:
One week prior to attending a PD workshop, participants will meet individually with the investigator at a pre-workshop session (15-minutes) in which they will take part in a score analysis task and a musical expression task, followed by a brief investigator-led, semi-structured interview. At the conclusion of the pre-workshop session, the investigator will instruct participants to read an introductory text explaining PD content, prior to the upcoming PD workshop. The following week, participants will attend a one-day PD workshop (5 hours with lunch provided) designed to inspire use of an unfamiliar-to-participants approach to teaching beginning band. Each cohort of three participants will experience the PD content through one of three learning contexts—reading, observation or collaboration—during the morning session. The afternoon session will dedicate time for participants to create a plan for a first rehearsal of a beginning band melody as informed by what they learned during the morning session. The PD workshop will conclude with a 10-minute, participant-led rehearsal provided as an opportunity to apply what they have learned to teaching practice. One week following the workshop, participants will compose a post-workshop reflection which will be submitted to the investigator electronically.

The hands-on workshop tasks of score analysis and rehearsal planning will constitute the main features of workshop design and will be audio- and video-recorded. These activities will provide data, as will musical expression tasks, semi-structured interviews, and participants’ notes and reflections, available variously in written and recorded formats. The data set will be transcribed and analyzed for emergent themes relating to instrumental music teacher effectiveness, as evident in participants’ decision-making and attitudes in preparation for rehearsal delivery.

During face-to-face portions of the study, participants and research staff are expected to follow CDC and LSU recommended guidelines and protocols as described below.

Risks/Discomforts: There are no known risks or discomforts.

Benefits: Data collected from this collective case study may inform effective short-term PD design for instrumental music teachers and thereby positively contribute to the advancement of music education research.

Alternative: Not applicable.
Contacts:
Primary Investigator: Jennifer Pulling
Office: CMDA 253, Email: jpulli5@lsu.edu
Phone: 985-966-5706, Office Hours: By appointment

Principal Investigator and Supervising Professor: Dr. James Byo
Office: 102B School of Music Building, Email: jbyo@lsu.edu
Phone: 225-578-3261, Office Hours: By appointment

Performance Sites:
LSU CMDA Room 247 and School of Music Board Room

Number of subjects: \( N = 9; n = 3 \) in each learning context cohort

Subjects: Preservice instrumental music teachers.

Inclusion criteria: Junior or senior level instrumental music education majors who are currently or have previously taken conducting.

Exclusion criteria: Junior or senior level instrumental music education majors with public or private school teaching experience as in-service teachers. Non-music education majors.

Privacy:
Subjects' identities will be kept confidential. Records will be maintained in a locked cabinet and confidentiality will be maintained unless release is legally compelled.

Financial Information:
Each participant will receive $60. Compensation will be disbursed as a check at the end of semester.

Right to Refuse: Participation is voluntary. Participants may change their mind and withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefit to which they may otherwise be entitled.

COVID-19 Safety Measures:
To ensure the health and safety of participants as it pertains to COVID-19, the following CDC and LSU recommended guidelines and protocols will be adhered to during face-to-face portions of the study:

Social distancing. The number of individuals in workshop facilities at one time will be limited to 8 or fewer. Participants and research staff will be instructed to maintain at least 6 feet between individuals in all directions. Appropriate spacing is viable at the two on-campus locations that will be utilized for the study. CMDA Room 247 has a seating capacity of 78 and will contain no more the 8 individuals at a time. The School of Music Howard Board Room has a seating capacity of 20 and will contain no more than 4 individuals at a time.
Wind instrument playing. Distance will exceed 6 feet during instances when participants play wind instruments. There will be approximately 3 hours of performing wind instruments. There will be no singing or flute playing since those activities have been found to be major aerosol particle producers.

General. Desks, counters, and high-touch areas will be sanitized on a regular schedule and hand sanitizer will be available to participants. All participants will be required to wear a face mask, practice social distancing, wash hands frequently, avoid touching your face, eyes, nose or mouth and cough or sneeze into the crook of the arm to limit the spread of COVID-19 while on campus.

Signatures:

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigator. For injury or illness, call your physician, or the Student Health center if you are an LSU student. This study has been approved by the LSU IRB. If I have questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, I can contact Alex Cohen, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, www.lsu.edu/irb. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the researchers’ obligation to provide me with a copy of this consent form if signed by me. If I am unable to do so in person, I will print out, sign, then send an image of my written consent to the researcher via email.

Subject Signature: ________________________________ Date: ______________
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APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Interview 1 (semi-structured)

1. Describe your approach to score analysis when referring to this simple beginning band melody at this point you can include going through your target list and explain your choices.

2. What would you hope to guide your students to accomplish in a first rehearsal of this melody?

3. Explain your approach to teaching musical expression through a rehearsal of this simple beginning band melody.

4. Describe how you would lead a first rehearsal of this piece.

5. What previous experience have you had with the Habits of Musicianship approach to teaching beginning band.

6. Describe your comfort level with teaching musical expression in conjunction with technical skills when rehearsing a beginning band melody.

Interview 2 (semi-structured)

1. Describe your approach to score analysis when referring to this simple beginning band melody at this point you can include going through your target list and explain your choices.

2. What would you hope to guide your students to accomplish in a first rehearsal of this melody?

3. Explain your approach to teaching musical expression through a rehearsal of this simple beginning band melody.

4. Describe how you would lead a first rehearsal of this piece.

5. Has your understanding of the Habits of Musicianship approach to teaching beginning band changed since our last interview? If so, in what ways?

6. Describe your comfort level with teaching musical expression in conjunction with technical skills when rehearsing a beginning band melody.
Pre-Rehearsal Interview (structured)

1. Talk through your rehearsal plan. Tell me what you plan to do.

2. Describe your confidence level with your rehearsal plan.

Focus Group Interview (semi-structured)

1. How do you feel your rehearsal went?

2. If you had the opportunity to do it again, what would you do differently?

3. What do you think about reading, observing, or collaborating with each other as you learned this content?

4. Describe your confidence level using the Habits of Musicianship approach in future teaching. To what degree can you envision yourself using this approach in the future?
APPENDIX D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

Reading Cohort

Prior to the Workshop Activities (Part 6), participants in the Reading cohort was given the following verbal instructions from the investigator:

“In this session, you are expected to complete 3 sessions of silent reading. The reading materials are intended to explain and/or inform you about the Habits approach to teaching beginning instrumental music. As you read, please highlight, underline and or take notes on any topics or concepts that resonate with you. This is an untimed reading session. It should take you approximately 15-20 minutes to complete the reading. If you need to be excused, you may quietly leave the room at any point. After the reading, you will be instructed to think reflectively on the content you encountered and provide a written reflection accessed via a Qualtrics link on your electronic device.”

Observation Cohort

Prior to the Workshop Activities (Part 6), participants in the Observation cohort was given the following verbal instructions from the investigator:

“In this session, you are expected to complete 3 sessions of video observations. The introductory video will feature a young musician describing the story he tells while playing a piece of music. This video segment provides the ideal student outcome in the Habits approach. There will be five subsequent video excerpts all featuring an experienced, successful middle band director teaching and leading rehearsal of various groups of her students. Her teaching is informed by the Habits approach and she is a Habits clinician. She has been teaching middle school band for 16 years and her bands have consistently superior ratings among other accolades. As you observe, please highlight, underline and or take notes on any topics or concepts that resonate with you. There will be two video excerpts in each observation session. Each observation session will last approximately 20 minutes. Following each session, you will be instructed to think reflectively on the content you observed, refer to your notes, and provide a written reflection accessed via a Qualtrics link on your electronic device.”

Collaboration Cohort

Prior to the group specific activities (Part 6), participants in the Collaboration cohort was given the following verbal instructions from the investigator:

“In this session, you are expected to complete 3 segments of group collaboration. You should have your assembled primary instrument with you for this session. At the start of
each segment, I will introduce discussion prompts intended to direct group discussion and rehearsal of selected five-part unison music scores. I will act as a facilitator as you all work together as a group to brainstorm, collaborate, and discuss the presented topics. Along with your prior knowledge and experience, you will apply these concepts to rehearsal of the music score. Work collectively as a group preparing to perform these pieces as well as work collaboratively on discussing ideas on how to teach the pieces in relation to the discussion topics. The topics are intended to explain and/or inform you about the Habits approach to teaching beginning instrumental music. As you work, please take notes, mentally or written, of any topics or concepts that resonate with you. At the end of the session, you may jot down notes that you may not have been able to write out during the activity. Each activity segment will last approximately 20 minutes. After the activity, you will be instructed to think reflectively on the content you encountered, refer to notes and provide a written reflection accessed via a Qualtrics link on your electronic device.”
APPENDIX E. INSTRUCTIONS FOR WRITTEN REFLECTIONS

Workshop Activities Reflective Response Instructions
Take time to think reflectively and consider your personal response regarding the content you have encountered. As you process what you learned, identify any previous experience you have with this topic. Recognize and clarify the important connections between what you already know and what you are learning. Then complete the following steps:

a. Refer to any notes that you made. Consider why these points resonate with you.

b. Explore what you are learning from this material. Use this as an opportunity to make meaning out of you are learning.

c. Once you have processed your thoughts, document your response to the information you have encountered through writing a reflection.

d. Exhibit depth in your written reflection. Do not provide a summary.

e. There are no right or wrong answers or required length.

f. You will have approximately 10 minutes to write your reflection.

Post Workshop Reflection Instructions

1. What is your first name?

2. Which teacher cohort were you in, reading, observation or collaboration?

3. Think reflectively about your PD experience and your encounter with the Habits of Musicianship Approach to Teaching Beginning Band workshop content. Carefully compose a written reflection exploring what you learned from the PD workshop you attended. Freely share what comes to mind when you think back to the PD experience. Beyond your general reflection, be sure to include your responses to the following questions:

   (a) What experiences during the PD stand out as impactful on you as an instrumental music teacher?

   (b) What knowledge gained during the PD workshop has likely influenced how you will teach beginning band (or any type of beginning musician) in the future? Explain.
(c) In what ways was the delivery of the PD content (reading, observation, collaboration) an effective means of communicating the PD content? In what was it not?

This should be an essay-style response as opposed to a brief summary. There is no required length.

4. Briefly describe your understanding of the Habits of Musicianship Approach to Teaching Beginning Band.

5. Briefly describe your confidence level in using the Habits approach as part of your teaching in the future.

6. What is your general attitude toward using the Habits approach in the future?

7. Comments or questions. This is optional. If you have any comments or questions that have not already been addressed regarding the study or workshop experience, feel free to share them here.
APPENDIX F. MUSICAL EXPRESSION TASK EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

Pulling Dissertation Musical Expression Tasks

Your role as evaluator is to provide a brief description of each audio recorded performance based on the criteria listed below. This is a qualitative study so there will be no scores or ratings of the performance. Simply describe how each criterion manifests in the performance. If a specific criterion is not present, indicate that in your description. Music scores for the performed melodies are attached for you to view. Notice that the music score is void of dynamic, articulation and tempo markings. The performers add these elements based on their interpretation of the work.

Musical Expression Task performance criterion:
- Describe tempo choice and tempo variations if present.
- Describe the intensity and dynamic contrast.
- Describe rate of vibrato if present and musical effect of vibrato.
- Describe the timbre.
- Describe the articulation.
- General comments on the general mood or character of the performance.
  Include description overall musical effect here.

Open the attached file titled Musical Expression Evaluation. Input your descriptive evaluations for each performance into this file, label as “Last name_eval” and send to me via email. Make sure you have good quality headphones or speakers to use when listening to these performances to ensure that speaker quality does not hinder your analysis of the performer’s tone. Let me know if you need quality speakers or headphones. I will be happy to lend you some. You may access the google drive link (below) containing the recordings. These are presented as video files, but you will only hear audio. You will also see an onscreen text indicating which participant is performing and the title of the melody. Be aware that each participant has been given a pseudonym to maintain confidentiality.

Google link for performance recordings:
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1VYFmH553_rHQ_vyijTv6OA0WeYN6kdPL?usp=sharing

On the following page is an excerpt from my prospectus describing the musical expression task. It may provide understanding on how your evaluation fits into this component of my study. Let me know if you would like further information.

Thank you so much for your assistance!

Jennifer
aka JP
Musical Expression Task Performance Evaluation

Participant Name:
Instrument:
Title of Melody:
Evaluator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Descriptive Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe tempo choice and tempo variations if present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the intensity and dynamic contrast.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the timbre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe rate of vibrato if present and musical effect of vibrato.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the style and articulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments on the mood or character of the performance. Include description of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall musical effect here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G. THREE COHORT WORKSHOP VIGNETTES

Vignette 1: Collaboration Cohort Workshop

Sarah, Marsha and Allan are engaged in discussion about guiding beginning band students to develop the concept of musical communication as they improve their technical skills. They are sitting in a circle facing one another with their primary instrument in hand. They have an assorted collection of simple melodies on their music stands that accompany discussion prompts posed by the workshop facilitator (investigator). They exhibit a positive and upbeat rapport with one another as they discuss the topic:

Sarah: I think musical communication is like, digging into the music and seeing what lines, like, feed off of each other and kind of like, go back and forth creating a story with it, something like that. Just rather than just looking at it and saying, “Okay, these are just two notes I’m doing back and forth between G and A.” That’s just two things, but thinking about, okay, how can this convey something to me? How can this, how can I apply it to my personal life? Something like that just kind of getting ideas flowing and, like, the creativity.

Allan: Yeah, I agree with that. I think going off of that a lot of times, I think music is there’s a, like, personal component. And then also, it’s like, pretty much a form of entertainment for, like, most uses of music. So, to also, like, convey your musical ideas to an audience, whether it be like one person or you know, a whole group, but like, you should be able to let them know what you’re trying to say. With the music, even if it’s one note. You can do things with it…I feel like the technical skills part won’t be too difficult…So, I thought the technique would just kind of come.”

Marsha: Yeah, I agree. I think you can teach musical expression and the technique will come but you can’t teach technique and the musical expression will come.

They continue to engage in a vibrant discussion about the topic. Later, the facilitator encourages them to consider “what do we want the listener to get when we are communicating something with two notes?” She directs the cohort to apply their discussion as they rehearse Give It Up for Two Notes (pictured below), a simple melody using two notes.

Marsha: I feel like it’s more challenging to consider, like, musical expression with, like, beginner band pieces, because, like, I can think about it with, like, our level but it’s really hard to think what do I want to convey with these students.
Facilitator: What if this was not a beginning piece, just a flute part and Dr. Schultz (Marsha’s flute professor) said, ‘Marsha, this is a solo I want you to play…and just play it as beautifully as possible.’ Would that change a little bit of how you look at the piece?

Allan: Yes, definitely, I’ve immediately started thinking bigger phrases…

With a new outlook on the melody, the cohort continue to discuss and rehearse the melody. After the activity, the cohort wrote a reflective response. Marsha shared her realization that music she considers ‘easy’ as a college level musician can still be taught and learned with musical expression. Sarah wrote that she “realized” she sets low expectations for younger students due to her “preconceived notion that younger students will struggle with things such as expression and musicality.” Allan thought the discussion made him “think about how much music can be made with something as simple as a beginning band eight- or even four-bar melody.”

Score for melody discussed in Vignette 1: *Give It Up for Two Notes!* (Byo)
Vignette 2: Observation Cohort Workshop

Josh, Ian and Lindsey are watching a video in progress. Nathan Chan is performing The Swan by Camille Saint-Saëns. The music continues in the background as Nathan, age 11, describes what he thinks the music is about. Josh and Lindsey take notes as they observe. Ian simply watches.

Nathan: I think Saint-Saëns was trying to put a whole bunch of feelings together. Sad and happy at the same time. In some parts, the swan is doing something not so sad, like gliding through the water. Then all of a sudden, it’s starting to cry….”

The participants reflect through written responses. Ian, a senior who is currently student teaching writes, “I noticed how convinced he was of the decisions he had made…He seemed convinced that his decisions were the only way, perhaps because he came up with them…”

Time moves forward. Participants are now watching a teacher lead her 7th grade intermediate woodwinds in rehearsal on a syncopated rhythm:

Teacher counts off. Students play.
Teacher: Is this a happy chord or an angry and upset chord?
Students: Angry, upset.
Teacher: Play it and hold it so you can hear the resonance and the pitch. Ready and go!
Students play.
Teacher: What do we need to do better?
Student 1: Not play extra notes.
Teacher: Ok, not play extra notes.
Students play.
Teacher: What else can we do better?
Student 2: Blend?
Students play.
Teacher: You stopped on time. I think you blended a little bit better. What else do you need to do?
Student 3: I don’t think we’re, uh, like, it doesn’t have its own like, um, it doesn’t have the accents.
Teacher: Yea, it doesn’t have the accents. The note shape has kind of defaulted back to this #1 shape where it is all connected (she points to note shape diagrams on the board). And I bet if I was sitting in like the second row of the balcony, like, all the way back there, I couldn’t tell that you were playing different notes. I would just hear, “aaaaaahhhh.” I can’t hear “doo, doo, doo.” Can you play with more space between the notes?
In her reflective response, Lindsey, a junior, notices the teacher “incorporates a lot of questioning into her teaching” covering rhythm, musical mood, tuning and encouraging student investment. She reasons that because the teacher asks the students “what they can do better after they finish playing together” she guides them to “evaluate their [own] playing.” Through watching the teacher, Josh, a senior, discovers a way he can guide peer feedback with students by asking “If someone was having this issue, what would you tell them to do to fix it?” He finds the way the teacher worded this question helpful because he knows “kids can be sensitive” and this approach is less personally critical to other students.

The observing cohort participants noticed a student-centered learning approach in the videos as well as the intentional questioning style of the teacher among other things. In their afternoon workshop tasks, they attempt to incorporate selected aspects of what they saw into their own rehearsal plans of a simple melody.

**Vignette 3: Reading Cohort Workshop**

During the workshop activities, Brian quietly reads an article about score study aimed at the student’s role in expressive performance. He is a senior and soon to be a student teacher. He is “not a fan of reading” but he does like how even one sentence may spark “an idea in your head that shapes your thinking.” In a written response, he reflects on the reading: “the teacher should work with students to not only develop an understanding of these concepts within the music [score]…but also develop their understanding of their role executing what’s on the page.” He later extends this thinking as he applies it to his rehearsal planning in the afternoon.

Across from Brian sits Jason, a junior who has started his first semester of conducting. Jason “hates reading sometimes.” He makes himself do it or at least tries to. While reading, he sits quietly with ear buds in, listening to music. He reads about keeping musical communication
at the forefront of the learning process. Based on the reading, he considers that when students practice with the intention of communicating something, “their experimentation becomes more about refinement and expressive reflection rather than correct notes and rhythm.” In his afternoon workshop tasks, he embraces this concept as he plans a rehearsal on a simple melody.

Behind Brian and Jason sits Maria, a senior who has “always been pretty big into reading.” She sips coffee as she annotates and takes notes while reading about why children enroll in beginning band. She shares that what resonates with her the most is “students decide to start learning an instrument because they are inspired to play music.” She reasons that “they do not necessarily want to learn how to play scales or count rhythms correctly…fundamentals are important” but their purpose is to “beautifully convey a musical idea.” In the afternoon, she thinks through how she might guide students to consider “mood” or “colors” they want to convey through the melody and the “physical changes” they will execute to make their ideas come to life.
APPENDIX H. INVITATION FOR POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS

Invitation

Jennifer L. Pulling <pull5@lsu.edu>
Wed 9/9/2020 2:10 PM

Hello [Name],

I hope you are doing well and that the semester has started out smoothly for you. I am writing because I think you are a good fit for a study I will be doing in the coming weeks. See below.

I would like to invite you to participate in a music education research study that will serve as the data collection portion of my dissertation work. If you agree to participate, you will attend a professional development workshop centered on the Habits of Musicianship (Habits) approach to teaching beginning band, a concept authored by Robert Duke of UT Austin and James Byo of LSU. If you choose to participate, a brief overview of your role follows:

The Habits workshop will take place at LSU on a Saturday or Sunday (Fall 2020), depending on when participants are available. It includes a morning and afternoon session with lunch provided. Within the workshop, you will learn about Habits through one of three contexts: reading Habits material, observing video excerpts of a teacher leading beginning band rehearsals, or group collaboration with peers in your assigned teacher cohort. Afterwards, you will write a rehearsal plan for a simple, unison, five-part beginning band melody and lead a brief (10 minute) rehearsal based on your plan. One week prior to the workshop, you will meet with me (online or in person) for 15 minutes to perform two teacher tasks and discuss teaching. One week after the workshop, you will fill out an online questionnaire as a reflection. LSU safety measures regarding COVID-19 will be in place throughout the study.

The workshop day, itself, does take up some of your time. Time is valuable and so are you. To compensate for your time, you will receive a payment of $60.00 at the end of the semester. This is a unique opportunity to contribute to music education research and deepen your understanding of music teaching and learning.

If you are interested and/or have any questions, feel free to reply to this email. Let me know by September 18th if you are interested so that I may send you a consent form.

Thank you for considering!

Jennifer Pulling
PhD Candidate
Graduate Teaching Assistant
LSU Music Education
LSU School of Music Operations
APPENDIX I. THINKING OF YOU MAKES ME SMILE (MUSIC SCORE)
APPENDIX J. LITTLE BIRD (MUSIC SCORE)

Little Bird

Gracefully

Byo

Flute
Clarinet in Bb
Alto Saxophone
Trumpet in Bb
Trombone
Euphonium
### APPENDIX K. EXCERPT FROM CROSS CASE ANALYSIS CHART

#### Similarities and Differences Across Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-All prioritize tech before PD</td>
<td>-All prioritize tech before PD</td>
<td>-All prioritize tech before PD</td>
<td>Shift in Thinking over the course of the PD experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Tech to expression</td>
<td>-Slight change toward expression</td>
<td>-Tech to expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-All initial prioritize technical elements prior and expressive elements after</td>
<td>-Most of the observing participants prioritized technical elements prior to PD and little change in prioritization after PD.</td>
<td>-All initial prioritize technical elements prior and expressive elements after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-All secondary focus on expressive elements before PD</td>
<td>-Most treat expressive decisions as a secondary concern prior to PD</td>
<td>-All secondary focus on expressive elements before PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Low learner expectations to high</td>
<td>-Low learner expectations -- slight change</td>
<td>-Low learner expectations to high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-DI before, SE after</td>
<td>-DI before, SE after some change noticeable</td>
<td>-DI before, SE after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Noticeable shift in thinking</td>
<td>-Not as much shift in thinking compared to Reading and Collaborating</td>
<td>-Noticeable shift in thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Communication</td>
<td>Musical Expression</td>
<td>Musical Communication</td>
<td>Instructional Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-All engage students in interpretation/musical communication as goal</td>
<td>-All engage students in musical expression as goal. Little attention to musical communication.</td>
<td>-All musical communication guided rehearsal plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-All engage students after PD in multiple ways: discussion, student choice, peer feedback</td>
<td>-All engage students at least slightly more after PD mostly through teacher questioning</td>
<td>-All engage students after PD in multiple ways: discussion, student choice, peer feedback</td>
<td>Engaging Learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX L. EXAMPLE OF THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Three Learning Contexts: Thematic Analysis

CODES | CATEGORY | THEME with subthemes
---|---|---
Focus on expressive elements | Planning for Instruction | Instructional Goals
Focus on technique needed for expressive performance | | Musical Communication
Focus on technical elements | | Musical Expression
Class Discussion | Planning for Instruction | Engaging Learners
Student Input | | |
Peer Feedback | | |
Teacher Questioning | | |
Student-led Decisions | | |
Teacher Modeling | | |
Peer Modeling | | |
Direct instruction | | |
Teacher-led Decisions | | |

Three Learning Contexts: Thematic Analysis

CODES | CATEGORY | THEME
---|---|---
Treating beginners as musicians | PCK | PCK
Developing independent musicianship | | |
Balancing expression + tech | | |
Confidence | Self-Expressed Beliefs | Confidence Self-Efficacy
Comfortable | | |
Future interest | | |
Needing more time | | |
Negative attitude to context | | |
Positive attitude to context | | |
Finding it helpful | Self-Expressed Beliefs | |
Want to see more models | | |
Can re-read as needed | | |
Getting ideas from others | | |
APPENDIX M. EXCERPTS FROM BRIAN (READING) INDIVIDUAL CASE ANALYSIS

Example of First Cycle Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Task 1 Interview Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant: Brian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Cohort: Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator: Jennifer Pulling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Date Time: October 25, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>JP 00:38</strong></th>
<th>Describe your approach to score analysis when referring to this simple beginning band melody at this point you can include going through your target list and explain your choices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brian 07:51</strong></td>
<td>The first thing I did was audiating the melody as I was going through just went from beginning to end real quick to get an idea of what was going on. And then look for any, like anything within the score itself that looks different for instance, a second page in, I don't have measure numbers, but it goes to a section that's just straight quarter notes, a lot of repeated notes, whatever so I was like, that's a section to do something different. Um, so as my beginning approach from there, I decided what I wanted to do different so beginning it says tenderly, so I was like, Alright, so this should be legato connected, like the quarter note section, I thought that would be a nice place to add a little bit of detachment to the notes or the space in between, sort of like the legato staccato marking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JP 08:36</strong></td>
<td>When you say the quarter notes section, are you talking about those repeated notes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- AUDIATING MELODY
  - Looking for anything that looks different.
  - Looking at rhythms. RHYTHM
  - Noticing repeated notes. REPEATED NOTES

- Doing something different.
  - Planning to do something different.
  - Noting that is says "tenderly."

- CHARACTER OR MOOD
  - Deciding on detached articulation style.
  - STYLE and ARTICULATION

- TEACHER CENTERED DECISIONS
Example of Second Cycle Coding

Teacher Task 2 Interview Transcript: Brian

Participant: Brian  
Teacher Cohort: Reading  
Investigator: Jennifer Pulling  
Interview Date Time: October 25, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JP 00:05</th>
<th>Topic 1: Approach to score analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe your approach to score analysis when referring to the simple beginning band melody, what do you hope to guide your students to accomplish?</td>
<td>Previewing melody looking for areas that are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brian 03:09</strong></td>
<td>Thinking the two big sections at end stand out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So, I started by just reading through the melody or creating it to get an idea of what was going on. And the two big sections that stood out to me were the very end because it does not resolve for the time. And then measure nine we've come into sort of a new theme for the first time with these slurred 8th notes and then repeat?? on the matter. So, I thought both of those were areas where we could gain interest. Um, so I thought okay, Little Bird is name of the piece, I'm probably going to work with students to figure out what is that little new section at nine has to do with little bird I think like, flittering in the wings or thing and then toward the end, why doesn't it resolve to the tiger? What's the story of this little bird? What's happening? I don't know. That no one else? Um,</td>
<td>Focus on expressing musical ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP 04:17</td>
<td>Connecting 'little bird' with musical ideas in the melody through class discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher questioning and class discussion to develop the musical story.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on communicating through expressive elements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Reflections

Written reflective response to Group Activity 1
I can certainly see the cognitive background of Dr. Duke in the article, with lots of focus on how the mind makes sense of music learning. I agree that learning music can be like learning a language in that there are patterns and structures that we pick up on and use regularly, as well as the fact that there is much validity in picking up musical expression from observing others and trying to replicate, just as we learn all fundamental things before school. The most important factor, however, is that a motivation must be present in order for the student to want to think deeply on their playing. Creating environments that give them meaningful and enjoyable musical experiences early on is the best way to create that motivation, as a lack of early playing has been seen to be one of the leading causes of attrition in U.S. music education. Essentially, it all ties back the opening line of the chapter, that the best context to learn music is the act like a musician.

Agreeing that learning music can be like learning a language.

Learning music like learning language

How we learn

Picking up musical expression from observing others and trying to replicate it is a valid point.

Musical expression model is valid

Finding that the most important factor is that motivation must be present for the student to want to think deeply on their playing.

Student motivation.

Deep learning.
Creating environments that give them meaningful and enjoyable musical experiences early on is best way to create that motivation.

Learning environment
Thinking it all ties back to the best context to learn music is to act like a musician.

Acting like a musician.

TREATING BEGINNERS LIKE MUSICIANS

Written reflective response to Group Activity 2
It seems that Dr. Byre's goal with this method is that students also be able to utilize the info we gain through score study: the details of chords,

Thinking that the goal is for students to use the info we gain through score study.

STUDENT USE SCORE STUDY INFO
Reading Cohort Rehearsal Plan: Brian

November 1, 2020

Form of Original Rehearsal Plan – handwritten located in participant folder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehearsal Plan</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- play beginning to end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- discuss &quot;gracefully&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- discuss &quot;Little Bird&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- make story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- m. 1 → fluttering wings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- m. 19 → bird call? flying away?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- g minor → Bb major – why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- bird learning to fly, doesn’t succeed at first but eventually gets it and flies into the distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- decide on musical decisions and apply them to the piece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- by section, then play as a whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting with a run-through, RUN-THROUGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing &quot;gracefully.&quot; MOOD and CHARACTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT INPUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a story out of the music based on the title “Little Bird.” MUSICAL STORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling attention to tonal center and its relation to the story. SCORE ANALYSIS FACTOR CONNECT TO STORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing student input on musical decisions. STUDENT INPUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT CENTERED DECISIONS Applying decisions to the piece.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigator notes:

12/23 - Most of the participant’s plan reflects student-centered learning focused on the mood and story of the music. He briefly directs attention to the tonal center and how that may relate to the musical story.

Reading Cohort Pre-Rehearsal: Brian Briefing Transcription

November 1, 2020

Brian 00:00

Doing whole-part-whole. WHOLE-PART-WHOLE Playing through the whole thing first. RUN THROUGH Starting a discussion about musicality. DISCUSSION, STUDENT CENTERED Looking at the word ‘gracefully.’

CHARACTER INDICATOR Getting into a bigger discussion surrounding the little bird and creating a story for this piece. MUSICAL STORY

STUDENT INPUT Guiding them through my interpretation. TEACHER CENTERED DECISIONS Asking how beginning chord and end chord fit into the story. SCORE ANALYSIS

STUDENT ROLE IN EXPRESSIVE PERFORMANCE Going into the eighth note section. Looking at how it fits into the story.

Discussing musical decisions to be applied to convey the story. DISCUSSION
Excerpt from Focus Group Interview

**JP 02:04**
What did they say about tempo?

**Brian 02:06**
We thought that we thought that speeding up in this piece would sound hectic, like the bird was not doing too good of a job. And so, we said, okay, so like right here, these eighth notes we can like start fast then like slow down, like settle into like, Alright, birds learning how to fly. Yeah, like toward the end going into this since there is like, slowing down for like, just a nice, calming, peaceful feeling. So, we were like let's just try it out. And I really exaggerated it. On the last measure.

**JP 02:41**
Well, it sounds like you did a good job of sort of improvising, even though you had five more minutes, and you continued on with sort of a student-centered idea that still revolved around the whole idea, concept of building a story around this piece. So good thinking on your feet there. Maria?

**Maria 03:01**
I think mine went pretty well, um, it actually ended up working out perfectly in terms of time. I mean, my idea was to make it very, like student based, I didn't really I guess, like, structure it too much. I think I could have asked a better opening question. Because I kind of went in there with like, 'what musical thing do you think you could do to take,' like, it was just a very broad question at first. But, um, but I think it ended up going well, because was going like section by section over musical ideas and everything and then like in terms of time it ended up working out.

**Connecting tempo changes to action of bird learning to fly.**

**Connecting tempo changes to action of bird learning to fly.**

**Feeling like it worked out perfectly in terms of time. GOOD ON TIME**
Deciding not to structure the student-based learning too much. **Open-ended with student-centered learning aspects.**
Thinking I could have asked a better opening question. **Thinking the opening question was broad.**

**Going section by section over musical ideas.**
**Jason Post Workshop Reflection. Brian did not complete a Post Workshop Reflection.**

**Reading Cohort Post Workshop Reflection: Jason**

**October 17, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compose a written reflection</th>
<th>Notes/Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During my experience with the PD workshop, I was able to reevaluate my perspective on the value of reading as a form of learning. Usually, I would never willingly choose to read for more than a few hours. However, after reading some of the articles, I found it engaging and insightful to read some of these passages. I learned to be open to new approaches to teaching music, rather than teaching only with what I’m comfortable. Teaching music can in conjunction with new musical skills should not be seen as a new concept. I found that reading to be especially resourceful because I was able to reread passages and make connections across the entire article. I also felt like I was able to trust the article because it was in black and white and in front of me. However, I struggled most with applying it to my teaching. I was completely on my own when it came to how I would approach applying these concepts, rather than seeing how others would do it. It felt a little uncomfortable and insecure when teaching because I wasn’t entirely sure I was applying it the correct way.</td>
<td>Reevaluate value of reading as a form of learning. Found it engaging and insightful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of Habits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historically, beginning band is taught in a way that prioritizes fundamental skills and technique over musicality. As a result of this, students may have trouble making musical connections and</td>
<td>Focus on independent musicianship. Lacking when technique and expression are separated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading cohort analysis CODES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Brian</th>
<th>Jason</th>
<th>Maria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to score analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Focus on technical elements. Focus on technique needed to perform expressive elements.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Focus on technical elements. Focus on expressive elements. Engage student in talk focused on expression, musical goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Focus on musical communication through expressive elements. Focus on engaging students to collectively interpret the melody.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Focus on engaging students to collectively interpret a musical story guided by expressive elements in the melody.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Rehearsal goals** | | | |
| 1. | Focus on technique needed to perform expressive elements. | 1. | Setting low student expectations. Focused on technical elements. | 1. | Focus on musical expression. Focus on technique needed to perform expressive elements. |
Reading - Individual case description - Brian

Pre-Workshop

Interview 1

During his approach to score analysis response, Brian previews the melody via audiation and determines the form/structure of the melody. He looks for anything different such as repeated material or repeated notes. In this respect, he focuses on technical aspects in the score. He then shifts his attention to expressive elements; he decides on legato style based on character indicator “tenderly.” He continues to make decisions on expressive elements related mainly to style and articulation and how, when, and where to perform them. Brian wants to differentiate between legato and detached style. At the end of his score analysis talk through, he focuses on engaging students in discussion about “style words” and connecting style to the title. His decision-making is focused on what is written on the score with limited attention to interpretation by connecting the title to the character of the melody.

Brian’s rehearsal goals focus on expressive elements via introducing style to the students. He is focused on technical skills needed to perform expressive elements that he has chosen based on his score analysis. He emphasizes that his primary focus would be legato articulation and getting the students to perform it and understand it. His decisions-making is focused on technique needed to perform expressive elements.

Expressive Performance

His performance explanation displays his focus on adding dynamics in relation to phrasing such that it results in swells following the linear contour of the melodic line. His focus is on decisions which influence expressive quality of the performance. These decisions focus on technical aspects needed to perform expressive elements.

His approach to teaching musical expression using this melody mainly revolves around him modeling the melody with his voice. He acknowledges that he may prepare to model on secondary instruments if he has a student struggling on their instrument. He rationalizes that modeling is important so that student may construct a sound concept away from the instrument that they can think about when they bring the instrument to themselves to perform. He approaches teaching musical expression through providing an expressive model of the melody for students to replicate. There is no indication of what objectives he has for the students other than copying his model.

In a first rehearsal of the melody, Brian focuses decisions on technical aspects of expressive elements, primarily articulation and style. He plans to use a vocal model of the melody and makes decisions on rehearsal design and order. (whole-part-whole). He will lead the group in a run through first then look at each section at a time. He plans to mark articulation ahead of time. Most of his decisions reflect a focus on technical aspects needed to perform expressive elements. At the end, he plans to engage students via peer feedback and discussion on expressive elements (style + phrasing) without a goal beyond what is notated on the page. Brian initially focuses on functional features of the rehearsal (design/order), then decisions on articulation and he plans to write in articulation markings for students ahead of time based on his interpretation. He decides to engage students in discussion and peer feedback bout style and phrasing. His primary goal when engaging the students is to get them thinking about the technique needed to perform expressive elements.

Brian experienced Habits teaching as a beginning band student. He appreciates the design of the Habits book. He says that teaching the exercises outside of reading music is on the teacher. Brian’s middle school teacher exposed her students to the Habits approach and the Habits book. Brian’s recollected of
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