Preservice and experienced teachers (N = 58, from 7 universities) wrote lesson plans for a hypothetical beginning band lesson, using one page from a band method book as source material. Lesson plans were analyzed for word count, level of detail, and for strategies that appeared most frequently. Experienced teachers used fewer words than undergraduates but revealed the same number of strategies and level of detail, on average. There were institutional differences in the variety of strategies incorporated, indicating certain institutions may value a wider range of strategies and activities in beginning band classes. Participants also compared their written plans to a published lesson plan and rated their familiarity with various approaches, giving another view on strategies considered most common. Familiarity ratings were similar when comparing preservice and experienced teachers and when comparing institutions. Degrees of prevalence of specific strategies, such as decontextualization of material, repetition, and modeling, are discussed.

Ruth V. Brittin, *University of the Pacific*

Preservice and Experienced Teachers' Lesson Plans for Beginning Instrumentalists

Teachers are expected to set up the learning environment so students can learn. This involves planning in regards to materials, strategies, and timing. Planning for a lesson or rehearsal may be formal or informal in nature; in its more formal state, it is often called the lesson plan. Examining rehearsal plans may help us gauge the teacher's priorities in terms of lesson content and structure.

Good lesson-planning skills are generally associated with good teaching. Soderblom (1982) found that lesson planning is considered an essential, high-priority skill for first-year music teachers, in the opinion of experienced teachers, first-year teachers, and university professors. In a survey published in 1999, Gauthier and McCrary found that 98% of music education methods course professors identified "developing lesson-planning skills" as a primary purpose for their course, and 94% *always* or *almost always* covered "developing lesson plans" in their methods courses.

Ruth V. Brittin is the chair of music education in the Conservatory of Music of the University of the Pacific, 3601 Pacific Avenue, Stockton, CA 95211-0197; e-mail: rbrittin@ pacific.edu. Copyright © 2005 by MENC: The National Association for Music Education.

The rationale may best be stated by Duke and Madsen (1991, p. 11), who address "the importance of exercising some control over what is going to happen as opposed to reacting only to what has happened." They suggest that teachers should be skillful in selecting and structuring learning sequences that provide a high probability of success.

Music educators have examined effects of teaching music with structured plans. Sung (1982) examined university sophomores teaching short general music lessons. Assessments of teacher effectiveness were significantly higher for those using more-structured plans during the first few lessons; for later lessons, there was no significant difference in teacher effectiveness. However, those with more-structured plans gave significantly more approvals, and their students had significantly higher achievement compared to those using less-structured plans.

Duke and Madsen (1991) explored effects of teaching with hierarchical learning sequences; this amounted to a task analysis or a type of lesson plan. Novice guitarists taught a lesson to a friend who did not play guitar. Those using the hierarchical plan gave fewer nonspecific approval mistakes (e.g., saying "good job" when the performance was not very good) and generally achieved a higher performance level at the end of a longer lesson. Also, hierarchical lessons moved forward to a more difficult task approximating the final objective more frequently and with less need to repeat steps or move back to a simpler step. Both groups spent similar amounts of time modeling, describing tasks specifically, and giving nonspecific directives.

In an ensemble rehearsal setting, recent evidence shows experienced, successful band directors were particularly skillful in correcting performance errors when they identified the errors prior to the rehearsal (Cavitt, 2003). It is important to note, however, that these directors spent about 30% of their drill time on preidentified errors and about 70% responding to targets identified in the rehearsal itself.

Research on specific task analyses or lesson planning is somewhat difficult to find, perhaps because the context of each teaching situation varies. Score study is one type of task analysis where analyzing the music's demands leads to planning rehearsal strategies. In beginning instrumental settings, the beginner method book may be the score. As Byo (1988, p. 19) states, "instrumentalists are taught in heterogeneous groupings with the class method book functioning as the basic course of music study, in essence, the beginning band curriculum." Through his analysis of the content of nine beginning method books, Byo observed some pedagogical preferences, such as importance of singing, counting, use of labeling systems, student discovery, and independence. Heavner (1995) analyzed band method books' attention to comprehensive musicianship, postulating that more recent books "may have adopted the principles of comprehensive musicianship to meet the changing needs of contemporary instrumental music educators" (pp. 8–9). Heavner indeed found that more

recent books included elements of comprehensive musicianship. Both studies offered insight into the method-book authors' priorities. These priorities may be a reflection of what those in the field expect; this content may also influence instrumental teachers' values and teaching approaches.

There seems to be little, if any, systematic research into teachers' strategies when using band method books. Some investigators have focused on notation or specific strategies by contrasting an experimental group with researcher-designed materials and a control group using a traditional method book (Grutzmacher, 1987; MacKnight, 1975). However, there has been little scrutiny of ways the actual books are used, of techniques used by teachers, or of the prevalence of such techniques across experience levels. Through this research, I attempted to describe use of instrumental method-book material as seen through the lens of preservice and experienced teachers' lesson plans.

METHOD

This study is an exploration of how preservice and experienced teachers plan lessons and rehearsals in the context of a beginning band class. The study was built around materials commonly found in beginner band, in other words, the method book. *The Yamaha Advantage* (Feldstein & Clark, 2001) was chosen because it is relatively new and perhaps less familiar to respondents, and it is similar to other method books (Byo, 1988; Heavner, 1995) in that it is sequential and designed for a heterogeneous beginning band.

Participants were given a copy of this method book's page 8 (one side showing the clarinet music and the reverse side the snare/bass drum page). This represents the fifth page of music and presents two new notes for winds and keyboard percussion (concert C and B-flat). The page includes six melodies that use quarter, half, and whole notes (and rests); the snare/bass drum part has the same rhythm patterns as the winds. The most recognizable melody is "Hot Cross Buns," and the page ends with "Rock Time," an eight-bar duet. The melody "Lightly Row" is a theory assessment, calling for students to discern the melody by ear and write in missing notes and rhythms.

Participants were instructed to write a lesson plan for a heterogeneous beginning band class using this material. They were given details on the rhythms and notes presented in the previous seven pages of the book and reminded that melodies were presented in unison; thus, they could infer other wind parts from the clarinet part. They were instructed that they could structure their hypothetical lesson for any desired time format, such as a 30-minute lesson or an hour-long rehearsal. They were given a lesson plan format including objectives, learning activities (which consisted of a warm-up, then review, then presentation of new material), assessment, and enrichment sections. Participants generated their own objectives. They had 20 minutes to write their entire plan. Instructions were printed and

also read aloud by the survey administrator, and time for questions and clarification was provided.

After writing, participants were given a published lesson plan for page 8 (Brittin, 2002), shown in Figure 1 (on the following pages). Participants compared their plan to the published plan, underlining common points. Then they marked points on the published plan they had not included in their own plan and rated familiarity with each idea or strategy on a scale of 1 to 3. For each point identified, subjects indicated their degree of familiarity with the strategy. They wrote the numeral "1" if they had considered this point but not written it down that day; they gave it a "2" if they had not considered the point that day, but had observed this idea in instrumental settings before; or they wrote a "3" if they had never observed this particular point—it was a new idea. The entire process took approximately 45 minutes.

Individuals from nine universities participated, but not all subject pools were equivalent in experience level. Therefore, samples from seven universities were analyzed. Five subject pools (three in California, one in Texas, one in Illinois) included preservice teachers in methods courses and fieldwork (pre-student teaching). From each of these five institutions, six surveys (four from those playing band instruments and two from those with other backgrounds, i.e., pianists, vocalists, string players) were randomly selected. This resulted in a total of 30 undergraduate surveys.

Two universities contributed surveys from graduate students with 1–14 years of contractual, full-time teaching experience (Ohio, $n = 16$, and New York, $n = 12$). Experienced teachers included wind and string players, percussionists, and vocalists with various degrees of experience with beginning band; the proportion of those playing wind or percussion as their primary instrument was equivalent to the undergraduate sample. For experienced teachers, the entire set of completed surveys was analyzed ($n = 28$).

Surveys were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative analysis included word count, categorizing the level of detail in subjects' planning, counting number of different strategies described, and comparison of familiarity with selected ideas and techniques. Qualitative analysis included categorizing and coding the points in participants' plans (from the learning activities portion of the lesson: warm-up, review, then presentation of new material).

RESULTS

Preservice and experienced teachers' lesson plans for beginning band ($N = 58$) showed a significant difference in word count, $t (1, 56) = 4.85$, $p < .03$. Also, there was a significant negative correlation between years of full-time experience and number of words written, $r = -.57$, $p < .05$. Preservice teachers tended to use more words on average ($M = 274$ words compared to $M = 216$), perhaps because their lesson plans often took a narrative form.

Page 8   *Standards 1, 2, 3, 5*

Objectives: *After completing page 8, students will be able to:*

1.7   Name and perform concert C and concert B-flat. Percussion—identify and perform double strokes.

2.0   Identify the composers of a piece and their dates of birth.

1.7   Play patterns of five pitches in whole, half and quarter notes/rests.

1.9   Play a familiar song by ear, and notate pitches and rhythms within the song.

1.7   Identify rhythmic independence within a duet, and play rhythmically independent duet parts.

1.8   Breathe in appropriate places within a melody, based on the phrase structure.

Learning Activities

Warm-up and Review

1.9   Warm-up on mouthpiece long tones; echo patterns with whole, half, and quarter notes.

2.1   Echo patterns of 2, 3, 4, 5, and then 6 repeated half notes, on concert D, then E-flat, then F.

1.8   Review "accidental rule": When an accidental is introduced, it applies to the whole measure.

New Material

1.8   Demonstrate *concert C* and echo whole, half, and quarter note patterns on concert C.

     Line 14

2.4   Students point to airstream arrows while teacher models; students finger, then play.

1.8   Model *double strokes* for percussion. Pattern continues until new sticking appears.

     Line 15

2.1   Count, sing, and play "air band" (blowing softly through instrument while fingering).

2.1   Flutes and mallets: "How many E-flats are in the line?" (answer: five).

1.9   Snare drums: "What sticking is this?" (answer: alternate).

1.9   Line 16: While introducing *concert B-flat*, reinforce airstream.

1.7   Line 17: Keep instruments in playing position during rests. Encourage wind players to sustain quarter notes full duration; emphasize connected style with steady airstream and firm tonguing.

1.9   Line 18: Students sing melody while fingering before playing. Snare drums: Rest on beat 1, then start with a "left."

Line 19 ("Lightly Row"): Students:

2.1   1. Sing on "tah" several times in a slow tempo, or play CD, then ask students to hum along. When a pitch is repeated, students raise their hands.

1.8   2. Students write in missing pitches and determine rhythmic values. Go measure by measure if necessary for the dictation process.

Figure 1. Mean Familiarity Ratings for Published Lesson Plan (1 = Most Familiar to 3 = Least Familiar). From R. V. Brittin (2002), *The Yamaha Advantage Teacher Resource Kit* (New York: Carl Fischer), p. 8.

2.0   3. Students individually experiment with melody to play it by ear. Let students work in pairs if necessary. Individuals model for class.

Line 20 ("Rock Time" Duet):

1.8   1. Ask students whether parts' notes are different, rhythms are diffeent, or both. Students circle measures where rhythm is different.

1.7   2. Finger, count, and sing each part of duet before playing.

2.2   3. Part 2: The first breath mark is in the middle of the fourth measure. Ask "How is this different from the songs so far?" (answer: "longer until we breathe," or "more notes before we breathe," or "it's in the middle of the measure."). Model part 2 with the breath as marked and with the breath at the end of bar 4; ask which is better and why (answer: "more musical" or "it makes more sense to breathe after the long note"). Explain that we breathe where it makes the music sound right, making musical phrases, just as we breathe at commas and periods in a sentence. Emphasize that students are now capable of playing more than two measures in one breath.

2.2   5. Divide parts into high and low instruments to accentuate rhythmic independence.

2.3   6. Students find the composers of "Rock Time" and indicate each composer's birth year.

Assessment and Closure:

Using line 19, "Lightly Row," as a theory assessment, did students:

1.9   experiment until they discovered how to play the correct notes?

1.6   write the correct notes and rhythmic values through dictation?

Using line 20, "Rock Time," for assessment, did students:

1.6   demonstrate good posture and position?

1.4   demonstrate improved tone quality and correct stickings?

1.4   perform correct notes for full duration, with connected style?

1.6   breathe in the proper places, demonstrating longer phrases?

1.8   perform their own rhythms independently?

2.1   indicate the correct composers and dates of birth?

Enrichment:

2.3   Five-Note Challenge: Students write in the names of notes in 1 minute or less before moving on to page 9. An example for clarinets and trumpets is included; pages for all instruments may be printed from the Web site's "extras" section. The exercises also can be used for writing in fingerings or rhythms, or for ear-training activities ("Which measure did I play?").

Ear Training:

2.4   Listen to CD of "Rock Time"; students raise hands when they hear rhythmic independence.

2.2   Ask students to name other folk songs that use the five notes they have learned (such as "Go Tell Aunt Rhody," "Mary Had a Little Lamb," "Jingle Bells").

2.1   Perform line 17 ("New Note Workout"), purposefully changing quarter notes to half notes or playing wrong notes. Ask students to raise their hands when they hear a mistake.

Figure 1. (continued)

2.3	*Composition:* Students write out one measure each using only pitches learned. Each measure must have at least one note and one rest. From these, construct a melody for the section or class to play.
2.3	*Aesthetic judgment:* Model a familiar melody using two-bar phrases and again using four-bar phrases. Which do students prefer and why?
2.3	*Cultural identification:* Ask students if they know any other English or German folk songs, in addition to those on page 8.
2.2	*Musical style:* Play CD, Line 14 ("New Note") and Line 20 ("Rock Time"). Students determine styles they hear in accompaniment and identify differences between jazz and rock styles (duple versus swing subdivision, instrumentation, etc.).
2.2	*Technique decisions:* Mallets turn to page 42, line A1. Students decide whether to lead with left or right hand.

Figure 1. (concluded)

In the lesson plans, the mean number of words was highest for the learning activities (warm-up, review, and new material) portion of the lesson (objectives = 68 words, warm-up/review/new material = 107, assessment = 29, enrichment = 22). Thus the learning activities section was targeted for more in-depth analysis of content. Responses were categorized for level of detail (*vague, somewhat detailed, very detailed*); reliability of agreements between two independent raters was $r = .82$. Those in the first category wrote relatively brief instructions; they often dwelled more on principles of presenting material or general topics to be covered rather than presenting sequential plans. Those with somewhat detailed descriptions wrote a sequence of steps; those with very detailed plans featured series of specific steps-within-steps. Experienced and preservice teachers fell in all three categories, with no clear association between level of experience and detail of the plan.

Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric tests of ranks were used to test level of detail in the lesson plans. The samples from the seven universities were compared. There was a significant difference in the nature of plans based on institution, $H (4, N = 58) = 13.12, p < .04$. The Illinois responses were significantly more detailed and sequential than the others; for example, all of the Illinois participants' plans were very detailed or somewhat detailed (with half of the responses in each category). All other institutions had responses classified as vague; each of these samples had no more than 16% of plans in the most detailed category. There was a negative, significant correlation between the number of words in the learning activity section and the level of detail there, $r = -.71, p < .001$. Narratives with more words tended to be less detailed and sequential.

Participants' task analyses (from the Learning Activities' warm-up/review/new material) were categorized and coded to ascertain most common activities and strategies. Two independent readers were used to verify consistency of categorizations throughout this

process ($r = .81$). Four themes emerged, based on (a) [objectives stated as] *teacher will ...,*" (b) [objectives stated as] *students will ...,* (c) *teacher-student actions,* and (d) *tools.*

In all, 54 activities/strategies were coded across the four themes. The first theme, *teacher will ...,* concerned statements of teacher action, such as " teacher will play Concert B-flat" or "I will explain breath mark." The second theme, *students will ...,* comprised statements concerning student activities, such as "students play Line 14" or "students will figure out fingering." *Teacher-student actions* were statements showing student activity with teacher involvement, intervention, or direct preparation, for example, "students play line while teacher claps the beat" or "students play after I remind them to tongue the quarter notes." This theme also included combinations of steps, such as "to learn duet, students play top line, then top line while teacher plays bottom line, then switch, then divide in parts." Statements involving *tools* concerned solfège, echoing, finger-say-play activities, repetition, exercises, rest/ready position, visual aids, and contests.

Some of the most common *teacher will ...* strategies included targeting sections of the band to play (64% of plans), teacher modeling (53%), playing a recording (29%), and explaining (28%). Participants indicated they would review in 39% of plans, distributed as reviewing lines from a previous page (17%), notation (10%), techniques such as breathing or posture (5%), or using review activities to preview new material (7%). Some teachers were very vague, saying they would "discuss" (14%), as in "discuss new note" or "introduce" (7%) new material. Ten percent of teachers indicated that they would ask the students at least one question, 3% said they would teach transposition, 5% stated that they would assign homework, and 2% said that they would assign home practice, check practice logs, make a transfer to another subject, or give contingent approval (2% represents a rounding off of 1.7% and equals one response).

For *students will ...* statements, 57% of plans referred to students playing a line as a step in itself, without obvious or direct preparation on that line of music. A response would be coded this way if, for example, the teacher stated that he or she would model a new note but then provided no additional focus on the line with the new note before expecting students to play straight through. Student discovery, such as figuring out fingerings or new rhythms, was included in 36% of plans. Students were expected to sing (24%), count or clap (16%), and play individually (16%). Few plans included improvisation, peer tutoring, pointing to music or fingering instruments to show understanding, writing notes/cues in the music, tuning, or assembling instruments (3% each). Two percent of the sample indicated the following student actions: evaluate peers, evaluate self, sight-read, play duet, write on board, play with independence, scan ahead, and demonstrate good etiquette while others play.

The third theme concerned student activity with teacher involvement, intervention, or direct preparation, such as the teacher modi-

fying material in some way. The most popular strategy fell in this category; 95% of respondents indicated they would structure patterns out of context, such as long tones, rhythm, or scale patterns that were different from the melodies on the page. The "play with adaptation" strategy appeared in 16% of the lesson plans. Selecting a few notes or a rhythm from a melody and having students play that specific pattern from the music was categorized as play with adaptation. Slowing the tempo would be another example of a play-with-adaptation strategy.

Teachers wrote that they would invite students to play while the teacher provided cues, such as snapping, demonstrating fingerings, or other gestures (14%), or they would remind students of a particular concept just before playing (10%). Roughly a quarter of the plans (26%) indicated students would play with a particular target in view; however, the statements were comparatively vague as to how this would actually happen or what the teacher would do, for example, "students play, focusing on sound and support." Another strategy was frequently used for teaching the duet at the bottom of the page. The teacher would describe layering complexity across several steps. In all, "layer complexity" appeared in 34% of the plans. Sixteen percent of plans included " if, then" steps as well, as in "if they don't play the correct notes, then I will ..."

Regarding the fourth theme, *tools,* visual aids were mentioned in 24% of the plans and the "finger-say (or sing)-play" approach in 21%. Echoing (24% of respondents) was distributed as 16% echoing patterns on the instrument, 3% singing, 3% not clear as to what type of echoing would occur, and 2% with the teacher singing and students echoing on their instruments. Repetition as a strategy (14%) and exercises (14%), such as breathing or buzzing on mouthpieces, were mentioned more often than using a contest or competition, solfège, or use of rest-ready-play position (2% each).

Across the four different themes, some strategies and activities were included significantly more often by the experienced teachers, based on chi-square goodness-of-fit comparisons ($p < .05$). These included use of a recording, students playing through a line without specified preparation, counting out loud, layering complexity, playing with adaptation, finger-say (or sing)-play, and echoing the teacher's playing. Preservice teachers included the following points significantly more frequently compared to the experienced teachers: explaining a concept; playing with a target but few specifics on process; "if, then" statements; exercises (such as breathing or buzzing); and asking a question. The two groups mentioned the remaining strategies and activities at comparable levels.

The number of different strategies reported per person was analyzed; the mean number of strategies for preservice teachers was identical to the mean for experienced teachers ($M = 7.5$). There was a significant difference in the number of different strategies for the various sites, H (6, $N = 58$) = 17.18, $p < .01$. Two California universities' preservice teachers had significantly more strategies ($M = 10.3$

and $M = 9.3$) than the third California institution ($M = 5.0$). Other preservice teachers averaged 4.8 different strategies (Texas) and 8.5 (Illinois). Experienced teachers averaged 6.1 (New York) and 8.6 (Ohio).

The number of different strategies and word count for the New Materials section correlated positively and significantly, $r = .65$, $p < .001$. Those who wrote more tended to list more different strategies.

After writing lesson sequences and comparing them to a published plan, participants indicated their familiarity with a variety of objectives, learning activities, assessment, and enrichment activities. Of the 44 items presented in the published plan, 18 received a mean score higher than 2.0, meaning more than a few people indicated this statement represented a new idea. All items in the *Enrichment* section had a mean score above 2.0, indicating these were perceived as comparatively novel strategies. Mean responses are shown in the published lesson plan (see figure). Kruskal-Wallis analyses showed significant differences between preservice and experienced teachers' familiarity ratings for only three of the 44 items ($p < .05$); in all three cases (the fourth objective, "play by ear ...," and the first two items for Line 19, "Lightly Row"), experienced teachers rated themselves significantly more familiar with the item than did preservice teachers. Taken as a whole, there was little difference in preservice and experienced teachers' ratings of familiarity.

Individuals at different institutions seemed equally familiar with almost all points on the published plan; however, there were a few anomalies. Significant differences between institutions were seen with Kruskal-Wallis comparisons ($p < .05$) for four statements: the enrichment activities for composition, aesthetic judgment, and musical style, as well as the second step for learning "Lightly Row" (students writing in missing pitches). For example, undergraduates from two California universities rated themselves less familiar with the three enrichment activities, on average, while undergraduates from the Texas institution seemed particularly familiar with the CD-music style activity and those from Illinois were very familiar with the aesthetic judgment of phrasing point. Such data may point to differential attention to a few music activities in various institutions.

DISCUSSION

The ability to plan a lesson well is an important skill; however, little research has investigated approaches used in instrumental rehearsal plans. While we find detailed observations of activities in middle school and high school rehearsals with more seasoned players (Cavitt, 2003; Goolsby, 1999), we have less data on lesson strategies at the very start of the band experience. Understanding common approaches may be useful to those teaching in that context. We may learn where practitioners agree and disagree by examining teachers' plans. Just as Goolsby used an unfamiliar piece of band music to examine teachers' approaches in rehearsal, I used a single

piece of teaching material as a prompt for planning. The sample in this study represents several institutions across the United States and includes preservice and experienced teachers; however, the sample size and distribution prohibit making broad generalizations. That said, these responses give some ideas to where future research might go in the area of lesson planning.

From these responses, it seems that teachers with more experience may be more succinct when writing down their thoughts on planning for a lesson. However, the level of detail in their plans seems more idiosyncratic to individual style than to experience level. Time is a precious commodity, and teachers in the field likely develop a "shorthand" to refer to their teaching processes. We must be careful in drawing conclusions on strategies; however, we may assume that if a participant takes time to write out a teaching step, that step is valued. It is probably good that novices write out their proposed teaching process so fully, although we should continue to study how they plan (and the extent to which they *should* plan) in their first years of teaching.

Participants wrote quite a few strategies in their section on warm-up/review/new material. By far the most frequent was "structuring patterns out of context," meaning patterns separate from (though related to) melodies on the page. Likely due to their including ideas for warming up, participants focused on long tones, scale patterns, and particular rhythms. Virtually all participants also structured patterns out of context to present new material.

A similar (but not identical) strategy involves decontextualizing the music printed on the page. Duke (1999/2000) has outlined ways that music teachers decontextualize music, then put it back into context, to reach proximal goals or targets. Here, only 14% of respondents verbalized decontextualization by planning for students to play a line with an adaptation, such as playing the entire line at a slower tempo, or playing just one measure or phrase. About a third of the plans suggested layering complexity in successive steps, another procedure for de- and then recontextualization. These data raise questions. Why did so many stipulate separate patterns to teach new material, but so few describe decontextualization processes within the printed melodies? Did steps like slowing the tempo or targeting particular measures seem too obvious to write down? Would most teachers use these types of decontextualization when actually teaching, even though they might not specify them in their plans? Conversely, how many teachers simply read through the music, line after line, waiting for students to make an error before they react?

Repetition, a strategy stressed by Duke (1999/2000), Colprit (2000), and Cavitt (2003), was not overly apparent here. Only 14% of respondents mentioned repetition in their plans. Colprit observed that her subjects, Suzuki violin teachers working with students, ended rehearsal frames with two successful performances only 15% of the time, revealing less emphasis on immediate repetition than one might expect. Cavitt, however, observed that her expert band direc-

tors, videotaped 1–2 weeks before an important spring festival, were tenacious in achieving multiple correct performances of target passages.

Modeling has been shown to be a very effective strategy for instrumental conductors (Francisco, 1994). Modeling was suggested in just over half of the plans. Of these comments, about two-thirds addressed modeling by playing, a quarter suggested modeling the fingering, and the remaining few suggested modeling by singing, playing the piano, or clapping (one person each). A quarter of respondents indicated that students would sing at some point, but only 3% listed singing as an echoing response. From this, we see that very few teachers plan to model with their voices, and the majority do not state that they will ask students to use their voices. This is in direct contrast to evidence showing that use of the voice is very productive in developing instrumental tonal concepts and sight-reading ability (Grutzmacher, 1987), performance achievement (Davis, 1981), and sense of pitch (Elliott, 1974).

Echoing activities, suggested by authors such as Schleuter (1997), were not found in the majority of plans. Goolsby's recent data (1999) indicate that expert middle and high school directors model about the same amount as novices (60% gave nonverbal instruction, which amounted to roughly 5% of teaching time); however, experts modeled stylistic characteristics such as articulations and phrase shapes more than novices, who tended to "rote-teach" rhythms and notes. Indeed, the issue of modeling versus rote teaching is germane to teaching beginning instrumentalists and should be explored further.

Responses were analyzed for type and differentiation. Just as writing down a particular strategy shows its importance, verbalizing a number of different strategies shows a value for a variety of techniques. The data reveal differing patterns across institutions, in regards to the number of strategies verbalized. Participants from some institutions wrote significantly more different strategies compared to other universities. This does not suggest that one area's teachers are more effective than another's; however, it may show that teachers associated with certain institutions put a premium on a wider variety of approaches within the beginning band class. Perhaps certain programs have a few "tried-and-true" approaches, and teachers gravitate to those precisely because they seem so successful. Exploring the degree to which experts use a variety or narrow themselves to selected strategies may be useful to those studying teacher effectiveness.

Interestingly, the more the participants wrote, the more variety of strategies they tended to include. Conversely, those who wrote more material tended to include less detail on specific steps or sequences. Future research might explore whether patterns of greater specificity or greater breadth of strategies are tied to effective teaching.

Participants rated their familiarity with strategies they had not included in their own plans. Overall, preservice and experienced teachers responded similarly. For the most part, students at various institutions were equally familiar with various strategies, although

there were differences for a few items. Most of the published plan's points seem to represent common practice, with some points being quite novel to a number of respondents. Overall, responses show teachers may continue to gain new insight and techniques from analyzing others' rehearsal plans.

University faculty members may use this type of lesson plan analysis to illuminate and discuss strategies novel to their students. Such discussion raises awareness of teaching resources, encourages educators to critically consider resources' contents, and may be a useful activity for coursework and for in-service development.

In all, these data reveal what activities preservice and experienced teachers intend to do in beginning band classes. Determining the extent to which teachers actually do them is an obvious next step.

REFERENCES

Brittin, R. V. (2002). *Yamaha advantage teacher resource kit.* New York: Carl Fischer.

Byo, J. (1988). Beginning band instruction: A comparative analysis of selected class method books. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 7,* 19–23.

Cavitt, M. E. (2003). A descriptive analysis of error correction in instrumental music rehearsals. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51,* 218–230.

Colprit, E. J. (2000). Observation and analysis of Suzuki string teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 48,* 206–221.

Davis, L. M. (1981). The effects of structured singing activities and self-evaluation practice on elementary band students' instrumental music performance, melodic tonal imagery, self-evaluation, and attitude (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 42/07-A,* 3051.

Duke, R. A. (1999/2000). Measures of instructional effectiveness in music research. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 143,* 1–48.

Duke, R. A., & Madsen, C. K. (1991). Proactive versus reactive teaching: Focusing observation on specific aspects of instruction. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 108,* 1–14.

Elliott, C. A. (1974). Effect of vocalization on the sense of pitch of beginning band class students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 22,* 120–128.

Feldstein, S., & Clark, L. (2001). *The Yamaha advantage.* New York: Carl Fischer.

Francisco, J. M. (1994). Conductor communication in the ensemble rehearsal: The relative effects of verbal communication, visual communication, and modeling on performance improvement of high school bands (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56-08-A,* 3045.

Gauthier, D., & McCrary, J. (1999). Music courses of elementary education majors: An investigation of course content and purpose. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47,* 124–134.

Goolsby, T. W. (1999). A comparison of expert and novice music teachers' preparing identical band compositions: An operational replication. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47,* 174–187.

Grutzmacher, P. A. (1987). The effect of tonal pattern training on the aural perception, reading recognition, and melodic sight-reading achievement of first-year instrumental music students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 35,* 171–181.

Heavner, T. L. (1995). An analysis of beginning band methods books for principles of comprehensive musicianship (Doctor of Music Education, University of Northern Colorado). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56/08A,* 3045.

MacKnight, C. B. (1975). Music reading ability of beginning wind instrumentalists after melodic instruction. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 23,* 23–34.

Schleuter, S. (1997). *A sound approach to teaching instrumentalists.* New York: Schirmer Books.

Soderblom, C. J. (1982). Music and music-teaching competencies considered essential for first year elementary school general music teachers (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 43/04-A,* 1075.

Sung, K. H. (1982). The effects of differentially structured lesson plans on the elementary general music teaching behavior of sophomore music education students (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 43/09-A,* 2922.