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The purpose of this study was to compare student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in secondary band rehearsals in Florida schools. Twenty-one schools participated with ensemble teachers ($N = 34$) and their students ($N = 749$). Participants were surveyed collecting information for the variables of teacher expectations, teacher behaviors, teacher expectation congruency, teacher behavior congruency, and student rehearsal conduct. Demographic information was also collected for teachers, students, and schools. Descriptive analyses reveal that teachers and students had similar mean scores, however teachers consistently had higher mean scores for teacher expectations and teacher behaviors. MANOVA results suggest that teachers and students have different interpretations of teacher expectations. Regression results found that teacher expectations congruency, teacher gender, and teacher experience level were predictors of student rehearsal conduct. The majority of participating teachers claimed that student misbehavior was not a problem they were consistently addressing. When asked for reasons why they feel students misbehave, the largest response placed fault with the students, followed by performance-related, family-related, and the least accountable was teacher-related.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Classroom management has been a constant problem for teachers of all subjects (Buck, 1992; Marzano, 2003). Numerous studies have been conducted with general education teachers related to classroom management, but very few with secondary instrumental music classrooms. The secondary instrumental music classroom is different than the general classroom, and typical classroom management strategies of teachers may need to be altered to adjust to this unique classroom setting (Bauer, 2001; Brand, 1976; Buck, 1992; Graulty 2010). General education classrooms in secondary schools typically contain approximately 30 students per class, with student desks in rows facing the front, and the teacher’s desk in a location so that she can monitor the classroom. Although not all secondary general education classes are set up this way (woodshop, physical education, etc.), secondary instrumental music classrooms have unique aspects that are not found in other classes. Secondary band classrooms differ in many ways: traditional rehearsal procedures, physical environment, an inclusive teacher role, sound-producing goals, a group-learning environment, multi-level instruction, multi-age instruction, multi-instrument instruction, and a final product that is often performed for the public. Therefore, secondary instrumental music teachers need classroom management strategies that are customized to their unique situations in an effort to assist in effective teaching and learning.

There are several qualities that characterize an effective teacher. According to Wong & Wong (2009) in The First Days of School, an effective teacher has positive expectations for student success, can design lessons for student mastery, and is an
extremely good classroom manager. Administrators initially look at how teachers manage the classroom as an indicator of student learning (Doerksen, 2006). Classroom management techniques may also indicate the success level of the teacher (Brand, 1976; Marzano, 2003). Student learning is difficult to monitor or accomplish when classrooms are poorly managed. The topic of classroom management is a component agreed by most education professionals that contribute to teacher effectiveness (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993 as cited in Marzano, 2003; Wong & Wong, 2009).

For students to clearly understand the rehearsal conduct expectations of secondary instrumental music teachers, behavior expectations must be clearly communicated and interpreted, all in an effort to prepare an ideal learning environment (Buck, 1992; Emmer, Evertson, Sanford, Clements, & Worsham, 1984, as cited in Marzano 2003). Behavior expectations could include daily procedures for entering the music room, setting up for rehearsal, and how to behave during rehearsal. Are secondary instrumental music teachers communicating their behavioral expectations to the students? One goal of this study was to assess the congruency of teacher communication and student perception.

**Traditional Practices of Secondary Instrumental Music Classes**

Before continuing discussion on classroom management, it is important to operationally define traditional practices of secondary instrumental music teachers. The word *tradition*, found in Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary, is defined as “the handing down of information, beliefs, and customs by word of mouth or by example from one generation to another without written instruction” (www.Merriam-webster.com, February 24, 2011). In secondary instrumental music classrooms, traditions of rehearsing music for
performance are derived from the practices of early American music teachers (Mark & Gary, 2008). Instrumental music rehearsals are similar to the practices of early music teachers; basic music concepts are taught during class, and the goal of instruction is to prepare a performance.

Current practices of American instrumental music teachers continue to follow the traditions of the performance-based goals, modeling their practices after professional bands and orchestras throughout history. The seating arrangement and instrumentation used by John Philip Sousa band is the standard seating arrangement for modern instrumental music classrooms (Mark & Gary, 2008). Additionally, a great deal of repertoire performed in the early twentieth century is still played in modern instrumental music courses (Williamson, 2008).

The practice of the director standing on the podium in front of the ensemble dates back to Beethoven’s era (Layton, 1995), and is still maintained. Instrumental music teachers conduct the ensemble from the podium, modeling the practices of professional band and orchestra leaders. This is evident in the numerous books and journal articles that focus on rehearsal tips for directors by directors (Bauer, 2001; Graulty, 2010; Williamson, 2008).

There are several books, journals, and articles that imply that secondary instrumental music classrooms are performance-based with the majority of time spent on learning repertoire (Bauer, 2001; Graulty, 2010; Williamson, 2008). For the purpose of this study, traditional secondary instrumental rehearsals will be operationally defined as the common secondary band or orchestra rehearsal practices of the teacher, directing
the band from the podium, and the rehearsal being based around the music selected by the director.

Secondary Instrumental Music Classroom

The instrumental music classroom differs from the general education setting in several ways. First, the teacher is completely immersed in the music rehearsal as a part of the ensemble (Brand, 1990; Merrion, 1990). Traditional concert band practices involve the music teacher conducting and performing with the ensemble. Students’ learning outcomes, which actively include the teacher, are presented as a performance for the public to listen and critique (Gordon, 2001). The inclusive teacher role gives the teacher similar responsibilities as the students for performance, perhaps changing students’ perceptions of teacher authority. A mishap in authority perception can possibly lead to student misbehaviors.

Student enrollment can be much larger in the secondary instrumental music classroom than the general education classroom (Bauer, 2001; Brand, 1976). Band and orchestra courses allow school administrators to create classes with large numbers of students for the music teacher to instruct. Many times these music classes can have 70 students or more. The additional students create a larger barrier, making the task of communicating behavioral expectations more challenging.

The musical repertoire used in secondary instrumental music classrooms can contribute to classroom management problems. Traditional large ensemble music does not have all the students playing their instruments all at the same time. Many pieces contain sections with limited instrumentation, which causes students to be idle for periods
of time. Periods of student idleness can create classroom management challenges for the music teacher. Even though students should be attentive when they are not playing, students can engage in off-task behaviors when they are not actively participating (Bauer, 2001; Brendall, 1996; Buck, 1992; Forsythe, 1977; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Price, 1983; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). The different learning environment of the band class is a special situation that secondary instrumental music teachers must learn how to manage.

Ensemble seating arrangements based on instrumentation also affects classroom management practices for secondary instrumental music teachers. Typically, secondary instrumental music classrooms have chairs without desks and some students remain standing (Bauer, 2001). A common behavioral management technique that general education teachers use is moving the problem student closer to the teacher. However in an instrumental music classroom, the teacher has few options in moving a student because of the need to group similar instruments near each other. There might be some flexibility within a section of similar instruments, but secondary instrumental classrooms have fairly standard seating arrangements that are not readily adjustable for behavior management.

Likewise, using teacher proximity to control behavior can be limited in a secondary instrumental classroom. Typically, the instrumental music teacher spends large portions of time directing the ensemble from the front of the classroom. Recalling that the director is part of the performance outcome of the ensemble, a conductor who leaves the podium during rehearsal to address a behavioral problem can cause musical and behavior problems.
Finally, the music teacher’s classroom management skills are usually displayed and judged for the public to see and hear through concerts, performances, contests, and festivals (Gordon, 2001). The public judgment of student learning and conduct can put pressure on instrumental music teachers. This added pressure can affect the daily routine of the classroom environment for the instrumental music teacher. The general education teacher’s classroom management skills are rarely seen in public. Because the classroom settings between the general education classroom and the secondary instrumental classroom are so different, studies in communicated behavioral management strategies used by secondary instrumental music teacher are needed.

It appears that classroom management challenges for the music teacher are much higher than those of the general education classroom (Brand, 1976, 1990; Buck, 1992; Gordon, 2001). Classroom management principles from research conducted in general education classrooms suggest how teachers manage their classrooms, but because instrumental music classroom structures are different, classroom management strategies of general education teachers may not apply to instrumental music. The secondary band teacher has the challenges of being part of the ensemble, larger class sizes, constant group learning environment, multi-level instruction, multi-age instruction, multi-instrument instruction, limited seating arrangements, and the final product on public display for (Bauer, 2001; Brand, 1976; Buck, 1992; Gordon, 2001). Teacher communication is key in communicating expectations of academic and social behaviors. All of these aspects create unique communication challenges for the instrumental music teacher.

Several classroom management theories exist that help teachers manage student behavior, but appear to apply most directly to the general education classroom. There are
some classroom management characteristics that carry over from general education classrooms to secondary instrumental music classrooms, but the secondary band rehearsal classroom management strategies need further examination.

**Classroom Management Theories**

The teacher’s role in education is not simply teaching subject content (Andrius, 2010). It involves managing many individuals, coming from different backgrounds, and creating an environment in which all individuals can learn. Educational theorists have developed theories to help classroom teachers establish guidelines for managing student behavior within a classroom. After searching several educational classroom management theories, four will be discussed: Kounin (1970), Canter (1976), Dreikurs (2004), and Ginott (1972). These four were selected because they are common, well-known theories and appear adaptable for secondary instrumental music classrooms. This section is an overview of these four theories and discusses both relevant aspects and portions that appear to be non-congruent with traditional practices of secondary instrumental music teachers.

Jacob Kounin, an educational psychologist who is best known for his work in classroom management studies conducted in the 1970’s, summarizes behaviors encountered in classroom management in his book entitled, *Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms*. Kounin suggests that student classroom behavior is based on teacher planning, organizing, and executing of lessons. Teachers should strive to maintain consistent momentum in teaching lessons, activities, and through transitions of activities so that students do not fall into the boredom state, causing misbehavior. Student
involvement must be at a high level for all students. The teacher must be proactive and alert at all times. This level of alertness Kounin refers to as “with-it-ness.”

As far as correcting misbehavior, Kounin believes that when a teacher corrects one student’s misbehavior, it directly influences the other students’ perceptions of that behavior. Kounin’s classroom management model places the teacher at the center of classroom behavior. Verbal communication is used more for correcting misbehavior and non-verbal teacher actions dictate pacing of instruction. It is centered on how well the teacher has planned and executed the lessons, the pacing or flow of the lessons, the level of student activity throughout the lessons, how much the teacher knows what is going on in the classroom, and the overall ability to multitask the daily events and activities of a classroom (Kounin, 1970).

The Kounin model of classroom management is ideal for the general education classroom because activities and pacing are all within the teacher’s control. However, in secondary instrumental music classrooms, this management theory does not work as well. Traditional rehearsal techniques of secondary instrumental music classrooms focus on learning repertoire. Because customary large ensemble music does not have all the students playing all the time, the level of activity for the students is based on the music. The possibility of students being idle for long periods of time can increase misbehavior (Bauer, 2001; Brendall, 1996; Forsythe, 1975, 1977; Kostka, 1984; Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Price, 1983; Watkins, 1996; Yarbrough, 1975; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). In short, the musical demands of the repertoire are sometimes at odds with goals of keeping all students actively involved, which makes the application of Kounin’s model difficult at times.
Another aspect of Kounin’s classroom management theory that does not transfer well into secondary instrumental music classrooms is the planning and pacing of instruction. Traditional rehearsal practices of the secondary instrumental music teachers focus on the current skill level of student performance. The students’ level of performance assists in determining the pace of the lesson as well as future activities (lesson plans). The instrumental music teacher’s planning and pacing control is co-determined by the level of student performance. The contribution of unprepared or weak student(s) performance level can delay the pacing of instruction, potentially causing student misbehavior in other sections to occur. Therefore, implementing Kounin’s classroom management theory in secondary instrumental classrooms becomes difficult because of the students’ performance level assist in determining the planning and pacing of rehearsals.

The classroom management model of Lee and Marlene Canter attempts to suit every teacher regardless of varying situations. This model of classroom management takes an assertive approach to communication, with the teacher insisting and demanding appropriate classroom behaviors from the students (Canter & Canter, 1976). Canter and Canter developed this model by concluding that students in modern society do not view the role of the teacher as the authority figure. They believe that the teacher’s basic discipline practices are no longer effective in the classroom (Canter & Canter, 1976). Parents are also guilty of belittling the teacher’s authority role by openly questioning the education their child is receiving and by choosing not to support the teacher’s needs (Canter & Canter, 1976). Canter concludes that expectations of classroom behavior have
changed over time, so there is no longer one way to run a classroom (Buck, 1992; Canter & Canter, 1976).

In response, the Canter model of classroom management states that both the teacher and students have rights. Teachers have the right to make the best decisions for their students: (a) the right to establish the best learning environment, (b) the right to request and expect appropriate behavior, and (c) the right to ask for help from administrators and parents when it is needed (Canter & Canter, 1976).

Along with teachers having rights, Canter and Canter state that students have rights as well: (a) the right to have a teacher who helps the student limit inappropriate behavior, (b) the right to have a teacher who positively supports appropriate behavior, and (c) the right to choose how to behave, with a full understanding of the consequences that will automatically follow from their choices. The Canter model believes that assertive discipline is the way to meet the rights of the teacher and the students.

Canter (1976) defines an assertive teacher as “one who clearly and firmly communicates her [or his] wants and needs to her [or his] students, and is prepared to reinforce her [or his] words with appropriate actions. She [or he] responds in a manner that maximizes her [or his] potential to get her [or his] needs met, but in no way violates the best interest of the students” (p. 9). The teacher’s assertive behavior sets parameters of expectations for the both the students and teacher.

Lee Canter’s field is in social work. He adapted the research in social learning theory of Assertion Training and applied it to classroom management (Canter & Canter, 1976). Assertive teachers communicate clear messages to the students and are ready to back up the message with action. Teachers are persistent in demanding their needs while
maintaining positive student expectations. Even in the case of the problem child, by using assertive communication, the child will understand exactly what the teacher expects of student behavior (Canter & Canter, 1976).

The Canter model of classroom management is similar to the Kounin model of classroom management in that it focuses mostly on the teacher. Traditional practices of secondary instrumental music teachers leave little to no room for students to make choices about how to behave without affecting the group-learning environment. If students start choosing to misbehave, the entire class is affected and learning suffers. Student synchronicity is vital to successful ensemble music performance; therefore student choices are not practical.

Critics of the Canter model of classroom management view assertive discipline as outdated (Andrius, 2010). Critics claim that some teachers feel that the assertive approach can be too harsh for younger students, demeaning for older students, and focuses on negative behavior. With the secondary instrumental music classroom differing from the general education classroom, written rules with rewards and consequences may disrupt the rehearsal process. Canter advocates that if a student talks out of turn, the first step should be to write name on the board. The second time the misbehavior occurs they receive check mark, third time they receive detention, and so forth. General education teachers typically divide class time between instruction and student individual learning time. If misbehaviors occur during individual learning time, teachers can monitor and follow through with series of steps and consequences. In secondary instrumental music classrooms, these steps would conflict because teachers are immersed within the ensemble. The additional time-consuming activities take teachers away from the
rehearsal, interrupting all students from learning. Trying to use the Canter model of classroom management in a secondary instrumental music classroom is problematic.

Rudolf Dreikurs, an American psychiatrist and educator, focused his research on why a child misbehaves. Dreikurs suggests that a child creates problematic behavior in search of attention. The child must feel a sense of belonging, either within a family or within a school. If the child does not feel this sense of belonging, they will act out in search of recognition (Dreikurs, Cassel, & Dreikurs-Ferguson, 2004). Dreikurs describes the levels in which the child will act out, starting with behaviors demanding attention. If the child is denied attention, the child seeks to control the situation, or a sense of power. If the power seeking behavior is challenged, the child seeks revenge. Finally, if revenge behaviors do not satisfy the child’s expectations, then the child begins to feel inadequate (Dreikurs et al., 2004). This theory of classroom management does not advocate punishment, but rather recommends preventative measures. For example, using a democratic approach, the teacher includes the students in creating the classroom rules and consequences so that students feel a sense of belonging and will behave appropriately.

The seeking of attention and the search for a sense of belonging in misbehaving children often generate general education classroom rules and consequences. Because traditional instrumental rehearsal practices are performance goal-oriented, classroom activities rarely deviate from large ensemble activities. If one student begins to act out and defy the rules, the student’s behavior affects the entire class (as in all classes). However, secondary instrumental music rehearsals require a unified class with synchronicity from the teacher and all students, for optimal music learning and quality of
ensemble rehearsal. Dreikurs’ classroom management theory appears less practical in secondary instrumental music rehearsals because of the constant group participation.

The final classroom management theory reviewed is that of Haim Ginott, a clinical psychologist who helped parents understand and communicate better with their children. He is not far removed from the classroom because he began his career as an elementary school teacher, and his main focus is a combination of setting boundaries and having compassion for children’s feelings.

The Ginott model of classroom management focuses on the discipline of teachers and their communication with the students. The emphasis is placed on teachers, who must be self-disciplined at all times and model the behavior that they hope to see in their students (Ginott, 1972). Students need a model as well as someone who understands their emotions, and Ginott’s theory on classroom management gives this responsibility to teachers. When teachers are self-disciplined role models who are receptive to student emotions, student behavior will be more favorable.

Ginott’s model of classroom management not only deals with communication, but also with the overall student well-being. According to this theory, the role of teachers goes beyond subject content and includes building self-esteem in all students. This is the only model found thus far that mentions communicating with students to help change their behavior, not just for the class, but to help mold them into better functioning members of society (Andrius, 2010; Ginott, 1972).

Ginott’s classroom management model combines teachers’ self-discipline and communication to their students. Teachers are at their best when their communication considers students’ feelings, the present situation, and themselves (Andrius, 2010).
Teachers must exhibit communication that is appropriate to the situation and not attack nor label students’ characters.

In traditional practices of instrumental music classrooms, the teacher constantly corrects behavior from the podium, be it physical, musical, or behavioral. Due to traditional practices of secondary instrumental classrooms, students are grouped and labeled by instrumentation, which opposes Ginott’s model.

With the secondary instrumental classroom being different from regular classroom settings, Ginott’s model of classroom management has another drawback. The number of students in the classroom becomes an issue when trying to identify and recognize all of the students’ feelings on a daily basis. Ginott’s classroom management theory becomes difficult to implement in the secondary instrumental classroom because teachers have to become acquainted with more students.

The theories mentioned thus far stress communication on methods of classroom management. The theories approach communication of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors from teacher-centered perspectives (Kounin and Canter) and student-centered perspectives (Dreikurs and Ginott). Even though different classroom management theories are taught and implemented in schools of various forms, there continues to be secondary instrumental music teachers who struggle with classroom management because of built-in constraints within traditional rehearsal practices. There are hundreds of books, articles, and case studies that are centered on problems of classroom management. Some of these publications take ideas from the theorists, and some are just tips that have worked for teachers during their career. Regardless of how these
publications came to fruition, the reason why they appear is more important; instrumental music teachers’ classroom management practices continue to be problematic.

**Communication Congruency**

One concern with existing classroom management theories is that most were developed almost fifty years ago. Modern students are different from the students of the 1960’s. More students are dealing with single parent families, divorces, re-marriages, extended families, violence, along with additional modern chaos occurring in American schools and society (O’Hair, 1995).

The accessible technology that students exploit daily (cellular phones, instant text messages, and social media networks) affects how they communicate. Because modern students communicate differently, perhaps they interpret differently as well. These additional gadgets can also cause distractions for modern classrooms. Although distractions existed in the past (passing notes), students have more ways of being off-task with the technology in their hands (instant messages, games, etc.).

The classroom management theories discussed thus far approach communication from varying perspectives. Kounin’s use of communication is placed on the teacher’s actions and behaviors. This teacher-centered approach does not allow students to become idle preventing boredom, which causes misbehavior. Canter’s approach to communication is based on assertive discipline. Teachers use a directive approach and students can chose to obey or disobey teacher authority, knowing the rewards and consequences that follow. Dreikurs’ and Ginott’s models are student-centered as they both attempt to take a democratic approach to setting rules based on the students’ needs.
(Dreikurs) and emotions (Ginott). The democratic approach incorporates the students in building classroom rules and consequences.

Canter’s model is solely based on verbal communication however modern students may interpret a directive approach different from the teacher (Duke & Henninger, 1998). Although Dreikurs and Ginott models have students and teachers create classroom rules together, teachers ultimately guide the rules to their liking. Setting rules in small groups might allow all voices to be heard, however with a much larger class size, the variability of students’ wants and needs is larger, and with some voices might possibly not be heard. In Kounin’s model of classroom management, communication is based on teacher actions, and it assumes that students interpret teachers’ behaviors with the same intent as the teachers.

Communication congruence occurs when the meaning of verbal and nonverbal communication from the teacher has a corresponding understanding by the students. There are many opportunities for incongruence to occur between teachers and students within these models of classroom management. Teacher communication is important for student learning, but student interpretation of teacher communication is equally important.

An abundance of articles and studies exist in general education and in special education regarding classroom management (Marzano, 2003). The articles that exist in music education and classroom management usually deal at the elementary level (Duke & Henninger, 1998, 2002), are choral-based (Brendall, 1996; Watkins, 1993, 1996, & 1999), or are studies that have been done over 20 years ago (Madsen & Duke, 1985a, 1985b, 1987; Thurman, 1978). Recent articles written about music education and
classroom management are mostly strategies and tips given and not necessarily researched-based.

Need for the Study

The history of music education in American schools has set a path for strong performance-based large ensemble courses. Rehearsal practices of secondary instrumental music teachers continue to follow the traditional practices of both American music education pioneers and professional ensembles.

The secondary instrumental music classroom is different from the general classroom in many ways. It differs because instrumental music teachers deal with the challenges of the teacher being part of the ensemble, larger class sizes, constant group learning environment, multi-level instruction, multi-age instruction, multi-instrument instruction, and the final product being displayed for public viewing (Bauer, 2001; Brand, 1976; Gordon, 2001). With all these challenges, while trying to maintain a classroom environment suitable for learning, the secondary instrumental music teacher needs a classroom management strategy that is suitable to this setting.

The classroom management theories of Kounin, Canter, Dreikurs, and Ginott have made contributions to the general education classroom. Because secondary instrumental music classrooms have additional obstacles within traditional rehearsal practices, communication congruency between teachers and students is imperative for student academic and behavioral success. The classroom management theories discussed contain some excellent traits, however the additional challenges of traditional instrumental music teacher practices require more structure. There is a need for exploring
the classroom management strategies of successful teachers used in traditional secondary instrumental music rehearsals.

Classroom management is an area of education that has so many variables it becomes difficult to understand how the classroom environment affects the learning process of the student. A big part of teacher success depends on how well teachers manage the classroom (Brand, 1976; Marzano, 2003). Previous theories of classroom management have helped general education classrooms, but the additional obstacles within the secondary instrumental music classrooms make implementing any of these theories difficult.

In music education research, there is a lack of recent studies that deals with the different components that create good classroom management skills. An unexamined area in the music teacher literature concerning feedback is the area of communication congruency. Exploring the areas of teacher communicated expectations and behaviors, to the students’ interpretations and responses, are essential for determining classroom management techniques that are successful in a secondary instrumental music classroom. Communication congruency among teachers and students, and also within teachers themselves, could help determine predictors of student off-task behaviors in secondary instrumental music classrooms. It is essential to narrow the gap of research and explore this unclaimed territory of secondary band rehearsal classroom management strategies, in efforts to help teachers maintain control of the modern student in the secondary instrumental music classroom environment.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in a secondary band rehearsal in Florida schools. Perceptions were surveyed regarding teacher behavioral expectations and actual teacher behaviors of classroom management. If communication incongruence exists among teachers and students based on teacher expectations and behaviors of classroom management, predictions could be made to help improve off-task student behavior in secondary instrumental music classrooms.

Research Questions

This study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. How do teachers and students perceive teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct in the instrumental music classroom?

2. Do perceptions of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors differ by group (students and teachers), teacher gender and teacher experience?

3. How congruent are secondary instrumental music teacher and music student ratings of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct?

4. How do teacher gender, teacher experience and the overall congruency of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors predict rehearsal conduct?

5. What are secondary instrumental music teacher perceptions as to why students misbehave?
**Operational Definitions**

In order to be able to complete this study, there are several terms that need to be operationally defined.

*Attentiveness* is synonymous with student on-task behavior (see on-task student behavior).

*Communication Congruence* is the verbal and nonverbal communication from the teacher, and the interpretation of the communication from the students.

*Congruency* for teacher expectations and teacher behavior is the magnitude of difference among individual items responses and composite score between teachers and students.

*Effective Teachers*, defined by Porter and Brophy (1988), demonstrate knowledge of content and teaching strategies, knowledge about instructional needs of the students, the ability to set clear instructional goals, and the ability to communicate expectations to their students.

*Effective Teaching Components*, according to Wong & Wong (2009), there are three components of teacher effectiveness which include having positive expectations for student success, knows how to design lessons for student mastery, and an extremely good classroom manager.

*Inattentiveness* is synonymous with student off-task behavior (see off-task student behavior).

*Off-Task Student Behavior*, often referred to as inattentiveness, refers student behaviors that do not match the teacher’s instructions.
On-Task Student Behavior, often referred to as attentiveness, refers to student behaviors that match the teacher’s instructions.

Secondary General Education Classrooms typically contain approximately 30 students per class, with student desks in rows facing the front, and the teacher desk in a location so that they can monitor the classroom.

Teacher Behavior Congruency is the summed magnitude of differences between teachers and student among calculated composite scores of teacher behaviors.

Teacher Expectation Congruency is the summed magnitude of differences between teachers and students among calculated composite scores of teacher expectations.

Teacher Intensity, defined by Madsen (1990), has sustained control of the student/teacher interaction with efficient, accurate presentation of subject matter combined with enthusiastic affect and pacing.

Traditional Band Music refers to commonly selected band pieces that are performed by bands for festivals, concerts, and performances.

Traditional Band Rehearsal Practices refers to the common secondary band rehearsal practices of the teacher, directing the band from the podium and the rehearsal based around the music selected by the director.
Secondary instrumental music classrooms are different than general education classrooms. One of the biggest differences is that the teacher is a member of the band that performs with the students displaying learned goals. This inclusive role that the secondary band teacher possesses creates a more critical scenario for the teacher to establish and maintain a suitable classroom environment. Other obstacles that make the instrumental music classroom different from the general education classroom are the traditional practices of instrumental music teachers, larger class sizes, physical set up, group-learning environment, multi-level instruction, multi-age instruction, multi-instrument instruction, and the final product being performed for the public. Managing all of these additional obstacles, along with ensuring student achievement, all contribute to the monumental task of being an effective instrumental music teacher.

There are several components that make up effective teaching. Most experts agree that classroom management not only affects the learning environment, but is also a key component for effective teaching (Doerkson, 2006; Hendel, 1995; Marzano, 2003; Wong & Wong, 2009). An abundance of research has been conducted in the area of classroom management but those mostly deal with general education, elementary education, or special education. In music education, there is a lack of recent research regarding classroom management. The research that does exist in music education is both limited in quantity and also considered outdated.

Effective teaching and classroom management in music education contain several variables that overlap (Hendel, 1995). While few studies exist regarding the variables...
used in this study, several related studies help clarify the behavioral environment of music classrooms. Because there are so many components of classroom management and effective teaching, this literature review is divided into four areas: (a) verbal feedback, (b) on-task student behavior, (c) teaching intensity, and (d) teacher behaviors.

**Verbal Feedback**

The area of music education classroom management research that has been studied the most is teacher verbal feedback (Duke, 1999). Within music education verbal feedback component, subcategories were formed to specify types of feedback studied: (1) perceptions of teacher approval/disapproval feedback, (2) level of teaching experience in providing feedback, (3) academic or social feedback, (4) direct feedback versus negative feedback, and (5) verbal feedback in a complete teaching cycle.

**Perceptions of Teacher Approval/Disapproval Feedback.** A teacher providing feedback can be approached with various intentions (Duke & Henninger, 1998; Madsen & Duke, 1985b). Because intentions of feedback can vary, student responses to the feedback can also vary (Hendel, 1995). Teacher feedback’s intent and student response ideally should be linked, but that is not always the case. A third party observer’s perception often determines if verbal feedback is appropriate for the student academic or social behavior.

The effect of trained and untrained observers’ perception of teacher feedback is important in music teacher training (Madsen & Duke, 1985b). While untrained participants were not as accurate in estimating teacher feedback responses as trained participants (Madsen & Duke, 1985b), both groups viewed teacher approval given to
younger students more favorable than approval given to older students (Kostka, 1994; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; White, 1975).

The ability to train observers to recognize the need to give verbal feedback is also important in music teacher training (Madsen & Duke, 1987). While results suggest that observers can be taught to identify moments to provide positive verbal feedback, music educators and therapists struggle to deliver positive feedback to older students as opposed to younger students (Kostka, 1994; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; White, 1975). Music teachers and therapists also tend to provide more negative feedback following inappropriate behaviors than positive feedback following appropriate behaviors (Madsen, 1985a; Madsen & Duke, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989).

There appears to be consistent trends among the practices of music teachers to deliver more negative feedback following inappropriate behavior as opposed to positive feedback following appropriate behavior (Madsen & Duke, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). Madsen & Alley (1979) used this premise and compared music and non-music teacher’s use of disapproving feedback. Results found that music teachers give more disapproving feedback compared to non-music teachers, however students were more on-task in choral and instrumental groups despite these courses having lower teacher approval feedback (Madsen & Alley, 1979). Although these two performance groups displayed a substantial amount of disapproval feedback, there are strong implications that music as a subject can be intrinsically rewarding if performance outcomes appear successful to the student (Duke & Henninger, 1998, 2002; Forsythe, 1975; Madsen & Alley, 1979).
A completely different approach in studying verbal feedback by observers’ perceptions compared the evaluation of observers to the actual events using four versions of an observation form (Duke & Blackman, 1991). Music majors and non-music majors rated a video of the music teacher’s overall performance and found significant differences in three areas: reinforces correct responses, gives corrective academic feedback, and reinforces appropriate behavior. Although no significant difference was found in the relationship between what an observer actually records versus what the teacher actually does, non-music majors on average rated the teacher significantly higher than music majors (Duke & Blackman, 1991). This implies that music majors appear to have higher expectations from teachers in the verbal corrective feedback than non-music majors. This might be an instinctual practice to the music majors based on traditional practices of music teachers in correcting music performance during rehearsal.

**Summary of Perceptions of Approval/Disapproval Feedback.** The majority of studies agree that perceptions of teacher verbal feedback can be taught, learned, performed, and observed in music teaching classrooms (Duke & Blackman, 1991; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987). The perception of who is observing can affect how the feedback is being interpreted: trained versus untrained observers, music education versus music therapy students, or music or non-music students (Duke & Blackman, 1991; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; Madsen & Alley, 1979). The overall consensus is that music teachers display more disapproving feedback compared to non-music teachers (Madsen & Duke, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989) yet the disapproving feedback does not affect the overall student attitude of a music course as long as the performance outcome is successful (Duke & Henninger, 1998, 2002; Forsythe, 1975;
Madsen & Alley, 1979). Research is also consistent with younger students receiving more approving feedback (Madsen, 1985a; Madsen & Duke, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). Overall, the perception of approval/disapproval teacher verbal feedback can directly affect student attentiveness, classroom management, and effective teaching and learning.

**Level of Teaching Experience in Providing Feedback.** The level of teaching experience of those providing verbal feedback is key to understanding student/teacher communication. Many studies in verbal feedback mention the observer’s level of experience (Duke & Blackman, 1991; Duke & Henninger, 2002; Madsen & Duke 1985a, 1985b, 1987) but very few mention the experience level of the teacher being observed or providing the feedback.

The experience level of a teacher can affect the outcome of the complete teaching cycle. A complete cycle was defined as having three components, including presentation of task, student response, and reinforcement (Becker, Englemann, & Thomas, 1971, as cited in Yarbrough & Price, 1989). A study was conducted regarding the experience level of teachers and the complete cycle of teaching in a music course (Yarbrough & Price, 1989). Participants were freshman music education majors teaching a song to preschool children, sophomore music education student with training of complete teaching cycle rehearsing their peers, and experienced instrumental and choral teachers in their regular rehearsal setting teaching their students. The area of reinforcement, or verbal feedback, showed that experienced teachers were more disapproving compared to the highly approving college students (Yarbrough & Price, 1989). This finding supports previous research that more time is spent giving disapproving feedback than approving feedback.
(Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; Thurman, 1978). Additionally, little time was spent on reinforcement with all participant teachers, regardless of teaching experience. With so much research conducted on verbal feedback (Duke, 1999) and its importance in teaching, teachers continue to produce incomplete teaching cycles by not providing ample feedback. It appears that traditional practices of instrumental music teachers continue to dominate the practice of instrumental music education as experienced teachers provide the least amount of feedback.

Thirty band directors participated in a study that compared various levels of teaching experience and their use of time in rehearsal (Goolsby, 1996). Although this study was primarily based on rehearsal pacing, verbal feedback concepts overlap. Participants were divided into three groups: experienced teachers, novice teachers, and student teachers. The experienced teachers needed to have a minimum of eight years teaching experience, have a comprehensive band program, serve as a cooperating teacher for student teachers, and receive superior ratings at assessment regularly. Novice teachers were in their first or second year of teaching and student teachers were from four universities within a seventy-five mile radius. Results indicate that experienced teachers allowed the ensemble to perform more but stop more frequently compared to the novice and student teachers. Additionally, when the experienced teachers did stop, the feedback was concise and often nonverbal in form of demonstration. The novice teachers spent the most time verbalizing musical and nonmusical instruction.

Goolsby took the data from the 1996 study and analyzed it again in a 1997 study on verbal instruction in instrumental rehearsals. Of the three groups of teachers, experienced, novice, and student teachers, experienced teachers stopped more often but
for shorter amounts of time. It is important to note that more concepts were addressed within these brief moments, compared to novice and student teachers.

Typically, effective teachers have more teaching experience (Hendel, 1995). A study conducted on the teacher behavioral characteristics that make up effective teaching used the level of teaching experience as a variable to examine verbal feedback (Hendel, 1995). Hendel specifically used experienced teachers who were recommended by music supervisors and university music education professors and deemed as “excellent” music teachers to be the model for effective teaching to be observed. The nine study participants’ approval expressions and verbal feedback superseded the disapproving looks by more than 35%. Contrary to previous research that found music teachers gave a higher amount of negative feedback (Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Duke, 1985a, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989), Hendel found that these effective teachers showed more approving feedback than disapproving feedback.

**Summary of Level of Teaching Experience in Providing Feedback.** The use of verbal feedback and level of teaching experience are directly related. Studies mentioned show novice teachers spending more time verbalizing instruction and administering corrective feedback than those teachers with more experience (Goolsby, 1996, 1997; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). A portion of research conducted in music teacher’s use of verbal feedback found that experienced music teachers used negative feedback more compared to general education teachers (Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; Thurman, 1978). However, a more recent study found that experienced effective music teachers used positive feedback more often than negative (Hendel, 1995). These mixed results need more examination.
**Academic or Social Feedback.** The verbal feedback that teachers provide can be categorized into either academic or social feedback. The ability to recognize the need to give approval for appropriate academic or social behavior is essential for effective teaching. Duke & Madsen (1987) found that the participants were able to recognize the ability to provide approval for appropriate behavior after taking a course in behavior techniques, however there was no indication whether the approval responses were for academic or social behaviors.

A study that categorized feedback into academic or social comments was Goolsby’s (1996) study on time use in instrumental rehearsals. Three rehearsals were timed and divided into categories of musical instruction/performance, verbal instruction, nonverbal modeling, and verbal discipline of disapproving social behavior. Because Goolsby separated the verbal feedback into academic and social feedback, it was easy to identify the time use of the various experience levels of band teachers.

Regardless of teaching experience, all teachers spent the most amount of time in verbal instruction (Goolsby, 1996). Verbal and nonverbal communications were outlined as either academic instruction or responses to student tasks. Verbal discipline, which was operationally defined as the amount of time spent on disapproving social behavior, was minimal by all teachers. Student teachers and novice teachers spent almost the same amount of time on disapproval of social behavior, which nearly doubled the time for the experienced teachers. One can infer that experienced teachers were more effective and little time was needed to correct student social behavior (Goolsby, 1996).

A study that separates academic and social feedback and determines approval/disapproval level is rare in music education research. Duke & Blackman (1991)
study separated academic and social feedback and allowed trained and untrained observers to determine appropriateness for approval or disapproval. The means of both music and non-music majors for academic approvals were much higher than approvals for social feedback. Perhaps music teachers focus approval feedback solely for academic purposes (Duke & Blackman, 1991).

**Summary of Academic or Social Feedback.** Determining the type of verbal feedback, academic or social, can add clarity to teachers intent and focus of delivery. There are many studies on teacher feedback, but few are specific to define whether the feedback is academic or social in content. It appears within the complete teaching cycle, approval feedback implied is academic (Yarbrough & Price, 1989), however other studies allude to correcting feedback as being social (Madsen & Duke, 1987). Two studies contained in this literature review specified the feedback as either academic or social (Duke & Blackman, 1991; Goolsby, 1996). Verbal feedback is a broad term that needs definition when observing specific behaviors.

**Direct Feedback versus Negative Feedback.** A few studies have explored the various types of teacher academic verbal feedback in music education research. Duke and Henninger (1998) observed the effect of verbal corrections that music teachers make on the student performance during instruction. This study specifically focused on the attention of negative feedback statements and directive feedback statements that help correct student performance.

Participants were divided into two groups that received different experimental conditions: the Directive Condition and the Negative Feedback Condition. In the directive condition, the teacher would make verbal corrections in the student’s
performance by clearly stating specific directions as to what the student needs to do to perform the task better the next time. In the negative feedback condition, the teacher would make negative statements regarding the student’s previous performance task, but without specifics as to what to do to get it better the next time. The participants were not aware of either of the treatment group existence.

At the end of a one-on-one lesson, the participants were given a questionnaire to complete outside the teacher’s presence using a four-point Likert scale to evaluate how they felt about the lesson and the activity they just completed. Results indicated no significant difference between the two experimental groups in terms of number of student performance trials, amount of positive feedback statements, or the time required to reach the performance goal. Because there were no significant differences in participant responses, this suggests that students do not perform differently (either better or worse) whether the verbal feedback is negative or directive in nature. The negative verbal feedback had enough information to correct the performance behavior and the students still responded the same in the attitude questionnaire, implying that music, is intrinsically rewarding. However the overall enjoyment of the activity had high responses regardless of age group or experimental condition group.

Duke and Henninger (2002) conducted another study which used the recordings of the 1998 study, but added a third party observer to reveal their perceptions of teaching that occurred during the lesson. At the conclusion of each video, participants were asked to complete a ten-statement questionnaire, similar to the one used in the 1998 study. Participants were unaware that the lessons differed in teacher feedback responses to the
student performance, and their written responses were a way to see if the students were able to notice the differences in teaching.

No significant differences were found among participant responses for either directive or negative feedback lessons. Only one item differed, “the teacher being encouraging and positive,” in which a higher rating was given in the negative feedback condition. Mean responses of participants regarding the enjoyment of the activity, teacher helpfulness, positive approach to teach verbal feedback, and the effectiveness of teacher feedback were high for both types of lessons, despite the differences in the amount of times the negative feedback statements occurred between the two conditions.

No significant difference was found in how observers view two distinct lessons with negative and directive verbal feedback as long as the performance and attitude were considered successful. The observers appear to feel the same way the participants did regarding the negative feedback; the feedback provided must have had enough implication to change the performance result to a more successful one. The teacher’s comments in the negative feedback video specifically focused on the student performance and not social behavior, in which the student and the observers probably felt the teacher’s intentions to help the performance.

Duke and Henninger emphasized in both studies that the lessons were considered successful because of the use of expert techniques. They referred to expert techniques in the way the lessons were planned, paced, and the amount of feedback given both positive and negative. The emphasis of both conditions being successful is important as this models effective teaching. Within the context of successful lessons, negative feedback
appears to have no effect on level of achievement of students’ performance, perception from an observer’s view on teaching and learning, or the student’s attitude of the lesson.

**Verbal Feedback in a Complete Teaching Cycle.** Effective teaching of tasks can be broken up into three parts: teacher instruction, student response, and teacher feedback (Becker, Englemann, & Thomas, 1971 as cited in Yarbrough & Price, 1989). Although studies have suggested that teacher verbal behavior should be kept to a minimum because it increases student off-task behavior (Forsythe, 1977; Yarbrough & Price, 1981), the complete teaching cycle verbal feedback component is important because it affects student behavior and performance.

Yarbrough & Price (1989) used the complete teaching cycle concept to review effective teaching techniques. Participants were music education majors and experienced choral and instrumental music teachers that taught lessons to specific classes to determine how often the complete teaching cycle occurred. Results showed that verbal feedback was more disapproving in experienced teachers compared with the highly approving music education students. This supports previous research that more time is spent on teachers giving disapproving feedback than approving feedback (Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Duke, 1985b; Thurman, 1978). Results also show that very little time was spent on this third part of the teaching cycle compared to the other two sections. Combining the two results of this study suggest that music teachers spend less time with teacher feedback but when it is used, it is more disapproving than approving.

**Summary of Verbal Feedback.** Verbal feedback has the largest amount of research in music education classroom management domain (Duke, 1999). All the subcategories that fall within verbal feedback help provide a better understanding of how
teachers approach correcting student behavior. Music teachers administer more disapproving feedback after negative behaviors than approving feedback after positive behaviors (Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). When approval feedback is given, there is a tendency to administer it more to younger students compared to older students (Kostka, 1984; Madsen & Duke, 1987; White, 1975). Experienced teachers tend to give the least amount of verbal feedback (Goolsby, 1996, 1997; Yarbrough & Price, 1989), but specificity within the articles rarely identifies feedback as either academic or social. Regardless of how teachers speak to their students, research has suggested that the subject of music is intrinsically motivating as long as students feel successful at the end product (Duke & Henninger, 1998, 2002; Forsythe, 1975).

Teacher communication is an integral part of effective teaching and classroom management. In the studies mentioned there remain several inconsistencies within the body of research. It is a difficult task to understand how teachers provide feedback to the students and how the students interpret the feedback. The additions of the modern student and the unique secondary band setting add to the difficulty in understanding teacher verbal expectations. The present study is an attempt to close the gap of research and investigate how students and teachers interpret teacher expectations and behaviors of student conduct in a secondary band rehearsal.

**On-Task and Off-Task Student Behavior**

Several educational researchers have explored on-task and off-task student behaviors. However on-task and off-task student behaviors can be interpreted several
ways. For the purpose of this study, on-task student behaviors are operationally defined as the student behaviors that meet the teacher’s instructions. On-task student behavior is synonymous with attentiveness. Off-task student behaviors, or inattentiveness, are the behaviors of students that do not meet the teacher’s instructions. The more on-task behavior occurs, the more likely the environment is suitable for effective teaching and learning to take place.

Level of student attentiveness is a major component that comprises classroom management and effective teaching and learning. K. Madsen’s (2003) study investigated teacher delivery methods and the effect on teaching effectiveness perceived by an observer. Participants, ranging from middle, high, and college music students through experienced music teachers, viewed a video containing eight lessons of an elementary music class in which scripted variables in various combinations were incorporated into the lesson. The variables used in combination were accurate and inaccurate instruction, on-task/off-task student behavior, and high and low intensity of teacher delivery. At the end of the video, participants were instructed to record their evaluation using a 10-point Likert scale. The response form also had a place for written comments to verify why that number rating was given. The written comments were categorized into: Accuracy of Instruction, Delivery, Classroom Management, and Other.

Adolescents and adults agreed on six of the eight teaching segment combinations in labeling effective teaching. The teaching segments with different results were inaccurate information/high level delivery/on-task behavior and inaccurate information/high level delivery/off-task behavior. The middle and high school students mean rated the teacher as effective if the delivery is high, regardless of the accuracy of
instruction or on-task/off-task behavior. The comments also differed in the area of classroom management: as the level of experience increased, the comments of classroom management decreased.

Another study involving student behavior in music classes was a teacher opinion poll using components of effective teaching (Teachout, 1997). Pre-service and experienced music teachers were given a list of skills and behaviors that comprise effective music teaching and rank them in order of most important. Of the 40 listed behaviors, experienced teachers ranked “maintain student behavior” first, while pre-service teachers ranked it fourteenth. This poll implies that experienced teachers view student behavior as the most important aspect to effective teaching. However, K. Madsen’s (2003) study showed that the experienced teachers were less concerned with managing student behavior, compared to the inexperienced college students and middle and high school students. The Teachout (1997) and K. Madsen (2003) results do not agree.

A different type of study based on student attentiveness attempted to predict off-task behaviors of students in high school large ensemble classrooms based on the teacher behavior and rehearsal activity (Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Participants were six high school ensemble teachers and their students and two trained observers. The ensembles were recorded once during their regular class time and the two observers watched the video and gathered data that consisted of percentage time of off-task behavior, amount of time in seconds of performance and nonperformance, frequency of stops, academic and social approval or disapproval from the teacher, complete and incomplete teaching units, and teacher eye contact.
Results suggested a relationship between off-task student behaviors and individual teachers, nonperformance activity, and lack of teacher eye contact. There was a relationship between off-task student behaviors and teacher disapprovals, stops, and complete/incomplete teaching units. It should be noted that because these recorded rehearsals were very short and the teacher variability was so large, the ability to generalize is limited. Overall, when students were actively participating, there was more on-task student behavior (Yarbrough & Price, 1981), which supports previous research (Forsythe, 1975, 1977; Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Geringer, 1983).

When students were more passive in class, more off-task student behavior occurs. Kostka’s (1984) study of reinforcement, time use, and student attentiveness in piano lessons revealed that students were on-task when actively playing or answering questions. The inattentiveness occurred during teacher instruction time and non-music activity, which supports previous research (Forsythe, 1977; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Price, 1983; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Although this was in private lesson scenario, a similar study was conducted using large ensembles.

High school choral rehearsals were the scene in a study that observed time use, rehearsal activity, and student off-task behavior at the beginning of choral rehearsals (Brendall, 1996). Subjects were 33 high school choral teachers who were recorded and observed for various rehearsal activities and student off-task behaviors. Results agree with previous research that off-task student behavior is a function of the activity (Brendall, 1996; Forsythe, 1977; Kostka, 1984; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Price, 1983; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). If the activity does not require active student participation, off-task behavior has a tendency to be higher (Brendall, 1996).
Summary of On-Task and Off-Task Student Behavior. Music education research of on-task and off-task student behavior has been fairly consistent throughout the years. Generalized results show that the more active the student is participating in class, the more on-task the student will be (Kostka, 1984; Price, 1983; Watkins, 1996; Yarbrough, 1975; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). More inactive time given to the students equates a higher level of inattentiveness (Brendall, 1996; Forsythe, 1977; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Price, 1983; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). One inconsistency found in this review of literature was how experienced and pre-service teachers viewed the importance of managing student behavior with K. Madsen (2003) and Teachout (1997) having contrasting results. Overall, the level of student attentiveness is an important component of classroom management, which leads to effective teaching.

Teacher Intensity

For some students, level of attentiveness is dependent on the level of teacher intensity. Teacher intensity was defined as having “(1) sustained control of the student/teacher interaction with (2) efficient, accurate presentation of subject matter combined with (3) enthusiastic affect and pacing” (Madsen, 1990). Maintaining a high level of intensity seems to contribute to student attentiveness, which directly relates to classroom management and effective teaching and learning.

Music education research has shown that intensity can be taught, learned, and measured (Madsen, 1988; Madsen, Standley, & Cassidy, 1989), and that musical performance can enhance teacher intensity (Standley & Madsen, 1987 as cited in Madsen, 1990). These studies appear to measure brief moments of teacher intensity.
spanning about 15-60 seconds each example. Cassidy & Madsen (1987) approached ability to maintain intensity while teaching and found that teachers can be trained in maintaining intensity for longer periods of time. Madsen & Geringer (1989) focused on the relationship between demonstrated effective teaching and teacher intensity and found that intensity is an important component of effective teaching. An earlier study conducted by Madsen (1988) also found a high relationship between teaching intensity and teacher effectiveness. A commonality in all the studies mentioned thus far associate high level of intensity with effective teaching, which agrees with other research (Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992).

A study conducted on the effects of magnitude of conductor behaviors in chorus classes with student attentiveness, performance, and attitude had similar results (Yarbrough, 1975). Participants ($N = 207$) were randomly selected members of mixed choruses that were observed in two experimental conditions: high and low conductor magnitudes. Conductor magnitude defined in this study contained similar characteristics of intensity. Trained observers viewed recorded rehearsals and results showed that groups received the lowest ratings under low magnitude condition and that students preferred the high magnitude conductor. Although no significant relationships were found among conductor magnitude and musical performance, student attentiveness, or attitude, it is important to realize that off-task student behavior was at its highest under low magnitude conductor. Therefore, the implication is that high intensity teaching is associated with on-task student behavior and can lead to good classroom management and effective teaching.
Observer perceptions of teacher intensity being perceived as effective teaching links intensity and effective teaching with interesting results (K. Madsen, 2003). As long as teacher intensity was high, young observers (middle and high school students) viewed the lesson as effective. Student attentiveness or accuracy of instruction did not affect how student observers perceived effective teaching as long as intensity was high. Undergraduate student observers and experienced teacher observers still viewed teacher intensity as a contributing factor, but as the experience level of observer increased, the lower the rating of effective teaching. This result is not consistent with Teachout’s (1997) study in which pre-service and experienced teachers ranked important teacher behaviors in effective teaching. Teachout found that experienced teachers mean ranked the item, “be enthusiastic, energetic” third while pre-service teachers ranked it fifteenth. Although this term is not exactly coined as teacher intensity, it implies a fast pace high magnitude style of teaching, similar to intensity.

In many studies, pacing of instruction seems to be inseparable with teaching intensity. Perhaps researchers perceive a fast pace delivery of instruction as part of high intensity. Studies have already shown that the concept of a fast-paced rehearsal is connected with students remaining on-task, good classroom management, and effective teaching (Duke, Jellison, & Prickett, 1997). Pacing of instruction is also viewed in comparison of experienced, novice, and student teachers in an instrumental rehearsal (Goolsby, 1996) with experienced teachers using the most amount of time for warm up but the least amount of time verbalizing instruction. Research has implied that pacing of instruction is an important aspect of teaching intensity, which leads to effective teaching.
**Summary of Teacher Intensity.** Teacher intensity, or delivery of instruction, is an important component of classroom management. Studies have shown that intensity can be taught, learned, and measured (Madsen, 1988; Madsen et al., 1989; Standley & Madsen, 1987 as cited in Madsen, 1990) and for various periods of time (Cassidy & Madsen, 1987). Research suggests that a high level of teacher intensity leads to a fast-paced class, high level of student attentiveness, good classroom management, and effective teaching (Duke et al., 1997; Yarbrough, 1975).

**Teacher Behaviors in Classroom Management**

Everything a teacher does affects the classroom environment. When teachers make decisions on procedures, establish rules or consequences, or simply communicate with their students, it sends messages on how teachers want their classrooms to be managed. A few teacher behaviors, such as verbal feedback and teacher intensity, have already been reviewed in this chapter. There are other studies conducted that may not fit into theses categories, but greatly influence classroom management and effective teaching.

The idea of proactive versus reactive teaching has been observed in music education research (Duke & Madsen, 1991). Proper sequencing of instruction along with verbal feedback represent proactive teaching, while a non-structured “what comes naturally” approach is reactive teaching. Results showed that student learning percentage was higher in the proactive compared to reactive teaching approach.

Proactive teaching is similar to a study of sequential patterns of instruction (Yarbrough & Price, 1989), where observers searched for the complete teaching cycles in
a lesson. The effect of “initiating student responses” was more effective “…rather than simply reacting to them” (Yarbrough & Price, 1989, p. 185). This directive approach to instruction appears to be constant in music education research as it also appears in verbal feedback research (Duke & Henninger, 1998, 2002).

Teacher behavior and classroom management is connected to communicative feedback in ways such as eye contact (Yarbrough & Price, 1981), conducting gestures (Yarbrough, 1975), volume and modulation of voice, pacing of instruction (Duke et al, 1998; Goolsby, 1996), facial expressions, and proximity. Hendel’s (1995) study of behavioral patterns of quality music teachers suggest that effective teachers use various nonverbal teacher behaviors to show approval of academic and social behaviors. Experienced teachers tend to spend more time with nonverbal communication and less time with verbal instruction (Goolsby, 1996). Effective experienced teachers use a fast pace instruction, high intensity, and high use of nonverbal communication (Goolsby, 1996), which keeps the students on-task leading to good classroom management. Therefore the actions of teachers affect the delivery of instruction, teacher feedback, and classroom management.

Teacher behavior can be observed, measured, and discussed all in efforts to create successful well-managed classrooms and effective music teaching. The student teaching experience is a critical time for the student teacher to learn how the cooperating teacher maintains a classroom environment suitable for effective rehearsal teaching and learning. Brand (1982) found no significant difference in pre and post-test for student teachers and their beliefs and skills on classroom management after completing the student-teaching
experience. Apparently, cooperating teacher behaviors, skills, or beliefs of classroom management do not transfer to student teachers.

The level of teaching experience and focus of attention on perceptions of effective teaching also contributes to teacher behaviors (Madsen & Cassidy, 2005). Participants were undergraduate and experienced teachers who saw two videos of a first grade and third grade music classes with two separate cameras, one focused primarily on the students, and the other camera focused exclusively on the teacher. The “teacher-focused” group would observe the videos of the teacher and the “student-focused” group would only observe the student video. Participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of the teacher on a scale of 1 to 10, with ten being the highest. A detailed statement was to follow explaining the rationale for assigning the number. Descriptions were categorized into teacher related or student related comments. Teacher comments were coded into categories of instruction, delivery, classroom management, or other and student behaviors were coded into academic or social behaviors.

Results revealed that experienced teachers’ mean ratings of teacher effectiveness and student learning were much lower than the undergraduate participants, regardless of the focus of attention. However, more comments were given for teacher behaviors, regardless of focus group or level of teaching experience. These results agree with previous research that experienced teachers are more critical in rating effective music teaching than pre-service teachers (K. Madsen, 2003; Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Madsen et al., 1992).

An interesting finding was that pre-service teachers had more comments regarding teacher classroom management compared to experienced teachers. Madsen and
Cassidy (2005) discuss that these findings “suggests that pre-service teachers with recent field experiences may be more affected by classroom management and student related behavior[s]…” (p. 230) compared to experienced teachers. These results can help music teacher preparation courses in having more strategies for classroom management strategies in music classes. Brand’s (1982) study found that the student teaching experience does not influence the classroom management beliefs or skills from the cooperating teacher to the student teacher. Therefore to be effective, classroom management strategies and skills must be incorporated at a larger level in the curriculum of the music teacher preparation programs.

**Summary of Teacher Behaviors in Classroom Management.** Classroom management and teacher behaviors are inseparable. The ways teachers present instruction, use gestures, move around the classroom, and communicate send messages to students about classroom environment. The use of proactive teaching has been more effective than reactive teaching (Madsen & Duke, 1989). The idea of proactive teaching was also used in research of complete teaching cycles (Yarbrough & Price, 1989) and verbal feedback (Duke & Henninger, 1998, 2002) and consistently showed in effective teaching and classroom management.

Although pre-service teachers appear to be more concerned with classroom management (Madsen & Cassidy, 2005), research shows that the student teaching experience does not influence the student teachers beliefs or strategies on student behavior or classroom management (Brand, 1982). More attention should be paid to classroom management strategies in preparing students for student teaching.
Review of Literature Summary

Although there are several opinions as to what constitutes an effective teacher, most experts agree that classroom management is an important component (Doerksen, 2006; Hendel, 1995; Marzano, 2003; Wong & Wong, 2009). Within music education classroom management research, verbal feedback was the area that has the most attention (Duke, 1999). Providing feedback can be taught, learned, observed, and performed in effective music teaching (Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; Duke & Blackman, 1991). Consistent results suggest that music educators use more negative feedback in correcting inappropriate behaviors as opposed to approving feedback for positive behaviors (Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). Some research supports the idea that as long as the outcome of the musical performance is considered successful, verbal feedback of the teacher does not affect the student’s attitude toward music (Duke & Henninger, 1998, 2002; Forsythe, 1975; Madsen & Alley, 1979).

Teacher expectations of student academic and social behaviors have foundations in verbal and nonverbal communication. With a large portion of music education research pertaining to teacher verbal feedback (Duke, 1999), music teachers continue to provide the least amount of positive verbal feedback to their students (Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). Additionally, research shows that younger students receive more approving feedback compared to older students (Kostka, 1994; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; White, 1975). This implies that secondary music students do not receive as much approval feedback for either academic or social behaviors. With all these findings in music education research, the
lack of clear communication of teacher feedback continues to contribute to problems in music classrooms.

Teacher behaviors, including intensity and pacing of instruction, and student attentiveness are inseparable. Research suggests effective teachers are those who use a fast-paced, high intensity, and pro-active approach (Duke et al., 1997; Yarbrough, 1975). These teachers tend to have more students on-task which leads to better classroom management (Kostka, 1984; Price, 1983; Watkins, 1996; Yarbrough, 1975; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Although results of teacher behaviors are consistent, music teachers continue to struggle maintaining student attentiveness and good classroom management. This is evident through the countless journal articles based on tips for improving classroom management in music classrooms (Bauer, 2001; Brand, 1976; Buck, 1992; Graulty 2010). The struggle appears to be getting worse because the modern student is different from the students of the 1970’s, when the majority of behavioral research was conducted (O’Hair, 1995). In addition, within music education research, the secondary band rehearsal differs from the majority of sites in which research was conducted such as private lessons (Duke & Henninger, 1998; Kostka, 1984) or elementary general music (Duke & Henninger, 1998; Hendel, 1995; K. Madsen, 2002; Madsen & Duke, 1985a). All of these factors contribute for the need to investigate the secondary instrumental music classroom teacher expectations of student behaviors.

The teachers’ ability to establish and maintain a well-organized classroom environment, have worthy lesson plans, provide excellent pacing and intensity of instruction, and provide feedback that is meaningful to the lesson which can motivate students’ performances and attitudes toward music, is a difficult task to balance. Teacher
and student agreement of verbal and nonverbal communications becomes critical for effective classroom management. Therefore teacher congruency in teacher expectations and teacher behaviors can predict student rehearsal behavior. The body of research in music education classroom management has inconsistencies and gaps. This study will help narrow the gap of modern students’ perception of teacher expectations and behaviors of student rehearsal conduct. If teacher expectations and behaviors are congruent with student perceptions, perhaps teacher expectation and behavior consistency are predictors of rehearsal conduct.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to compare student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in secondary band rehearsals in Florida schools. Comparisons were made between teachers’ and students’ perceptions of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors on classroom management. This study was conducted to better understand the modern instrumental music classroom teacher, students, and rehearsal conduct. The following research questions were devised to clarify behavior management perspectives:

1. How do teachers and students perceive teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct in the instrumental music classroom?

2. Do perceptions of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors differ by group (students and teachers), teacher gender and teacher experience?

3. How congruent are secondary instrumental music teacher and music student ratings of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct?

4. How do teacher gender, teacher experience and the overall congruency of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors predict rehearsal conduct?

5. What are secondary instrumental music teacher perceptions as to why students misbehave?
Participants

Participants were Florida middle and high school band teachers and their students. An email was sent to the executive director of the Florida Bandmasters Association (FBA) explaining the study and requesting support by using the FBA email list (see Appendix A). Participant selection began with an email sent out to members of the Florida Bandmasters Association active school band directors \( N = 938 \) explaining the study and asking for volunteers to participate (see Appendix B). Participant sampling was limited to FBA members who supplied email addresses to the mailing list. Although one hundred six directors from various counties agreed to participate, using Internal Review Board specifications, county approval was needed to conduct research in public schools (see Appendix C). After approval was granted, thirty-three public and private schools principals (see Appendix D) and instrumental music teachers (see Appendix E) were notified of the study and twenty one teachers and principals gave consent to participate. The return rate of school participation was 63.6% (approved requested volunteer schools \( N = 33 \), actual volunteer schools \( n = 21 \)). Although there were twenty-one schools and teacher participants, several teachers instruct more than one advanced ensemble during the day, making ensemble teacher participants higher \( (N = 34 \) ensemble directors).

Finally, students and parents/guardians were informed of the study through letters sent home by the band directors (see Appendix F). The letter explained the study and was returned to the teacher, signed by both the parent/guardian and the student in order for students to participate \( (N = 1261) \). The return rate of student participation was 59.4% (requested student participation \( N = 1261 \), actual student participation \( n = 749 \)). Students
who were 18 years of age or older did not need a parent/guardian signature on their consent form, but needed to sign student consent form.

Student participation was limited to active performing bands. The student must have been enrolled in a band class that was not beginning level, in other words, intermediate, advanced, symphonic, jazz, or other ensembles where students already could perform the basics of playing a wind or percussion instrument within an ensemble. Middle and high school band students, grades six through twelve, were the student participants. Many schools had multiple ensembles being surveyed ($N = 34$).

Frequency counts of teacher demographic data were collected in order to better understand the situation for each band that responded (see Table 1). Almost half of the teachers that participated (47.6%) had sixteen or more years of teaching experience. The substantial percentage of veteran teachers in this sample provides an important context for interpreting results.

Another characteristic that stands out is the number of years that participating teachers spent teaching at their current schools. More than one third of the teachers (38.1%) had been teaching at their current school for 2-5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Demographic Characteristics of Participating Teachers ($N = 21$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 1 continues)
(Table 1 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 16 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching at Current School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 16 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency counts were also performed on the students that completed the survey (see Table 2). Younger students, ages fourteen and under, dominated participation with 62.7% of the sample.

Table 2
Demographic Characteristics of Participating Students ($N = 749$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or younger</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 years</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17 years</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years or older</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 2 continues)
Variables

Research variables used in this study were (a) teacher expectations, (b) teacher behaviors, (c) teacher expectation congruency, (d) teacher behavior congruency, and (e) student rehearsal conduct. Teacher expectations refer to teacher communicated behavioral desires of student conduct during rehearsal. Both teacher and student perspectives of teacher expectations were taken to determine if the groups interpret expectations differently.
Teacher behaviors refer to the teacher practices of classroom management based on student conduct during rehearsal. Both teacher and student perceptions of teacher behaviors were collected to determine how teacher actions were perceived.

Student and teacher perceptions for teacher expectations determined expectation congruency. The magnitude of difference among individual expectation survey items determined teacher expectation congruency. Similarly, teacher behavior congruency was determined by the magnitude of difference among individual teacher behavior survey items.

Student rehearsal conduct refers to common student behaviors that occur during rehearsal. This variable was obtained through student perspectives about behaviors that occur during rehearsal. Common behaviors such as talking, getting out of seat, being unprepared, doing other coursework, etc., were mentioned and student responses rated how often they occur.

Directors provided information about their gender, ethnicity, age, years of teaching experience, and years teaching at current school. Student background variables were gender, age, ethnicity, instruments, grade level, and number of years participating in band. Supplementary variables included type of school, level of band, size of program, and size of school.

**Measure**

A measure was created to assess the variables of teacher expectations - TE, teacher behaviors - TB, teacher expectation congruency - TEC, teacher behavior congruency – TBC, and student rehearsal conduct - SRC. The measure, referred to as the
Lalama Instrument for Measuring Behaviors in Band or LIMBB, consisted of two surveys: one for the students, LIMBB-S (see Appendix G), and a similar survey for the teacher, LIMBB-T (see Appendix H). The teacher survey was constructed using the student survey but re-worded to accommodate the teacher perspective. The surveys were created using common teacher and student behaviors as seen in previous measures (Brand, 1976; Ratzburg, 2010), but added a section on teacher expectations. Additional student behaviors such as, cellular phone use during class, was added to the measure to establish the modern student’s accessibility to technological gadgets. A table of specifications was done for both surveys (see Table 3).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIMBB Student and Teacher Survey Specification Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect the band room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a positive role model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend every rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students know how to play the music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students behave appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students know policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives clear instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs student of misbehavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues immediate consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair when addressing misbehavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows frustration when students talk during rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantly addressing misbehaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 3 continues)
The student survey had four sections: teacher expectations, teacher behaviors, student behaviors, and demographics. Students were asked to respond to eight items pertaining to teacher expectations, six items concerning teacher behavior, eight items regarding common student behaviors and how often they occur, and six demographic items. The first two sections, teacher expectations and teacher behaviors, used a 4-choice Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. An example of a teacher expectation item is, “The band director expects me to attend every rehearsal.” A teacher behavior example from section two is “The band director is fair when addressing misbehaving students.” The third section, common student behaviors, used a similar 4-choice scale but with responses to indicate how often these behaviors occur (Always, Sometimes, Occasionally, and Rarely). For example, “How often are students using cell phones during rehearsal?”

### (Table 3 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Item Type</th>
<th>Other Measures</th>
<th>Affective Domain Level</th>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking during rehearsal</td>
<td>S, L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>S-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not paying attention</td>
<td>S, L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>S-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing out of turn</td>
<td>S, L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>S-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared for class</td>
<td>S, L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>S-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using cell phones</td>
<td>S, L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>S-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing other class/home work</td>
<td>S, L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>S-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of seat behavior</td>
<td>S, L</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>S-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating/chewing gum</td>
<td>S, L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>S-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons why students misbehave</td>
<td>T, O</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Organize</td>
<td>T-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Teacher behavior items 15 and 16 were omitted from the study due to low reliability. Table does not include teacher, student, or school demographic information. T indicates items answered by teachers, S indicates items answered by students, O represents open response items, and L designates Likert-scale items. B represents similar item found in Brand (1976) measure, and R represents similar item found in Ratzburg (2010) measure.
The teacher survey was constructed using the same concepts of the student survey. The teacher survey consists of eight items pertaining to teacher expectations, six items concerning teacher behavior, two items based on student behavior, and finally nine items regarding school and program information as well as director demographics. The first section, pertaining to teacher expectations, and the second section, regarding teacher behaviors related to student conduct, used a 4-choice Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The next two items were items related to student conduct. The first item was a yes/no response and the second item is an open-response item asking for reasons why teachers feel student behavioral problems occur. This open-response question was used in previous research (Brand, 1976) to help bring clarity to each teaching situation. The remaining items pertained to the band program and the school such as school type and size. Finally, directors were asked to provide personal background information for gender, age, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, and years teaching at current school.

A Likert scale was used to assess attitudes. This form of measurement has been used in other studies of classroom behavior (Brand, 1976; Ratzburg, 2010) and was particularly effective as it portrays the participant’s attitudes toward the various statements regarding band rehearsal and classroom management. The surveys were piloted with teachers and graduate students outside the state of Florida. Comments were requested regarding readability but none were received.

The survey took five to ten minutes to complete. An entire packet was provided, which included a counted set of surveys, consent forms, and a stamped return envelope. Specific directions for the teachers to administer and collect the surveys were also
provided (see Appendix I). Once completed, the teacher returned all surveys in the envelope provided.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The survey packets were mailed to the participating schools ($N = 21$) and were administered during the regular scheduled class time. Administration of the survey was given during the first ten minutes of class time to ensure that the students had ample time to read and answer each item. If a student was absent or tardy, they were not able to participate because only one administration of the survey was permitted for each class. If there were students enrolled in more than one advanced ensemble on the day the surveys were administered, directions were given so that students only completed the survey once.

Because this survey was being administered during class and especially at the beginning of class time, the teacher selected the day to administer the survey so that it would not interfere with preparations for upcoming performances. Most teachers administered the surveys either after Florida Bandmasters Association Concert Band Music Performance Assessment or after their Spring Concert.

Teachers administered, answered, and collected the surveys all in one portion of a rehearsal setting, not taking more than ten minutes. If the teacher was administering the survey for more than one advanced band, the teacher needed to complete one survey for each class. If there were multiple band teachers in one program, instructions were given so that all band teachers completed the survey independently.
There was no cost to the participants to take this survey. The teacher had to read the instructions carefully and follow the directions as to how to administer, collect, and submit all collected forms. Because the teacher administered and collected the surveys, simple instructions were provided. Email follow-ups were sent to ensure that the teachers’ questions, if they had any, were answered. Reminder emails were also sent out for deadlines to administer, collect, and submit the packet. All surveys were numbered by school and coded for the researcher to analyze demographic data; however, teachers, students, or schools were not identified.

**Preliminary Data Analysis**

Both surveys, *LIMBB-T* and *LIMBB-S*, were divided in sections: teacher expectations, teacher behaviors, and student rehearsal conduct. Composites were created using the questions that specifically related to each section (see Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Expectations – Teacher (TET)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>LIMBB-T</em> 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Expectations – Student (TES)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>LIMBB-S</em> 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Behaviors – Teacher (TBT)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>LIMBB-T</em> 9-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Behaviors – Student (TBS)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>LIMBB-S</em> 9-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Rehearsal Conduct (SRC)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>LIMBB-S</em> 17-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s *alpha* was used to check reliability using the three composite sections of the surveys. Several combinations of reliability were run. Composite scores showed high levels of reliability, TET reliability was *r* = 0.856, TES was *r* = 0.851, and combined teacher expectation reliability (using both TET and TES scores) was *r* = 0.800. The initial reliability for teacher behavior items was very low, therefore responses for
items 15 & 16 were removed from both student and teacher scales and not used for analysis. TBT reliability was $r = 0.756$, TBS was $r = 0.657$, and combined behavior reliability, (using both TBT and TBS scores) was $r = 0.679$. Student rehearsal conduct (SRC) was calculated separately since only the students were asked about this category. Student rehearsal conduct was calculated at $r = 0.813$. 
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to compare student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in secondary instrumental music classrooms in Florida schools. Music teachers of public and private schools volunteered to participate from Miami-Dade County \( (n = 11) \), Broward County \( (n = 3) \), Palm Beach County \( (n = 3) \), Lee County \( (n = 2) \), Duval County \( (n = 1) \), and Lake County \( (n = 1) \). Twenty-one Florida secondary schools were represented with 34 instrumental music ensemble teachers and 749 band students. Teachers and students answered survey questions from *Lalama Instrument for Measuring Behaviors in Band – Teacher survey* or *LIMBB–T* and *Lalama Instrument for Measuring Behaviors in Band – Student survey* or *LIMBB–S* accordingly. Responses of the surveys were used to answer the formulated research questions.

1. How do teachers and students perceive teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct in the instrumental music classroom?

2. Do perceptions of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors differ by group (students and teachers), teacher gender, and teacher experience?

3. How congruent are secondary instrumental music teacher and music student ratings of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct?

4. How do teacher gender, teacher experience, and the overall congruency of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors predict rehearsal conduct?

5. What are secondary instrumental music teacher perceptions as to why students misbehave?
Research Question One

To answer research question one, *How do teachers and students perceive teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct in the instrumental music classroom?*, descriptive analyses were performed using individual expectation and behavior items and composites from both *LIMBB*-T and *LIMBB*-S (see Table 5 and 6). Composites consist of the sum of mean scores for teacher expectation items for teachers, TET, and students, TES. Similarly, teacher behavior composites were formed using the sum of mean scores for teacher behavior items for teachers, TBT, and students, TBS.

Teacher expectations and behaviors mean scores were similar among teachers and students. Expectation and behavior mean responses were consistently higher for teacher responses compared to student responses for both individual items and composite scores. In only one case did a teacher behavior receive a higher mean score from student responses, and that item was, _teacher uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior._

Table 5  
*Teacher Expectations on Classroom Management Seen by Teachers (N = 34) and Students (N = 749)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Expectations</th>
<th>Teacher Responses</th>
<th>Student Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect the Teacher</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect all Students</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect the Band Room</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Role Model</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend All Rehearsals</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Music Correctly</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behave Appropriately</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Program Policies</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Expectation Composite</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
*Teacher Behaviors on Classroom Management Seen by Teachers (N = 34) and Students (N=749)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Behaviors</th>
<th>Teacher Responses</th>
<th>Student Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives clear instructions</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs students of misbehavior</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues immediate consequence after misbehavior</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair when addressing misbehavior</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows frustration when students talk during rehearsal</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Behavior Composite</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson correlation statistics were performed for teacher expectation individual items for both teacher and student scores (see Table 7 and 8). Teacher expectation items displayed some significant relationships at 0.05 and 0.01 levels. The items in which teacher scores had the highest correlations dealt with *respect* in some form. *Respect the teacher* had very strong correlations with *behave appropriately*, \( r = .602 \), and *know program policies*, \( r = .766 \). Additionally, *respect the band room* had very strong relationship with [be a] *positive role model* with a correlation of \( r = .685 \). Teacher scores showed strong correlations between *behave appropriately* and *know program policies*, \( r = .602 \).

Significant positive relationships were found among all the student’s individual expectation items all at the 0.01 level. Although all student scores showed significant positive relationships, only one expectation correlation was very high, \( r = .612 \), and that was *respect the teacher* and *respect all students*. 
Correlation statistics were performed for teacher behavior individual items for both teachers and students scores (see Table 9 and 10). Compared to student results, only a few significant relationships were found among teacher scores, which could be a reflection of the smaller teacher sample size \((N = 34)\). Despite the small sample, the significant relationships found within teacher scores for teacher behaviors were strong.
Uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior displayed high significant correlations with issues immediate consequence after misbehavior, \( r = .687 \), and fair when addressing misbehavior, \( r = .518 \). Another significant correlation among teacher scores was between items gives clear instructions, and informs students of misbehavior, \( r = .528 \).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informs students of misbehavior</th>
<th>Issues immediate consequence after misbehavior</th>
<th>Fair when addressing misbehavior</th>
<th>Uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior</th>
<th>Shows frustration when students talk during rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives clear instructions</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs students of misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues immediate consequence after misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.687**</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair when addressing misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Significant relationships were found among student responses for most teacher behavior items at 0.01 and 0.05 levels. The item gives clear instruction, showed very high significant correlations with informs students of misbehavior, \( r = .647 \), issues immediate consequence after misbehavior, \( r = .644 \), fair when addressing misbehavior, \( r = .686 \), and uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior, \( r = .704 \). The other student response items that showed very high relationships were informs students of
misbehavior with issues immediate consequence after misbehavior, \( r = .704 \), and uses encouraging words when correcting misbehaviors and fair when addressing misbehavior, \( r = .777 \).

Table 10
Correlation Matrix of Individual Items of Teacher Behaviors as seen by Students (\( N = 749 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informs students of misbehavior</th>
<th>Issues immediate consequence after misbehavior</th>
<th>Fair when addressing misbehavior</th>
<th>Uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior</th>
<th>Shows frustration when students talk during rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives clear instructions</td>
<td>(.647^{**})</td>
<td>(.644^{**})</td>
<td>(.686^{**})</td>
<td>(.704^{**})</td>
<td>(.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs students of misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.704^{**})</td>
<td>(.514^{**})</td>
<td>(.322)</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues immediate consequence after misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.557^{**})</td>
<td>(.404^{**})</td>
<td>(.140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair when addressing misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.777^{**})</td>
<td>(.352^{*})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.322)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*, Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). **, Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Research Question Two

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedures were performed to answer research question two, *Do perceptions of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors differ by group (students and teachers), teacher gender, and teacher experience?* (see Table 11). Composites created in research question one were used to compute question two calculations. In order to have adequate cell sizes for the analysis, teacher experience was categorized as high or low levels of experience and only two-way interactions were examined.
Table 11
MANOVA Analyses of Expectation and Behavior Composites by Group (Teacher/Student),
Teacher Gender and Teacher Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2, 59</td>
<td>21.963</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Gender</td>
<td>2, 59</td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>2, 59</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Gender</td>
<td>2, 59</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Experience</td>
<td>2, 59</td>
<td>3.278</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender X Experience</td>
<td>2, 59</td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F Tests: Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.677</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F Tests: Teacher Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F Tests: Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F Tests: Group X Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F Tests: Group X Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.850</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F Tests: Gender X Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Composite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.856</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multivariate analysis revealed a significant Wilks' Lambda for group. Univariate F-test results indicated a significant main effect for group (teacher/student) for the expectations composite, while no significant differences were found for the behavior composite. Table 12 shows higher mean expectation composite scores for teachers. The only significant difference found for behavior composite scores was the interaction of gender and teaching experience. Multiple comparison tests (LSD) revealed significant differences between low and high teaching experience male teachers, and between high experience male and female teachers.

Table 12
*Group Descriptive Analysis for all Main Effects and Significant Interaction Effects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24.55</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group by Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Low Teaching Experience</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-High Teaching Experience</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Low Teaching Experience</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-High Teaching Experience</td>
<td>24.46</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Three

To answer research question number three, *How congruent are secondary instrumental music teacher and music student ratings of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct?*, several steps were taken. Congruency needed to be operationally defined in order to create a statistical formula. Congruency for teacher expectations and teacher behaviors was operationally defined as the magnitude of agreement among individual items responses between teachers and students. Teacher expectation congruency was calculated using the absolute value of the difference in mean teacher and student scores for each item using this formula:

\[ |\text{TET} - \text{TES}| = \text{Teacher Expectation Congruency (TEC)} \]

The absolute difference indicated the magnitude of agreement, or congruency, per item. The larger the difference the more responses differed between teachers and students. A score closer to zero indicated more congruency. Absolute value scores for individual items were then summed to form teacher expectation congruency composite.

\[ \text{TEC1} + \text{TEC2} + \text{TEC3} + \text{TEC4} + \text{TEC5} + \text{TEC6} + \text{TEC7} + \text{TEC8} = \text{TEC Composite} \]

The same procedures were performed for teacher behavior individual items to create teacher behavior congruency composite.

\[ |\text{TBT} - \text{TBS}| = \text{Teacher Behavior Congruency (TBC)} \]

\[ \text{TBC9} + \text{TBC10} + \text{TBC11} + \text{TBC12} + \text{TBC13} + \text{TBC14} = \text{TBC Composite} \]

Descriptive statistics were performed on TEC composite and TBC composite (see Table 13). TEC composite mean was 3.09, which was lower than the TBC composite
mean at 3.50. The lower the mean score, the higher the agreement level, therefore TEC had a higher level of agreement compared to TBC.

Table 13
Descriptive Analysis of Teacher Expectation Congruency (TEC) and Teacher Behavior Congruency (TBC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEC</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics for rehearsal conduct was analyzed in both individual items and rehearsal conduct composite (see Table 14). Talking dominates student responses as the behavior that occurs the most often. Behaviors such as other class/homework and eating/chewing gum, were items that appeared to occur the least.

Table 14
Common Misbehaviors Reported by Students (N=749)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior During Rehearsal</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Paying Attention</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Out of Turn</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared for Class</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Seat</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phones in Class</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating/Chewing Gum</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Class Work/Homework</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal Conduct Composite</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation statistics were then run to determine how TEC, TBC, and SRC relate (see Table 15). Results show a significant positive correlation between TEC and SRC ($r = .356, p < .05$). No significant correlations existed between the remaining variables.
Table 15
Correlation of Teacher Expectation Congruency, Teacher Behavior Congruency, and Student Rehearsal Conduct (N = 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TBC</th>
<th>SRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEC</strong></td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.356*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBC</strong></td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Research Question Four

Using the results of the previous three questions, regression statistics were used to answer question four, *How do teacher gender, teacher experience, and the overall congruency of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors predict rehearsal conduct?*

Results indicate that TEC was a positive predictor of SRC but TBC was not. TEC had a strong effect (Keith, 1999) with a standardized beta weight of .255 (see Table 16).

Table 16
Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Student Rehearsal Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEC</strong></td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBC</strong></td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .473$

Gender also had a strong effect on rehearsal conduct with a standardized beta weight of .257. Table 17 reveals gender means for rehearsal conduct means higher for female music teachers compared to male teachers (female teachers, $M = 18.92$ male
teachers, $M = 17.25$). Higher rehearsal conduct scores indicate more problematic student behaviors.

The teaching experience variable was the strongest predictor of rehearsal conduct (beta weight of .530), with less experienced teachers having higher rehearsal conduct scores. The analysis accounted for 47.3% of the variance in rehearsal conduct.

Table 17
Descriptive Analysis of Teacher Demographic Information that were Predictors of Rehearsal Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehearsal Conduct</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Five

Research question five, What are secondary instrumental music teacher perceptions as to why students misbehave?, two items from the LIMBB-T survey were used, one was a yes/no question while the other was an open response question.

To get a better understanding of the participating teachers’ perspective of their own classroom teachers were asked, Do you feel student conduct is a problem you are consistently addressing? Of the responses given, 64.7% said student conduct was not a problem for their class (see Table 18).
Table 18
*Teacher Responses to Item 17, Do you feel student conduct is a problem you are consistently addressing? (N=34)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years Teaching Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years Teaching Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years Teaching Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 16 Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this was a *yes/no* item, two teachers decided to select both the yes and no boxes. No explanation was given therefore the researcher interpreted this response as though the teachers felt addressing behavior problems is sometimes problematic. Perhaps a lack of consistency in teacher expectations or behaviors allows students to misinterpret expectations, which ultimately affects rehearsal conduct.

The second item was an open-end response that asked the teacher their opinions as to why they think students misbehave during band rehearsal. This item did not necessarily reflect their current teaching situation, but it did seek opinions as to why behavior management is problematic for so many instrumental music teachers. Multiple responses were given by each teacher, which appears to vary for each ensemble they have taught. Some teachers chose to leave this item blank ($n = 4$).

Responses were grouped into categories by the researcher: Performance Related, Teacher Related, Student/Socially Related, and Family Related areas (see Table 19). Percentages were calculated by individual responses within the categories, as well as category percentages. Of these four categories, an overwhelming 49% of the responses given placed reasons directly on the students. The leading responses were lack of
focus/social distractions with 15.7% and immaturity with 11.9%. Surprisingly, 9.8% of the responses were blaming the students’ age as reason for misbehavior. Regardless of the students’ age, guidance is needed to teach appropriate student behaviors.

Performance related responses had the second highest percentage with 23.5%. While only one teacher mentioned the type of ensemble or music being performed, the remaining responses appeared to have problems in extreme levels of talent in one class that leads to down time for students 11.8%, selection of music 7.8%, and advanced literature in chamber music settings 3.9%.

Table 19

Open-end Teacher Responses as to Why Students Misbehave (N=34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons Given</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student/Socially Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of focus/Social distractions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaturity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain individuals will act out</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student/Socially Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme levels of talent in same class</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music too difficult/easy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced literature allows idle time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of music being played (jazz, rock, etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect/responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of discipline at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Teacher Preparedness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level with teacher &amp; subject</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class sizes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much structure in other classes than band</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Teachers were given this open-end response and did not have a limit as to how many responses they chose to give.
Family related responses totaled 17.6%. This category had the most nonspecific responses such as home environment, lack of discipline, and lack of respect/responsibility. Although responses appeared to be vague, it seems that teachers are teaching students whose focus on school is not supported at home. Reasons could vary from social economic status, single parent homes, or even poor parenting, but no specific reasons were given. Perhaps future studies can explore instrumental music teacher’s perspective of misbehaving students with their home environment.

Finally, the category that had the fewest reasons given was teacher related at 9.8%. Although responses were more specific, 3.9% of the teachers acknowledged their own lack of preparedness were reasons for student misbehavior. The other responses had one teacher response for each holding at 1.9% were larger class size, comfort level with the class, and less structure in band than other classes. To help clarify, the response given for comfort level of class refers to the student comfort level. The teachers’ responses was interpreted as the students had been in band class with the same teacher and same students for years, therefore the student was more comfortable to act out and perhaps misbehave. Exact wording of all teacher responses can be found in Appendix J.

The varying responses to the open-ended question reported by teachers showed a wide range of reasons as to why the students misbehave during band class. Teachers placed the majority of the reasons in the student and the least amount within themselves. Regardless of where blame is placed, ultimately teachers are still responsible for setting and maintaining an appropriate learning environment.
Discussion

Although teachers and students had similar scores for teacher expectations and teacher behaviors, teachers consistently had slightly higher mean scores. Significant correlations were found among most individual items of student responses for expectations and behaviors. A small number of significant relationships were found among teacher responses, however the small teacher sample ($N = 34$) could contribute to the lack of significant correlations.

Teacher responses were higher than student responses in all items except one, *uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior*. This directly relates to verbal feedback, which has the largest amount of research in music teacher behavior management (Duke, 1999). Typically, studies have shown that music teachers tend to use more negative feedback compared to positive feedback (Duke & Blackman, 1991; Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Duke, 1985b, 1987; Thurman, 1978; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). The present study adds a new perspective to the body of research where students perceive their teacher’s use of encouraging words better than teachers themselves.

Composites were used to determine whether various combinations of group (teacher/student), teacher gender, or teacher experience perceive teacher expectations and teacher behaviors differently. Results indicated that teacher expectation composite significantly differed by group, suggesting teachers and student have dissimilar perceptions of teacher expectations. Analysis for teacher behavior composite did not differ by group as no significant difference was found.
It appears that teachers and students have slightly different interpretations of teacher expectations, which is consistent with the research literature on verbal communication. There is a misunderstanding of teachers’ perspective on what they are communicating to the students and how the students are actually interpreting. Duke & Henninger (1998) found that students interpreted teacher negative feedback and directive feedback similarly, whereas that was not the intention of the teacher. Similarly, Madsen & Duke (1985b) found differences in trained and untrained observer’s perceptions of teacher verbal feedback. Although Madsen & Duke (1985b) participants were all adults, the difference between trained and untrained observers is parallel with teachers and students. Results of the present study add and support the current body of research that exists in music education verbal communication. Specifically, communicated teacher expectations are interpreted differently by teachers and students.

The only significant difference found for the teacher behavior composite scores was the interaction of gender and teaching experience. Significant differences were found between low and high teaching experience male teachers, and between high experience male and female teachers. The body of literature does not contain research in the combined areas of gender, teaching experience, and classroom management, therefore, future research can investigate these unexplored areas.

Congruency for both teacher expectations and teacher behaviors was influential for this study. Results showed that teacher expectation congruency had a higher level of agreement between teachers and students compared to teacher behavior congruency (TEC = 3.09 and TBC = 3.50). Comparing congruency for both teacher expectations and teacher behaviors from teacher and student perspectives is a new area to music education.
research. Future studies can explore developing different ways of measuring congruency of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors between the two groups.

Rehearsal conduct data was taken exclusively from the students. The researcher perceived student reports to be a more accurate account of actual happenings in the classroom. This supports previous research that students comment more on classroom management compared to experienced teachers (K. Madsen, 2003). The younger the student the more comments on classroom management were given, while the more experienced the teacher, a decline in comments were given on classroom management.

A positive significant correlation was found between teacher expectation congruency and student rehearsal conduct. Regression techniques were used to determine whether teacher expectation congruency, teacher behavior congruency, teacher gender, or teacher experience level were predictors of rehearsal conduct. Results found that teacher expectation congruency was a positive predictor of student conduct, but teacher behavior congruency was not. This contradicts previous research that shows teacher behaviors were directly related to student behavior (Duke et al, 1998; Duke & Madsen, 1991; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Perhaps teacher behavior congruency is conceptually different than teacher behavior. Madsen & Geringer (1983) found that teacher intensity, a form of teacher behavior, was an important component of effective teaching, which ultimately affects rehearsal conduct. Yarbrough & Price (1981) found significant relationships between teacher behavior and rehearsal conduct, however the ability to generalize this finding was extremely limited as only six teachers participated.
Brendall (1996) found that student misconduct within choral music classes was related to student inactivity (Kostka, 1984; Price, 1983; Watkins; 1996; Yarbrough, 1975; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). While student misconduct was shown to have a relationship with inactivity, it appears to have an indirect relationship with teacher behaviors. After all, student inactivity is a reflection of teacher pacing and execution (Kounin, 1970). Perhaps future research can explore music teacher planning and execution methods as it relates to student rehearsal conduct.

Although results found TEC as a predictor of student conduct, there is a lack of research in this area. Duke’s (1999) review of music education research shows verbal feedback as having the most amount of research in behavioral management in music education. Perhaps verbal feedback studies had been used more as corrective academic measures rather than corrective social measure. Only two studies in music education research mention how verbal feedback was recorded, either academic or social (Duke & Blackman, 1991; Goolsby, 1996). Future studies can investigate verbal feedback not only by specifying whether it is academic or social but also relating feedback as teacher expectations of classroom behaviors.

Results also found teacher gender and teacher experience as predictors of rehearsal conduct. While there is a lack of research relating to teacher gender and rehearsal conduct, a few studies support teacher experience relating to student rehearsal conduct. Goolsby (1996) found that novice teachers spend more time on verbal instruction (including corrective social feedback) compared to experienced teachers. This supports previous research that student inactivity, which includes teacher talk time,

Teachers were asked two items regarding typical classroom student behavior. The first item was a yes/no response asking if they felt they were constantly addressing behavior problems in their classes. Many teachers, 64.7% replied no. This is a possible reflection of the sample as many teachers were veteran teachers. One can speculate that veteran teachers would not have as many classroom management problems because of their experiences (Goolsby, 1996). Additionally, experienced teachers comment the least on behavior management issues (K. Madsen, 2003). Perhaps student misbehavior is not a factor for the majority of the teacher participants, or maybe teachers were reluctant to report student misbehavior. Regardless, the majority of teacher participants reported that student misbehavior was not a major issue they were addressing consistently.

Teachers were also asked to give reasons they felt students misbehave during band rehearsal. Responses were categorized into four groups: performance-related, student/socially related, teacher related, and family related. Student/socially related category is where 49% of teachers placed blame with examples such as age, immaturity, and lack of focus. The area within the literature that supports the student-related category of teacher open-ended responses was in student on-task and off-task behavior. The present study teacher perception results displayed lack of focus/social distractions as the leading contributor of student misbehavior. This supports previous research that student inattentiveness is caused by lack of active participation (Brendall, 1996; Forsythe, 1975, 1977; Kostka, 1984; Madsen & Alley, 1979; Madsen & Geringer, 1983; Price, 1983; Watkins, 1996; Yarbrough, 1975; Yarbrough & Price, 1981).
The category that contained the second highest amount of responses was performance related, with extreme levels of talent in one class and music selection being too easy or too difficult for students to be successful. It appears that teachers are feeling the challenges of traditional music classroom expectations of multi-level instruction and managing the students simultaneously. Perhaps future studies can investigate various teaching techniques used in multi-level instruction.

The family-related category had the third highest teacher responses in which blame was placed on the student’s lack of responsibility, or lack of a supportive home environment. This study does not contain home environment literature, but perhaps future studies can investigate students’ home environment and their behavior in band.

The teacher related category received the least amount of responses. Less than 4% of teacher responses admitted that lack of teacher preparedness was reason for student misbehavior. Ironically, the majority of research reviewed in this study pertains to teacher related activities preventing student misbehavior. Verbal feedback, teacher intensity, and teacher behaviors in classroom management dominated the literature review, yet these are all teacher-initiated actions. It appears that teachers in the present study perceive the problem of student misbehavior is not in the fault of the teachers, yet the research suggests teacher actions as a main contributor of student misconduct.

Large class sizes and comfort level of the class were two other reasons teachers presented within the teacher related category. These responses support the plethora of articles that exist in music classroom management issues (Bauer, 2001; Brand, 1976; Buck, 1992; Graulty 2010). The secondary instrumental music classroom is different
compared to the general education classroom and this setting justifies exclusive classroom management approaches.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in secondary instrumental music classrooms in Florida schools. Comparisons were made between teachers and students using teacher expectations and teacher behaviors on student conduct to answer the following questions:

1. How do teachers and students perceive teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct in the instrumental music classroom?
2. Do perceptions of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors differ by group (students and teachers), teacher gender, and teacher experience?
3. How congruent are secondary instrumental music teacher and music student ratings of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors related to managing student conduct?
4. How do teacher gender, teacher experience, and the overall congruency of teacher expectations and teacher behaviors predict rehearsal conduct?
5. What are secondary instrumental music teacher perceptions as to why students misbehave?

Instrumental music teachers were contacted through the Florida Bandmasters Association membership email list and asked to participate. Twenty-one schools from six Florida counties agreed to participate. After meeting Internal Review Board criteria, eligible volunteer band directors response rate was 58.62%. Student volunteers were
limited to their director participation and parent consent form signed, therefore student response rate 59.4%. Ensemble music teachers \((N = 34)\) and their students \((N = 749)\) were given the *Lalama Instrument for Measuring Behaviors in Band* or LIMBB teacher and student surveys. The teacher and student surveys are mostly parallel with slight re-wording to accommodate perspectives. Likert scale items were adapted from previous research measures (Brand, 1976; Ratzburg, 2010) to accommodate modern teacher expectations (TE), teacher behaviors (TB), and student rehearsal conduct (SRC).

Cronbach’s *alpha* was used to check reliability of each of its components. Reliability for TET was \(r = 0.856\), TES was \(r = 0.851\), and combined teacher expectation reliability was \(r = 0.800\). TBT reliability was \(r = 0.756\), TBS was \(r = 0.657\), and combined teacher behavior reliability was 0.679. Student rehearsal conduct (SRC) reliability was calculated at \(r = 0.813\).

Surveys were mailed to participating schools and were administered by the participating secondary instrumental music teachers during regularly scheduled class time. Frequency counts, descriptive analyses, correlations, and regression techniques were used to analyze and answer the research questions. A congruency formula was created using the absolute value of the difference between teacher and student responses for individual items, and then summed to create composite congruencies for teacher expectations and teacher behaviors.

**Results and Conclusions**

Descriptive analyses for teacher expectations and teacher behaviors revealed that teachers’ mean scores were consistently higher than students’ mean scores for all items
except uses encouraging words when correcting misbehavior. The difference in mean scores suggests that teachers and students interpret teacher expectations and teacher behaviors slightly different and needs further investigation.

Correlation results showed significant relationships existed within student responses for almost all teacher expectation and teacher behavior individual items. Teacher scores displayed some significant correlations however not as many as the students.

MANOVA results found that teacher expectation composite significantly differed by group, suggesting that teachers and student have dissimilar perceptions of teacher expectations. The only significant difference found for behavior composite scores was the interaction of gender and teaching experience. Multiple comparison tests revealed significant differences between low and high teaching experience male teachers, and between high experience male and female teachers.

Teacher expectation congruency and teacher behavior congruency were calculated, and results found that teacher expectations had a higher level of agreement among teachers and students than teacher behavior. These composites were correlated with student rehearsal conduct composite and results displayed significant relationships between teacher expectation congruency and student rehearsal conduct.

Regression statistics were used to determine if teacher expectation congruency, teacher behavior congruency, teacher gender, and teacher experience were predictors of rehearsal conduct. Results displayed teacher expectation congruency, teacher gender, and teacher experience as predictors of student rehearsal conduct, but not teacher behavior congruency.
More than half of the participating teachers, 64.7%, felt that student conduct was not a problem in their classroom. Such a large response could have occurred because of the amount of experienced teachers in the sample, or perhaps teachers were reluctant to report student misconduct.

The open-ended response item that asked teachers their opinions as to why they feel students misbehave had interesting responses. All responses were grouped into categories of Performance Related, Teacher Related, Student/Socially Related, and Family Related. The largest portion of teacher responses, 49%, placed reasons directly on the students, while only 9.8% placed responsibility on the teacher. Generalizing these responses is a major factor to how teachers perceive foundations of student behavior and needs further exploration.

Based on the results, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Teachers and students perceive teacher expectations and teacher behaviors slightly different from one another.
2. Teacher mean scores were consistently higher than student mean scores for both teacher expectations and teacher behaviors.
3. Teacher expectation congruency had a higher level of teacher/student agreement than teacher behavior congruency; therefore there is more agreement between students and teachers regarding teacher expectations than teacher behaviors.
4. Significant correlations existed between teacher expectation congruency and student rehearsal conduct.
5. Teacher expectation congruency, teacher gender, and teacher experience level were predictors of student rehearsal conduct, but teacher behavior congruency was not.

6. Teachers generally did not feel behavior management was a problem, yet it clearly exists.

7. Teachers place student misbehavior blame mostly on students, followed by performance issues and home environment, and the least accountable were the teachers themselves.

Implications

Mean scores for teacher expectations and teacher behaviors were similar for students and teachers, but teachers’ scores were consistently higher than student scores. Results found that students and teachers interpret teacher expectations differently. Teacher expectation congruency had strong relationships with student rehearsal conduct. Results also suggest that teacher expectation congruency, teacher gender, and teacher experience level were important components for predicting student rehearsal conduct. Results must be interpreted carefully because of the small teacher sample size. The following implications can be made based on the results of the study.

1. Communicating teacher expectations of classroom behavior should be in a manner that students can relate to. Teachers are encouraged to use multiple methods of communicating expectations so that various learning styles are covered. Repetition and reminders of classroom expectations should be addressed
year round as students (and sometimes teachers) tend to forget beginning of the year expectations.

2. Teacher behavior is a topic well explored in music education research, however results vary in multiple studies. Effective teacher behavior is important for academic and social avenues for optimal student learning. Teachers should follow effective teaching techniques that are used in academic settings and apply them to their behavioral settings.

3. Because teachers and students have a higher level of agreement for teacher expectations than teacher behaviors, teachers need to be more aware of their verbal approaches and how they can be interpreted differently than anticipated.

4. Since teacher expectation congruency relates to rehearsal conduct, teachers should take measures to ensure behavior expectations exist and are presented and enforced year round.

5. Behavior management strategies are necessary for band teachers to help fit the needs of their particular situation. Teachers should have a behavioral plan, communicate it in several ways so that students could understand, and reinforce the plan verbally and through teacher behaviors year round. These steps are important for maintaining rehearsal conduct, which could lead to more effective teaching and learning.

6. Regardless of where foundations of student misconduct are categorized, teachers are ultimately responsible for establishing the ideal learning environment. Teachers should be proactive by establishing and maintaining a behavioral plan that all students understand and follow.
**Recommendations**

The present study compared student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in secondary instrumental music classrooms in Florida schools. The following considerations should be taken into account for replication of this study or future research in the area secondary instrumental music classroom management.

1. A larger teacher sample size will improve reliability and gain broader perspective of teacher accounts on classroom management practices.

2. Student participants were limited to students who returned parent/guardian consent form. Those who turned in the forms (perhaps the more responsible students) could have a different perspective of actual student and teacher behavior occurrences. A replication of this study using all students in band classes could give a more accurate account of student and teacher happenings.

3. Future studies can explore instrumental music teacher’s perspective of misbehaving students with their home environment.

4. According to student participants, student rehearsal conduct appeared to have varying occurrences according to the individual items surveyed (*i.e.*, talking, chewing gum, etc.). Teachers appear to have more control over certain behaviors compared to others. Future research can investigate the type of consequences teachers issue for the behaviors they seem to have control over, and see what is effective.

The present study displayed student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in secondary band rehearsals in Florida. Teachers and students had similar
mean scores but teachers consistently had higher scores for teacher expectations and
teacher behaviors. Although mean scores were similar, significant differences were found
in teacher expectation composite, which suggests that teachers and students have
dissimilar interpretations of teacher expectations. Teacher expectations congruency had a
significant relationship with student rehearsal conduct. Teacher expectation congruency,
teacher gender, and teacher experience level were found to be predictors of student
rehearsal conduct, but teacher behavior congruency was not. Essentially, the areas of
teacher expectations, teacher behaviors, and student rehearsal conduct are all related, yet
teachers and students have varying interpretations.

Communication is key to any relationship. Teachers tend to focus on the verbal
explanation of instructions, however, rarely are concerned with student interpretations.
For communication to be successful, intent and interpretation should be synchronized.
Further exploration is needed to better understand the relationships between student and
teacher interpretations of teacher expectations, teacher behaviors, and overall classroom
management for the ideal learning environment. When interpretations are congruent, this
could lead to better student rehearsal conduct, which could lead to more effective
teaching and learning. A replication of this study, with suggested revisions, could help
narrow the gap of how teachers and students interpret classroom expectations and
behaviors.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FLORIDA BANDMASTERS ASSOCIATION
February 1, 2011

Dear Duane Hendon,

My name is Susana M. Lalama and I am currently pursuing my Masters degree in music education at the University of Miami Frost School of Music. Prior to my graduate schooling, I was a high school band director for seven years at Barbara Goleman High School in Miami-Dade County. While at Goleman, I was not only able to improve the students’ musical skills and musicianship, but I simultaneously developed an interest in how students learn music and the necessary environment conducive to successful band teaching and learning.

My thesis is based on classroom management in a secondary instrumental classroom in Florida schools. More specific, I am comparing teacher expectations and behaviors on student conduct with their students’ interpretations of those expectations and behaviors. I am looking to see if a match or mismatch in behavior expectations can be a predictor of student behavior or a predictor of band success. Results of the study can be beneficial to band teachers throughout Florida and the United States as we gain a better understanding of perceptions of classroom management from teacher and student points of view.

I am asking for the support of the Florida Bandmasters Association in cooperating with this study. I would like to request volunteer band directors and their students involved in Florida Bandmasters Association to participate. I will send out all necessary information via email, but would like your consent in soliciting volunteers through the FBA mailing list.

If you desire more information regarding the study, please contact me at s.lalama@umiami.edu or 305-968-8252. I hope we will be working together in pursuit of improving effective band teaching and learning.

Sincerely,

Susana M. Lalama

Graduate Student
Frost School of Music
University of Miami
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO BAND DIRECTORS
February 1, 2011

Dear Florida Band Directors,

My name is Susana M. Lalama and I am pursuing a Masters degree in music education at the University of Miami Frost School of Music. My thesis is based on classroom management in a secondary instrumental classroom in Florida schools. More specific, I am comparing teacher expectations and behaviors on student behavior with their students’ interpretations of those expectations and behaviors. I am looking to see if a match or mismatch in behavior expectations can be a predictor of student behavior or a predictor of band success. Results of the study can be beneficial to band teachers throughout Florida and the United States.

The study will include both you and your band students filling out a brief survey about perspectives of teacher expectations on student behavior. Being a high school band director for 7 years, I understand how precious rehearsal time is for both you and your students, but this survey will take about 5-10 minutes to distribute, complete, and collect. With your participation, hopefully our profession can gain a better understanding of perceptions of classroom management from teacher and student points of view.

Simply reply to this email (either YES, I will participate, or NO, I will not participate) and you will receive instructions as to what needs to be done.

I thank you in advanced for your time in an effort to improve the daily lives of our students and band teachers.

Sincerely,

Susana M. Lalama
Graduate Student
University of Miami
Frost School of Music
APPENDIX C

INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTERS
EXEMPT - CONFIRMATION

March 3, 2011

Stephen Zdzinski, Ph.D.
University of Miami
Department of Music Education and Music Therapy
Volpe, Room 201
Coral Gables, FL 33124

HSRO STUDY NUMBER: 20100744

STUDY TITLE: A comparison of student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in secondary band rehearsals in Florida schools.

IRB ACTION DATE: 2/28/2011

FWA #: FWA00002247

On 2/28/2011, an IRB Chair determined that the above referenced protocol qualifies for exemption form IRB review.

APPROVAL INCLUDES:

New Research Protocol
Research Materials (English Version Only)

- Student Survey
- Teacher Survey
- Recruitment Letter – Executive Director
- Recruitment Letter – Band Directors
- Recruitment Letter – School Principal
- Recruitment Letter – Teachers
- Parent & Student Informed Consent Form
- Teacher Informed Consent Form

Note to PI: Please submit a copy of the IRB approval from the following County Public Schools once it is obtained via a Notification Form: Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach Volusia, Okeechobee, Orange, St. Lucie, Leon, Duval, Jackson, Martin, Lee, Collier, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, St. Johns, Alachua, Sarasota, Lake, Escambia, Seminole, Osceola, Brevard, Madison, Monroe, Bay, Pinellas, Citrus, Pasco, Hillsborough, Clay, and Polk. Study activities with public schools in these counties cannot be initiated until approval is granted.

NOTE: Translations of IRB approved study documents, including informed consent documents, into languages other than English must be submitted to HSRO for approval prior to use.
A request to continue this study must be submitted to the HSRO at least 45 days before IRB expires. If this study does not receive continuing IRB approval prior to expiration, all research activities must cease, and it may be officially suspended or terminated.

Please remember that the Human Subjects Research Office (HSRO) must be notified of any proposed changes in research activities. Changes must receive IRB review and approval prior to implementation. Upon completion of the study, submit a closure report via eProst.

Sincerely,

[This is a representation of an electronic record that was signed electronically and this page is the manifestation of the electronic signature]

Amanda Coltes-Rojas, MPH, CIP
Director
Regulatory Affairs & Educational Initiatives

/ar

cc: IRB File
There are no items to display
Dear Ms. Lalama,

Our District Research Committee has reviewed your proposed study “A comparison of student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in a secondary band rehearsal in Florida schools.” We find your study interesting and do not have any objection to you contacting our principals to see if any of them are interested in pursuing this. Please make sure principals are aware that participation on the part of teachers and students is voluntary.

In addition, we really do not want schools to take up class time for an activity of this nature. Therefore, I will encourage schools that are interested to explore methods of data collection which do not impact student instructional time.

Please plan to provide us with a copy of the final results when your study is completed.

Thank you for your interest in conducting research in Lee County.

Richard Itzen, Director  
Dept. of Accountability, Research, and Continuous Improvement  
(239) 335-1448
Dear Ms. Lalama:

I am pleased to inform you that the Research Review Committee (RRC) of the Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS) has granted you approval for your request to conduct the study, "A comparison of student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in a secondary band rehearsal in Florida Schools" in order to fulfill the requirements of your Thesis at the University of Miami.

The approval is granted with the following conditions:

1. Participation of the schools targeted in this study is at the discretion of each principal. Please note that even with the approval of the RRC, it is still the responsibility of the Principal as the gatekeeper of the school to decide whether to participate or not. As stated in the Board rule, "the principal of the individual school has the privilege of deciding if RRC-approved research will be conducted within his/her school." A copy of this approval letter must be presented to each principal.

2. Before entering a school, the researcher must have District security clearance from the district. The researcher must present the following documents to the principal: (a) a copy of this approval letter; (b) a copy of the security clearance letter; and (c) a picture ID. The application for District security clearance can be found at:

3. The participation of all subjects (such as students, faculty, or staff) is voluntary.

4. The anonymity and/or confidentiality of all subjects must be assured.

5. Parent permission forms must be secured for all participating students prior to the beginning of the study.

6. Teacher consent forms must be secured for all participating teachers prior to the beginning of the study.

7. The study will involve surveying students participating in band rehearsal music program at various M-DCPS Secondary schools.

8. Disruption of the school's routine by the data collection activities of the study must be kept to a minimum. Data collection activities must not interfere with the district’s testing schedule.

May 9, 2011

Ms. Susana Lalama
5221 Geneva Way # 303
Doral, FL 33166

Miami-Dade County School Board
Perla Tabares Hantman, Chair
Dr. Lawrence S. Feldman, Vice Chair
Dr. Dorothy Bendross-Mindinggill
Carlos L. Corbello
Renier Diaz de la Portilla
Dr. Wilbert "Tee" Holloway
Dr. Martin Karp
Dr. Martha Perez
Raquel A. Regalado

Office of Program Evaluation
Miami-Dade County Public Schools
Superintendent of Schools
José M. Carvalho

Program Evaluation
Jerome L. Leist
9. All research activities must be conducted with the knowledge and approval of the Principal. All efforts should be made to minimize any negative on the learning environment.

It should be emphasized that the approval of the Research Review Committee does not constitute an endorsement of the study. It is simply a permission to request the voluntary cooperation in the study of individuals associated with M-DGPS.

It is your responsibility to ensure that appropriate procedures are followed in requesting an individual’s cooperation, and that all aspects of the study are conducted in a professional manner. With regard to the latter, make certain that all documents and instruments distributed within M-DGPS as part of the study are carefully edited.

The approval number for your study is 1734. This number should be used in all communications to clearly identify the study as approved by the Research Review Committee. The approval expires on 6/29/2012. During the approval period, the study must adhere to the design, procedures and instruments which were submitted to the Research Review Committee.

Finally, as indicated in your application, please submit to the RRC an abstract of the research findings by July, 2012.

If there are any changes in the study as it relates to M-DGPS, the RRC must be notified in writing. Substantial changes may necessitate resubmission of the request. Failure to notify me of such a change may result in the cancellation of the approval.

If you have any questions, please call me at 301-595-7326. On behalf of the Research Review Committee, I want to wish you every success with your study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tarak Chebbi, Ed. D.
Chairperson
Research Review Committee
TC:bf

Note: The researcher named in this letter of approval will be solely responsible and strictly accountable for any deviation from or failure to follow the research study as approved by the RRC. M-DGPS will NOT be held responsible for any claim and/or damage resulting from conducting this study.
April 4, 2011

Ms. Susana M. Lalama
5221 Geneva Way, #303
Miami, FL 33166

Dear Ms. Lalama:

The Superintendent's Research Review Committee has approved your request to conduct research entitled *A Comparison of Student and Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Management in Secondary Band Rehearsals in Florida Schools* in the School District of Palm Beach County (the District). The purpose of your study as indicated in your application is to compare the student and teacher perceptions of classroom management in a secondary band rehearsal.

According to our District's procedures, school participation is voluntary and subject to the authority of the school administration. To administer your research study, you require the participation of the band teacher and students enrolled in the band class at the schools listed below. Your request to conduct research has been approved at the following eligible schools:

- Alexander W. Dreyfoos Jr. School of the Arts
- Lantana Middle
- Omni Middle
- Western Pines Middle

The application that was submitted included Palm Beach Gardens High and Tradewinds Middle, but as we discussed research is not allowed at these schools. You have agreed to exclude these schools from your research.

As you conduct your research, please use the following guidelines:

- Contact no school other than the schools listed above. School contact information may be found on the District website (www.palmbeachschools.org) under the tab labeled Schools;
- Refrain from conducting any research activities at schools or contacting students or school instructional staff during the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) blackout period (February 28, 2011 through April 29, 2011);
- Summarize findings for reports prepared from this study and do not associate responses with a specific school or individual (information that identifies our District, schools, or individual responses will not be provided to anyone except as required by law);
August 29, 2011

Ms. Susana Lalama
3411 SW 112 Ave
Miami, FL 33165

Dear Ms. Lalama:

Thank you for submitting your research proposal, #651 — *A Comparison of Student and Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Management in a Secondary Band Rehearsal in Florida Schools*, for consideration by the Broward County Public Schools (BCPS). Staff has reviewed your research proposal and approval has been granted to contact the Principals at all Middle and High Schools only.

- One reviewer commented that the issue is not identified as one of major significance via data collection and interview of teachers.

This approval means that we have found your proposed research methods to be compatible with a public school setting and your research questions of interest to the school District. The expiration date on your proposal is **Wednesday, August 29, 2012**. If you are unable to complete your research by the expiration date, you must submit an Annual Report/Request for Renewal, (http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/research_evaluation/IRB_Pdf), to the Student Assessment and Research Department **four weeks** prior to the expiration date. If a renewal is granted, a Renewal Approval Letter and Memorandum will be issued.

Implementing your research, however, is a decision to be reached by the affected school-based staff on a **strictly voluntary basis**. To assist the school-based staff in their decision to participate, please outline the operational steps to be performed by staff at their school. Based upon this information, each school-based staff would then be **asked to make a decision to participate or not and inform you or the requesting research parties of their decision at the time of your/thier request**. School-based staff have been instructed not to cooperate unless you provide both pieces of Approval Documentation.

The anticipated date for submitting an electronic copy of your research findings is **Friday, December 28, 2012**. If additional assistance is needed from our staff, please contact me at 754-321-2500.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Maria R. Ligas, Ph.D.

MRL/MAL:bt
Attachments
TO: Principals at all Middle and High Schools

FROM: Maria R. Ligas, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair

VIA: Desmond K. Blackburn, Ph.D.
Central Area Superintendent

SUBJECT: REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH FOR PROPOSAL, #651 — A COMPARISON OF STUDENT AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IN A SECONDARY BAND REHEARSAL IN FLORIDA SCHOOLS

Staff has reviewed the research proposal, #651 — A Comparison of Student and Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Management in a Secondary Band Rehearsal in Florida Schools, submitted by Ms. Susana Lalama a Doctoral Candidate at University of Miami, and approval has been granted for him and/or any member of the research team to contact you and request your participation.

The recently completed review involved school-and/or District-based staff. These steps were taken to determine if the proposed methods demonstrated reasonable promise of generating data/analyses that will accurately answer the main research questions of interest.

Your participation in this research project is strictly voluntary. To aid in your decision, Ms. Lalama has been instructed to share, with each selected school-based staff, a complete description of research activities, as well as all Approval Documentation. Based upon this information, each school-based staff would then be asked to make a decision to participate or not and inform the requesting research parties of their decision at the time of their request.

DKB/MRL/MAL:bt
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
February 1, 2011

Dear School Principal,

My name is Susana M. Lalama and I am pursuing a Masters degree in music education at the University of Miami Frost School of Music. My thesis is based on classroom management in a secondary instrumental classroom in Florida schools. More specific, I am comparing teacher expectations and behaviors on student behavior with their students’ interpretations of those expectations and behaviors. I am looking to see if a match or mismatch in behavior expectations can be a predictor of student behavior or a predictor of band success. Results of the study can be beneficial to band teachers throughout Florida and the United States.

There are no risks or discomforts to either the students or teachers participating in the study. Appropriate parent/guardian consent forms are also distributed and collected before any child can participate.

The study will include the band director(s) and their band students filling out a brief survey about perspective of teacher expectations on student behavior. The survey will take about 5-10 minutes to distribute, complete, and collect. All student and teacher responses will remain anonymous and only be used in generalizing results. With your consent, hopefully the music education profession can gain a better understanding of perceptions of classroom management from teacher and student points of view.

Simply sign this letter at the bottom to allow the school band program to participate in this study. If you desire further information regarding this study, contact me at s.lalama@umiami.edu.

I thank you in advanced for your time in an effort to improve the daily lives of our students and band teachers.

Sincerely,

Susana M. Lalama
Graduate Student
University of Miami
Frost School of Music

_______________________________
Principal’s Signature
APPENDIX E

TEACHER CONSENT FORM
University of Miami
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

A Comparison of Student and Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Management in Secondary Band Rehearsals in Florida Schools

The following information describes the research study in which you have volunteered to participate. Please read the information carefully. At the end, you will be asked to sign if you agree to participate.

PURPOSE OF STUDY: The purpose of this study is to compare teacher expectations and behaviors on student conduct with their students’ interpretations of those expectations and behaviors to determine if a match or mismatch can be predictors of student behavior or band success.

PROCEDURES: As the teacher, your role is vital for this study. Instructions will be given to you to distribute and collect parent/guardian consent forms before the students are allowed to participate. Once the consent forms are collected, distribute the surveys, have the students respond to the items on their own as you respond to your corresponding survey. Both surveys are brief and should be completed in about 5 minutes. Collect the surveys and mail them back in the stamped envelope provided.

RISKS AND/OR DISCOMFORTS:
We do not anticipate you will experience any personal risks or discomfort from taking part in this study.

BENEFITS:
No benefit can be promised to you from your participation in this study. The study is expected to benefit society at large by gaining a better understanding of perceptions of classroom management from both teacher and student points of view. This is turn can lead to a more harmonious classroom environment conducive for learning.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Upon receiving all materials, the investigator will collect and sort all data. All information will be kept in a locked filling cabinet in the music education teaching assistant office at the University of Miami. There is no way to identify an individual because of anonymous responses.

By signing this consent, you authorize the Investigators(s) and his/her/their staff to access information provided in the survey necessary for purposes of this study.

COSTS:
There are no costs associated with your participation in this study.

RIGHT TO DECLINE OR WITHDRAW:
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to refuse to participate in the study or withdraw his/her consent at any time during the study. If you as the teacher withdraw from the study, the students you teach will automatically be withdrawn as well.
If you are an employee or student at the University of Miami, your desire not to participate in this study or request to withdraw will not adversely affect your status as an employee or grades at the University of Miami.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Susana Lalama, 305-284-6252 will gladly answer any questions you may have concerning the purpose, procedures, and outcome of this project. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact Human Subjects Research Office at the University of Miami, at (305) 243-3195.

TEACHER PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT:
I have read the information in this consent form and agree to participate in this study. I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study, and they have been answered for me. I am entitled to a copy of this form after it has been read and signed.

Signature of Teacher Participant ____________________________ Date __________________________
APPENDIX F

PARENT/GUARDIAN/STUDENT CONSENT FORM
University of Miami
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

A Comparison of Student and Teacher Perceptions of Classroom Management in Secondary Band Rehearsals in Florida Schools

The following information describes the research study in which your child is being asked to participate. Please read the information carefully. At the end, you will be asked to sign if you agree to allow your child to participate.

PURPOSE OF STUDY:
The purpose of this study is to compare teacher expectations and behaviors on student conduct with their students’ interpretations of those expectations and behaviors to determine if a match or mismatch can be predictors of student behavior or band success.

PROCEDURES:
Your child’s role is very important but also very simple. Once the teacher collects this letter of consent, the survey will begin.

The band director will administer a brief survey to participating students enrolled in band classes. The survey consists of opinion-based items pertaining to teacher expectations and teacher behaviors of student conduct. The survey will take about 5-10 minutes to complete and will be done during regular class time. Once the survey is complete, the teacher will collect all surveys and return them in the envelope provided.

RISKS AND/OR DISCOMFORTS:
We do not anticipate your child will experience any personal risk or discomfort from taking part in this study.

BENEFITS:
No benefit can be promised to your child from your participation in this study. The study is expected to benefit society at large by gaining a better understanding of perceptions of classroom management from both teacher and student points of view. This is turn can lead to a more harmonious classroom environment conducive for learning.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Once the surveys have been completed, the teachers are instructed to send them back in the stamped envelope provided. Upon receiving the materials, data will be sorted and collected by the investigators of the study. All information will be kept in a locked filling cabinet in the music education teaching assistant office at the University of Miami. There is no way to identify an individual because of anonymous responses.

By signing this consent, you authorize the Investigators(s) and his/her/their staff to access information provided in the survey necessary for purposes of this study.

COSTS:
There are no costs associated with your child’s participation in this study.
RIGHT TO DECLINE OR WITHDRAW:
Your child’s participation in this study is voluntary. Your child is free to refuse to participate in the study or withdraw his/her consent at any time during the study.

If you are an employee or student at the University of Miami, your desire not to participate in this study or request to withdraw will not adversely affect your status as an employee or grades at the University of Miami.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Susana Lalama, 305-284-6252 will gladly answer any questions you may have concerning the purpose, procedures, and outcome of this project. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact Human Subjects Research Office at the University of Miami, at (305) 243-3195.

PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT:
I have read the information in this consent form and agree to allow my child to participate in this study. I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study, and they have been answered for me. I am entitled to a copy of this form after it has been read and signed.

_________________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Student Participant                               Date

_________________________________________________  __________________________
Parent/Guardian Signature of Consent                               Date

_________________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Participant if 18 years or older                     Date
APPENDIX G

LALAMA INSTRUMENT FOR MEASURING BEHAVIORS IN BAND – STUDENT SURVEY
February 2011

Dear Students,

Thank you for participating in this study on behaviors that occur in band. A few reminders:

1. Do NOT write your name on this survey
2. Do NOT make any stray marks outside the indicated area
3. Select the response that best describes how you feel

Your participation is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Susana M Lalama
Graduate Student
University of Miami
Frost School of Music
Student Survey
Select the response that best reflects your current experience in band.

The band director expects me to respect him/her.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

The band director expects me to respect all students.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

The band director expects me to respect the band room as a place to create music.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

The band director expects me to be a positive role model for other students.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

The band director expects me to attend every rehearsal.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

The band director expects me to know how to play my music.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

The band director expects me to behave appropriately in rehearsal.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree

The band director expects me to know the policies, procedures, and expectations of the band program.
   □ Strongly Agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly Disagree
The band director gives clear instruction on how to behave during class.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

The band director tells me if I am misbehaving.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

If I misbehave, there is an immediate consequence.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

The band director is fair when addressing misbehaving students.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

The band director uses encouraging words when correcting student behavior.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

The band director shows his/her frustration when students talk during rehearsal.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

The band director stops rehearsing the music to correct students who are misbehaving.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

The band director ignores student misbehaviors and tries to focus on rehearsing the music.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree
How often do students talk during rehearsal?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Occasionally
- Rarely

How often are students not paying attention during rehearsal?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Occasionally
- Rarely

How often are students playing out of turn?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Occasionally
- Rarely

How often are students unprepared for band rehearsal (for example, left instrument, music, or supplies at home)?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Occasionally
- Rarely

How often do students use cell phones during rehearsal?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Occasionally
- Rarely

How often do students do other classes homework during band rehearsal?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Occasionally
- Rarely

How often do students leave their seat during band rehearsal?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Occasionally
- Rarely

How often do students eat or chew gum during band rehearsal?
- Always
- Sometimes
- Occasionally
- Rarely
Select your gender.
□ Male
□ Female

Select your age.
□ 11 or under
□ 12 - 14
□ 15 - 17
□ 18 or older

Select your ethnicity.
□ Caucasian
□ African American
□ Hispanic/Latino
□ Asian
□ Native American
□ Other:

Select the instrument you play in band class.
□ Flute
□ Oboe
□ Clarinet
□ Saxophone
□ Bassoon
□ Trumpet
□ French Horn
□ Trombone
□ Euphonium
□ Tuba
□ String Bass
□ Percussion
□ Other:

How many years have you participated in band?
□ 1 – 2 years
□ 3 – 5 years
□ 6 years or more

Select your current grade level in school.
□ 7th
□ 8th
□ 9th
□ 10th
□ 11th
□ 12th
□ Other:

Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX H

LALAMA INSTRUMENT FOR MEASURING BEHAVIORS IN BAND – TEACHER SURVEY
February 2011

Dear Teachers,

Thank you for participating in this study on behaviors that occur in band. A few reminders:

1. Do NOT write your name on this survey
2. Do NOT make any stray marks outside the indicated area
3. Select the response that best describes how you feel

Your participation is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Susana M Lalama
Graduate Student
University of Miami
Frost School of Music
Teacher Survey
Select the response that best reflects your current experience in band.

I expect my students to respect me.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

I expect my students to respect each other.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

I expect my students to respect the band room as a place to create music.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

I expect the students to be positive role models for other students.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

I expect the students to attend every rehearsal.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

I expect the students to know how to play their music.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

I expect the students to behave appropriately in rehearsal.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree

I expect the students to know the policies, procedures, and expectations of the band program.
- □ Strongly Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Disagree
- □ Strongly Disagree
I give clear instruction on how the students should behave in class.
□ Strongly Agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly Disagree

I let the students know if they are misbehaving.
□ Strongly Agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly Disagree

If a student misbehaves there are immediate consequences.
□ Strongly Agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly Disagree

I am fair when addressing misbehaving students.
□ Strongly Agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly Disagree

I use encouraging words when correcting student behavior.
□ Strongly Agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly Disagree

I show frustration when students talk during rehearsal.
□ Strongly Agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly Disagree

I stop rehearsing the music to correct students who are misbehaving.
□ Strongly Agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly Disagree

I ignore audible student misbehavior in order to focus on rehearsing the music.
□ Strongly Agree
□ Agree
□ Disagree
□ Strongly Disagree
Do you feel student conduct is a problem you are consistently addressing during rehearsal?
- Yes
- No

What do you think are some possible causes for student misbehavior?

In the last 3 years, how many overall superior ratings did the most advanced concert band earn at the Florida Bandmasters Association district Music Performance Assessment?
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- Did not participate

Teaching Experience
- 1st year
- 2 – 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 11 - 15 years
- 16 + years

Years Teaching at Current School
- 1st year
- 2 – 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 11 - 15 years
- 16 + years

School Level [check all that apply]
- Middle/Junior High School
- High School
- Other ________________________________

School Type [check all that apply]
- Public School
- Private School
- Charter School
- Arts Magnet School
- Other ________________________________

Approximately how many students are enrolled at your school?
☐ Less than 500 students
☐ 500 - 999 students
☐ 1000 - 2499 students
☐ Over 2500 students

**Approximately how many students are enrolled in the band program?**
☐ Less than 50 students
☐ 51 – 100 students
☐ 101 – 200 students
☐ Over 200 students

**Select your gender.**
☐ Male
☐ Female

**Select your age group.**
☐ 21 – 30
☐ 31 - 40
☐ 41 - 50
☐ Over 50

**Select your ethnicity.**
☐ Caucasian
☐ African American
☐ Hispanic/Latino
☐ Asian
☐ Native American
☐ Other:

Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX I

TEACHER INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING LIMBB
Teacher Instructions for Study on Perceptions of Classroom Management

Preparations
1. Take letter explaining the study to principal/administrator and retrieve signature
2. Briefly explain the study to the students (you can use the letter to the administration as a guide)
3. Distribute consent forms to students and obtain student and parent/guardian signature. ONLY DISTRIBUTE TO INTERMEDIATE-ADVANCED BAND SETTINGS…no beginning band classes will be used in this study.
   a. Give the students a due date as to when you are collecting the forms (write it on the board and remind them that they will not be able to participate if appropriate forms are not in)
   b. Be sure to sign the Teacher Consent Form

Administering the Survey
1. Use the beginning of the class period to administer the survey
2. Only distribute the survey to the students who returned a signed student/parent consent form. *If consent forms are not signed, the data collected cannot be used
3. Have the students answer the survey items directly on the survey. Remind the students NOT to write their name or any stray marks outside indicated areas.
   a. If there are multiple classes that you are distributing the survey to, use the a different colored survey for each class (i.e. white surveys = top band, red surveys = second band, orange surveys = third band, yellow surveys = jazz bands, etc.)
   b. If a student is enrolled in multiple band classes, have the student fill out a survey in each band class he/she is enrolled
4. Complete the teacher survey
   a. If there is more than 1 band teacher for the same class (team-teaching), please indicate at the top right hand corner of the first page.
   b. For every class that is taking a survey, the teacher must complete a survey.

Collecting and Returning Procedures
1. Upon completion, collect the student surveys (he survey should take about 5-10 minutes to complete on average)
2. Sort the survey by each class period and place the teacher survey on top of each set of class surveys.
3. Place all materials in envelope provided and place in regular mail.
   i. School administration letter with signature
   ii. Teacher consent form with signature
   iii. Parent/Student consent form with signatures
   iv. Surveys grouped by level (teacher survey on top of student surveys per class), top band is first, second band follows, etc.
APPENDIX J

TEACHER RESPONSES TO OPEN-END ITEM, WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE POSSIBLE CAUSES FOR STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR?
Teacher Responses to Item 18, *What do you think are some possible causes for student misbehavior?* Responses are unedited.

1. Lack of awareness
2. Immaturity
3. Immaturity
4. Home Life
5. Too young
6. Unclear expectations
7. Discipline not established at home
8. Entitlement
9. Music is too hard for them (frustration)
10. Music at inappropriate level
11. Feeling too comfortable with teacher and classmates (3rd year with same people)
12. Age
13. Teacher lacks knowledge of classroom management skills
14. Immaturity
15. Immaturity
16. Home environment
17. Home environment
18. Middle school maturity (lack of)
19. Lack of individual attention given
20. Advanced music does not allow all students to play at all times, which leads to down time which leads to more talking
21. Percussion instruments are louder and the students are standing
22. Lots of individual parts in Jazz Band music
23. Several individuals refuse to act appropriate (behavior and performance)
24. Lack of teacher preparation for the second band
25. Extreme levels of ability and motivation among students
26. Not paying attention
27. Respect for authority not taught at home
28. Student following wrong examples
29. Middle school age
30. Middle school age
31. Immaturity
32. Lack of awareness and understanding
33. Lack of experience of correct rehearsal etiquette
34. Social distractions
35. Music is too easy (boredom)
36. Spending too much time working small section instead of full ensemble
37. Type of music being performed (rock/jazz)
38. Lack of focus
39. Teacher not well organized regarding lessons and delivery
40. Lack of respect/responsibility
41. Lack of respect/responsibility
42. Idle time while working with other sections
43. Classes range in size from 50-74 so it is hard to give each student individual attention
44. Percussion has more sectional and freedom

45. Time spent with weaker students bores the more advanced students

46. Talking

47. Too much structure in other class, less structure in band

48. Hormones (boys)

49. Frustration of not being able to play something

50. Drastic changes in routine (don’t know what to expect)

51. Boredom sets in when they get ignored too long

52. Boredom sets in when they get ignored too long

53. Lack of respect for others

54. Lack of attention at home

55. *Reported positive behavior reasons - strong student leadership, most advanced and responsible group, living up to reputation of previous jazz band*