

Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

2008

The Influence of Social Intelligence on Effective Music Teaching

Jay Juchniewicz



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF MUSIC

THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE ON EFFECTIVE MUSIC TEACHING

By

JAY ALLEN JUCHNIEWICZ

A Dissertation submitted to the
College of Music
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Summer Semester, 2008

Copyright © 2008
Jay Allen Juchniewicz
All Rights Reserved

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation of Jay A. Juchniewicz defended on June 6, 2008.

Steven N. Kelly
Professor Directing Dissertation

Clifford K. Madsen
Professor Co-Directing Dissertation

John Drew
Outside Committee Member

Patrick Dunnigan
Committee Member

John M. Geringer
Committee Member

Approved:

Don Gibson, Dean, College of Music

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank many people who have provided help and support during this process.

Dr. Drew: Thank you for serving on my committee and treating me with professionalism throughout my studies at FSU.

Dr. Geringer: Thank you for always answering my questions and providing the knowledge to become a better researcher.

Dr. Dunnigan: Thank you for the opportunity to work with the bands and for your help in developing my abilities as a musician, conductor, and teacher.

Dr. Madsen: Thank you for all of the opportunities you have given me, for all of the talks in the chair, and for treating me “to become what I ought to be and could be.”

Dr. Kelly: Thank you for serving as my major professor. This project would not have been possible without your constant availability, guidance, and for always knowing how to point me in the right direction. Thank you for always helping me see “the forest instead of the trees,” but most of all, thank you for being a mentor during my doctoral studies.

Thank you to my friends and colleagues, especially Amy, Matt, Eric, and Frank, for helping me with this project.

Above all, thank you to my family, parents, and Julianna, whose love and support was constant and unwavering. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vi
Abstract	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	3
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Effective Teaching	6
Effective Teaching Techniques	6
Personality	13
Characteristics of Effective Teachers	14
Intelligence	16
Definitions of Intelligence	16
Definitions of Social Intelligence	21
Measures of Intelligence	24
Measures of Social Intelligence	27
Measures of Social Intelligence within Music Education	38
Summary	38
3. METHOD	40
Selection and Description of Measurement Tool	40
Selection of Music Teachers	41
Administration of the <i>IPT-15</i>	42
Selection of Videotaped Teachers	42
Construction of the Master Videotape	43
Construction of the Evaluation Form	44
Pilot Studies	45
External Evaluators	45
Administration of the Master Videotape	46
Data Analysis	47
4. RESULTS	48
Demographics of Teacher Participants	48
Implementation of the Independent Measure	48
External Evaluation	49
Classification of Teacher Responses	51
5. DISCUSSION	57
Purpose Statement	57
Answers to Research Questions	57
Summary of the <i>IPT-15</i>	58
Summary of the External Evaluation	59
Summary of the Classification of Teacher Responses	60

Limitations of the Study	62
Implications of the Findings	63
Recommendations for Future Research	65
APPENDICES	67
A: Human Subjects Approval	67
B: Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15)	69
C: E-mail to University Faculty and Music Supervisors	72
D: E-mail to Music Teachers	74
E: Teacher Consent Form	76
F: E-mail to Videotaped Music Teachers	78
G: Teacher Videotape Consent Form	80
H: Informed Consent Form (Student)	82
I: Parent Consent Form	84
J: E-mail to External Evaluators	86
K: External Evaluator Consent Form	88
L: Teacher Evaluation Form	91
M: Classification of Teacher Attributes and Overall Effectiveness of the Teacher Ratings	97
REFERENCES	134
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	161

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Mean Overall Effectiveness of the Teacher Ratings and Standard Deviations for Teachers A –L	49
Table 2. Two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Ratings of Teacher Excerpts	50
Table 3. Percentages of Effective and Ineffective Social, Nonsocial, and Miscellaneous Attributes for Teachers A – L	52
Table 4. Percentage of Effective and Ineffective Classroom Management, Instructional Communication, Non-instructional Communication, and Instructional Organization Attributes for Teachers A – L	54

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of social intelligence on effective music teaching. A panel of music education experts, comprised of music education faculty members and music supervisors from large county public school systems in the State of Florida, were asked to list up to five teachers and their schools from “exemplary programs” and up to five teachers and their schools from “more challenging programs” for each of the areas of band, chorus, orchestra, and general K-12 Florida public school music programs. The top five most frequently listed teachers from each category within each area of music were selected, resulting in a total of 40 teachers ($N = 40$). Each of the 40 teachers was administered the *Interpersonal Perception Task (IPT-15)*, a performance-based instrument that assesses an individual’s ability to “decode” information perceived in human interaction and an accurate way to assess a level of social intelligence within individuals. Additionally, 12 teachers, randomly selected from the original group of 40 teachers, agreed to participate in the videotaping of their instruction. These 12 teaching excerpts were viewed by 84 external evaluators, comprised of equal number of inservice music educators ($n = 42$) and undergraduate preservice music teachers ($n = 42$). External evaluators rated the overall effectiveness of the teacher for each teaching excerpt on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not effective at all* to 7 = *highly effective*). Further, evaluators were asked to list the main attribute that influenced their evaluation of each teaching excerpt.

Results showed that “exemplary” teachers scored higher than “challenged” teachers on the *IPT-15*. However, these differences were not significant. No significant differences were found between the experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers when evaluating the overall effectiveness of music teacher participants. Additionally, the external evaluators concurred with the recommendations of the panel of music education experts, rating teachers identified as “exemplary” or effective significantly higher than teachers labeled as “challenged” or ineffective. The majority of attributes that influenced external evaluators’ ratings of overall teacher effectiveness were social, constituting over 85% of all responses. Further, with the exception of one teaching excerpt, the percentage of effective and ineffective social attributes reflected the teacher’s overall effectiveness ratings given by the external evaluators. *Ineffective Classroom Management* was the most cited attribute as rationale for why

teachers were rated as ineffective. Effective communication skills, including both categories of *Effective Instructional Communication* and *Effective Non-instructional Communication* were the most frequently cited attributes for “exemplary” teachers. More specifically, *Effective Instructional Communication* constituted the highest percentage of attributes listed for six of the seven teachers rated effective by external evaluators. Implications for music educators and suggestions for future research are made.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Social relationships are prevalent throughout all aspects of life as humans interact within a multitude of venues that include personal and professional settings. Often, the ability to effectively interact with others plays a pivotal role in the successes or failures of the individual. Within our society, many professionals rely on social skills to be effective including doctors, politicians, social workers, attorneys, business leaders, police officers, and teachers. Inherent within these professions is a level of leadership, as each position demands the ability to effectively understand and navigate human behavior. Therefore, the ability to socially interact may be an important component of successful leadership, regardless of the discipline, which requires an individual to successfully manage interpersonal relationships.

Historically, questions regarding leadership components have sought to answer (a) what makes a person an effective leader, (b) which characteristics help to determine whether an individual will be effective in a leadership role, and (c) are individual qualities inherent within a leader born or made? The Occidental philosophers, Socrates and Plato, partially answered questions of leadership by creating the ideal of the “philosopher-king” who they believed should rule because of his possession of vast amounts of knowledge, recognition of the good, and ability to avoid corruption (Plato, trans. 1987). Subsequently, Aristotle, while conflicted over the establishment of the “good man” or “good citizen” as the ruler, nevertheless echoed the importance of virtue and competence in rulers of the state (Aristotle, trans. 1984).

The ancient Chinese military strategist Sun Tzu viewed an effective general as an authority figure who, when responsible for the operation of the army, evidenced both method and discipline while upholding moral law (Tzu, trans. 2005). Tzu posed that a general must maintain an awareness of the morale and condition of his soldiers while honoring his responsibility and obligation to take care of their well being. This social obligation was shared by Frederick the Great (trans. 2005) who considered the primary concern of officers as maintaining strong discipline while respecting the welfare of their troops. Frederick the Great, in a complete rejection of the Machiavellian philosophy (Machiavelli, trans. 1984) that a leader must possess the courage to achieve an end result regardless of the cost to his troops or country, believed a

leader was not an absolute monarch, rather a servant of the state and the people (Frederick the Great, trans. 1981).

Currently within the fields of modern business and management, extensive research has been conducted to isolate attributes that contribute to effective leadership (Oldham & Hackman, 2005; Smith & Hitt, 2005; Young & Hester, 2004). Northcutt (1991) surveyed 249 females to determine those personal characteristics possessed by successful career women. The most frequently listed traits included: responsible, competent, hardworking, committed, achievers, having a strong drive, self-confident, setting goals, and being organized. However, several questions arise: Does simply possessing this “laundry list” of attributes ensure success? Alternately, does the presence of these characteristics necessarily indicate that an individual will be an effective leader? Or perhaps, is an effective leader someone who understands how to implement these characteristics successfully in social situations? While it is apparent that certain attributes are embedded in successful individuals, researchers within business and management settings have recently proposed that effective leaders serve and build positive relationships with others (Autry, 2001; Covey, 1989; Covey, 2004; Young & Hester 2004).

Few would argue that effective teachers are successful leaders in the classroom. Leadership skills are apparent in all aspects of teaching and include creating a positive learning environment, motivating students to succeed, understanding the abilities of their students, adapting the instruction to fit each student’s needs, determining appropriate feedback, and providing a role model for students to emulate. Since a teacher will only be effective if he/she is able to get the desired responses from students, *social behaviors*, such as successfully interacting with students, must be developed in order to become a good teacher (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1985). The development of these social skills seems essential due to their influence on effective teaching in order to establish a positive teacher/student relationship.

Research into the characteristics of effective teachers has resulted in listings of numerous personal and social characteristics, traits, and behaviors. Berliner (1986), Brand (1986), Brophy and Good (1986), Charters and Waples (1929), Collins (1978), Hamachek (1975), Kerlinger (1966, 1967), Knudsen and Stevens (1931), Onwegbuzie et al. (2007), Porter and Brophy (1988), Rosenshine (1983), Ryans (1960, 1975), Ryans and Wandt (1942), Shannon (1928), Turner (1965), Waller (1966), Wayne and Youngs (2003), and Witty (1948) refer to attributes such as understanding students, adaptability, leadership, caring and consideration for the student, sense

of humor, sociability, and enthusiasm, specified to highlight the importance of both social skills and teaching skills required of effective teachers. Because many educators and researchers recognized the importance of these skills, many of the earliest rating scales created to rate teacher effectiveness were designed to measure both personal and social behaviors (Barr, 1950; Barr, Eustice, & Noe, 1955; Butts, 1943; Cooke & Ayers, 1943).

Within music education, several investigations have produced characteristics possessed by effective music teachers (Baker, 1980; DePugh, 1987; Grant & Drafall, 1991; Taebel, 1980; Taylor, 1980; Teachout, 1997). These results mirror data found in general education research, indicating that personal and social teaching skills are directly related to effective teaching. In fact, personal and teaching skills have been demonstrated to be more critical when compared to musical skills for ensuring success in music teaching (Taebel, 1980; Teachout, 1997). As Brand (1985) added, “Music teaching is a highly complex process characterized by hundreds of personal interactions between student and teacher” (p. 13). Therefore, it could be argued the primary concern for music educators and the training of prospective music teachers should focus on identifying skills needed to establish a successful teacher/student relationship.

Need for the Study

Effective leadership, whether in politics, military, business, management, or education, requires an individual to successfully interact with others. A clear understanding and command of social skills is necessary in order to manage personal relationships. This ability to manage personal relationships has been commonly referred to as “interpersonal intelligence” (Gardner 1983, 1993; Weinstein, 1969), “practical intelligence” (Sternberg & Wagner, 1986), and “social intelligence” (Thorndike, 1920; Goleman 2006). Recently, researchers have specifically investigated the concept of social intelligence by examining the ability to effectively interact with and navigate through social situations (Gesn & Ickes, 1999; Goleman, 2006; Goody, 1995; Ickes, 1993, 1997, 2001; Jones & Day, 1997; Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000). However, while social intelligence has been investigated across multiple areas of education (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993; Bernieri, 1991; Hall & Bernieri, 2001; Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979; Wilmington, 1992), only two investigations were found that originated specifically from a music education perspective.

Hamann (1995) administered the *Social Skills Inventory (SSI)* (Riggio, 1986, 1989; Riggio & Carney, 2003), a self-report assessment tool designed to measure basic skill in emotional communication, as well as social skills related to social intelligence, to undergraduate preservice music teachers. Using the *Pre-Service Teaching Evaluation* (Baker, 1991) students' teaching episodes were evaluated and compared to their scores on the *SSI*. Results indicated students possessing superior teaching skills scored higher on the *Emotional Expressivity*, *Social Expressivity*, and *Social Control* subscales of the *SSI*.

In a subsequent study, Hamann, Lindeburgh, and Paul (1998) utilized the *Survey of Teaching Effectiveness* (Hamann & Baker, 1995) and the *SSI* to investigate relationships between effective teaching and social skills. Similarly, findings indicated *Emotional Expressivity*, an individuals' skill in nonverbal communication, *Emotional Sensitivity*, the ability to receive and interpret nonverbal communication of others, and *Social Control*, an individual's skill to interpret verbal communication of others were found to positively correlate with ratings' of teaching effectiveness.

While results obtained by researchers of previous investigations lend initial support to the relationship between preservice teachers' self-reporting of emotional and social skills and effective teaching, several questions arise. Can social intelligence be determined through performance-based measures as opposed to self-report measures? Is social intelligence a component of effective music teaching? To what degree does social intelligence impact student behavior and learning? Can social intelligence accurately predict potential effective music teachers? Is social intelligence inherent within an individual or can it be taught?

The research literature demonstrates that social skills are attributes possessed by effective teachers. It also appears that all social components of effective teaching can improve with training. If social intelligence is revealed to relate to effective teaching, it could have a profound impact on teacher training. Teacher training provides students with the knowledge and skills needed to become effective music teachers. Perhaps identifying social intelligence as a component of effective teaching will allow future teachers to improve classroom interactions with students, which could influence their effectiveness and ultimately student learning. An investigation into social intelligence and effective teaching is important because of the potential benefit to inservice music educators as well as enhancing the music education curricula.

Since no study has used performance-based measures to assess social intelligence in music educators and its relationship to effective music teaching, an investigation seemed essential. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate whether social intelligence is a component of effective music teaching. Specific questions to be addressed were:

1. Can the social intelligence of music teachers be measured?
2. To what degree is social intelligence a component of effective music teaching?
3. Are there differences between a panel of music education experts, experienced music educators, and undergraduate preservice music teachers in identifying effective music teachers?
4. Can experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers identify social intelligence in their evaluation of effective music teaching?
5. What attributes do experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers consider to be related to effective teaching?

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Effective Teaching

It appears axiomatic that teachers have a profound effect on students. Frequently, students' successes and failures can be directly attributed to teacher effectiveness. The ability to understand how each student learns will often determine the overall effectiveness of the teacher. As Brophy and Good (1986) stated "most definitions [of teacher effectiveness] include success in socializing students and promoting their affective and personal development in addition to success in fostering their mastery of formal curricula" (p. 328). Therefore, a positive student-teacher interaction should be a goal for all music educators (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1985).

Researchers have concluded that effective teaching may be the result of successful teacher-student interactions (McCombs, 2003, 2004; McCombs & Whisler, 1997). This conclusion is demonstrated through strong relationships between positive teacher-student interactions and student participation, critical thinking, math and verbal achievement, grades, *IQ*, perceived achievement, and social connections with others (Cornelius-White, 2007). Conversely, researchers have identified that a principal indicator of failing schools is due to the lack of positive relationships between the teachers and students (Poplin & Weeres, 1994). Thus, effective teaching may be more than simply transferring academic information; it extends to the social skills and abilities of teachers to form relationships with students.

Effective Teaching Techniques

Empirical attempts regarding effective teaching have employed a number of approaches to isolate specific attributes. As a result, effective teaching may not be the result of a single technique or skill, but due to a number of factors. One specific area of research into effective teaching has focused on student achievement. While several meta-analyses have revealed that student achievement may be the result of effective teaching (Fraser, Walberg, Welch, & Hattie, 1987; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997; Seidel & Shavelson, 2007), other researchers caution against using this variable as a direct measure of teaching effectiveness (Berliner, 1976; Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Cangelosi, 1986; Doyle, 1981; Rowen, Correnti, & Miller, 2002; Seidel & Shavelson, 2007). It is often difficult to determine whether student achievement gains are due to

the effectiveness of the teaching (Berliner, 1976; Cassidy, 1990; Doyle, 1981), or a result of nonacademic factors including social and personal influences that affect student performance (Brophy & Good, 1986; Rosenshine, 1976).

To evaluate effective teaching, researchers have attempted to design assessment instruments to measure specific instructional techniques. The “direct instruction model” was developed to analyze effective teaching within classroom settings. This model involves academic instruction structured by the teacher, fast pacing, opportunities for practice after each step, and provides for individual feedback from the teacher (Brophy, 1979; McDonald, 1976). The direct instruction model has been shown to increase engaged time, student success during practice sessions, and ultimately the effectiveness of the lesson (Blair, 1984; Brophy, 1979; McDonald, 1976; Powell, 1978; Rosenshine, 1976).

The direct instruction model was modified for music education to analyze complete and incomplete teaching units. Referred to as sequential patterns or teaching cycles, Yarbrough and Price (1981) delineated each unit into three components: (1) teacher presentation, (2) student response, and (3) teacher reinforcement. Teacher presentation can be coded as academic tasks, social tasks, conducting tasks, or off-task statements. Student response is coded as ensemble performance, sectional performance, verbal, or nonverbal responses. Teacher reinforcement is defined as verbal academic or social approval, verbal academic or social disapproval, facial approval, facial disapproval, approval errors, or disapproval errors. A complete teaching unit can consist of a 1-2-3 sequence, or possibly a 1-2 sequence, since in many instances music serves as its own reinforcement.

Researchers utilizing sequential patterns have observed that effective teaching may be the result of optimal instructional patterns (Yarbrough & Price, 1989). For example, effective teachers have been found to maintain on-task student behavior through the use of eye contact and frequent use of performance time as opposed to nonperformance time (Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Researchers have been critical of ineffective classroom instruction that spends too much time giving verbal directions rather than presenting musical information (Price & Yarbrough, 1994/1995; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). Teaching episodes evaluated on prescribed sequential patterns of instruction found patterns beginning with musical instruction were rated higher than those beginning with verbal directions (Yarbrough & Hendel, 1993; Price & Yarbrough, 1993; Yarbrough, Price, & Hendel, 1994). Experienced teachers utilize more positive and specific

feedback and reinforcement (Hendel, 1995). Further, prescribed sequential patterns ending in approvals and specific reinforcement are rated higher than those ending in disapprovals and nonspecific reinforcement (Yarbrough & Hendel, 1993; Price & Yarbrough, 1993; Yarbrough, Price, & Hendel, 1994).

Regarding music teacher training, it appears effective teaching techniques *can be taught*. Researchers have successfully used training to increase the number of complete sequential patterns during a teacher's instructional episode (Bowers, 1997; Maclin, 1993; Price, 1992; Yarbrough, Price, & Bowers, 1991). Videotaped self-analysis was demonstrated to effectively increase complete sequential patterns, with or without instructive feedback (Arnold, 1991, 1995; Price, 1992). Additionally, training on complete units, most notably teacher feedback, led to an increase in teacher reinforcement approvals (Price, 1992; Jellison & Wolfe, 1987) and specificity (Benson, 1989; Bowers, 1997; Jellison & Wolfe, 1987; Price, 1992).

Feedback from the teacher has been considered a critical component of effective teaching as

A person's ability to give and receive appropriate feedback from other individuals appears to be a basic and requisite skill for effective human interaction...of great importance to a teacher in order to further a student's academic grasp of the subject matter as well as in shaping socially acceptable behavior (Madsen & Duke, 1985a, p. 199).

The type of feedback used is crucial as positive feedback has shown to increase student motivation (Brophy, 1981; Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Van-Dijk & Kluger, 2001) and attentiveness (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Within music education, a positive relationship exists between teacher approval and on-task behavior (Madsen & Alley, 1979; Forsythe, 1977; Greer, 1980). Likewise, Forsythe (1975) and Kuhn (1975) concluded that approving reinforcement for social and academic behaviors increased the amount of on-task student behavior.

It appears that training and experience also affects teachers' abilities to identify and offer appropriate feedback. While music education and music therapy students can identify the need for approving feedback (Madsen & Duke, 1985a), specific training on behavioral feedback appears to increase the effectiveness of approval statements (Madsen & Duke, 1985b).

Additionally, behavioral training can increase specific and verbal approval feedback (Madsen & Duke, 1987).

Teacher approval may be the most important aspect of teacher/student interaction (Madsen, 1982; Madsen & Duke, 1987; Marlow, Madsen, Bowen, Reardon, & Louge, 1978) and perhaps, accounts for differences in the teaching effectiveness of music educators (Madsen & Madsen, 1998). This appears evident as experienced music teachers give more approvals than disapprovals (Moore, 1981). Specifically, Whitehall (1970) found that high ability teachers praised and encouraged student behaviors and ideas more than low ability teachers. Fiocca (1986) concluded that exemplary choral directors maintained an appropriate rehearsal atmosphere through positive and supportive verbalization. Expert teachers in applied music (Siebenaler, 1997) and instrumental rehearsals (Goolsby, 1997) provided more positive and specific feedback than other teachers (Duke, 1999/2000). Further, while a teacher's positive feedback is frequently nonspecific (Hendel, 1995; Speer, 1994), expert teachers' positive statements are generally more specific (Goolsby, 1997).

In addition to teacher feedback, efficient use of time, specifically, the verbal behavior of teachers appears related to effective teaching. Research into the use of time suggests experienced teachers use time more efficiently than less experienced teachers (Goolsby, 1996; Moore & Bonney, 1987; Wagner & Struhl, 1979). Efficient use of time in music classes or rehearsals has shown to impact student attentiveness (Price, 1983; Spradling, 1985) as students are most attentive when actively participating (Dunn, 1997; Napoles, 2007; Sims, 1986; Yarbrough, 1975).

While most researchers agree that music teachers talk about 40% of a music class or rehearsal (Caldwell, 1980; Napoles, 2007; Pontious, 1982; Sherill, 1986; Thurman, 1977), the type of verbal behavior has often been criticized for the minimal time spent on presenting musical information (Blocher, Greenwood, & Shellahamer, 1997; Yarbrough & Price, 1989). However, effective teachers spend more time discussing musical material within the elementary (Hendel, 1995), middle (Sherill, 1986), and high school settings (Caldwell, 1980). Additionally, expert teachers incorporate verbal modeling to demonstrate musical information (Thurman, 1977; Wang & Sogin, 1997).

Another technique to aid teacher/student classroom interaction is the concept of pacing, or ability to structure classroom delivery. While the majority of research indicates that

exemplary and/or experienced music educators incorporate fast pacing in their instruction (Brand, 1985; Moore, 1981, 1987; Duke, Prickett, & Jellison, 1998), Arthur (2003) demonstrated that effective teachers can implement both slow and fast pacing in their teaching as warranted.

Investigations into pacing have been conducted within a broader context of the teacher-student interaction often referred to as teacher magnitude and/or intensity. Yarbrough (1975) operationally defined teacher magnitude as incorporating teacher behaviors of eye contact, closeness or proximity, volume of voice, modulation of voice, gestures, facial expressions, and rehearsal pacing. Examining the effects of low magnitude versus high magnitude on student attitude, attentiveness, or performance achievement, students from several mixed choruses rehearsed under a high magnitude teacher, low magnitude teacher, and their regular teacher. Results indicated that while no differences were found in musical performance or attitude, students were found to be the least off-task during the high magnitude teaching. Additionally, students indicated a preference for the high magnitude teacher. Fredrickson (1992) and Hendel (1995) found similar results, concluding that high magnitude contributes to effective teaching through increased student attentiveness and attitude.

Similarly, teacher “intensity” has been defined as “sustained control of the student/teacher interaction with efficient, accurate presentation of subject matter combined with enthusiastic affect and pacing” (Madsen, 1990, p. 38). In a series of investigations, intensity was isolated to examine whether it contributed to effective teaching. In the first study, intensity was found to be an attribute of music teaching that could be accurately assessed (Standley & Madsen, 1987). Subsequently, teacher intensity between freshman music education and senior music education/therapy students were examined during rote song teaching to preschoolers. Results showed that senior music education/therapy students displayed higher levels of intensity than freshman music education students in their teaching. As a result, Madsen and Geringer (1989) determined a relationship between intensity and effective teaching. Findings from senior music education majors completing their last week of student teaching indicated a high correlation between effective teaching and teacher intensity (.92) indicating that intensity is an important attribute of effective music teaching.

Because teacher intensity was demonstrated to relate to effective teaching, Madsen (1988) investigated whether intensity can be taught. During a five-day inservice workshop, extreme contrasts in teacher intensity were modeled to teachers. Teachers taught their peers

using both high and low intensities as part of their instruction. At the conclusion, teachers videotaped their best teaching in their regular classroom. When analyzed for teacher intensity and overall effectiveness, a high correlation was found for effective teaching and teacher intensity (.84). Additionally, the ability to communicate was a common behavior listed for teachers with high effective teaching ratings.

In the following study, Madsen, Standley, and Cassidy (1989) specifically investigated whether intensity could be taught to preservice music teachers and if contrasts in high/low intensity could be recognized by other students. They found that teacher intensity could easily be taught to preservice music teachers and could be recognized with great accuracy by untrained observers. Likewise, Byo (1990) replicated Madsen's (1988) experiment by teaching high/low intensity contrasts to undergraduate conducting students. Byo asked participants, ranging from high school students to graduate music majors, to indicate their perception of varying intensity teaching episodes. He concluded that teacher intensity is recognizable across a variety of contrast illustrations and levels of musical experience, validating existing research on teacher intensity.

Cassidy and Madsen (1987) investigated intensity training by examining preservice music teachers' abilities to maintain intensity across longer teaching episodes. While instructional content and accuracy of the material presented was not affected by training, students did maintain longer durations of intensity during their training and improved their delivery of intensity. Subsequently, Cassidy (1990) examined the effect of intensity training on preservice nonmusic elementary education majors for high and low intensity teaching. Low intensity was analyzed for poor information and/or ineffective delivery. Results found that training did not increase high intensity teaching, but low intensity teaching did decrease across peer teaching episodes. During preschool field teaching, effective delivery increased across all participants, while those participants who did not receive intensity training increased the number of high intensity teaching intervals.

Researchers have investigated the extent to which teachers can recognize teacher intensity during self-evaluations of their own teaching episodes. In similar studies, Madsen, Standley, Byo and Cassidy (1992), Cassidy (1993), and Wang and Sogin (1997) examined students' and inservice teachers' abilities to pinpoint effective teacher intensity through self-observations and analyses. Results of these investigations indicated a high relationship between

teacher participants and experienced observers in identifying both high intensity and effective teaching. An increase in teacher intensity was observed as a result of training. However, though teacher intensity and effective teaching were identified by all participants, differences were found between variables associated with these attributes. Both student teachers and inservice teachers consistently gave higher ratings for their own instruction than the expert observers. Additionally, when asked to list best and worst teaching skills, and any distracting mannerisms displayed during teaching, student teachers and expert teachers disagreed on classifying individual components that comprise effective teaching (Madsen, Standley, Byo & Cassidy, 1992). Thus, while it appears while everyone can recognize effective teaching, it is often difficult to identify the variables specifically associated with it (Duke 1999/2000).

For many researchers, the techniques associated with effective teaching culminate with the ability to effectively deliver information to the students. In a set of landmark studies, Ware and Williams (1975, 1976) examined the effect of a lecturer's expressive delivery on student perceptions of teaching effectiveness and class performance in an undergraduate psychology course. Expressiveness was defined as enthusiasm, humor, friendliness, charisma, and personality. A guest teacher presented six 20-minute lectures using both high- and low-expressive delivery conditions. In both studies, the teacher's effectiveness was perceived higher with high-expressive delivery over low-expressive delivery. Expressiveness influenced lesson as well; high-expressive/low-content was rated higher than low-expressive/low-content lectures. With respect to student achievement, results appear to be mixed, as the first study indicated expressive delivery influenced student achievement, while the second study did not find this to be true.

Within music education, lesson delivery has also been found to influence students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. Hamann, Baker, McAllister, and Bauer (2000) investigated the impact of teacher-delivery skills and lesson content on students' perception of teaching episodes. Good presentation skills were perceived as the most interesting and likeable component of teaching episodes. Presentation skills were also viewed as more interesting and likeable than lesson content as good presentation/poor content was rated higher than poor presentation/good content. Madsen (2003) examined the accuracy of instruction with teacher-delivery skills on perceived teaching effectiveness. Using middle school, high school, undergraduate, and experienced teacher participants, accurate and inaccurate instructions were

mixed with high- and low-delivery observed in eight teaching episodes. While experienced teachers attended to the accuracy of instruction more than other groups, all participants focused on the delivery style of the teacher over instruction. Madsen also found that regardless of experience or training, teachers were viewed as more effective during high-delivery conditions, *even when presenting inaccurate information*. Thus, both Hamann et al. (2000) and Madsen (2003) concluded that teacher-delivery skills have the most influence on students' perception of teaching, regardless of the quality or accuracy of the material being presented.

Personality

The ability to effectively relate to students seems to be a direct reflection of a teacher's personality. Smith (1971) posits that "teaching behavior is so much an expression of the teacher's personality that the skills he will use, how he will use them, and their effects on pupils' achievement are in a large measure dependent on his personality" (p. 7). While many different forms of personality have been theorized, most personality behaviors are generally exhibited in one of two manners, (a) extroversion, defined as gregariousness, assertiveness, or outgoing, and (b) introversion, defined as reserved, less social, and concerned for internal thoughts and feelings (Jung, 1921/1971). Within music education, three prominent indices have been used as measures of personality: (a) *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (Myers & McCauley, 1985), (b) *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory* (Hathaway & McKinley, 1943), and the (c) *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire* (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970).

Schmidt (1989a) sought to examine whether specific teaching behaviors were exhibited amongst differing personality types in applied music teachers. Using the *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)*, personality variables were revealed related to approvals, rate of reinforcement, teacher model/performance, and pace. Specifically, extroverted teachers displayed more approval behavior and rate of reinforcement than introverted teachers. Subsequently, Schmidt (1989b) investigated students' personality types on their perceptions of applied music teacher feedback. While results indicated that extroverted individuals may provide more feedback as teachers, extroverted students appeared not to value feedback when they were the recipient.

Researchers have also investigated personality traits for any differences between music teachers and performers. Results have been inconclusive. In a series of investigations, Kemp (1979, 1982) found that student music teachers showed higher levels of extroversion, through

being more outgoing, adventurous, and tough-minded than other music majors when measured by the *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire*. However, Wubbenhorst (1994) found no differences between teachers and performers when compared by scores on the *MBTI*.

Conflicting results have also materialized when analyzing personality traits for relationships with effective teaching. While it has been proposed that teacher effectiveness is directly related to a music teacher's personality (Bessom, Tatarunis, & Forcucci, 1980; Krueger, 1976; Wink, 1970), Barth (1961) and Teachout (2001) found no differences in the effectiveness of music teachers and student music teachers, respectively, when compared by personality factors. Kemp (1996) also concluded that successful music teachers can be either introverted or extroverted; extroverted teachers are needed with students at younger age, while introverted teachers appear to thrive with older students. In fact, personality type may be unique to each situation as "what the teacher gets from experience is an understanding of the social situation of the classroom, and an adaptation of his personality to the needs of that milieu" (Waller, 1965, p. 1).

Characteristics of Effective Teachers

Characteristics of effective teachers have garnered much interest in educational literature. Researchers have investigated characteristics of effective teachers through comparisons with teacher rating scales, student ratings of teachers, and student achievement. However, these dependent measures are typically a derivative of characteristics and/or traits of effective teachers obtained through the listing of characteristics of effective or ineffective teachers by students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators. Through these methods, researchers have produced a plethora of findings into characteristics of effective teachers, including traits of successful teachers (Berliner, 1986; Brand, 1986; Charters & Waples, 1929; Collins, 1978; Hamachek, 1975; Kerlinger, 1966, 1967; Knudsen & Stevens, 1931; Onwegbuzie et al., 2007; Shannon, 1928; Turner, 1965; Waller, 1966; Wayne & Youngs, 2003; Witty, 1948), behaviors of effective teachers (Brophy & Good, 1986; Porter & Brophy, 1988; Rosenshine, 1983; Ryans, 1960, 1975; Ryans & Wandt, 1942), traits of ineffective teachers (Hamachek, 1975; Shannon, 1928; Witty, 1948), and reasons for teacher failure (Barr, Burton, & Brueckner, 1947; Overn, 1943; Shannon, 1928).

Further examination of effective characteristics indicates that a majority of the responses focus on the ability of the teacher to interact effectively with students. Kounin (1970) defined this characteristic as “withitness” or the ability to know what students are doing in the classroom. Porter and Brophy (1986) determined that to understand students’ ability level and adapt instruction to fit needs is a characteristic of effective teaching, while Berliner (1986) commented that expert teachers form their own relationships with students and use these relationships to form the basis of their teaching strategies.

Within music education, a number of investigations have sought to determine which characteristics are most important to effective music teaching. Sims (1986) found that high teacher affect is a crucial teaching characteristic within preschool music settings. Enthusiasm has been cited as a characteristic of effective teachers in the elementary classroom (Collins, 1978), high school choral rehearsals (DePugh, 1987; Yarbrough, 1975), and university choral ensembles (Yarbrough & Madsen, 1998).

Taebel (1980) asked 201 public school teachers to rate the importance of 51 musical competencies and 59 teaching competencies. Teaching competencies received the highest ratings, with social skills, such as working cooperatively with coworkers and administrators and demonstrating enthusiasm for teaching and students emerging as the most important characteristics. Baker (1981) asked music teachers to identify personal, musical, or professional characteristics of effective music teachers. Teachers rated enthusiasm for teaching, caring for students, and interest in student enjoyment as important for teaching success. Teachout (1997) asked preservice and experienced music teachers to rate the skills and behaviors most important to successful music teaching. These responses were categorized into personal skills, teaching skills, and music skills. Both preservice and experienced music teachers rated personal and teaching skills higher than music skills, with seven of the ten top-ranked items common to both groups. Additionally, the ability to motivate and involve students in the learning process was viewed as essential to successful music teaching.

From the research literature, it seems apparent that the personal and social characteristics of teachers are directly related to effective music teaching. Taylor (1980) cited communication and human relations as the most important characteristics for effective teachers. These relationships extend to the interaction between teacher and students, as effective teachers are shown to be adept at human relationships (Goodstein, 1984). More specifically, researchers have

observed that the ability to adapt instruction and relate materials to fit each student's needs is demonstrated to be an important characteristic of effective music teaching (Brand, 1985; Grant & Drafall, 1991; Taebel & Coker, 1980; Taylor, 1980). Therefore, it is essential that future investigations into effective music teaching examine a teacher's ability to utilize personal and social attributes to develop a positive teacher/student interaction that will foster student development and learning.

Intelligence

Historically, society has placed an emphasis on defining and characterizing the mental capability and capacity of individuals. The importance placed on intelligence has direct consequences in all facets in life, ranging from academic success to engaging in a personal relationship. Many decisions for children regarding specific opportunities and guidance they receive are often a result of perceived intelligence or intellectual capacity. Subsequently, judgments on intelligence frequently determine the successes and failures of an individual. Therefore, the study of intelligence and its function appears to be valuable, and perhaps vital, for understanding ordinary human behavior, including interactions that occur within educational settings.

Definitions of Intelligence

No other concept may be as ambiguous as intelligence. Virtually every person has his/her own definition of what constitutes intelligence and is able to judge the intellectual abilities of others (Jensen, 1980); however, determining a universal definition has remained elusive. While common dictionary definitions have included the "ability to learn and understand and or to deal with new or trying situations" (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2003), the "ability to acquire and apply knowledge and skills" (McKean, 2005), and the "ability to perceive and understand" (Kipfer, 2005), academic experts have also varied according to their conceptions of intelligence, ranging from the ability to reason abstractly, to solve problems, and to learn (Sternberg & Berg, 1986; Synderman & Rothman, 1988).

However, conceptions of intelligence are not viewed similarly by all cultures (Berry, 1984; Sternberg, 2000; Sternberg & Kaufman, 1998). For example, the theory that intelligence is related to the speed of mental processing may not exist outside of the Western philosophy

(Sternberg, Conway, Ketron, & Bernstein, 1981), where other cultures place a greater emphasis on the depth of processing (Sternberg, 2000). Globally, researchers examining intelligence have found that Chinese notions of intelligence include benevolence, humility, and knowledge of oneself and of external conditions (Yang & Sternberg, 1997a), Buddhist and Hindu philosophies incorporate determination, mental effort, feelings, and opinions (Das, 1994), and African conceptions range from maintaining stable intergroup relations to successfully participating in social responsibilities (Ruzgis & Grigorenko, 1994; Serpell, 1974). Differing viewpoints of intelligence have also been found within the U.S. when compared across ethnic groups, namely African-American, Asian, Caucasian, and Hispanic groups (Okagaki & Sternberg, 1993). Thus, regardless of cultural background, intelligence is a term that is universally understood, but unable to be globally defined. As Sternberg (2000) states, “Looked at in one way, everyone knows what intelligence is; looked at in another way, no one does” (p. 3).

Attempts to understand and construct definitions of intelligence have historically focused on isolating differences between the mental acuity of individuals. For example, Plato likened intelligence to a block of wax consisting of differing sizes, textures, and manageability according to the mental capacity of each person, Aristotle viewed intelligence in terms of “quick wit,” or the ability to understand causes behind any given event, while Thomas Aquinas defined intelligence as the ability to combine and separate similarities and dissimilarities of things (Jensen, 1980; Sternberg, 2000).

The first formal definition of intelligence in psychological terms was provided by Spencer who defined intelligence as the “power of combining many separate impressions” (Spencer, 1895, p. 403). He viewed its importance in allowing an individual to adapt effectively to a complex and ever changing environment (Burt, 1955; Guilford, 1967). Arguing against the notion of separate cognitive functions, Spearman (1904) determined that a common intellectual ability existed that accounted for all measures of intelligence (Brody, 2000). Drawing from positive correlations between cognitive tests, Spearman developed the concept of “general intelligence,” or “g,” that represented an individual’s global, or overall, intelligence. A person’s “g,” was the general factor responsible for the ability, or perhaps, inability to perform well on specific cognitive ability tasks (Spearman, 1904). Therefore, the concept of “general intelligence” was defined as an individual’s global ability to infer and apply relationships drawn from experience (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Spearman, 1927).

Critics of “general intelligence” have long disputed the proposition that intelligence could be characterized by a single factor. Ebbinghaus (1895) through his work with “cancellation tests” found that individual differences in intelligence were a result of a combination of mental processes. Likewise, Binet and Henri (1896) concluded individual intellectual differences were due to “superior processes,” rather than the result of sensations and simple cognitive functions (Brody, 2000). Rejecting Spearman’s notion of intelligence as a global attribute, Binet (Binet & Simon, 1905) viewed intelligence as a result of complex mental processes (Peterson, 1925). Intelligence was demonstrated through complex tasks that required comprehension, invention, direction, and censorship (Binet, 1910). Thus, Binet’s emphasis in measuring intelligence centered on the development of tests that accounted for the overall complexity of intelligence (Guilford, 1967).

As a result of Binet’s and Spearman’s conflicting views, many researchers attempted to determine whether intelligence was a singular global factor or a result of more complex forms. Several psychologists have concurred with Spearman’s original assessment of intelligence as an overall global attribute (Jensen, 1969, 1980, 1998, Wechsler, 1958). Conversely, other researchers have rejected this claim citing the presence of multiple factors including academic and social abilities not accounted for in the general intelligence model (Cattell, 1987; Guilford, 1967; Thurstone, 1931, 1938; Vernon, 1950). Proponents of a multi-faceted concept of intelligence have viewed intelligence as a function of higher order mental processing; offering theories ranging from the ability to perform abstract thinking (Terman, 1916), to the ability to transfer training (Ferguson, 1954), to a synthesis of thought processes characterized as “an orchestration of knowledge and judgment and temperament” (Cronbach, 1976, p. 209).

Further attempts to understand the nature of intelligence led to the speculation of separate forms of intelligence. Adaptability has been posited as one form of intelligence. This capacity has been defined as the ability to learn from experience (Sternberg, 2000), to the adaptation to one’s environment (Piaget, 1972), and the ability to adapt to relatively new situations (Sternberg, 2000). In his development of a revised *IQ* test, Wechsler (1958) viewed intelligence as the ability to deal effectively with one’s environment. Later, Wechsler modified this definition to assert that intelligence was the “capacity of an individual to understand the world about him and his resourcefulness to cope with its challenges” (Wechsler, 1975, p. 139).

Proposing that intelligence is a multifaceted phenomenon that encompasses both academic and nonacademic domains led to the “theory of multiple intelligences” (Gardner, 1983, 1993). According to this theory, human intelligence is categorized according to seven distinct and separate intelligences, including (a) linguistic intelligence, the ability to articulate spoken and written languages, (b) logical-mathematical intelligence, demonstrated in logical, mathematical, and scientific ability, (c) spatial intelligence, the ability to form a mental model of visual-spatial elements and to be able to transform these concepts, (d) musical intelligence, the ability to understand rhythm, pitch, and timbre, (e) bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, sensitivity to solve or fashion products using the actions of one’s body, (f) intrapersonal intelligence, understanding the nature of one’s self and being able to use this knowledge to effectively operate in life, and (g) interpersonal intelligence, the ability to understand and influence other people’s behavior (Gardner, 1983, 1993; Wagner 2000). Although all seven intelligences state a case for the plurality of intellect, each represents a raw potential that requires development and nurture to achieve its full potential of these abilities (Gardner, 1993).

Other psychologists have validated intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences as legitimate forms of intelligence. In terms of Taiwanese conceptions of intelligence, the knowledge of an individual’s internal world has been revealed as a valued form of intrapersonal intelligence (Yang & Sternberg, 1997b). Vygotsky (1978) also characterized intelligence in intrapersonal terms; the ability to watch behavior in social interactions and internalize. Accurately perceiving human behavior and personality to form impressions has been viewed as an interpersonal form of intelligence (Taft, 1956; Wedeck, 1947). Allport (1937) theorized intelligence as being able to perceive human behavior, stating that “understanding people is largely a matter of perceiving relations between past and present activities, between expressive behavior and inner traits, between cause and effect, and intelligence is the ability to perceive just such relations as these” (p. 514). Competence in interpersonal intelligence also provides for ability to determine other people’s emotions and intentions (Bar-On, 1997). Since interpersonal intelligence relies on the ability to recognize distinctions among others, even the intentions and desires of another, professionals specializing in relationships with others including politicians, salespeople, clinicians, and teachers are likely to possess this type of intelligence (Gardner, 1983, 1993).

An additional aspect of intelligence that has gained recent notoriety is emotional intelligence, defined as the ability to perceive and express emotion and feelings in oneself and in others, and use that knowledge to solve problems in the self and with others (Goleman, 1995; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotional intelligence may account for individuals who have developed strong social skills and may be more socially effective than others (Goleman, 1995; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). There are four skills exhibited in this level of intelligence, (a) perception of emotion, or the ability perceive emotions in oneself and others, (b) use of emotion to facilitate thinking, which refers to the skill of using emotions in cognitive processes, such as reasoning, problem-solving, and decision making, (c) understanding of emotion, or the ability to understand the information, adaptation, and causes behind emotions, and (d) management of emotion, which refers to the ability to acknowledge feelings and use effective strategies to understand and grow from emotions (Ciarrochi & Mayer, 2007; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). As proficiency in one skill is learned and mastered, the other skills are influenced, culminating in proficiency of the management of emotion.

Attempting to combine the aforementioned forms of intelligence into a broader conception of intelligence, researchers have proposed the theory of practical intelligence. Commonly referred to as “everyday intelligence” (Sternberg & Wagner, 1986) and “street smarts,” (Seligman, 1992) practical intelligence has been operationally defined from responses that occur outside the school setting (Frederiksen, 1986), to the organization and adaptability of everyday activities to accomplish what we must (Goodnow, 1986), to the knowledge of effective plans and strategies for dealing with ordinary problems (Berg, 1989; Berg & Calderone, 1994). Sternberg and Wagner (1986) proposed that intelligence was divided into three distinct areas, analytic, or what *IQ* tests traditionally measure, creative, and practical intelligence. Thus, practical intelligence is the knowledge to solve personal problems, including the ability to manage others (Wagner, 2000).

Researchers have also linked practical intelligence with social competence. Mercer, Gomez-Palacio, and Padilla (1986) identified social competence as synonymous with practical intelligence. Their definition of social competence encompassed the extent that an individual is able to meet the social expectations of others in six forms of social roles: family roles, community roles, peer roles, nonacademic school roles, earner-consumer roles, and self-maintenance roles (Wagner, 2000). Ford (1982, 1986) also emphasized social competence in his

conceptualization of practical intelligence. Referring to social competence as “the attainment of relevant social goals in specified social contexts, using appropriate means and resulting in positive development outcomes” (Ford, 1982, p. 2) he theorized that practical intelligence is demonstrated through transactional goals, or goals that “refer to an effect outside of the person” (Ford, 1986, p. 183). Goals are attainable through four facets of social competence: (a) prosocial skills, the sensitivity to the needs of others, (b) social-instrumental skills, the knowledge of how to get things done, (c) social ease, or comfort in social activities, and (d) self-efficacy, or a positive self-concept (Ford & Miura, 1986). Thus, given the social nature of human beings, these goals are met through the use of skills that utilize social competence, or social intelligence.

Definitions of Social Intelligence

The emphasis placed on psychometric measures of intelligence in the first part of the twentieth century led to a greater need for understanding and defining the nature of intelligence (Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000). As a direct result, Thorndike’s (1920) research into psychometric measures of intelligence for employment sorting purposes led to the delineation of three separate forms of intelligence: (a) abstract intelligence, i.e. ideas and symbols, (b) mechanical intelligence, i.e. things and mechanisms, and (c) social intelligence (Goleman, 2006). Defining social intelligence as “the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls - to act wisely in human relations” (p. 228), Thorndike added, “The best mechanic in a factory may fail as a foreman for lack of social intelligence” (p. 229). Thus, social intelligence was introduced as an independent form of intelligence, critical for individuals working in social environments.

However, not all psychologists have concurred that social intelligence exists separately from general intelligence. Spearman (1927) and Jensen (1998) view this form of intelligence as *g*, or general intelligence, applied to social situations. Riggio, Messamer, and Throckmorton (1991) found high correlations between social intelligence results and *IQ* test results, concluding that differences may not be present between cognitive and social abilities. Likewise, Wechsler (1958) dismissed the notion of social intelligence as its’ own form of intelligence, suggesting that it is simply general intelligence applied to social situations. Though rejecting the concept of social intelligence, Wechsler noted the importance of social skills with respect to intelligence stating, “individuals with identical IQs may differ very markedly in regard to their effective

ability to cope with the environment” (Wechsler, 1940, p. 444). In contrast to social intelligence measures, he offered the *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised Comprehension and Picture Arrangement* subtests, designed to assess the social aspects of general intelligence. However, recent investigations have cautioned against the uses of these subtests as measures of social intelligence, citing an apparent lack of construct validity (Campbell & McCord, 1996; Lipsitz, Dworkin, & Erlenmeyer-Kimling, 1993).

Despite attempts to demonstrate that intelligence exists only as a singular form, many psychologists have continued to offer theories regarding the conceptualization of social intelligence. Several definitions of social intelligence have included:

1. The ability to get along with others (Moss & Hunt, 1927);
2. The knowledge and strategies used to achieve personally relevant life goals (Showers & Cantor, 1985);
3. The depth of knowledge about the social world (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987);
4. The ability and flexibility to apply social knowledge to solve problems (Jones & Day, 1997; Wong, Day, Maxwell, & Meara, 1995); and
5. The ability to use the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of one’s self and others in understanding and solving interpersonal problems (Marlowe, 1986).

Further, a great deal of attention has been placed on the notion that social intelligence functions as a separate entity, independent of general intelligence (Ford & Tisak, 1983; Goleman, 2006; Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000; Hoepfner & O’Sullivan, 1969; O’Sullivan, Guilford, & deMille, 1965). In an attempt to determine whether separate intellectual abilities exist, Guilford (1967) posited a system of 120 separate intellectual abilities based on Thorndike’s (1920) original classification of intelligences. In this *Structure of Intellect* model, findings showed that 30 out of the 120 intellectual abilities were represented by social intelligence abilities. Subsequent investigations support results that social intelligence abilities are present and independent of other cognitive abilities (Chen & Michael, 1993; Hendricks, Guilford, & Hoepfner, 1969). These studies indicated two domains of social intelligence, (a) understanding the behavior of other people, and (b) coping with the behavior of other people (Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000).

Another aspect of social intelligence garnering more recent attention is the concept of empathic accuracy. Empathic accuracy refers to the extent to which people successfully infer

other people's thoughts and feelings (Ickes, 1993; 1997). It has been described as ability that distinguishes "the most tactful advisors, the most diplomatic officials, the most effective negotiators, the most electable politicians, the most productive salespersons, the most successful teachers, and the most insightful therapists" (Ickes, 1997, p. 2). Researchers have proposed that empathic accuracy provides a fundamental dimension on which an individual's social intelligence can be assessed (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987; Ickes, 1997; Goleman, 1995, 2006; Goody, 1995). Initially defined in clinical therapy situations, empathic accuracy has been used to track the accuracy of therapist's inferences during client-therapist interactions (Rogers, 1957). Utilizing unstructured interaction scenarios between two strangers, empathic accuracy has been shown to improve as individuals become more acquainted and comfortable with each other (Gesn & Ickes, 1999; Stinson & Ickes, 1992), verbal and nonverbal cues between dyads increase (Ickes, 2001), and as individuals interacting become more interested in each other (Ickes, Stinson, Bissonnette, & Garcia, 1990).

Based on existing literature regarding social intelligence, Goleman (2006) theorized that social intelligence is comprised of two broad categories: (a) social awareness, or what we sense about others, and (b) social facility, what we do with that information. The amount of social awareness for each individual is determined through four distinct skills; or, (a) primal empathy, the ability to perceive nonverbal emotions and feelings of others, (b) attunement, complete attention to listening to establish rapport, (c) empathic accuracy, the ability to understand another's thoughts, feelings, and intentions, and (d) social cognition, understanding how the social world works. Additionally, an individual's social facility is determinant on four skills; or, (a) synchrony, the successful interaction at the nonverbal level, (b) self-presentation, an effective presentation of oneself, (c) influence, the ability to shape an interaction using tact and self-control, and (d) concern, the ability to care for another's needs and act accordingly. Goleman posited that while traditional theories of social intelligence have focused solely on cognitive aspects of social intelligence, it is the combination of emotional and cognitive functions which work synchronously to form social intelligence. In essence, "empathic accuracy builds on listening and primal empathy; all three enhance social cognition. And interpersonal awareness in all its guises provides the foundation for social facility" (Goleman 2006, p. 91). Goleman summarizes the capacity for social understanding, attuned listening, and empathic concern are vital skills for social intelligence. Therefore, an appropriate measure of social intelligence is

needed that accurately assesses the ability to comprehend and successfully interact in social situations.

Measures of Intelligence

In the last half of the nineteenth century, scientific inquiry into human development led to a greater need for understanding psychological functioning. Specifically, the development of evolutionary theory led Darwin (1859) to conclude that intelligence was an inherited trait that accounted for the advancement of the human species. It was also speculated that intelligence was not only responsible for elevating humans above the other species, but also the central factor that explained differences between individuals' mental capacities and abilities (Galton, 1869). Combining findings of intelligence across family strains with the newly developed concept of normal distribution (Quetelet, 1849), Galton concluded that intelligence is genetically and normally distributed within humans (Brody, 2000). Variations in intelligence are a result of traits passed along hereditary lines, separating the intellectual superiority of certain races of humans (Galton, 1869). To compare the mental abilities of families and family strains, Galton devised a series of auditory and visual discrimination ability tasks that could separate individuals with high intellectual abilities from those with low intellectual abilities (Brody, 2000; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994).

While Galton's initial attempts to establish a measure of intelligence failed due to lack of validity, other performance-based assessments were later developed that focused on psychological functions (Cattell, 1890), motor functions (Oehr, 1895), and memory abilities (Bolton, 1891-1892; Jastrow, 1891-1892). Through these performance-based tasks, Spearman attempted to calculate the intelligence of an individual based on positive correlations obtained between different mental tests. Spearman (1904, 1927) attempted to validate the concept of "general intelligence" through examining the relationship between singular performance tasks and academic achievement. Expanding on the "correlation coefficient" originally devised by Galton (1888) and Pearson (Stigler, 1986), he concluded that intelligence is a single factor determined through the aggregate score of discrimination and intellectual abilities in academic performance.

However, critics supported the belief that intelligence was not composed of specific sensory and motor functions, and therefore, could not be measured through singular performance

tasks (Binet & Henri, 1896; Ebbinghaus, 1897). Attempting to create a mental test that could discriminate between normal and mentally deficient children, Binet developed the first intelligence test that assessed the level cognitive functioning of children (Binet & Simon, 1905). A comprehensive scale was constructed of thirty tests to measure a child's ability to reason, draw analogies, and identify patterns through a combination of complex mental processes that included memory, imagery, imagination, attention, comprehension, suggestibility, aesthetic appreciation, moral sentiment, muscular force/force of will, motor skill, and judgment of visual space (Guilford, 1967; Herrnstein & Boring, 1965). Grouping items according to difficulty, the intelligence test provided for a calculation of a child's mental functioning, or mental age (Peterson, 1925). As a result, the ratio of mental age to chronological age was developed to determine the intelligence quotient (*IQ*) of an individual (Stern, 1912), thereby providing the first representation of an individual's intelligence.

The allure of the psychometric approaches to assess an individual's intelligence became the focus of much cognitive research in the beginning of the 20th century. Because of direct applications to the job market, several group tests were developed to assess intelligence for purposes of military recruiting (Guilford & Lacey, 1947; Yerkes, 1921) and employment sorting (Dvorak, 1947; Guilford & Zimmerman, 1948). An American version of Binet's intelligence tests was developed, known as the *Stanford-Binet Scale* (Terman, 1916; Terman & Merrill, 1960). This standardized intelligence measure provided the first extension to assess adult levels of intelligence (Guilford, 1967). Citing problems with the *Stanford-Binet* intelligence test, Wechsler (1958) sought to develop a new standardized scale that improved on existing *IQ* measures. He viewed the fact that the *Stanford-Binet* had different tests for different ages as a major flaw, and set out to design tests that measured the same abilities and different ages. The *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale* was developed containing a verbal section which included tests of information, comprehension, arithmetic, digits forward and backward, similarities, and vocabulary, as well as a performance section that included tests of picture completion, picture arrangement, object assembly, block design, and digit symbols (Guilford, 1967; Wechsler, 1958). The scale also provided more assessment room at the top of the scale, another weakness of the *Stanford-Binet*.

While many intelligence experts believed that intelligence tests provide an accurate measure of an individual's intellectual ability (Eysenck, 1971; Snyderman & Rothman, 1988),

critics of the psychometric approach have raised numerous concerns regarding what is actually assessed (Hartigan & Wigdor, 1989; McClelland, 1973; Wagner, 1997; Wigdor & Garner, 1982). Subsequently, the widespread use of these assessment measures has been mired with controversy regarding the administration of *IQ* tests and the application of results.

One subject that has received a great deal of attention from proponents and critics alike revolves around the suggestion of racial and genetic hierarchies with respect to intelligence. Psychometric measures of intelligence were initially constructed to provide empirical evidence that intelligence was an inheritable trait (Galton, 1869). Since then, several investigations utilizing psychometric assessments have concurred with Galton's original proposition of racial and genetic hierarchies, revealing differences in intelligence when compared across racial and genetic lines (Eysenck, 1971; Herrnstein, 1973; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Jensen, 1969, 1998). However, other psychologists have discounted genetic influences and proposed outside factors for the differences in intelligence scores between races. Spearman (1904) believed that differences in sensory-discrimination ability, and thereby intelligence, was due to the environmental influences of the different social classes. Binet also found differences in performance in children originating from various social backgrounds (Guilford, 1967). He attributed these differences to environmental factors that provided stimulation in intellectual development (Brody, 2000). Further, differences in intelligence may be attributed to environmental factors, suggesting that the assimilation of cultures and races negates differences in intelligences between races (Flynn, 2007; Gladwell, 2007; Hunt, 1961; Wheeler, 1942).

One inherent problem associated with intelligence measures is that "...throughout the years, the development of tests has generally far outrun the development of the understanding of that which tests have measured" (Guilford, 1967, p.2). In fact, it has been stated that *IQ* tests measure everything except intelligence, including personality traits, cultural background, opportunity, quality of schooling, values, interests, and attentiveness (Jensen, 1980). Further, *IQ* tests have been criticized for only identifying individuals at either extreme end of intellectual ability while discounting the possibility of multiple forms of intelligences (Ackerman, 1996; Ackerman & Heggestad, 1997; Neisser, 1976). To address this need, the *Basic Skills Test* (Educational Testing Service, 1972) and the *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test* (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002) were designed to provide a measure of nontraditional intelligence testing. However, the continued development of measures to assess multiple forms

of intelligence is warranted to "...diversify and broaden the concept of ability to include areas other than those school-defined abilities traditionally assessed, as...the domains of academic aptitude and achievement, or even of intelligence in the *IQ* sense, are too restrictive to account for all of the educationally relevant individual differences in abilities" (Keating, 1978, p. 218).

Measures of Social Intelligence

Perhaps the first evidence of research on human interactions was conducted by Charles Darwin (1872/1965) during his proposition of natural selection. Darwin argued that emotions give humans a distinct evolutionary advantage because of the development of consistent signal systems (Ekman, 1973). As emotions are learned and developed, they are modified to fulfill cultural expectations (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). Subsequently, human emotions are dictated by the social definitions that humans place on them. This influence of societal expectations is exhibited in social skills involved in everyday life. Therefore, social intelligence, a person's ability to successfully decode and interact in social situations, may be inherent within humans, albeit at differing ability levels. People are genetically "hardwired" to perceive emotion and adapt socially; as Goleman (2006) stated, "we are wired to connect" (p. 4).

The development of measures for assessing social intelligence evolved as early empirical studies attempted to correlate specific cognitive functions with overall human intelligence. However, Thorndike (1920) accurately predicted problems associated with developing a method for assessing, and thereby defining this type of human intelligence, when he acknowledged that

convenient tests of social intelligence are hard to devise...Social intelligence shows itself abundantly in the nursery, on the playground, in barracks and factories and salesroom, but it eludes the formal standardized conditions of the testing laboratory. It requires human beings to respond to, time to adapt its responses, and face, voice, gesture, and mien as tools (p. 231).

Thorndike continued stating that one problem associated with assessing social intelligence exists when one tries "... to state just what it is, and how it is to be measured, there is difficulty" (Thorndike, 1920, p. 227). Therefore, an accurate measure of social intelligence would need to be constructed based on a "genuine situation with real persons" (Thorndike, 1920, p. 228).

As a result of Thorndike's delineation of intelligence into three separate categories, abstract intelligence, mechanical intelligence, and social intelligence, the *George Washington*

University Social Intelligence Test (GWSIT) (Hunt, 1928) was developed as the first empirical attempt to measure individual differences in social intelligence. Divided into six subtests, (a) Judgment in Social Situations, (b) Memory for Names and Places, (c) Recognition of Mental States from Facial Expression, (d) Observation of Human Behavior, (e) Social Information, and (f) Recognition of the Mental States Behind Words, the *GWSIT* paralleled many standardized general intelligence measures, including the *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test* (Terman, 1916; Terman & Merrill, 1960) and the *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Test* (Wechsler, 1958), in that all subtests were combined to produce a total social intelligence score. Participants whose occupations involve a large amount of social interaction with others, including teachers, tended to score well above average on the test. However, critics argued against the validation of this instrument, citing the difficulties involved in finding external sources of social intelligence to which to compare the *GWSIT* scores (Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000; Thorndike & Stein, 1937). In this manner, the *GWSIT* provided an early example of the challenges present for researchers in developing and validating an instrument designed to specifically assess social intelligence.

While other early pioneering attempts to measure social intelligence focused on interpersonal interactions and relationships in group settings (Bales, 1950; Flanders, 1964, 1966; Withall, 1949), a small number of empirical assessments were created to measure specific social intelligence abilities. Chapin (1942) created a scale that attempted to determine the social insight of an individual by assessing "...the ability to define (i.e., by classifying, diagnosing, inferring causes, or predicting) a given social situation in terms of the behavior imputed to others present, rather than in terms of the individual's own feeling about the others" (p. 215). Problem scenarios were constructed allowing participants to infer or conclude a response for each social situation. Results determined that individuals with high social insight scores were more frequently represented with political, professional, social, and civic groups, and were more active in memberships, attendance, contributions, and offices than individuals with low social insight scores.

Investigating another specific aspect of social intelligence, an individual's empathic ability, or the skill to understand another person's condition or state of mind, led to the development of the *Empathy Scale* (Hogan, 1969; Hogan & Henley, 1970). Hogan designed this instrument to examine the relationship of empathy with role-taking ability; a theory derived from Mead (1934) and Cottrel and Diamond (1949) who speculated that empathy was the foundation

for all social intelligence and interaction. When compared with two personality measures, the *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (Myers & McCauley, 1985) and the *Maudsley Personality Inventory* (Eysenck, 1959), high scores were related to extroversion, the trait typically associated with an outgoing and assertive personality. Subsequent investigations into the relationship of the *Empathy Scale* with encoding skills, the ability to send stimuli, and decoding skills, the ability to receive and interpret incoming stimuli, revealed the scale to be more highly correlated with encoding ability over decoding ability (Hogan & Henley, 1970). Additionally, the scale was shown to be a valid measure of role-taking ability (Mills & Hogan, 1978) and a predictor of how successful high school students can perform the role of a teacher (Bernieri, 1991).

More recent investigations into empathic accuracy, the accuracy of an individual's empathic ability, led to the development of the *Unstructured Dyadic Interaction Paradigm* (Ickes, Stinson, Bissonnette, & Garcia, 1990), which measures an individual's ability to infer the specific content of another person's thoughts and feelings during a brief interaction period, and *The Standard Stimulus Paradigm* (Gesn & Ickes, 1999), designed to assess empathic accuracy in a clinical setting (Ickes, 2001). In the *Unstructured Dyadic Interaction Paradigm*, two participants were brought into an observation room for what they believed to be an experimental session. The experimenter notified the participants that he/she must run a quick errand, leaving the participants alone to interact for six minutes. After the six minutes were completed, participants were shown a videotape of the interaction and estimated what they believed the other person was thinking and feeling at the exact moment during the interaction. Additionally, participants were shown the videotape for a second time to notate exactly what they were thinking and feeling at the exact moment in the interaction. In a similar fashion, *The Standard Stimulus Paradigm* (Gesn & Ickes, 1999) involved a model in which three female clients were videotaped in a naturalistic, clinical therapy session discussing real-life personal problems with their therapist. After the session, clients recorded their thoughts and feelings at the exact moments while watching a videotape of their session. Participants were asked to perceive the thoughts and feelings each client was having at the exact moment that they were occurring.

Results revealed that both the *Unstructured Dyadic Interaction Paradigm* and *The Standard Stimulus Paradigm* provided a reliable and accurate way to assess empathic accuracy. Findings from the *Unstructured Dyadic Interaction Paradigm* showed the more an individual was interested in their partner, or found them more physically attractive, the more accurate the

individual was in perceiving what the person's thoughts and feelings were (Ickes et al., 1990). Additionally, a person's grade point average was found to predict content accuracy as well. With respect to the findings of *The Standard Stimulus Paradigm*, participants' accuracy scores were greater at the end of clinical sessions than the beginning, showing a propensity to become more acquainted with the clients (Gesn & Ickes, 1999). Additionally, verbal cues were more relevant for empathic accuracy than nonverbal cues (Ickes, 2001). It also appears that close friends have higher levels of empathic accuracy than compared with strangers when inferring each other's thoughts and feelings (Stinson & Ickes, 1992).

Another aspect of social intelligence assessment has focused on the encoding and decoding of an individual's emotions. The *Communication of Affect Receiving Ability Test* (CARAT) (Buck, 1976) was designed to measure spontaneous expression of emotional cues revealed on an encoder's face. Participants viewed a videotape of an individual's spontaneous and unknowingly videotaped reactions to emotionally-loaded color slides that contained sexual, scenic, pleasant people, unpleasant, and unusual situations. Decoders identified which slide was being shown from the five emotional categories and asked to rate how pleasant or unpleasant the senders' responses were. Though the CARAT has been shown to reliably measure sending accuracy in both children and adults, concerns have been raised about the use of slide-viewing techniques in measuring receiving ability (Buck, 1979). One major weakness associated with the CARAT is the restriction of emotions used, which are limited to the use of color slides.

Focusing on an individual's ability to decode underlying emotions associated with facial expressions led to a series of assessment instruments designed to examine these social skills. First in this series of measurement tools was the *Facial Affect Scoring Technique* (Ekman, Friesen, & Tomkins, 1971), an observational coding system used to examine Japanese and American students' facial behavior as they viewed stressful films alone and in the presence of an authority figure. Differences in facial affect between the Japanese and American students during the condition stimuli led to the development of the *Brief Affect Recognition Test* (Ekman & Friesen, 1974), which assessed viewers' ability to recognize emotions of happiness, sadness, disgust, fear, surprise, anger, and neutral in facial expressions flashed at speeds faster than 1/25th of a second. While researchers concluded that emotions expressed appear common to all people, different cultural expectations dictated facial appearance within certain social situations.

Accounting for these cultural differences, the *Japanese and Caucasian Facial Expressions of Emotion* (Matsumoto & Ekman, 1988) and later the *Japanese and Caucasian Brief Affect Recognition Test* (Matsumoto, et al., 2000) improved on previous facial decoding instruments by including encoders balanced across ethnicity, gender, and facial expressions. Additionally, contempt was added to the six previously existing emotions that were displayed through facial expressions. Further, all muscular movements observable were measured and coded based on the *Facial Action Coding System* (Ekman & Friesen, 1978; Ekman, Friesen, & Hager, 2002), enabling decoders to focus on "core" facial muscular movements present in certain emotions (Rosenberg & Ekman, 2005).

While these assessment instruments have been shown effective in determining a level of social intelligence in adults, many were subsequently adapted for evaluating the encoding and decoding of emotions in children. However, several of these instruments, specifically the *Children's Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity* (Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979) and *Communication of Affect Receiving Ability Test - Children* (Buck, 1980), have been criticized for their accuracy because of the knowledge of adult social situations needed to decode the nonverbal cues provided (Nowicki & Duke, 1994; O'Sullivan, 1982). Consequently, the *Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy (DANVA)* (Nowicki & Duke, 1994) was created to identify children who may be deficient in social skills necessary for successful social interactions with others. Measuring children's ability in nonverbal receiving and sending accuracy through the encoding and decoding of facial expressions, postures, gestures, and paralanguage, the *DANVA* assesses the four basic core emotions of happiness, sadness, anger, and fear through a number of subtests. Results from the *DANVA* indicated children's self-esteem was found to be positively correlated with scores on all receptive subtests (Nowicki, 1992), positive and negative ratings by children's peers correlated to greater and lesser accuracy, respectively (Nowicki & Duke, 1992), and social behavior of children, as rated by their teachers, was related to the facial expressions, paralanguage, and postures receptive subtests (Nowicki & Duke, 1994). Academically, the *DANVA* correlates with standardized achievement tests but not with *IQ* (Nowicki & Duke, 1992; Nowicki & Duke, 1994). Thus, the authors concluded the *DANVA* represents a valid and accurate way to assess children's ability to encode, and more definitively decode, nonverbal situations that aid in identifying children who may be at risk for poor social interaction skills.

Two prominent concerns arose regarding existing standardized measures of children's social abilities: (a) each component of facial expression, gestures, tone of voice, postures, and situational cues were presented separately or in partial combinations, and (b) children selected responses from a list of possible answers. Attempting to improve on these limitations, Magill-Evans, Koning, Cameron-Savada, & Manyk (1995) developed the *Child and Adolescent Social Perception Measure (CASP)* to measure a child's ability to interpret social cues by: (a) inferring emotions from facial expression, tone of voice, gestures, postures, and situational cues presented simultaneously, and (b) creating their own responses as opposed to choosing from a list of possible answers. Consisting of ten scenes of child actors, performing without scripted dialogue in various settings across multiple emotional intensities, the *CASP* asked children to describe occurrences in the scene, what each person felt, and how they could tell the individual was feeling that way. All responses were divided into a Total Emotion Score, for partially and fully correct emotional score, and a Total Nonverbal Cues Score, for identifying facial cues, body cues, voice cues, and context cues. Additionally, all qualitative information obtained from participants allowed for determining the vocabulary abilities of each child.

In a similar fashion to previous children's social assessment measures, emotional and nonverbal scores of the *Child and Adolescent Social Perception Measure* correlated with age and gender; validating the findings of earlier studies that revealed social perception abilities increased with age and girls showed higher scores than boys on these measures (Hall, 1984; Magill-Evans et al., 1995; Nowicki & Duke, 1994; Rosenthal, Hall, Archer, DiMatteo, & Rogers, 1977). However, no correlations were found between a child's expressive vocabulary and Total Emotion Score or Total Nonverbal Cues, and no difference between genders with respect to vocabulary. While the relationship between specific cognitive abilities and a child's ability to perceive social situations may not be evident through assessment measures developed to date, information regarding a child's ability to interpret nonverbal cues in social situations is apparent.

Self-report measures have been developed to assess various aspects of social intelligence. Though typically used to measure personality traits, attitudes, and emotional states (Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991), many self-report inventories have been constructed to identify interpersonal skills and other levels of social intelligence (Riggio & Riggio, 2001). While critics argue that self-reports of skills are strongly affected by response biases, and therefore, do not

provide accurate assessments of these skills (Cheek, 1982; Cronbach, 1990; Davis & Kraus, 1997; Ickes, 1993, 2001; Kagan, 1988; Oskamp, 1991; Wiggins, 1973; Zuckerman, Koestner, & Driver, 1981), proponents maintain that self-reports are easy to use, cost effective, reflect skill levels across a multitude of domains and situations, and allow for individual perceptions of abilities (Friedman, Prince, Riggio, & DiMatteo, 1980; Riggio, 2005; Riggio & Riggio, 2001). Regardless, numerous methods, including the *Questionnaire Measure of Emotion Empathy* (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972), the *Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire* (Buhrmester, Furman, Wittenberg, & Reis, 1988), and the *Interpersonal Sensitivity Measure* (Boyce & Parker, 1989) have not been widely used due to a lack of established validity and varying definitions of interpersonal sensitivity (Riggio & Riggio, 2001).

Two of the earliest attempts to use self-report inventories to measure social intelligence skills were the *Perceived Decoding Ability (PDA)* and *Perceived Encoding Ability (PEA)* scales (Zuckerman & Larrance, 1979). The *PDA* was created to investigate facial-visual and vocal-auditory decoding skills through 46 self-report items such as, “When someone tries to please me, I can usually tell from his or her facial expression” and “I can usually tell when someone is angry from his or her tone of voice.” The *PEA* was designed to examine encoding skills through 49 self-report items including, “I cry easily at sad movies” and “People can usually tell when I am angry from my tone of voice.” While the *PDA* and *PEA* were correlated with each other, validity was not established for these instruments, as weak correlations were found when compared with performance measures.

Designed to focus on the social intelligence factor of “charisma,” the *Affective Communication Test (ACT)* (Friedman, Prince, Riggio, & DiMatteo, 1980) examined expressiveness through self-report statements. The *ACT* attempted to isolate the concept of “charisma” by investigating individual differences in nonverbal emotional expressiveness. Thirteen statements including, “I can easily express emotion over the telephone” and “I am terrible at pantomime as in games like charades,” were rated on a 9-point scale from “not at all like me” to “very true of me.” Results indicated high scorers on the *ACT* were perceived as more likeable when meeting new people, possessed the ability to influence others’ moods, displayed more political charisma, had more acting experience, were more successful in sales, and were more likely to pursue jobs that required social skills, than low scorers (Knapp & Hall, 2006). Additionally, women tended to score higher than men. However, one problem that may have

confounded the results of the *ACT* as well as the *Perceived Decoding Ability* and *Perceived Encoding Ability* scales, was the influence of social desirability or the propensity to agree or disagree with questions based on the wording of each item (Friedman et al., 1980; Oskamp, 1991; Zuckerman & Larrance, 1979).

In order to create a self-report method that could accurately assess social intelligence skills while minimizing the biases of social desirability, Riggio (1986; 1989; Riggio & Carney, 2003) created the *Social Skills Inventory*. Six subscales were designed to measure emotional and social skills: (a) Emotional Expressivity, which measures emotional expressiveness, (b) Emotional Sensitivity, measuring nonverbal decoding skill, (c) Emotional Control, which assesses ability to monitor and control one's own emotional expressions, (d) Social Expressivity, which measures verbal speaking ability and skills in engaging others in social interaction, (e) Social Sensitivity, measuring the ability to decode and interpret social situations, and (f) Social Control, which assesses the ability to know how to act in social situations (Riggio, 2005). These subscales were constructed to indirectly assess interpersonal skills, by wording each item so that participants responded based on some amount of personal feedback received (e.g. "People have told me that I am a sensitive person" as opposed to "I am a sensitive and understanding person") (Riggio & Riggio, 2001).

Results of the *Social Skills Inventory (SSI)* indicate many subscales have shown positive correlations with other standardized performance-based measures. For example, the *Social Sensitivity* subscale was highly correlated with the *Interpersonal Perception Task* (Archer & Costanzo, 1987), and the *Emotional Sensitivity* subscale was highly correlated with the *Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity* and the *Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy* (Riggio & Carney, 2003). High scorers on the *Emotional Expressivity* and *Social Expressivity* subscales were rated as more likeable and attractive than low scores (Riggio, 1986; Riggio, Widaman, Tucker, & Salinas, 1991). Specific to interpersonal relationships, *SSI* scores correlated with ratings of communication skills in management positions (Riggio, Aguirre, Mayes, Belloli, & Kubiak, 1997), and predict success in ratings of leadership effectiveness (Riggio, Riggio, Salinas, & Cole, 2003) and performance evaluations with hospice workers (Riggio & Taylor, 2000). Consistent with previous literature, women scored higher than men on the subscales of *Emotional Expressivity*, *Social Expressivity*, *Emotional Sensitivity*, and *Social Sensitivity*.

However, men tend to score higher than women on the *Emotional Control* subscale (Riggio & Carney, 2003).

Recently, the *Test of Nonverbal Cue Knowledge (TONCK)* (Rosip & Hall, 2004) was designed to provide a reliable and valid method for self-reporting knowledge of social interactions. Eighty-one true-false items were created based on findings of research on nonverbal communication (Burgoon, Buller, & Woodall, 1989; Ekman & Rosenberg, 1987; Hall, 1984; Knapp & Hall, 2006; Siegman & Feldstein, 1985). These items represented a diverse selection of empirical research that covered meanings of nonverbal cues, correlates of nonverbal cue usage, and knowledge of stereotypes about nonverbal cues of appearance. General intelligence was found to have no affect on the predictive ability of the test. Additionally, the *TONCK* was able to predict accuracy on both the *Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity* and the *Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy*. However, the test was not recommended as a substitute for measuring nonverbal interaction skills, but rather as a supplement to existing social intelligence measurements (Knapp & Hall, 2006).

Perhaps the most influential and most widely used social intelligence test measurement was developed by Robert Rosenthal and his team of Harvard graduate students (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001; Goleman, 2006). The *Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity* (Rosenthal et al., 1979) sought to improve on the limitations of previous measures of social intelligence instruments by creating a film containing multiple channels of nonverbal communication (Rosenthal et al., 1977). Eleven nonverbal channels were created including: (a) the face, (b) the body, (c) the entire figure, (d) randomized spliced voice (random scrambling of the speaker's voice), (e) content-filtered voice (electronic removal of the high frequencies of the voice that help identify specific words), (f) face and randomized spliced voice, (g) face and content-filtered voice, (h) body and randomized spliced voice, (i) body and content-filtered voice, (j) figure and randomized spliced voice, and (k) figure and content-filtered voice. Combinations of these 11 channels provided a way to isolate certain nonverbal characteristics in the encoding process. Each channel was created by recording a female encoder with three videotape cameras. One camera focused on the face, one on the body, and another on the full figure of the encoder. The encoder is shown expressing 20 different affective scenes across the quadrants of positive-submissive ("expressing gratitude"), positive-dominant ("admiring a baby"), negative-submissive ("asking forgiveness"), and negative-dominant ("criticizing someone for being late")

(Hall, 2001). Participants viewed the 45-minute stimulus videotape and recorded their responses on a multiple-choice format answer sheet.

Results of numerous studies using the *Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity (PONS)* revealed high scorers were more extroverted, interpersonally encouraging, popular, and were judged as more interpersonally sensitive by friends, spouses, and superiors (Rosenthal et. al, 1979). Specifically, educators scoring high on the *PONS* were found to be more encouraging toward pupils through behavioral observations. Teachers' *PONS* scores were found to correlate with ratings of excellence in teaching. But perhaps the most important discoveries of the *PONS* were that (a) sensitivity to nonverbal communication, an aspect of social intelligence, is not related to general intelligence, (b) women are more accurate readers of nonverbal cues, and therefore do better on standardized measures designed to assess such skills, than men, and that (c) using a videotaped format provides a method to investigate multiple and simultaneous channels of encoding and decoding emotional and social behavior (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001; Hall, 2001).

While developing the *PONS*, one author concluded the answers to the multiple-choice questions for the *PONS* were dependent on the participants' personal social experiences and observations, and were thereby answered according to the participants' subjectivity (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001). Additionally, each scene of the *PONS* film consisted of the same female encoder acting out each situation. Therefore, an attempt was made to design a measurement instrument that demonstrated the elements of human communication and social perception in a naturalistic environment, while creating an objectively correct answer for each social situation.

The first of these instruments, the *Social Interpretations Task* (Archer & Akert, 1977) attempted to improve on previous assessment measures by (a) using unscripted behavior and spontaneous conversation, (b) presenting the verbal and nonverbal channels, including gestures, facial expressions, movement, and physical appearance naturalistically, (c) continuous sequences of behavior in context, (d) different encoders for each of the social scenes, (e) required that viewers must reach interpretations about a variety of interpersonal questions, other than solely emotion, (f) intended to examine the process of social interpretation, rather than a test of decoding ability, and (g) provides an objectively correct answer to measure social interpretation accuracy. A 30-minute videotape containing 20 scenes was created. Upon completion of each

scene, an interpretive question with one objectively correct answer concerning the relationships between the people involved was posed.

Initial results of the *Social Interpretations Task (SIT)* found that the interpretation accuracy for participants viewing the videotape were much higher than chance levels for each question. Additionally, accuracy of interpretations were more accurate when viewing the full videotape containing verbal and nonverbal channels than when judges viewed only printed transcripts of interactions, validating earlier findings which concluded that in social settings verbal and nonverbal cues are not isolated from one another, but rather occur simultaneously and are combined to form a perception or impression (Hastorf, Schneider, & Polefka, 1970). However, one limitation of the *SIT*, as well as the *PONS*, was that it was filmed in black and white, often making it difficult to determine who was speaking (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001).

Therefore, the *Interpersonal Perception Task (IPT)* (Archer & Costanzo, 1987) was designed to provide an improved and up to date video measure, as well as a brief, standardized instrument that could assess nonverbal behavior, social perception, social sensitivity, and “social intelligence” or “social competence” (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001). Five categories of social interaction, kinship, lies, competition, status, and intimacy were captured in a similar fashion to the *SIT*, through unscripted, naturalistic behavior. One exception occurred in the filming of “lies,” in which certain aspects were acted out. The *IPT* scenes include the communication channels of verbal, coverbal, and nonverbal behavior, depending on the natural occurrences during each social situation. These channels employ multiple cues occurring simultaneously in the scenes, including facial expressions, words, tones of voice, hesitations, eye movements, gestures, personal space, posture, and touching (Costanzo & Archer, 1994; Hall, 2001). A total of 30 scenes, each containing an interpretive question with an objectively correct answer at the end of each scene, were compiled for the master videotape.

Results of the *IPT* paralleled those found by the *SIT*, accuracy scores were found to be higher than chance levels. Consistent with previous findings, females scored slightly higher than males in all five interpretive areas, kinship, lies, competition, status, and intimacy. As a whole, more accurate scorers are rated higher with peer ratings of interpersonal sensitivity and social skills (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001; Costanzo & Archer, 1994). *IPT* scores have been found to be positively correlated with sociability and public self-consciousness (Schroeder, 1995), as

well as perceived emotional sharing between two persons (Hodgins & Zuckerman, 1990). Additionally, no relationship was found with *IPT* scores and subscales of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale, further suggesting that the social intelligence measured by the *IPT* is different from the general intelligence measured by *IQ* and other applicable tests (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001; Campbell & McCord, 1996).

Measures of Social Intelligence within Music Education

Using the *Social Skills Inventory (SSI)* to measure emotional and social skills in preservice music educators, Hamann (1995) divided undergraduate preservice teachers into two groups, a superior teaching skills group and an average teaching skills group, using the *Pre-Service Teaching Evaluation* (Baker, 1991). Participants were administered the *SSI*. Results indicated the superior teaching skills group obtained higher ranking scores on the Emotional Expressivity, Social Expressivity, and Social Control subscales than the average teaching skills group. However, in contrast to the majority of investigations into social skills, no differences were found when compared by gender.

In a second study, Hamann, Lineburgh, and Paul (1998) administered the *SSI* to preservice music elementary teachers. Using the *Survey of Teaching Effectiveness* (Hamann & Baker, 1995), the participants' teaching episodes were evaluated and compared to their scores on the *SSI*. Results from a regression analysis revealed the subtests of Emotional Expressivity, Emotional Sensitivity, and Social Control were found to positively correlate with the preservice teachers' rating of teaching effectiveness by the *Survey of Teaching Effectiveness*. Thus, it was concluded that certain subscales of the *SSI* may provide insight into teaching effectiveness potential in preservice music teachers.

Summary

Research into effective teaching within music education has focused on a plethora of components including teaching cycles, verbal behavior, use of time, pacing, teacher intensity, and delivery. Through student achievement gains, attitudes, on-task behavior, student preference, and teacher evaluations, these techniques have shown to improve teacher effectiveness and the material being presented. Encouragingly, it appears that techniques associated with effective teacher/student interactions can be taught, though not easily transferred

to varying classroom situations. Effective teachers are not defined by one personality type, as both extroverts and introverts can be successful music educators. However, effective teachers appear to possess certain personal and social characteristics that aid in the fostering of positive teacher/student interactions.

Intelligence, like effective teaching, is a concept that everyone can recognize, but is extremely difficult to define. While numerous theories regarding the nature of intelligence have been cited from psychologists to lay persons, no singular global definition has been agreed upon. However, considerable attention has recently been given to the proposition that intelligence may consist of multiple facets, including emotional intelligence, practical intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, and social intelligence. Social intelligence, defined as a person's ability to successfully decode and interact in social situations, is theorized to separate individuals who are successful in effective relationships with others. Since establishing successful teacher/student relationships is the primary component in teaching effectiveness, it seems essential to possess a certain level of social intelligence.

Only two investigations within the research literature have focused on assessing a measure of social intelligence in music educators. However, these investigations employed the use of self-report measures to ascertain the social skills in preservice music teachers, a technique that has been criticized for lack of reliability and validity. Therefore, the present investigation is an attempt to empirically measure a level of social intelligence in music educators and examine its relationship to effective teaching through performance-based assessments. Specific questions addressed were:

1. Can the social intelligence of music teachers be measured?
2. To what degree is social intelligence a component of effective music teaching?
3. Are there differences between a panel of music education experts, experienced music educators, and undergraduate preservice music teachers in identifying effective music teachers?
4. Can experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers identify social intelligence in their evaluation of effective music teaching?
5. What attributes do experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers consider to be related to effective teaching?

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Selection and Description of Measurement Tool

The *Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15)* (Costanzo & Archer, 1993; Costanzo & Archer, 1994) is a revised edition of the *Interpersonal Perception Task* (Archer & Costanzo, 1987). Designed to investigate the process of interpersonal perception, this instrument "...measures the ability to interpret accurately the expressive behavior of others. Because achieving interpersonal goals depends significantly on our ability to correctly interpret accurately the behavior of others, the *IPT-15* measures a core component of what has been called 'social intelligence' or 'social competence'" (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001, p. 172). The validity of coefficient of the experiment has been shown to be .81 and the test-rest reliability is .73. Therefore, the *IPT-15* has been found to be a reliable measure of an individual's ability to "decode" information perceived in human interaction and an accurate way to assess a level of social intelligence within individuals.

The *IPT-15* consists of 15 videotaped scenes in DVD format, each lasting approximately one minute in length, which encompasses a variety of natural, everyday interactions between people. Within these interactions five categories of social interaction, kinship, lies, competition, status, and intimacy are measured. Text, coverbal, and nonverbal cues are present to allow for the accurate interpretation of each scene. For each scene, one interpretive question is presented on a multiple-choice answer sheet with only one correct answer available. For example, one scene involves two children and two adults having a discussion while sitting on a couch. After the scene is completed, a question is asked on the answer sheet: Who is the child of the two adults? (a) only the little boy, (b) only the little girl, or (c) neither the boy or the girl is the child of the adults. The total time of the DVD, including instructional narration and recorded scenes is approximately 20 minutes.

The process of administering the *IPT-15* consists of participants viewing the DVD and recording their responses on the multiple-choice answer sheet provided by the facilitator. Once the participants have completed recording their responses, the facilitator can score the participants' answers with the provided answer "key."

The *IPT-15* was selected for this study because it presents many advantages over the original *IPT* in that it: (a) contains half the scenes (a reduction from 30 to 15), (b) reduces administration time (from 40 to 20 minutes), (c) less difficult, (d) can be completed in a reasonable amount of time, (e) provides high test-retest reliability and validity, and (f) maintains all the important design features including: objectively correct answers, text, coverbal, and nonverbal cues, spontaneous behavior with unscripted conversation, and five categories of social interaction (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001; Costanzo & Archer, 1993; Costanzo & Archer, 1994). A copy of the *IPT-15* is located in Appendix B.

Selection of Music Teachers

The initial phase of the study required the identification of a large pool of K-12 public school music teachers to identify possible teacher participants. The researcher sought input from a panel of experts in music education because of their knowledge, training, and experience in identifying and evaluating teacher characteristics. Twenty-seven experts were consulted, including 14 music education faculty members from five large universities and 13 music supervisors of large county public school systems in Florida. Each expert was contacted via e-mail (see Appendix C). The experts were asked to list up to five teachers and their schools from “exemplary programs” and up to five teachers and their schools from “more challenging programs” for each of the areas of band, chorus, orchestra, and general K-12 Florida public school music programs (Johnson & Memmott, 2006). Therefore, the possibility existed for each expert to identify a total of 40 teachers. If the experts could not come up with five names or did not feel comfortable listing teachers within certain music areas, they were instructed to list only those teachers they felt represented each category. Additionally, the e-mail notified the experts that all information would be kept confidential; teachers and programs identified would be kept anonymous and would not know how or why they were selected.

From the most frequently listed teachers of “exemplary programs” and teachers of “more challenging programs” for each of the areas, band, chorus, orchestra, and general music, one of three options could occur:

1. The top five most frequently listed teachers from each category within each area of music was selected, resulting in a total of 40 teachers.

2. More than five teachers were most frequently listed for each category and within each area of music. Therefore, five teachers from each category within each area of music were randomly selected, resulting in a total of 40 teachers.
3. Less than five teachers were listed more than once for each category within each area of music. The teachers listed more than once were selected and the remaining teacher slots were randomly selected from the group of teachers listed only once, resulting in a total of 40 teachers.

Administration of the *IPT-15*

The 40 teachers selected for the study were contacted by the researcher via e-mail to obtain consent to participate in the study. A copy of this e-mail is located in Appendix D. All teachers were informed that they were randomly selected from a pool of K-12 public school music teachers in Florida to participate in a study that will focus on teacher characteristics specific to music educators.. Therefore, teachers did not know why they were selected or the category they represented. Each teacher was visited by the researcher to gain written consent and to administer the *Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15)*. These teachers read and signed the consent form to voluntarily agree to participate in the study (see Appendix E). Each teacher was then administered the *IPT-15* by receiving a multiple-choice answer sheet and viewing the *IPT-15* on either a HP Pavilion dv8000 Laptop computer with headphones or with a television (based on availability at the school). Total administration time lasted approximately 20 minutes.

Selection of Videotaped Teachers

Prior to visiting each teacher, a stratified random sample of 40% ($n = 16$) was chosen from the group of 40 teachers to serve as participants for the videotaped teaching episodes. These teachers were then contacted via e-mail (see Appendix F). This stratified sampling allowed for the differentiation of two teachers from “exemplary programs” and two teachers from “more challenging programs” in each of the four areas of band, chorus, orchestra, and general music to be selected for inclusion in the master videotape.

While 16 teachers were actively sought, only 12 teachers ($n = 12$) agreed to participate in the videotaping of their instruction. These selected teachers were comprised of seven males and

five females within all four areas of band, chorus, orchestra, and general music. All 12 teachers read and signed the consent form to voluntarily agree to participate in the videotaping procedure (see Appendix G). These teachers were notified that an entire class would be videotaped for the purposes of constructing a master videotape. Additionally, students and their parents/guardians were informed that their classroom would be videotaped and signed consent forms to voluntarily participate in the procedure (see Appendices H & I).

The teachers were videotaped by the researcher in their normal classroom environment using a Sony DCR-SR200 Digital Video Camera Recorder. The video camera was placed in a position toward the rear of the classroom where the teacher could be viewed without disrupting any classroom activity. Immediately upon the start of class, the video camera began recording and continued until the conclusion of the class. The researcher operated the video camera to ensure consistency with the video recording.

Construction of the Master Videotape

The 12 videotaped teaching episodes were used in creating the master videotape. To produce a videotape that could be shown to a large number of participants within a minimal amount of time, the researcher determined that the overall length of the final master videotape should not exceed 20 minutes in length. Therefore, because the final master videotape required several minutes of directives, as well as space in between each teaching excerpt, the videotape contained a 45-second teaching excerpt of each of the 12 teachers, for a total of nine minutes for all of the teaching segments.

A process was created to establish uniformity among the selection of each teacher's excerpt. Because many classroom settings begin with non-teaching tasks such as attendance and/or other "housekeeping" items, it was decided to select excerpts ten minutes into each class. This also allowed time for the teachers and students to become accustomed to the video recording equipment and provided a more natural, realistic environment to observe (Archer & Akert, 1977; Napoles, 2007). The teaching episodes were analyzed for conditions in which at least 40% of the excerpt included interaction between the teacher and student. This percentage of interaction was selected based on research literature that concluded music teachers spend approximately 40% of their instructional time engaged in verbal communication with the students (Caldwell, 1980; Napoles, 2007; Pontious, 1982; Sherill, 1986; Thurman, 1977). A stop

watch was used to standardize the excerpt selection process. If after 45 seconds a 40% interaction was not fulfilled, the following 45 seconds of class time was viewed, and so on, until 45 seconds of teaching contained at least 40% of interaction between the teacher and students.

The teaching excerpts were viewed for reliability to ensure the excerpts selected accurately reflected the predetermined teacher/student interaction percentage minimum. Two independent observers, trained in behavioral observation, viewed a random selection of 33% of the teaching excerpts. Using the formula: agreements divided by the sum of agreements plus disagreements (Madsen & Madsen, 1998), reliability was found to be .99.

All directions for the administration of the master videotape were created and placed at the beginning of the videotape. Directive screens were shown instructing the participants to: (a) take out their Teacher Evaluation Form, (b) fill out the demographic area, (c) match the excerpt number on the Teacher Evaluation Form to the teaching excerpt shown on the videotape, and (d) answer two questions for each of the teaching excerpts. A practice example was presented at the beginning of the videotape to illustrate how to fill out the Teacher Evaluation Form. This example allowed participants to watch a teaching excerpt and practice filling out the Teacher Evaluation Form, enabling participants to become familiar with the evaluation process. After the practice example, the video was paused to allow participants an opportunity to ask any final questions. A screen, which read "Teaching Excerpt #1," was shown directly before viewing the first teaching excerpt. Between each of the 12 teaching excerpts, ten seconds was given to allow time for the participant to notate their responses. Once all 12 excerpts were completed, a random order of episodes was selected for the presentation on the master videotape. The duration of the completed master videotape was approximately 13 minutes.

Construction of the Evaluation Form

A Teacher Evaluation Form was created to provide external evaluators a method for assessing teacher effectiveness for each of the 12 teaching excerpts (see Appendix L). External evaluators for this study consisted of experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers. The Teacher Evaluation Form was constructed based on previous research that incorporated evaluation forms in rating teacher effectiveness (Bowers, 1997; Cassidy, 1989; Hamann, Lineburgh, & Paul, 1998; Kaiser, 1998; Madsen, 1988; Madsen, 2003; Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992; Yarbrough & Madsen, 1998). The

Teacher Evaluation Form included demographic information asking each participant to indicate their teaching position and gender. A 7-point Likert-type scale was used (1 = *not effective at all* to 7 = *highly effective*) to rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher for each one of the 12 teaching excerpts on the videotape. Additionally, each item asked participants to list the main attribute that influenced their evaluation of this teaching excerpt. This technique of open-ended responses has been found to provide a method for obtaining evaluators' perceptions without the bias of predetermined answer categories (Conway, 2002; Kaiser, 1998; Kelly, 2000; Madsen, 2003; Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Madsen & Kaiser, 1999; Madsen & Kelly, 2002; Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992; Teachout, 1997). Participants completed this form while viewing the 12 teaching excerpts on the videotape.

Pilot Studies

The researcher pilot tested the use of the video recording equipment and administration of the *Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15)*, master videotape, and Teacher Evaluation Form to a group of certified and experienced music teachers pursuing a graduate degree at a large southeastern state university before beginning the data collection. These pilot studies were conducted to:

1. Ensure proper functioning of all equipment.
2. Practice video recording a teacher's class instruction.
3. Familiarize researcher with *IPT-15* answer key and grading.
4. Validate the clarity and use of the master videotape and Teacher Evaluation Form.
5. Provide pilot study participants opportunity to offer feedback and suggestions for improving the study's components.

Results of the pilot studies guided the final design and procedure. The administration of the *IPT-15*, master videotape, and Teacher Evaluation Form functioned properly. The Teacher Evaluation Form was adjusted slightly to provide a more appropriate example item and to improve the clarity of wording for several items.

External Evaluators

Eighty-four ($N = 84$) music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers served as external evaluators for this study. An equal number of music educators ($n = 42$) and

undergraduate preservice music teachers ($n = 42$) was obtained. Of the 42 music educators, 21 females and 21 males participated. Additionally, 16 music educators had between 1 – 10 years of teaching experience, 15 teachers had between 11 – 20 years of teaching experience, and 11 educators had taught for more than 21 years. The final group of undergraduate preservice music teachers included 24 females and 18 males.

These evaluators were selected to provide an evaluation of teacher effectiveness from multiple perspectives within music education. To protect the anonymity of the videotaped teachers, external evaluators from different southeastern state universities and public school systems outside the State of Florida were sought. These evaluators were identified through contacts from music education faculty members at several southeastern state universities.

Administration of the Master Videotape

The external evaluators were contacted via e-mail by the researcher to obtain consent to participate in the study. A copy of the e-mail is located in Appendix J. The researcher visited all external evaluators to gain written consent and to administer the master videotape and the Teacher Evaluation Form. All evaluators read and signed the consent form to voluntarily agree to participate in the study (see Appendix K). The evaluators then received the Teacher Evaluation Form and were directed to fill out the demographic information located at the top of the form. A short introduction was read to the evaluators immediately prior to the start of the experiment which stated:

“You are participating in a study in which you will be evaluating teaching effectiveness. You will observe 12 excerpts of music instruction from various levels and disciplines. Each teaching excerpt lasts approximately 45-seconds. Once the excerpt is completed, please rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher on the Teacher Evaluation Form. Additionally, please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt. There will be approximately ten seconds between each teaching excerpt to give you time to notate your responses. A practice example is provided at the beginning to allow you to become acquainted with the viewing process and evaluation. Please note the Teacher Evaluation Form contains three pages, with teaching excerpts located on the front and back of each page. Make sure the excerpt number on the evaluation form corresponds to the excerpt number on the videotape. Are there any questions? Please do

not talk during the presentation of the videotape. From this time on, all directions for completing the study will be shown on the videotape.”

Data Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative methods were employed to collect data for this study. A Mann-Whitney *U* test was used to compare the *IPT-15* scores of teachers from “exemplary programs” to teachers from “more challenging programs” across the four areas of music education. Additionally, a two-way analysis of variance (*ANOVA*) with repeated measures on one factor was conducted to determine possible differences between inservice music educators’ and undergraduate preservice music teachers’ evaluations in relationship to the overall effectiveness of the teacher ratings for “exemplary” and “challenged” teachers. Further, open-ended responses listed for each excerpt were categorized and calculated according to frequency of response and percentage data.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Demographics of Teacher Participants

The panel of experts in music education listed a total of 186 music teachers and their schools from “exemplary programs” ($n = 135$) and teachers and their schools from “more challenging programs” ($n = 51$) for the areas of band, chorus, orchestra, and general K-12 Florida public school music programs. Of the teacher participants listed, the breakdown included:

	Exemplary Programs	More Challenging Programs	Total
Band	40	19	59
Chorus	30	9	39
Orchestra	26	8	34
General	39	15	54
Total	135	51	186

Music teachers selected for this study included participants from 13 Florida counties. Teachers from “exemplary programs” consisted of 12 females and 8 males. “Exemplary” teacher participants ranged in age from 27 to 58 ($M = 44.5$). Teachers from “more challenging programs” consisted of 8 females and 12 males. “Challenged” teacher participants ranged in age from 25 to 59 ($M = 39.7$).

Implementation of the Independent Measure

The *Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15)* served as the independent measure to assess a level of social intelligence for both “exemplary” and “challenged” teacher participants. Because the *IPT-15* contains 15 interpretative questions, with only one correct answer available, a score within the range of 0 – 15 was obtained for each teacher participant. Mean scores were calculated for both “exemplary” and “challenged” participants. Results indicated that “exemplary” teachers ($M = 10.25$, $SD = 1.27$) scored higher on the *IPT-15* than “challenged” teachers ($M = 9.55$, $SD = 1.61$). To determine any differences between the two groups, a

nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test was utilized for examining ordinal data within the small sample size. No significant difference was found between the *IPT-15* scores of the “exemplary” and “challenged” teachers, $U(20, 20) = 139, p > .09$.

External Evaluation

Twelve teaching excerpts, seven “exemplary” teachers and five “challenged” teachers, were viewed by external evaluators ($N = 84$). The external evaluators, comprised of equal numbers of inservice music educators ($n = 42$) and undergraduate preservice music teachers ($n = 42$), gave an overall effectiveness of the teacher rating for each of the excerpts on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not effective at all* to 7 = *highly effective*). Ratings of teaching effectiveness for all 12 excerpts were analyzed descriptively. Mean scores and standard deviations for each of the 12 excerpts are provided in Table 1, listed in videotape presentation order as Teachers A – L and as either “exemplary” or “challenged.”

Table 1

Mean Overall Effectiveness of the Teacher Ratings and Standard Deviations for Teachers A – L.

Teacher	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Teacher A (Exemplary)	5.07	1.01
Teacher B (Challenged)	2.66	.94
Teacher C (Exemplary)	4.76	1.24
Teacher D (Challenged)	4.42	1.28
Teacher E (Challenged)	2.90	1.46
Teacher F (Exemplary)	3.84	1.71
Teacher G (Exemplary)	6.03	.97
Teacher H (Exemplary)	4.75	1.24
Teacher I (Exemplary)	5.59	1.07
Teacher J (Challenged)	1.95	1.05
Teacher K (Exemplary)	5.00	1.42
Teacher L (Challenged)	3.46	1.37

Both inservice music educators ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 1.73$) and undergraduate preservice music teachers ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.72$) rated the overall effectiveness of the 12 teachers in a similar fashion. Overall, “exemplary” teachers received higher overall effectiveness ratings ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.41$) than “challenged” teachers ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.48$). Mean scores indicated that all “exemplary” teachers were rated as moderately effective to highly effective in overall effectiveness, with the exception of Teacher F, who was rated slightly below moderately effective. All “challenged” teachers were rated less than moderately effective to not effective at all, with the exception of Teacher D, who received ratings slightly above moderately effective. Six of the seven “exemplary” teachers received the highest overall ratings, while four of the five “challenged” teachers received the lowest overall ratings.

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures on one factor was conducted to determine possible differences between inservice music educators’ and undergraduate preservice music teachers’ evaluations in relationship to the overall effectiveness of the teacher ratings for “exemplary” and “challenged” teachers. Each external evaluator’s ratings for all 12 teachers were combined into two teacher groups (“exemplary” and “challenged”) for statistical comparisons. Results indicated no significant differences between inservice music educators’ and undergraduate preservice music teachers’ overall effectiveness of the teacher ratings, $F(1, 82) = .369$, $p > .05$. However, significant differences were found between all external evaluators’ teacher effectiveness ratings for “exemplary” and “challenged” teachers, $F(1, 82) = 307.02$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .79$. No significant interactions occurred between the “exemplary” and “challenged” teachers and the two groups of external evaluators, $F(1, 82) = 1.39$, $p > .05$. See Table 2 for complete results of the ANOVA.

Table 2

Two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Ratings of Teacher Excerpts.

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	partial η^2
Evaluator	.32	1	.32	.36	> .54	
Error	72.88	82	.88			
Teacher	146.44	1	146.44	307.02	< .001	.79
Evaluator x Teacher	.66	1	.66	1.39	> .24	
Error	39.11	82	.47			

Classification of Responses

Open-ended responses consisted of the external evaluators' listing of the main attribute that influenced their evaluation of each teaching excerpt while viewing the stimulus videotape. One attribute per excerpt was used for the purposes of classification; if multiple comments were listed, only the initial attribute was recorded. Using response classification procedures previously established (Kelly, 2000; Madsen & Kaiser, 1999; Madsen & Kelly, 2002), the researcher and a trained observer classified and tabulated the evaluators' responses to determine a taxonomic structure. The taxonomy was developed through a series of classifications until the clarity of the attributes and categories were agreed upon.

Evaluators' responses were categorized according to social, non-social, or miscellaneous attributes. Social attributes were defined as written comments that occurred within any teacher/student interaction both verbally and nonverbally. Non-social attributes were defined as other comments not affected by teacher/student interactions. Miscellaneous attributes were defined as general comments such as "good," vague or noncommittal comments, or if a response was not provided. After this initial classification, responses were further classified as effective or ineffective attributes. Effective attributes were comments that were positive in nature, or neutral comments notated in conjunction with a rating of 4 (*moderately effective*) to 7 (*highly effective*) for the overall effectiveness of the teacher. Ineffective attributes were comments that were negative in nature, or neutral comments notated in conjunction with an overall effectiveness of the teacher rating of 1 (*not effective at all*) to 3 (*less than moderately effective*). Additionally, evaluators' responses were coded to provide a further breakdown of responses pertaining to *Classroom Management* (discipline, student on- and off-task behavior, group involvement, etc.), *Instructional Communication* (conducting, modeling, questioning, explaining, etc.), *Non-instructional Communication* (eye contact, facial expressions, personal affect, etc.), and *Instructional Organization* (pacing, sequencing, organization, etc.).

An additional observer, trained in music education techniques, viewed a random selection of 20% of all responses and placed the attributes into the established categories. Reliability was calculated by counting the number of identical response classifications and comparing the two lists using the formula agreements divided by the sum of agreements plus disagreements (Madsen & Kelly, 2002; Madsen & Madsen, 1998). Reliability for the first category (social; non-social; miscellaneous) was .98. Reliability for the second classification (effective;

ineffective) was .99. The final classification (classroom management; instructional communication; non-instructional communication; instructional organization) resulted in .95 agreement.

The total number of attributes listed ($N = 1008$) were coded and tabulated according to the specified taxonomic structure. A complete list of attributes, classification categories, and overall effectiveness of the teacher ratings for each of the 12 teachers is located in Appendix M. The frequency of responses within each category was analyzed. Percentage data classified according to the first two categorizations, including social, nonsocial, and miscellaneous attributes as well as effective and ineffective attributes are listed in Table 3. Results indicated the large majority of attributes that influenced external evaluators' ratings of overall teacher effectiveness were social. For all 12 teachers, social attributes were listed at least twice as frequently as non-social attributes. Overall, social attributes constituted 85.71% of the total comments, with 10.71% categorized as non-social and miscellaneous comments comprising 3.58%. Additionally, with the exception of Teacher D, the percentage of effective and ineffective social attributes reflected the teacher's overall effectiveness ratings given by the external evaluators.

Table 3

Percentages of Effective and Ineffective Social, Nonsocial, and Miscellaneous Attributes for Teachers A – L.

Teacher	Social	Non-social	Miscellaneous
Teacher A (Exemplary)	80.96	19.04	0.00
Effective	58.33	9.52	
Ineffective	26.33	9.52	
Teacher B (Challenged)	85.71	13.10	1.19
Effective	0.00	0.00	
Ineffective	85.71	13.10	
Teacher C (Exemplary)	94.05	3.57	2.38
Effective	63.10	0.00	
Ineffective	30.95	3.57	

Table 3 - Continued

Percentages of Effective and Ineffective Social, Nonsocial, and Miscellaneous Attributes for Teachers A – L.

Teacher	Social	Non-social	Miscellaneous
Teacher D (Challenged)	92.86	2.38	4.76
Effective	46.43	2.38	
Ineffective	46.43	0.00	
Teacher E (Challenged)	89.29	8.33	2.38
Effective	14.29	1.19	
Ineffective	75.00	7.14	
Teacher F (Exemplary)	90.48	2.38	7.14
Effective	35.71	1.19	
Ineffective	54.77	1.19	
Teacher G (Exemplary)	67.86	27.38	4.76
Effective	66.67	25.00	
Ineffective	1.19	2.38	
Teacher H (Exemplary)	91.67	4.76	3.57
Effective	53.57	1.19	
Ineffective	38.10	3.57	
Teacher I (Exemplary)	86.91	7.14	5.95
Effective	73.81	7.14	
Ineffective	13.10	0.00	
Teacher J (Challenged)	89.29	8.33	2.38
Effective	4.76	0.00	
Ineffective	84.53	8.33	
Teacher K (Exemplary)	85.71	13.10	1.19
Effective	59.52	13.10	
Ineffective	26.19	0.00	
Teacher L (Challenged)	73.81	19.05	7.14
Effective	19.05	1.19	
Ineffective	54.76	17.86	

Percentage data were calculated for effective and ineffective attributes within the categories of *Classroom Management*, *Instructional Communication*, *Non-instructional Communication*, and *Instructional Organization*. The data according to this taxonomic structure are listed in Table 4. Effective communication skills were the most listed comments for “exemplary” teachers and effective teachers rated by the external evaluators. *Effective Instructional Communication* constituted the highest percentage of attributes listed for six of the seven effective teachers, with one effective teacher receiving the highest percentage of responses for *Effective Non-Instructional Communication*. Further examination of the data determined that responses categorized as *Ineffective Classroom Management*, *Ineffective Instructional Communication*, and *Ineffective Non-Instructional Communication* were the highest percentages for the five teachers rated ineffective. Additionally, *Ineffective Classroom Management* was the most cited attribute as rationale for why teachers were rated ineffective.

Table 4

Percentage of Effective and Ineffective Classroom Management, Instructional Communication, Non-instructional Communication, and Instructional Organization Attributes for Teachers A – L.

Teacher	Effective	Ineffective
Teacher A (Exemplary)		
Classroom Management	4.76	3.57
Instructional Communication	47.62	15.47
Non-instructional Communication	5.95	3.57
Instructional Organization	9.53	9.53
Teacher B (Challenged)		
Classroom Management	0.00	52.38
Instructional Communication	0.00	19.06
Non-instructional Communication	0.00	14.28
Instructional Organization	0.00	13.09

Table 4 - Continued

Percentage of Effective and Ineffective Classroom Management, Instructional Communication, Non-instructional Communication, and Instructional Organization Attributes for Teachers A – L.

Teacher	Effective	Ineffective
Teacher C (Exemplary)		
Classroom Management	4.76	10.71
Instructional Communication	50.00	16.67
Non-instructional Communication	8.33	3.57
Instructional Organization	0.00	3.57
Teacher D (Challenged)		
Classroom Management	4.76	7.14
Instructional Communication	10.71	28.57
Non-instructional Communication	30.95	10.71
Instructional Organization	2.38	0.00
Teacher E (Challenged)		
Classroom Management	1.19	2.38
Instructional Communication	11.90	7.14
Non-instructional Communication	1.19	65.48
Instructional Organization	1.19	7.14
Teacher F (Exemplary)		
Classroom Management	14.29	22.62
Instructional Communication	10.71	9.52
Non-instructional Communication	10.71	22.62
Instructional Organization	1.19	1.19
Teacher G (Exemplary)		
Classroom Management	10.71	0.00
Instructional Communication	44.05	1.19
Non-instructional Communication	11.90	0.00
Instructional Organization	25.00	2.38

Table 4 - Continued

Percentage of Effective and Ineffective Classroom Management, Instructional Communication, Non-instructional Communication, and Instructional Organization Attributes for Teachers A – L.

Teacher	Effective	Ineffective
Teacher H (Exemplary)		
Classroom Management	4.76	1.19
Instructional Communication	42.86	7.14
Non-instructional Communication	5.95	29.76
Instructional Organization	1.19	3.57
Teacher I (Exemplary)		
Classroom Management	0.00	1.19
Instructional Communication	69.05	4.76
Non-instructional Communication	4.76	7.14
Instructional Organization	7.14	0.00
Teacher J (Challenged)		
Classroom Management	0.00	76.19
Instructional Communication	0.00	4.76
Non-instructional Communication	4.76	3.57
Instructional Organization	0.00	8.33
Teacher K (Exemplary)		
Classroom Management	5.95	1.19
Instructional Communication	36.90	21.42
Non-instructional Communication	16.67	3.57
Instructional Organization	13.10	0.00
Teacher L (Challenged)		
Classroom Management	1.19	7.14
Instructional Communication	16.67	26.19
Non-instructional Communication	1.19	21.42
Instructional Organization	1.19	17.86

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether social intelligence is a component of effective music teaching. Specific questions addressed were: (1) Can the social intelligence of music teachers be measured? (2) To what degree is social intelligence a component of effective music teaching? (3) Are there differences between a panel of music education experts, experienced music educators, and undergraduate preservice music teachers in identifying effective music teachers? (4) Can experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers identify social intelligence in their evaluation of effective music teaching? (5) What attributes do experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers consider to be related to effective teaching?

Answers to Research Questions

1. Can the social intelligence of music teachers be measured?

Previous investigations demonstrated the *IPT-15* to be a valid and reliable performance-based measure of a person's ability to "decode" information perceived in human interactions. All 40 music teacher participants were administered and completed the *IPT-15*, providing an accurate assessment of a level of social intelligence within music teachers.

2. To what degree is social intelligence a component of effective music teaching?

No significant differences were found between "exemplary" and "challenged" teachers scores on the *IPT-15*, yet "exemplary" teachers tended to score slightly higher than "challenged" teachers. The main attributes that influenced external evaluators' ratings of effective music teaching were social skills, accounting for over 85% of all responses listed. Ratings of teaching effectiveness were related to social skills, as all teachers who demonstrated effective social skills were perceived as effective music teachers. Further, effective teachers displayed the highest percentage of effective social attributes.

3. Are there differences between a panel of music education experts, experienced music educators, and undergraduate preservice music teachers in identifying effective music teachers?

Effective and ineffective music teachers used in this study were validated by three sources. No significant differences were found between the experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers when evaluating the overall effectiveness of music teacher participants. Additionally, the external evaluators concurred with the recommendations of the panel of music education experts, rating teachers identified as “exemplary” or effective, significantly higher than teachers labeled as “challenged” or ineffective.

4. Can experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers identify social intelligence in their evaluation of effective music teaching?

This study showed social skills and attributes were listed more than 8 times as frequently as non-social and miscellaneous attributes when assessing effective music teaching.

Additionally, with the exception of Teacher D, the percentage of effective and ineffective social attributes reflected the teacher’s overall effectiveness ratings given by the external evaluators.

5. What attributes do experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice music teachers consider to be related to effective music teaching?

Social attributes including *Classroom Management*, *Instructional Communication* and *Non-Instructional Communication* skills appear to be the most prevalent skills observed in music teaching episodes. *Ineffective Classroom Management* was the most cited attribute as rationale for why teachers were rated ineffective. Effective communication skills, including both categories of *Effective Instructional Communication* and *Effective Non-instructional Communication* were the most frequently cited attributes for “exemplary” teachers. More specifically, *Effective Instructional Communication* constituted the highest percentage of attributes listed for six of the seven teachers rated effective by external evaluators.

Summary of the IPT-15

The *Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15)* provides a performance-based assessment of an individual’s ability to interpret numerous forms of everyday social interactions. Containing an objectively correct answer for each question, the *IPT-15* is a reliable and validated instrument that requires each participant to decode verbal, coverbal, and nonverbal behaviors within the social categories of kinship, lies, competition, status, and intimacy. Thus, the *Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15)* was selected for the present study as the independent measure to provide a performance-based assessment of a level of social intelligence within music

teacher participants. The present investigation provided the first examination into any possible relationship between a performance-based measure of social intelligence, as determined by the *IPT-15*, and the teaching effectiveness of music educators (Costanzo, 2008).

Statistical analysis revealed no significant differences between the *IPT-15* scores of the “exemplary” and “challenged” teachers ($p > .09$). These findings may have been due to the small sample size of “exemplary” ($n = 20$) and “challenged” teachers ($n = 20$) employed for this investigation. However, the data indicate that “exemplary” teachers ($M = 10.25$) tended to score slightly higher on the *IPT-15* than “challenged” teachers ($M = 9.55$). These results appear to mirror previous findings that concluded undergraduate preservice teachers’ effectiveness scores were related, though not significantly, to the ability to receive and interpret the nonverbal communication of others (Hamann, Lindeburgh, & Paul, 1998). Future investigations might consider utilizing a larger sample size in order to obtain a more definitive answer as to any possible relationship between scores on the *IPT-15* and teacher effectiveness.

If, as Goleman (2006) posits, social intelligence is comprised of social awareness, or what we sense about others, and social facility, what we do with that information, then its implications could have a great effect on teachers because of the importance of the teacher/student relationship. As Goleman (1995) stated, “People who are empathic are more attuned to the subtle social signals that indicate what others need or want. This makes them better at callings such as the caring professions, teaching, sales, and management” (p. 43). If future investigations were to validate trends suggested from the results of this study, that “exemplary” teachers were able to decode social signals more accurately than “challenged” teachers, this would give those “socially adept” teachers a distinct advantage in the classroom. Obviously, future research is needed to address these possibilities.

Summary of the External Evaluation

Results indicated the panel of music education experts, experienced music educators, and undergraduate preservice music teachers were successful in identifying effective music teachers. Across the 12 teachers (seven “exemplary” and five “challenged”) who were randomly selected to serve as videotaped music teacher participants, the external evaluators were able to rate the overall effectiveness of their instruction. These evaluations resulted in the validation of the panel of experts’ recommendations. Six of the seven “exemplary” teachers received the highest

overall ratings, from moderately effective to highly effective in overall effectiveness, while four of the five “challenged” teachers received the lowest overall ratings, from less than moderately effective to not effective at all. Additionally, no differences were found between the ratings of experienced music educators and undergraduate preservice teachers, demonstrating that all external evaluators perceived the overall effectiveness of teaching for the 12 teaching excerpts in the same manner.

From the recommendations of the expert panel and the overall ratings of the external evaluators, it is clear that effective and ineffective teachers were identified and recognized consistently and reliably by all participants, even with relatively short 45-second excerpts. While the existing research literature suggests that everyone, regardless of training or experience, appears capable of recognizing effective teaching (Duke 1999/2000; Madsen, 2003; Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992), experienced teachers have been found to be more critical than preservice teachers in evaluations of effective teaching (Madsen, 2003; Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Madsen, Standley, Byo, & Cassidy, 1992). However, because inservice and undergraduate preservice music teachers rated teacher participants similar to each other, the data from the present study are in contrast to findings from these previous investigations.

Summary of the Classification of Teacher Responses

A substantial amount of the research literature has investigated components of effective teaching, including the use of sequential patterns, intensity, magnitude, and delivery (see Review of Literature). However, the operational definitions of these teacher behaviors involved the pairing of social skills, including both verbal and nonverbal communication, with non-social techniques, such as pacing, sequencing, or other organizational skills. A unique feature of the present investigation was to isolate and determine the number of social and non-social skills that could be observed by external evaluators. Additionally, these attributes were examined as to their effectiveness or ineffectiveness, and ultimately categorized according to the specific function in which they operated.

From the external evaluators’ listing of the main attribute influencing their rating of teaching effectiveness, the categorization of responses resulted in an overwhelming majority of socially-related comments. These social attributes, which ranged from *Instructional Communication* such as conducting, modeling, and questioning, to *Non-instructional*

Communication, including eye contact, facial expressions, and personal affect, to *Classroom Management*, involving discipline, student on- and off-task behavior, and group involvement, constituted over 85% of the 1008 total responses listed. The perception of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of these social attributes also influenced the teaching effectiveness ratings of the external evaluators. With the exception of one teacher who received an equal number of effective and ineffective social attributes, all participants who used more effective social skills were perceived as effective teachers, and vice versa. Thus, evaluation of teaching effectiveness for effective and ineffective teachers apparently functioned as a direct reflection of the ability to use effective social skills.

Further examination of the open-ended responses revealed that “exemplary” or effective teachers employed a higher percentage of effective communication skills in their teaching excerpts. Most notably, six of the seven effective teachers received the highest percentage of attributes for *Effective Instructional Communication*, with *Effective Non-Instructional Communication* as the most listed attribute for the additional effective teacher. The influence of *Effective Instructional* and *Non-instructional Communication* abilities on the evaluators’ ratings of the overall effectiveness of the teacher indicates a clear relationship between social communication skills and teacher effectiveness.

Previous research has suggested that effective teaching may be the result of successful student/teacher interactions. The findings from the present study lend support to this conclusion. Utilizing instructional techniques that fostered student/teacher interactions, including directions, expectations, repetition, modeling, and questioning, effective teachers demonstrated multiple ways of presenting the material, eliciting student response, and providing appropriate feedback. In this manner, effective teachers displayed a clear knowledge of how to successfully interact and communicate with their students (Berliner, 1986; Flanders, 1964) and the ability to adapt instruction to fit each student’s need (Porter & Brophy, 1988; Rosenshine, 1983), a skill referred to as “withitness” (Kounin, 1970). It is also not surprising that effective non-instructional communication skills influenced the ratings of effective teaching, as effective eye contact (Byo & Austin, 1994; Fredrickson, 1992), facial approval (Grechesky, 1986), high teacher affect (Sims, 1986), enthusiasm (Collins, 1978; DePugh, 1987; Yarbrough, 1975; Yarbrough & Madsen, 1998) and a positive approach (Teachout, 1997) have all been demonstrated as aspects of effective teaching. If the definition of social intelligence includes a thorough understanding of

social interactions and the ability to adapt and act accordingly based on that information, then the differences between the social attributes listed and the overall effectiveness of the teachers participating in this study could be construed as social intelligence.

Another finding showed that while “challenged” or ineffective teachers were viewed as ineffective with regards to *Classroom Management*, *Instructional Communication*, and *Non-instructional Communication*, *Ineffective Classroom Management* emerged as the most frequently cited response as to why a teacher was rated ineffective. Although researchers within music education have concluded that teacher effectiveness ratings are influenced more by off-task, or unfavorable, teacher behaviors than on-task behaviors (Hancock, 2003; Madsen, 2003), there is no direct evidence from the present investigation to support this claim. However, it is interesting that while *Classroom Management* was a noticeable attribute that influenced the ratings of ineffective teachers, it did not appear to have an impact on the evaluators’ ratings of effective teachers. Perhaps this is due to the evaluators’ lack of classroom management awareness unless it is a disruption or concern. It could also be plausible that the high use of *Effective Instructional* and *Non-instructional Communication* skills functioned as its’ own form of classroom management by keeping students engaged; a finding that would lend support to existing research which has linked positive student/teacher interactions with student involvement (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Cornelius-White, 2007; Fiocca, 1986; Forsythe, 1975; Greer, 1980; Kuhn, 1975; Madsen, 1982; Madsen & Alley, 1979).

Limitations of the Study

In order to investigate effective music teachers it was necessary to obtain teacher participants that were both effective and ineffective. A panel of music education experts was asked to recommend teachers and their schools from “exemplary programs” and teachers and their schools from “challenged programs.” The intention was to isolate and select both effective and ineffective music teachers, as this specific wording was chosen to alleviate hesitation on the part of the panel of experts and to maintain a level of respect for the teachers in the music education profession that were identified. While it could be theorized that this wording may have led to some confusion or to the panel of experts to recommend individuals based on the overall status of their school program rather than the effective teaching ability of the music educator, it is interesting that most experts personally contacted the researcher to confirm exactly

what they were being asked to recommend. In all cases, the panel of experts concurred with the conceptualization that the effectiveness of the teacher is the determinant of the success of a music program and understood the process was to ultimately select individuals who were perceived as effective and/or ineffective music teachers.

It should also be remembered that all teachers identified for this study as “exemplary” or “challenged” teachers were certified music educators in the State of Florida. While many music educators have developed and refined their teaching and musical skills to become effective music teachers and were justifiably recommended as “exemplary” teachers, those individuals identified as “challenged” teachers did have teacher certification. Therefore, any differences found between the “exemplary” and “challenged” teachers may be mitigated in comparison to investigations utilizing groups that would inherently have larger differences in teaching skill levels between them, such as teachers without certification and/or experience in the classroom.

Another potential limitation to this study could be the small sample size of “exemplary” and “challenged” teachers. Because the researcher chose to administer the *IPT-15* personally in order to ensure consistency throughout the collection of data, it was necessary to limit the number of music teacher participants. Utilizing a larger sample size may have led to different results.

Implications of the Findings

Hamann (1995) and Hamann, Lindeburgh, and Paul (1998) concluded an individual’s ability to receive and interpret nonverbal communication of others and the ability to engage others socially, an aspect of social intelligence, was related to effective teaching. Findings of the present study found similar trends, most notably, with the large number of effective social communication skills exhibited by effective teachers. Implications of these findings are of great importance for inservice teachers because of the potential benefits to subsequent classroom instruction. Therefore, it seems warranted to ascertain resources that could foster the identification, development, and implementation of effective social skills that music educators need to facilitate successful interactions with students.

For inservice teachers, creating an awareness of the importance of effective social skills as well providing opportunities for improving these skills may lead to more effective instruction.

While the *IPT-15* has been widely used to measure a level of social intelligence, researchers have also advocated its use for the identification and development of nonverbal communication skills (Archer, Costanzo, & Akert, 2001). The *IPT-15* has been shown to be a valuable training instrument for helping individuals increase their social perception skills and enhance their understanding of human communication and interaction (Costanzo & Archer, 1991, 1993). In addition, Costanzo (1992) and Bush and Marshall (1999) validated that training through the use of the *IPT-15* improves decoding verbal and nonverbal skills as well as enhances the accuracy of decoding skills. For purposes of improving specific techniques through observation and feedback, the use of videotaping teaching episodes has been found to increase awareness and improvement in several teaching techniques within music education (Arnold, 1991, 1995; Cassidy, 1993; Madsen, Standley, Byo & Cassidy, 1992; Price, 1992; Wang and Sogin, 1997). Perhaps these same techniques could be utilized to help inservice teachers identify, develop, and implement social skills in their instruction through self-observation and analysis.

Similar procedures may prove to be effective with preservice teachers as well as music educators involved in teacher training. If social skills and social intelligence are essential components of effective teaching, then identifying and developing successful social skills appears to be essential for preservice teachers who are training to enter the music education profession. Thus, providing opportunities for the development of social skills for preservice teachers within teacher training programs seems prudent. Addressing this issue, Kemp (1982) theorized that “music students who, over several years, will have spent long periods in the solitary confinement of the practice room focusing on their own personal musical development may find it difficult to readjust to the interests and learning difficulties of others” (p. 73). These concerns have been further expressed in that music education courses typically focus on the refining of musical skills and spend much less time on developing personal skills (Hamann, Lindeburgh & Paul, 1998; Teachout, 1997). Subsequently, preservice teachers may not be learning the necessary social skills needed in order to maximize their effectiveness as a teacher. Thus, the fostering of social skills appears to warrant a place in the music education curricula. Learning and developing appropriate nonverbal communication skills, guided observations that focus on recognizing, identifying, and anticipating student behavior, and providing multiple opportunities for practicum teaching experience in the college classroom as well as in the

schools, represent a small number of approaches that could be implemented to help strengthen preservice teachers' skills within the social interactions of the classroom.

Previous research has indicated that preservice and novice teachers express concerns and fears regarding their ability to manage a classroom or maintain classroom discipline (Kelly, 2000; Madsen & Kaiser, 1999). In light of the findings from the present study, it would appear that effective teachers utilize social skills, or social intelligence, to facilitate a successful classroom environment from which to teach music. Learning appropriate effective instructional communication and non-communication skills may help to strengthen the confidence and alleviate fears regarding classroom control on the part of inexperienced teachers.

Further, while many students have indicated their desire to become music teachers is based on their love of music and wanting to emulate influential music teachers from their own experiences (Bergee, Coffman, Demorest, Humphreys, & Thorton, 2001; Madsen & Kelly, 2002), findings from the present study may inform students of the skills necessary in order to become effective music teachers. This information may provide potential candidates for music education with a more realistic view of the responsibilities and skills needed to be successful music teachers. Additionally, Hamann, Lindeburgh, and Paul (1998) noted that a measure of social skills could help to determine which students might be successful as teachers and should be admitted into the music education program. While the use of one measure for predicting success is not encouraged or advocated at this time, an accurate assessment of social intelligence may provide feedback as to the social ability of an individual and any social deficiencies that each student may need to improve on during their course of study.

Recommendations for Future Research

To date, the *IPT-15* appears to provide the only reliable and valid performance-based instrument that encompasses numerous forms of personal interactions nested within everyday social situations. However, this particular social instrument assesses only the ability to decode social situations, and therefore, limits the amount of social intelligence truly being examined. From conclusions drawn by Hamann (1995) and Hamann, Lindeburgh, and Paul (1998), effective teaching was found to relate to preservice teachers' self-reported abilities to not only decode nonverbal communication, but also to encode and engage in successful social interactions. Therefore, it is vital that a performance-based instrument be developed to assess the

ability to encode and decode social situations, in order to definitively examine the impact of social intelligence in relationship to effective music teaching.

While results of the present investigation suggests that effective social skills, and thereby a level of social intelligence, are a component of effective music teaching, many more questions are raised than answered. Since only undergraduate preservice and inservice teachers were asked which attributes they considered to be related to effective music teaching, it would be interesting to see if the same results materialized when principals and music supervisors are questioned. Additionally, while several opportunities were hypothesized regarding the implementation of social skill development in music training, it seems prudent to examine additional methods that facilitate these skills in music teacher training curricula. Are social skills an accurate predictor of potential success as a music educator? What percentage of effective teaching is related to musical skills as opposed to social skills?

Future research into social intelligence will need to consider utilizing a larger sample of music teachers if any definitive conclusions are to be drawn, especially if one is assessing these teachers with a performance-based measure. However, based on the conclusions from the research literature and the present study, it seems warranted to continue empirical examination into the social aspects of effective music teaching.

APPENDIX A
HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 . FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 11/1/2007

To: Jay Juchniewicz

Address: 317 De Soto St. #3 Tallahassee, FL 32303
Dept.: MUSIC SCHOOL

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
Social Intelligence in Music Educators and its Relationship to Effective Teaching

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the research proposal referenced above has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Committee at its meeting on 10/10/2007 2:00:00 PM. Your project was approved by the Committee.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 10/8/2008 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the Chair of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Steven Kelly, Advisor
HSC No. 2007.712

APPENDIX B

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION TASK-15 (IPT-15)

THE INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION TASK-15 (IPT-15)

Mark Costanzo and Dane Archer, Copyright 1993

The videotape you are about to see contains 15 brief scenes and lasts about 20 minutes. There is one question on this answer sheet for each of the 15 scenes on the videotape. Before each scene, you should read the corresponding multiple choice answer options on this sheet.

Please try to answer every question, even if you feel you are merely guessing. Indicate your answer to each question by writing the letter of the answer you believe to be correct in the space provided ("a", "b", or "c").

- ____ 1. Who is the child of the two adults?
 - a) only the little boy.
 - b) only the little girl.
 - c) neither the boy nor the girl is the child of the adults.
- ____ 2. What is the relationship between the man and the woman?
 - a) they are lovers who have been together for about 10 months.
 - b) they are lovers who have been together for about 3 years.
- ____ 3. The two people in the next scene work together. Which person is the other person's boss?
 - a) the man is the boss.
 - b) the woman is the boss.
- ____ 4. You will see the same woman in two separate scenes. Which is the lie and which is the truth?
 - a) the first is a lie, the second is the truth.
 - b) the first is the truth, the second is a lie.
 - c) both are lies.
- ____ 5. Who won the game of one-on-one basketball?
 - a) the man on the left.
 - b) the man on the right.
- ____ 6. What is the relationship between the man and the woman?
 - a) they are brother and sister.
 - b) they are friends who have known each other for about three months.
- ____ 7. In which scene is the woman talking to her boss?
 - a) only in the first scene.
 - b) only in the second scene.
- ____ 8. Which man won the racquetball game?
 - a) the man on the left.
 - b) the man on the right.

- _____ 9. Who are the women talking to?
a) both women are talking to strangers.
b) both women are talking to friends.
c) the first woman is talking to a friend, the second woman is talking to a stranger.
- _____ 10. Which is the lie and which is the truth?
a) the first is a lie, the second is the truth.
b) the first is the truth, the second is a lie.
c) both are lies.
- _____ 11. The two people in the next scene work together. Which person is the other person's boss?
a) the man is the boss.
b) the woman is the boss.
- _____ 12. Which man won the fencing bout?
a) the man on the left.
b) the man on the right.
- _____ 13. Who is the woman talking to on the phone?
a) her mother.
b) a female friend.
c) her boyfriend.
- _____ 14. Which man is the father of the two little boys?
a) the man on the left.
b) the man on the right.
c) neither man.
- _____ 15. Which is the lie and which is the truth?
a) the first is the lie, the second is the truth.
b) the first is the truth, the second is a lie.
c) both are lies.

Age? _____ Male or Female? _____

How many questions (0 to 15) do you think you answered correctly? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

The IPT-15 is distributed by:

Berkeley Media LLC	Email: info@berkeleymedia.com
Saul Zaentz Film Center	Phone: 510-486-9900
2600 Tenth Street, Suite 626	Fax: 510-486-9944
Berkeley, CA 94710-2522	Web: http://www.berkeleymedia.com

APPENDIX C

E-MAIL TO UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND MUSIC SUPERVISORS

Dear Mr./Mrs. XXX,

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation regarding music teacher characteristics under the direction of Dr. Steven Kelly. You have been specifically identified for this project because of your expertise in music education. I am interested in identifying K-12 teachers in public school music programs across the State of Florida.

Would you please list up to five teachers and their schools from “exemplary programs” and up to five teachers and their schools from “more challenging programs” for each of the areas of band, chorus, orchestra, and general K-12 Florida public school music programs. I realize that listing this many teachers is a large task, so if you can not come up with five names for each category or do not feel comfortable listing teachers within certain music areas, please list only those teachers you feel represent each category. Listed teachers do not need to be in any order as they will not be used for ranking purposes.

Please know that all information will be kept confidential, as the teachers and programs identified will be kept completely anonymous and will not know how and for what purpose they were selected. You will also have the opportunity to withdraw your consent at any time.

You may email your list to: jayjuchniewicz@hotmail.com, or if you would prefer to discuss this matter in person, please let me know when would be a convenient time for you.

If you have any questions, feel free to e-mail me and I will be glad to provide any clarification that is needed.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jay Juchniewicz
College of Music
Florida State University

APPENDIX D
E-MAIL TO MUSIC TEACHERS

Dear Mr./Mrs. XXX,

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation in music education at the Florida State University and would like to ask for your participation in my study. You have been randomly selected from a pool of K-12 public school music teachers in Florida to participate in this study that will focus on teacher characteristics specific to music educators.

Your involvement is simply completing a 15-item perception survey that takes about 20 minutes and can be done at any time convenient for you. All information obtained will be kept confidential and you will have the opportunity to withdraw your consent at any time.

Please also know that there are no foreseeable risks in participating in this study, however, potential benefits may include improved teaching and classroom techniques.

If you are able to participate would you please email me at jayjuchniewicz@hotmail.com or feel free to call me at (850) 527-1606.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jay Juchniewicz
College of Music
Florida State University

APPENDIX E
TEACHER CONSENT FORM

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

By signing this form I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in this experiment and consent to taking the Interpersonal Perception Task survey. The administration time of this survey will take 20 minutes. The study is investigating teacher characteristics specific to music educators. I understand the results obtained from this test will be used solely for the purposes of this experiment, and will not be viewed by any party outside of this investigation. I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time during the experiment. If I withdraw before the experiment is completed, I understand my results will be completely removed. I also understand that while there are no foreseeable risks to participating in this study, potential benefits may include improved teaching and classroom techniques.

Teacher's Name (Print)

Date

Teacher's Name (Signature)

Investigator's Name (Signature)

Date

If you have any questions concerning this research study, please call me at (850) 527-1606 or email me at jayuchmiewicz@hotmail.com, or you may contact Dr. Steven Kelly by phone at (850) 644-4069 or e-mail at skelly@admin.fsu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of Research at (850) 644-8633.

FSU Human Subjects Committee approved 10/10/2007. Void after 10/8/2008.
HSC#2007.784.

APPENDIX F

E-MAIL TO VIDEOTAPED MUSIC TEACHERS

Dear Mr./Mrs. XXX,

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation in music education at the Florida State University and would like to ask for your participation in my study. You have been randomly selected from a pool of K-12 public school music teachers in Florida to participate in this study that will focus on teacher characteristics specific to music educators.

Your involvement would include: 1) allowing me to videotape one class of your choice, and 2) completing a 15-item perception survey. Every effort will be made to be as unobtrusive as possible during your class and to not interrupt your schedule in any way. In addition, the perception survey takes about 20 minutes and can be done at any time convenient for you. All information obtained will be kept confidential and you will have the opportunity to withdraw your consent at any time.

Please also know that there are no foreseeable risks in participating in this study, however, potential benefits may include improved teaching and classroom techniques.

If you are able to participate would you please email me at jayjuchniewicz@hotmail.com or feel free to call me at (850) 527-1606.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jay Juchniewicz
College of Music
Florida State University

APPENDIX G

TEACHER VIDEOTAPE CONSENT FORM

TEACHER VIDEOTAPE CONSENT FORM

By signing this form I am voluntarily agreeing to participate as a teacher and consent to taking the Interpersonal Perception Task survey and being videotaped teaching for one class period. My involvement in this experiment will consist of the videotaping of one class period of my choice, as well as 20 minutes for the administration of the Interpersonal Perception Task. I understand that a master videotape will be made using excerpts from other music teachers to investigate teacher characteristics specific to music educators. This videotape will be viewed by approximately 200 participants, including principals, music educators, and college or university music majors across the country. I understand this videotape will be used solely for the purposes of this experiment, and will not be viewed by any party outside of this investigation. I also understand that while there are no foreseeable risks to participating in this study, potential benefits may include improved teaching and classroom techniques. Further, I understand that I may withdraw from the study before the videotapes are completed and viewed by the participants. If I withdraw before the videotape has been viewed by the participants, I understand I will be removed completely from the master videotape.

Teacher's Name (Print)

Date

Teacher's Name (Signature)

Investigator's Name (Signature)

Date

If you have any questions concerning this research study, please call me at (850) 527-1606 or email me at javiuchniewicz@hotmail.com, or you may contact Dr. Steven Kelly by phone at (850) 644-4069 or e-mail at skelly@admin.fsu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of Research at (850) 644-8633.

FSU Human Subjects Committee approved 10/10/2007. Void after 10/8/2008.
HSC#2007.784.

APPENDIX H
INFORMED CONSENT FORM (STUDENT)

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (STUDENT)

By signing this form I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in this study.

I realize that my music class will be videotaped for the entire class period. I am aware that while the teacher will be the primary focus of the video recording, I may be viewed or heard participating during this class. I understand the video camera will be placed in the back of the class so that if I am captured, I will be mostly seen from the back (to make sure my face is not featured).

I am aware that no student information will be collected and that I will not be identified in the video. I understand that my consent is completely voluntary, and that I may stop participating at any time. If I choose not to participate, there will be no penalty and I will be moved to a position in the class where I will not be captured or will be edited out of the final videotape.

I understand that excerpts of this videotape will be used to construct a master videotape that will be viewed by teachers from other areas of the country. I am aware that all videotaped materials will be kept by the researcher in a secure location and will be destroyed by September 1, 2008.

This research is being conducted by Jay Juchniewicz, a graduate student at Florida State University. If I have any questions or concerns I may contact him at jajuchniewicz@hotmail.com.

Again, I understand that I am not the subject of this study and voluntarily agree to participate in the videotaping of my class.

(participant) Date: _____

(witness) Date: _____

FSU Human Subjects Committee approved 10/10/2007. Void after 10/8/2008. HSC#2007.712.

APPENDIX I
PARENT CONSENT FORM

Dear Parent,

I am a graduate student in music education under the direction of Dr. Steven Kelly in the College of Music at Florida State University. I am conducting a research study investigating teacher characteristics specific to music educators.

Your child's music class will be videotaped for one class period, selected by his/her teacher, to capture the teacher in a normal class environment. Please know the video recording will focus on the teacher; students are not the subject of the study, but may be viewed or heard participating in their normal class activities. The video camera will be placed in the back of the class so that if the students are captured, they will be mostly seen from the back (to make sure the students' faces are not featured).

This videotape will be used in conjunction with video recordings of other music teachers to create a master videotape containing excerpts from teachers of various levels and disciplines throughout the state of Florida. This videotape will be viewed by teachers from other areas of the country to identify teacher characteristics specific to music educators.

No student information will be collected and students will not be identified in the videos. In addition, no identifiable teacher or school information will be used.

Your child's participation in this videotaping is voluntary. If your child chooses not to participate, there will be no penalty and will be moved to a position in the class where he/she will not be captured or will be edited out of the final videotape.

If you have any question regarding this research or your child's participation, please e-mail me at jayjuchniewicz@hotmail.com

Sincerely,

Jay Juchniewicz

I give consent for my child _____ to participate in the above study. I understand that my child may be captured or heard participating during the videotaping procedure. These tapes will be kept by the researcher in a locked filing cabinet. I understand that only the researcher will have access to these tapes and that they will be destroyed by September 1st, 2008.

Parent's Name _____

Parent's Signature _____ Date _____

FSU Human Subjects Committee approved 10/10/2007. Void after 10/8/2008. HSC#2007.784.

APPENDIX J

E-MAIL TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

Dear Mr./Mrs. XXX,

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation in music education at the Florida State University and would like to ask for your participation in my study. This study will focus on teacher characteristics specific to music educators.

Your involvement would include: 1) watching a 12-minute videotape of teachers in various music teaching situations and 2) completing an evaluation form of the videotape. The entire process takes 20 minutes and can be done at any time convenient for you. All information obtained will be kept confidential, and you will have the opportunity to withdraw your consent at any time.

Please also know that there are no foreseeable risks in participating in this study, however, potential benefits may include improved teaching and classroom techniques.

If you are able to participate would you please email me at jayjuchniewicz@hotmail.com or feel free to call me at (850) 527-1606.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jay Juchniewicz
College of Music
Florida State University

APPENDIX K
EXTERNAL EVALUATOR CONSENT FORM

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

By signing this form I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in this experiment.
I understand my participation will include:

1. Completing a demographic section on the evaluation form.
2. Watching a videotape of teaching excerpts containing music instruction from various levels and disciplines, which will last approximately twelve minutes.
3. Completing an evaluation form which will ask you to rate the teacher's effectiveness.

The total administration time of the videotape and evaluation form will be 20 minutes. I understand the results obtained from this test will be used solely for the purposes of this experiment, and will not be viewed by any party outside of this investigation. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law. I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time during the experiment. If I withdraw before the experiment is completed, I understand my results will be completely removed from the study. I also understand that while there are no foreseeable risks to participating in this study, potential benefits may include improved teaching and classroom techniques.

Please note that you must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this investigation.

Participant's Name (Print)

Date

Participant's Name (Signature)

Investigator's Name (Signature)

Date

(OVER)

FSU Human Subjects Committee approved 10/10/2007. Void after 10/8/2008.
HSC#2007.784.

If you have any questions concerning this research study, please call me at (850) 527-1606 or email me at jayjuchniewicz@hotmail.com, or you may contact Dr. Steven Kelly by phone at (850) 644-4069 or e-mail at skelly@admin.fsu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of Research at (850) 644-8633.

Approved

FSU Human Subjects Committee approved 10/10/2007. Void after 10/8/2008.
HSC#2007.784.

APPENDIX L

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Professional Status

Music Teacher _____
Music Education Student _____

Years of Teaching Experience

1 – 10 _____
11 – 20 _____
21 + _____

Gender

Male _____
Female _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Circle the number that corresponds with your rating.

EXAMPLE: How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the waiter during your dining experience?

Not effective at all Moderately effective Highly effective
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

EXAMPLE: Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this dining experience.

1. Prompt Service

~~~~~

**PRACTICE EXAMPLE**

**A.** How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?

Not effective at all                      Moderately effective                      Highly effective  
1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

**B.** Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.

1.

**PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE**

**TEACHING EXCERPT #1**

**A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?**

| Not effective at all |   | Moderately effective |   |   | Highly effective |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2 | 3                    | 4 | 5 | 6                | 7 |

**B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.**

1.

~~~~~

TEACHING EXCERPT #2

A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?

Not effective at all		Moderately effective			Highly effective	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.

1.

~~~~~

**TEACHING EXCERPT #3**

**A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?**

| Not effective at all |   | Moderately effective |   |   | Highly effective |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2 | 3                    | 4 | 5 | 6                | 7 |

**B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.**

1.

**PLEASE TURN OVER**

**TEACHING EXCERPT #4**

**A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?**

| Not effective at all |   | Moderately effective |   |   | Highly effective |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2 | 3                    | 4 | 5 | 6                | 7 |

**B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.**

1.

~~~~~

TEACHING EXCERPT #5

A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?

Not effective at all		Moderately effective			Highly effective	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.

1.

~~~~~

**TEACHING EXCERPT #6**

**A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?**

| Not effective at all |   | Moderately effective |   |   | Highly effective |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2 | 3                    | 4 | 5 | 6                | 7 |

**B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.**

1.

**PLEASE TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE**

**TEACHING EXCERPT #7**

**A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?**

| Not effective at all |   | Moderately effective |   |   | Highly effective |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2 | 3                    | 4 | 5 | 6                | 7 |

**B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.**

1.

~~~~~

TEACHING EXCERPT #8

A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?

Not effective at all		Moderately effective			Highly effective	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.

1.

~~~~~

**TEACHING EXCERPT #9**

**A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?**

| Not effective at all |   | Moderately effective |   |   | Highly effective |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2 | 3                    | 4 | 5 | 6                | 7 |

**B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.**

1.

**PLEASE TURN OVER**



**TEACHING EXCERPT #10**

**A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?**

| Not effective at all |   | Moderately effective |   |   | Highly effective |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2 | 3                    | 4 | 5 | 6                | 7 |

**B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.**

1.

~~~~~

TEACHING EXCERPT #11

A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?

Not effective at all		Moderately effective			Highly effective	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.

1.

~~~~~

**TEACHING EXCERPT #12**

**A. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the teacher during this teaching excerpt?**

| Not effective at all |   | Moderately effective |   |   | Highly effective |   |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2 | 3                    | 4 | 5 | 6                | 7 |

**B. Please list the main attribute that influenced your evaluation of this teaching excerpt.**

1.

**THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING**

APPENDIX M

CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHER ATTRIBUTES AND OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF  
THE TEACHER RATINGS

Teacher A (Exemplary)

| Attribute                                          | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Pacing and timing                                  | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Example                                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clear demonstration of expected outcome            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Did not allow time between attempts                | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Kept the pace of the rehearsal moving              | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Inconsistent instruction                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Takes too much to get point across                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Tone of voice                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Good teaching                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Slower first                                       | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Good communication                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Too fast                                           | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Too fast - start slower                            | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Asked students for goal                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Did not ask a specific question                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Sing                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Muddy instructions                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Poor control over group                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Goal achieved                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Singing correct pitches/rhythm for them to imitate | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clearly explained expectations                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Directions good                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Has their attention; control                       | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Modeled articulation                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Much background noise                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Unclear question at first                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Specific direction                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Don't ask students if it's right, tell them        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Demonstrates what he wants                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Fast paced                                         | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Vocal example                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clear, short instructions                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Repetition                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Explained                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Gave good examples                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good example                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |

Teacher A (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                     | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Precise                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clear expectation                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| “Articulate same way” too vague               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Improved sound                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Knowledgeable                                 | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Could have gotten to the point quicker        | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Identified problem and improved it            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Not clear in instructions from the start      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Clarity of initial directions                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Teacher example                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good pacing                                   | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Descriptive instructions                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Moving pace                                   | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Explained himself well                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Moved very quickly                            | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Gave exactly what’s wanted                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Very attentive                                | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Some interaction/not really enthused          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Failed to use immediate feedback              | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Told them what was wrong and how to fix it    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Unclear questioning                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Eye contact                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Used vocal and physical gestures              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Abrasive manner                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Communicated specifically                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Unclear questioning                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Communication of expectations                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Vocal modeling                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Student’s attention                           | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Not clear in instructions from the start      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Good pacing                                   | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Persistent                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Lots of talking                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Prompt, straight to the point with directions | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good eye contact                              | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Rehearsed one small section until correct     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |

Teacher A (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                               | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Too much space between talking and playing              | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Modeling with singing                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Student's attention                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Specific instruction and follow up                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Somewhat condescending in approach                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Good model                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Knew what he wanted, and conveyed that                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Asked too many questions instead of direct instructions | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Pacing                                                  | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Eye contact                                             | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Too much like a drill sergeant                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Clear instruction                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |

Teacher B (Challenged)

| Attribute                                                     | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Repeating                                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| No discipline                                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Seemingly disengaged from students                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Disorganized                                                  | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Classroom management missing                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| No expectations                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Class management                                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Repeating directions                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Not together                                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Needs control of the class                                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Not in control of room                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Not understand teacher                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Prepping time not effective                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Didn't have everyone's attention before starting              | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Says he will start, says something else, then actually starts | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| [At the] beginning not everyone working                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Lack of control                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Repeated self                                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| No attention                                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| No eye contact                                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Not in control at beginning                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Too much talking/off task                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Doesn't have their attention                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| No classroom control/discipline                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Not [in] control of classroom                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Slow start                                                    | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Too much start and stop                                       | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| No control of situation, lost attention span                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Repeats himself too much when students are talking            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Dead time at beginning                                        | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Students talking                                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Noisy classroom                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| No attention                                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Too many false starts                                         | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Did not have their attention                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Wasted time                                                   | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |

Teacher B (Challenged) – Continued

| Attribute                                              | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| (no response)                                          | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Wasted time                                            | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| No correction or instructions given                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Lack of student attentiveness                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Unorganized                                            | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| Teacher did not have the attention of the class        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| No control over class                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Dead-time                                              | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 1      |
| Lack of attention ad control of students               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Class attention                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Way too much down time                                 | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Waiting for the class instead of being in charge       | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Unorganized classroom management                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| I don't know what he was trying to teach               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Didn't look involved                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| No discipline                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Too much talking from students                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Does not have anyone's attention                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Lack of management                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Too scattered throughout classroom                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Counting off                                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| No leadership position                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Did not teach anything                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Unfocused                                              | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| Classroom management                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| No time given (conducting)                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Conducting                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Classroom management                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| No control                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Not involved                                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Couldn't get the student's attention                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| No enthusiasm                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Very little control                                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Not at all passionate                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Seemed disinterested                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Ensemble was talking and didn't get them under control | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |

Teacher B (Challenged) – Continued

| Attribute                                                | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Little classroom control                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Lack of enthusiasm                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Did not teach anything                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Lack of eye contact and energy                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Boring                                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Boring                                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| No control over classroom                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Didn't have control of the room                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Direction, engagement, involvement                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Doesn't control class well or quiet them before starting | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Didn't have control over the classroom                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Passive                                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |



Teacher C (Exemplary)

| Attribute                                             | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Not clear                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Too much talking                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Presenting question in a variety of ways              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Non clarifying                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Concentrating on reading the music                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Changed the question                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Did not prompt student attention                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Tone of voice                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Correct tone                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Kids didn't seem to understand instructions           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Question and answer with students                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Demonstration good                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Wasted time                                           | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Should have demonstrated fingering or reword it       | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Recalled previous knowledge to connect concept        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Personality in voice good                             | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Speaks very quickly                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Involved individual students                          | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Play more                                             | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Too much talking                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Questioning techniques                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Direct questioning                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Was trying to engage someone who is apparently lost   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Let student off without getting a positive response   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Ask across group                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Examples                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Singled out student                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Positive reinforcement                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Not enough student participation demonstration        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Engaging students                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Asked a question a different way                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Liked that the teacher is playing along with students | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Specific                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Student knowledge asked for                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Rephrased question to help understanding              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| (no response)                                         | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 3      |

Teacher C (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                                      | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| She muttered                                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Sought understanding                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| (no response)                                                  | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| Sequencing of questions                                        | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Spoke too much                                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Critical thinking                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Did not understand what she was asking the student             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Talks too much                                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clarity and simplification of directions                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Teacher shouldn't play                                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Asks the students questions                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Thinking processes                                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Example; modeling                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Rephrased her question when they didn't understand             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Got students thinking                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Let students figure it out                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Good work between student and teacher                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Complete interaction                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Singled student out                                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Associated with students                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Teacher intensity                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Informative                                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Put child on the spot                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Encouraged student in process                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Explored different learning styles                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Related note to what student knows                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Questions                                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Rewording for student                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Used different example                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Needed better demonstration                                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Too many questions                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Student participation                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Proximity                                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Engaged very well with student                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| I like the hands-on method used                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Asked the students questions instead of just giving directions | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |

Teacher C (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                         | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Too much talk explaining                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Use of classroom space/out of teacher area        | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Where teacher stood in room                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Proximity                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Asked same kid questions he didn't know answer to | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Had another student answer then went back         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Let students figure it out for themselves         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Positive                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Rephrasing                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Engaging                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Positive                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Too much talking                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |

Teacher D (Challenged)

| Attribute                                   | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Not clear                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| What is energy                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Engaged                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Conducting style off                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Doesn't have full attention                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Too relaxed on podium                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Student attention                           | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Enthusiasm                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| OK skills                                   | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Doesn't stop them so soon                   | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Vague                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Not good directing                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Direct students with correct time signature | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Kept talking without clear beginning        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Conducting is not effective                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Good eye contact                            | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Facial communication                        | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Fair control                                | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| No goal stated                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Very involved with students                 | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Control                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Immediate corrections                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Clear expectations                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Dresses inappropriately                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Control of class                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| No real given instruction                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Not very specific in directions             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Nonverbal cues                              | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Directions not as clear on entrances        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| More specific examples needed               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Prior explanation                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Short instructions                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Not specific on desire – “energy” – how?    | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Positive attitude                           | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| (no response)                               | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| Good adjective – energy                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |

Teacher D (Challenged) - Continued

| Attribute                                    | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Enjoyed his job – smiled at students         | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Focused                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| “Little more energy” is vague direction      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Quick direction                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| (no response)                                | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Teacher needs full attention of class        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Not as clear on instructions for kids        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Conducting                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Lack of dominant figure                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| No continuous conducting                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Engaged students well                        | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Energy                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Engaged with students                        | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Energetic leader                             | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Didn’t focus on details                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Did not explain well                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Energetic                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Doesn’t seem interested in teaching          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Energetic                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Not very assertive                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Instruction                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Lack of conducting                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Not encouraging                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Energetic                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Sloppy looking                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| No def. of energy                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Eye contact with students                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Unclear, unspecific instructions             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Not descriptive                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Was interested in students                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Good pacing                                  | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Control of the classroom                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Unspecific instruction without model         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Nothing special, he tried                    | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| Not very energetic                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Ensemble not focused in right from the start | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |

Teacher D (Challenged) – Continued

| Attribute                        | Classification Categories |           |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Not all kids were focused on him | Social                    | Effective | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Good eye contact                 | Social                    | Effective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Teacher enthusiasm               | Social                    | Effective | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Classroom Management             | Social                    | Effective | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Energetic                        | Social                    | Effective | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Good energy with the kids        | Social                    | Effective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Great ideas                      | Social                    | Effective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Energetic                        | Social                    | Effective | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Good energy                      | Social                    | Effective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Eye contact                      | Social                    | Effective | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Energetic                        | Social                    | Effective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Asked for more energy            | Social                    | Effective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |

Teacher E (Challenged)

| Attribute                            | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Speaking                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Good preparation                     | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Clear                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Soft tone in voice                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Sitting to teach                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| No energy                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Boring                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Use of time                          | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| More information needed              | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Good questions                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Boring                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Sitting is bad                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Talked too much                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Little energy                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Too quiet                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Sitting down                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| No energy                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Just talked                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| No energy from teacher               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Dull                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Voice is too soft                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Too laid back                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| No energy                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Does not speak clearly               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Sax moving around distracting        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Took a long time to get to the point | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| No animation                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Hard to understand                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Students need to be                  | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| Not engaging students                | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Questions                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Why is the teacher sitting?          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Seems disinterested in class         | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Didn't hear students                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Not prepared at first                | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| Boring – no energy                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |

Teacher E (Challenged) – Continued

| Attribute                                             | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Questioned students before playing                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Ensures understanding                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Started with dynamic map and comparison of mf with ff | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Lacks energy                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Not playing                                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Teacher seemed [effective] in spite of relaxed style  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Not very enthusiastic about work                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Boring                                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Confident speaking tone                               | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Class discussion                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Speaks too softly                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Slow pacing                                           | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Lack of attention                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Not [an] energetic teacher                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Talked through piece first                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Not enough playing                                    | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Too soft of a voice                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Has students' attention                               | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Appears to be complacent/lax                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Seems uninterested in students                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Intensity                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| No energy                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Lack of energy                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Teacher seemed bored                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Too passive                                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Too much talking                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Enthusiasm                                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Lack of energy                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| No enthusiasm                                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Needed to stand                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Dull, no excitement                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Energy                                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Good vocabulary to implement for students             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Engaged well                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Seems disinterested, bored                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Not speaking loud                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |



Teacher E (Challenged) – Continued

| Attribute                           | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| No energy                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Sitting                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Teacher enthusiasm                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Speaking mirrored the dynamic level | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Too quiet                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Boring                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| No energy                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Slow pacing                         | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| Dead, no energy                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Looked bored, disengaged            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Sat down during rehearsal           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Very passive                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |

Teacher F (Exemplary)

| Attribute                                                | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Clear indication                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Too much class time [on] one student                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Went to students' level for discipline                   | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Good body language                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Correction took too long                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Discipline was lacking                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Addresses student needs                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Energy                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Great                                                    | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 7      |
| Outstanding discipline                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Mean teacher                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| No directing                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| No enthusiasm                                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Too much time out with just one kid                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Negative                                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Mmm - I don't want to watch this                         | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 2      |
| Scolding                                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Child never stood                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Demand compliance                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Not involved with entire class                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Started with discipline                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Dealing with individual                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Clear expectations of student behavior                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Doesn't seem to have a passion for working with students | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Get down to their level                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Got all kids attention                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Clear directions                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Positive reinforcement                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| (no response)                                            | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| (no response)                                            | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| Explanation                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Is she singling out a child?                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Negative motivation                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Made eye contact                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Teacher somewhat adversarial                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Too much lecturing                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |

Teacher F (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                       | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Too much time wasted with one problem           | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Required discipline                             | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Negative                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Too much talking                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| (no response)                                   | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Teacher had good effect upon students           | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Lack of classroom management                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Looks ridiculous - too much time on one student | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Overbearing dominance                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Too much time lost on discipline                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Should punish in private                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Students need consequences                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Too much time spent on one person               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Very even tempered                              | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Didn't focus on music                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Very good discipline                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Too impatient                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Taking control                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Bad form of classroom management                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Doesn't relate and teach towards students' age  | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Encouraged defiance                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Tone in class                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Negative attitude                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Harsh                                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Not helping children be successful              | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| (no response)                                   | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 6      |
| Classroom management                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Demand                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Punished in front of other students             | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Needs to loosen up, choose battles better       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Mean                                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Attitude                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Good discipline                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Discipline act wasn't reasonable                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Straightforward & firm                          | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Making sure student does it correctly           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |

Teacher F (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                        | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Stern                                            | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Got to students level                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Teacher attitude                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Persistence                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Clear expectations                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Good pacing                                      | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Talking down to the students                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Discipline                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Proximity                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Discipline                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Needs to lighten mood after disapproval          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Instructions didn't set kids up to be successful | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |

Teacher G (Exemplary)

| Attribute                                                  | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Demonstration                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Positive                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Good audiation                                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Sets good example                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Kept students focused                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Modeling                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Does great job at keeping student involved                 | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Use of time                                                | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Sing before playing                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Outstanding response from students                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Effective use of teaching materials                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Demonstration with instrument is good                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Students were involved                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Good demonstration                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Saying and fingering then playing                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Nice, like the classroom                                   | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 7      |
| Call and response                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Encouraging                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Model and teach                                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Encouraging                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Good modeling                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Established routine in place                               | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Clear directions                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Positive attitude                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Visual and audio skills reinforced                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Didn't explain that it was added to what they knew already | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Good reinforcement                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Positive reinforcement                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Students knew how to respond                               | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Model and practice                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Sing and say                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Great visuals                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Small steps - repeat                                       | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Made all children feel comfortable                         | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Good questioning                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Rote/practice                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |

Teacher G (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                                                       | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Example first                                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Outstanding                                                                     | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 7      |
| Statement, practice, re-statement of concept                                    | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Left out necessary steps to get from 1 <sup>st</sup> example to 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| Multiple instruction methods                                                    | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Hard to evaluate this short excerpt                                             | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 6      |
| Students followed her well                                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Pace                                                                            | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Engaging                                                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Multiple methods of teaching the same thing                                     | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Good direction - clear                                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Minimal talking                                                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Shows good example before students attempt                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Reinforcing the fingerings                                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Play, sing, and respond                                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Moved too fast                                                                  | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Great pacing                                                                    | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Much participation                                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Used multiple learning styles                                                   | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Talked at students level                                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Rhythm                                                                          | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Demonstrating example                                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Considerate of all students                                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Taught by friendly demonstration                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| (no response)                                                                   | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Pitch recognition/tonal memory                                                  | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Encouragement                                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Set system                                                                      | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Different effective techniques                                                  | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Good demonstration                                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Understanding                                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Call and response                                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good progression                                                                | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Good ordered steps                                                              | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Engaged students in a lot of ways                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Plays it for them, has them say the notes, and then play back                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |

Teacher G (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                                         |            | Classification Categories |                                 |  | Rating |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------|
| Pitches and note names                                            | Non-social | Effective                 | Instructional Organization      |  | 5      |
| Sequencing                                                        | Non-social | Effective                 | Instructional Organization      |  | 6      |
| Student attention                                                 | Social     | Effective                 | Classroom Management            |  | 7      |
| Listen to chant to play sequence                                  | Non-social | Effective                 | Instructional Organization      |  | 7      |
| Great model                                                       | Social     | Effective                 | Instructional Communication     |  | 6      |
| Good sequence                                                     | Non-social | Effective                 | Instructional Organization      |  | 5      |
| All aspects of learning taking place (visual, aural, kinesthetic) | Non-social | Effective                 | Instructional Organization      |  | 7      |
| Positive attitude                                                 | Social     | Effective                 | Non-instructional Communication |  | 7      |
| Sequencing                                                        | Non-social | Effective                 | Instructional Organization      |  | 6      |
| Effective teaching sequence                                       | Non-social | Effective                 | Instructional Organization      |  | 6      |
| Modeled                                                           | Social     | Effective                 | Instructional Communication     |  | 7      |
| Clear – gave reasonable goals                                     | Social     | Effective                 | Instructional Communication     |  | 6      |

Teacher H (Exemplary)

| Attribute                                                | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Indication                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Repetition of question/answer for retention              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good at asking for student input                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Allows for student input                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| No enthusiasm                                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Got students involved                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Should have probed students more                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Enthusiasm                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Question                                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Problem solving                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Question and answer with students                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| No enthusiasm                                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| No enthusiasm                                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Seemed lethargic                                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Not exciting                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Maybe [a] little more expressive but good                | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Difficulty hearing him                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Long explanation                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Wasted time                                              | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Let them discover answer themselves                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Ask questions                                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Questioning technique                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Teaching with questions                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Ask questions to illicit appropriate musical response    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Involved students by name                                | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Questioned effectively                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Little vocal inflection                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Mixed cues                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Makes sure students understand the music notation        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Discussion                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Student involvement                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Using a baton in rehearsal                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Coaching in the middle - specific                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Explained what he wanted                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Uses multiple teaching styles (visual, singing, playing) | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Talks too soft                                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |



Teacher H (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                                | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| (no response)                                            | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| Asks questions                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good use of questioning                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Good student interaction with teacher                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Used questions                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Had class fully participating                            | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Asked probing questions                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Conducting                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Thinking process for students                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Too many prep beats                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Seems annoyed by students – “come on guys” sarcastically | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Asked students, helps with memory and understanding      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Encourages classroom discussion                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Asks questions                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Taught musicality                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Let the children learn for themselves                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Good control                                             | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Interaction                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| A little intimidating                                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Too monotone                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Negativity                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Too much moving                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Intimidating                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Eh.                                                      | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| (no response)                                            | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Good questioning                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Instruction while students play instruments              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| No vice inflections                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Wasted time                                              | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Could be looser with style                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Got a little frustrated                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Negativity                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Unspecific questioning                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Did not help “agitato”                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Pointing out good things                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Talked a lot                                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |

Teacher H (Exemplary) – Continued

| <b>Attribute</b>                              | <b>Classification Categories</b> |             |                                 | <b>Rating</b> |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Lacked energy that he wanted in music         | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4             |
| Trouble getting responses                     | Social                           | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3             |
| Teacher does not provide positive environment | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2             |
| Student thinks for self                       | Social                           | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5             |
| Little negative                               | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5             |
| Meaning of word                               | Social                           | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5             |
| Not happy about the music                     | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3             |
| No energy                                     | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3             |
| Slow pacing                                   | Non-social                       | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3             |
| Eye contact                                   | Social                           | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5             |
| Attitude                                      | Social                           | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4             |
| Passive                                       | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4             |

Teacher I (Exemplary)

| Attribute                                              | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Demonstration                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Talking to self                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Good demonstration                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Organized teaching style                               | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| No eye contact with students                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Explained clearly                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good examples of what [is] musically needed            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Use of time                                            | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Good directions                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Good instruction                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| How and why were explained                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Not enough direction                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Students were not involved                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Good eye contact                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Momentum - corrects and continues with little pause    | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Eyes                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Poor nonverbal communication                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Pretty good speed                                      | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Good detail                                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Good interaction                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Specific in expectations                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clear, specific instructions/corrections               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good knowledge of what he wanted them to do            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Good explanations of how to accomplish task            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Nose must really itch                                  | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 3      |
| Concise explanation                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Modeling                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Specific instructions                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| (no response)                                          | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 6      |
| Corrective                                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Teacher explained                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clear, clean instructions                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Detailed and corrective                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Thorough knowledge of expectations                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Speaks of intensity but doesn't conduct with intensity | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Section work                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |

Teacher I (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                         | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Fixed problem spot                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| High expectations                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Use of musical vocabulary                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Specific and immediate correction                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Specific instructions                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| (no response)                                     | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Succinct directions                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Picky                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Lead by example                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Language                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Good description of what he wanted                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Fights for what he wants                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Attention to detail                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Gives good info                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Broke it down                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Very good instruction                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Problem fixer                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Instruct very well                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Effectively corrected mistake                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Explains well                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Sequencing                                        | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| (no response)                                     | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Demonstrated                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Addressed problems specifically                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Fixed the problems with little verbiage           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Calm                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Constructive feedback                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clear instructions                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Gave example of how [it] should sound             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Good                                              | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| Explained well                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Very specific                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| First time not playing through issue, only saying | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Effective rehearsal                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Good comments                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Very focused                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |

Teacher I (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                       | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Good demonstration with energy  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Doesn't settle for poor quality | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clear communication             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Great model                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Clear instructions              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Gave a good model               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Good instruction                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Great pacing                    | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Conducting                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Demonstrated what he wanted     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Cussing                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Eye contact could be more       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |

Teacher J (Challenged)

| Attribute                                | Classification Categories |             |                             | Rating |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Class control                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Out of control                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| No control - too much chaos              | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 3      |
| Disorganized                             | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization  | 2      |
| Not in command of the class              | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| Waste of class time                      | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization  | 1      |
| Class management                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| Classroom control                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Not good                                 | Miscellaneous             |             |                             | 2      |
| Where's the teaching?                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication | 1      |
| Room out of control                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Not [a] controlled classroom environment | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| Wasted time                              | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization  | 2      |
| Kids talked too much                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Talking                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| Talkative class                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| One of the kids (he is)                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| Poor group control                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Yuck                                     | Miscellaneous             |             |                             | 1      |
| Confusion                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Students talking - no control            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 3      |
| Too much joking around                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Too much talking by the students         | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| No classroom structure/discipline        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| Control of class                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| Only spoke to some students              | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Too much going on                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| No control                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 4      |
| Students not listening                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 3      |
| Too much noise                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| Chaos                                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Noisy classroom                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |
| No attention - distracted                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| Not in control of behavior               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 3      |
| Class out of control                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 2      |
| No control                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management        | 1      |

Teacher J (Challenged) – Continued

| Attribute                                 | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Wastes time                               | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| Lack of discipline                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Noisy classroom                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| What teaching occurred?                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Lack of classroom control                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Seems disjointed                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Lack of respect for teacher               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| No discipline                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| No initial control and classroom focus    | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Class control                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Way out of control of class               | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Lacking discipline                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Lack [of] classroom management            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Too friendly with students                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Fun, but not working                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| No discipline                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Not enough control                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| No control                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| No learning going on                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| No control                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Classroom management                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Too much noise                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Watched clock                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Humor                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| No control                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Wasted time                               | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 1      |
| Classroom management                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| No classroom control                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Could turn it on/off                      | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Get student's attention                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| Not professional                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Classroom discipline                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Teaching not only conversation in room    | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |
| Having fun                                | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Use time more effectively                 | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| Students talking about whatever they want | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 1      |

Teacher J (Challenged) – Continued

| Attribute                         |            | Classification Categories |                                 |  | Rating |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------|
| Good energy                       | Social     | Effective                 | Non-instructional Communication |  | 4      |
| Lack of control                   | Social     | Ineffective               | Classroom Management            |  | 2      |
| Classroom management              | Social     | Ineffective               | Classroom Management            |  | 1      |
| No goal                           | Social     | Ineffective               | Instructional Communication     |  | 3      |
| Completely off task               | Social     | Ineffective               | Classroom Management            |  | 3      |
| No control                        | Social     | Ineffective               | Classroom Management            |  | 1      |
| No teaching occurred              | Social     | Ineffective               | Instructional Communication     |  | 1      |
| Wasting time                      | Non-social | Ineffective               | Instructional Organization      |  | 3      |
| No control                        | Social     | Ineffective               | Classroom Management            |  | 1      |
| Poor class control                | Social     | Ineffective               | Classroom Management            |  | 2      |
| Classroom control                 | Social     | Ineffective               | Classroom Management            |  | 1      |
| Doesn't have control of classroom | Social     | Ineffective               | Classroom Management            |  | 1      |



Teacher K (Exemplary)

| Attribute                                                      | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Demonstrating                                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Well-prepared                                                  | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Good demo                                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Teaches and fine tunes with each group                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Didn't correct pitches                                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Didn't teach effectively                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Did not correct the problem                                    | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Use of time                                                    | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Sing more to male sound                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Students need more section rehearsal                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Good musical analysis                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Choral director can't sing                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Poor pitch correction                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Good hand motions of teacher                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Breaking down parts                                            | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Nice flow - continuous                                         | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Moderately engaging                                            | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Kept things moving                                             | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Good direction                                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Told students exactly what she wanted to hear                  | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Specific expectations                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Not fixing errors                                              | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Engages the students                                           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| No sense of pitch accuracy from the director                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Example                                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Quick explanation                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 7      |
| Specific directions                                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Fast paced                                                     | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Isolates problems without leaving the other parts for too long | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 5      |
| Needs to provide concrete pitch reference                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Guided practice                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Short, clear                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Adding, but not necessarily connecting                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Students attentive and cooperating                             | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Sang examples for them                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Body engaging                                                  | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |

Teacher K (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                                                  | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Always faced class                                         | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Determined                                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Too much repetition of incorrect notes before correct ones | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Isolated but tenors never really sang it correctly         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Lack of energy                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Class needs to pay close attention                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Nice energy                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Pace                                                       | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 7      |
| Classroom attention                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Repetition                                                 | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| She engaged them nicely                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 5      |
| Modeling good                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Attention to detail                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Isolating problem sections individually                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Not fixing the problem                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Repetition helps                                           | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Lazy                                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| No instruction                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Engaging                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Promptly fixed problems                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Arms                                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Communication                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Encouraging                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Nice gestures                                              | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Musicianship                                               | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Positive feedback                                          | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Instruction                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Direct instructions                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Eye contact                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Student having stress, but teacher [was] patient           | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Sang/demonstrated well                                     | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Not specific                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Good model                                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Really bad choir                                           | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 4      |
| Keeps everyone busy/on task                                | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Approval error                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |

Teacher K (Exemplary) – Continued

| Attribute                             | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Good energy                           | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Isolate problem                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Approval error                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Lazy                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Great model                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Picked out trouble spots              | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Great changing of teaching position   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 7      |
| Good energy                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 6      |
| Pacing                                | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 6      |
| Didn't really insist on correct notes | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Classroom control                     | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 7      |
| Good pacing                           | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |

Teacher L (Challenged)

| Attribute                                                    | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Correcting                                                   | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Class time spent on preparation problems                     | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| No student choices - all teacher driven                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Fine tunes individually                                      | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Poor body language                                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Was not teaching                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Gives too much empty time                                    | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Energy                                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| OK                                                           | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Ask students about their pitch instead of telling them first | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Perfect pitch?                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| No body language                                             | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Boring                                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Good that he gave feedback to each one who played            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Needs to give a model of pitch                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Replay - speaking                                            | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Not really teaching                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Too much of group uninvolved                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Wasted time for class                                        | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 1      |
| Discouraging                                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Ineffective use of time                                      | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Too much time getting started                                | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Can't understand what he is saying                           | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Got to each individual with little wait time                 | Non-social                | Effective   | Instructional Organization      | 5      |
| Did not focus entire group on the task                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| Get hands out of pocket                                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 1      |
| Specific directions                                          | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Get student to use their ear, [don't] give notes             | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Stops for individual instruction                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Too much teacher talk                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Students had no say in tuning                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Like that individuals are playing and he is tuning           | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Individually centered                                        | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Gave individual attention                                    | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Should give example to match pitch to                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3      |
| Boring                                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |

Teacher L (Challenged) – Continued

| Attribute                                                    | Classification Categories |             |                                 | Rating |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Hmmm...                                                      | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| (no response)                                                | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Good use of instant feedback                                 | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| (no response)                                                | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 6      |
| Hard to tell what was going on                               | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| Used far too much [time] on one student                      | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 2      |
| What are they doing?                                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Talks too much                                               | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Time management                                              | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| What are the other player's doing                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Speaks too softly                                            | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Too much time tuning                                         | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2      |
| Example too short to evaluate                                | Miscellaneous             |             |                                 | 5      |
| He didn't say anything wrong, but he didn't give useful info | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Too much individual time                                     | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Should tune as an ensemble                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Too relaxed                                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4      |
| Inconsistent                                                 | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Looked sloppy                                                | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Works one on one                                             | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Mannerisms                                                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Attention [to] problem                                       | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 5      |
| Ignored rest of ensemble                                     | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 4      |
| Very specific                                                | Social                    | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6      |
| Too much time on one person                                  | Social                    | Ineffective | Classroom Management            | 3      |
| No feedback to group                                         | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 1      |
| Temper                                                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2      |
| Dress                                                        | Social                    | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3      |
| Not helping students know what's wrong                       | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Too verbal, needed to help with actual things more           | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 4      |
| Didn't let students figure out [for] themselves              | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Too much time on one student                                 | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3      |
| Classroom disciplined to allow each student time to tune     | Social                    | Effective   | Classroom Management            | 6      |
| Didn't know anything about his own players                   | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |
| Seemed unprepared at the beginning                           | Non-social                | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 4      |
| Not a lot going on, should ask students what they think      | Social                    | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2      |

Teacher L (Challenged) – Continued

| <b>Attribute</b>                                   | <b>Classification Categories</b> |             |                                 | <b>Rating</b> |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Wasting time with that amount of individual tuning | Non-social                       | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3             |
| Unaware of who has played                          | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 3             |
| Clarity of speech                                  | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4             |
| Specific feedback                                  | Social                           | Effective   | Instructional Communication     | 6             |
| He seems confused about what's going on            | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 2             |
| Not clear on what he wanted                        | Social                           | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 3             |
| Tuned for the students                             | Social                           | Ineffective | Instructional Communication     | 2             |
| No energy                                          | Social                           | Ineffective | Non-instructional Communication | 4             |
| Takes too much time                                | Non-social                       | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 1             |
| Not managing class time effectively                | Non-social                       | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2             |
| Should have done before class                      | Non-social                       | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 2             |
| Wasting rehearsal time for individual instruction  | Non-social                       | Ineffective | Instructional Organization      | 3             |

## REFERENCES

- Ackerman, P. J. (1996). A theory of adult intellectual development: Process, personality, interests, and knowledge. *Intelligence*, 22, 229-259.
- Ackerman, P. J., & Heggestad, E. D. (1997). Intelligence, personality, and interests: Evidence for overlapping traits. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121, 219-245.
- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 431-441.
- Archer, D., & Akert, R. M. (1977). Words and everything else: Verbal and nonverbal cues in social interpretation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 443-449.
- Archer, D., & Costanzo, M. (1987). *The Interpersonal Perception Task (IPT)* (Video). (Available from University of California Extension Center for Media and Independent Learning, 2000 Center Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Berkeley, California 94704).
- Archer, D., Costanzo, M., & Akert, R. (2001). The Interpersonal Perception Task (IPT): Alternative approaches to problems of theory and design. In J. H. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *Interpersonal sensitivity: Theory and management*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Aristotle. (1997). *The politics of Aristotle*. (P. L. Simpson, Trans.). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Arnold, J. A. (1991). Using videotape self-analysis to improve teaching during rehearsals. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 10, 10-14.
- Arnold, J. A. (1995). Effects of competency-based methods of instruction and self observation on ensemble directors' use of sequential patterns. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 43, 127-138.
- Arthur, J. A. (2003). *Experienced teachers use of time in choral rehearsals of beginning and advanced choirs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Autry, J. A. (2001). *The Servant Leader: How to Build a Creative Team, Develop Great Morale, and Improve Bottom-Line Performance*. Roseville, CA.: Prima Publishing.
- Baker, D. S. (1991). *The development of the Pre-Service Teaching Evaluation*. Unpublished manuscript.

- Baker, P. J. (1981). The development of music teacher checklists for use by administrators, music supervisors, and teachers in evaluating music teaching effectiveness. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42(08A), 3489.
- Bales, R. F. (1950). A set of categories for the analysis of small group interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 15, 257-263.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical Manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Barr, A. S. (1950). Teaching competencies. In W. S. Monroe (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. New York: Macmillan.
- Barr, A. S., Burton, W. H., & Brueckner, L. J. (1947). *Supervision: Democratic Leadership in the Improvement of Learning* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). New York: Appleton-Century.
- Barr, A. S., Eustice, D. E., & Noe, E. J. (1955). The measurement and prediction of teacher efficiency. *Review of Educational Research*, 25, 261-269.
- Barth, G. W. (1961). *Some personality and temperament characteristics of selected school music teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Benson, W. L. (1989). The effect of models, self-observation, and evaluation on the modification of specified teaching behaviors of an applied music teacher. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 7, 28-31.
- Berg, C. A. (1989). Knowledge of strategies for dealing with everyday problems from childhood through adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 607-618.
- Berg, C. A., & Calderone, K. S. (1994). The role of problem interpretations in understanding the development of everyday problem solving. In R. J. Sternberg & R. K. Wagner (Eds.), *Mind in context: Interactionist perspectives on human intelligence* (pp. 105-132). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bergee, M. J., Coffman, D. D., Demorest, S. M., Humphreys, J. T., & Thorton, L. P. (2001). Influences on collegiate students' decision to become a music educator. (Summary available on the MENC Web site at <http://www..menc.org/networks/rnc/Bergee-Report.html>).
- Berliner, D. C. (1976). Impediments to the study of teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 27(2), 5-13.
- Bernieri, F. J. (1991). Interpersonal sensitivity in teaching interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17, 98-103.



- Berry, J. W. (1984). Towards a universal psychology of cognitive competence. In P. S. Fry (Ed.), *Changing conceptions of intelligence and intellectual functioning* (pp. 35-61). Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Bessom, M. E., Tatarunis, A. M., & Forcucci, S. L. (1980). *Teaching music in today's secondary schools: A creative approach to contemporary music education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Binet, A., & Simon, T. (1905). Methodes nouvelles por le diagnostic du niveau intellectuel des anormaux. [New methods for the diagnosis of the intellectual level of the abnormal ones]. *L'Annee Psychologique*, 11, 191-244.
- Binet, A. (1910). *Les Idees modernes sur le enfants*. [The modern ideas on the children]. Paris: E. Flammarion.
- Binet, A., & Henri, V. (1896). La psychologie individuelle. [Individual Psychology]. *L'Annee Psychologique*, 2, 411-465.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5, 7-75.
- Blair, T. R. (1984). Teacher effectiveness: The know-how to improve student learning. *The Reading Teacher*, 38, 138-142.
- Blocher, L., Greenwood, R., Shellahamer, B. (1997). Teaching behaviors of middle school and high school band directors in the rehearsal setting. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 457-469.
- Bolton, T. L. (1891-1892). The growth of memory in children. *American Journal of Psychology*, 4, 362-380.
- Bowers, J. (1997). Sequential patterns and the music teaching effectiveness of elementary education majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 428-443.
- Boyce, P. M., & Parker, G. (1989). Development of a scale to measure interpersonal sensitivity. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 23, 341-351.
- Brand, M. (1985). Research in music teacher effectiveness. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 3(2), 13-16.
- Brand, R. S. (1986, October). On the expert teacher: A conversation with David Berliner. *Educational Leadership*, 4-9.
- Brody, N. (2000). History of theories and measurements of intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Intelligence* (pp. 16-33). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 5-32.
- Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Brophy, J. E. (1979). *Advances in teacher effectiveness research*. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education annual meeting, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED170281).
- Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. (1976). *Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Buck, R. (1976). A test of nonverbal receiving ability: Preliminary studies. *Human Communication Research*, 2, 162-171.
- Buck, R. (1979). Measuring individual differences in the nonverbal communication of affect: The slide-viewing paradigm. *Human Communication Research*, 6, 47-57.
- Buck, R. (1980). Nonverbal behavior and the theory of emotion: The facial feedback hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 811-824.
- Buhrmester, D., Furman, W., Wittenberg, M. T., & Reis, H. T. (1988). Five domains of interpersonal competence in peer relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 991-1008.
- Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G. (1989). *Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burt, C. (1955). The evidence for the concept of intelligence. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 25, 158-177.
- Bush, J., & Marshall, P. (1999). The inter-relationship between self-monitoring, interpersonal perception, and acting training. Unpublished manuscript.
- Butts, R. F. (1943). Teacher education. In H. N. Rivlin (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Modern Education*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Byo, J. L. (1990). Recognition of intensity contrasts in the gestures of beginning conductors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 38, 157-163.
- Byo, J. L., & Austin, K. R. (1994). Comparison of expert and novice conductors: An approach to the analysis of nonverbal behaviors. *Journal of Band Research*, 30(1), 11-34.

- Caldwell, W. M. (1980). A time analysis of selected musical elements and leadership behaviors of successful high school choral conductors (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41(3A), 976.
- Campbell, J., & McCord, D. (1996). The WAIS-R comprehension and picture arrangement subtests as measures of social intelligence: Testing additional interpretations. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 14, 240-249.
- Cangelosi, J. S. (1986). Evaluating teaching within a teacher advancement plan. *Clearing House*, 59, 405-409.
- Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J. (Eds.), (1987). *Personality and social intelligence*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cassidy, J. W. (1989, November). *The use of an instruction observation form and delivery observation form in the study of teacher intensity: A pilot*. Paper presented at the national convention of National Association for Music Therapy, Kansas City, MO.
- Cassidy, J. W. (1990). Effect of intensity training on preservice teachers' instruction accuracy and delivery effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 38, 164-174.
- Cassidy, J. W. (1993). A comparison between students' self-observation and instructor observation of teacher intensity behaviors. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 115, 15-29.
- Cassidy, J. W., & Madsen, C. K. (1987). *The effect of training in high versus low presentation styles on teacher intensity*. Paper presented at the national convention of the National Association for Music Therapy, San Francisco.
- Cattell, J. M. (1890). Mental test and measurements. *Mind*, 15, 373-381.
- Cattell, R. B. (1987). *Intelligence: Its structure growth and action*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). *Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Chapin, F. S. (1942). Preliminary standardization of a social insight scale. *American Sociological Review*, 7, 214-225.
- Charters, W. W., & Waples, D. (1929). *The commonwealth teacher-training study*. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press.
- Cheek, J. M. (1982). Aggregation, moderator variables, and the validity of personality tests: A peer-rating study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 1254-1269.

- Chen, S. A., & Michael, W. B. (1993). First-order and higher-order factors of creative social intelligence within Guilford's structure-of-intellect model: A reanalysis of a Guilford data base. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 53, 619-641.
- Ciarrochi, J., & Mayer, J. D. (2007). *Applying emotional intelligence: A practitioner's guide*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Collins, M. L. (1978). Effects of enthusiasm training on preservice elementary teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29, 53-57.
- Conway, C. (2002). Perceptions of beginning teachers, their mentors, and administrators regarding preservice music teacher preparation. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50, 20-36.
- Cooke, D. H., & Ayers, A. R. (1943). Rating of teachers. In H. N. Rivlin (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Modern Education*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Cornelius-White, J. H. D. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 113-143.
- M. Costanzo (personal communication, March 10, 2008).
- Costanzo, M. (1992). Training students to decode verbal and nonverbal cues: Effects of confidence and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 308-313.
- Costanzo, M., & Archer, D. (1991). A method of teaching about verbal and nonverbal communication. *Teaching of Psychology*, 18(4), 223-226.
- Costanzo, M., & Archer, D. (1993). *The Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15)*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Center for Media and Independent Learning.
- Costanzo, M., & Archer, D. (1994). *The Interpersonal Perception Task-15 (IPT-15): A guide for researchers and teachers*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Center for Media and Independent Learning.
- Cottrell, L. S., & Dymond, R. A. (1949). The empathic responses: A neglected field for research. *Psychiatry*, 12, 355-359.
- Covey, S. R. (1989). *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. New York: Free Press.
- Covey, S. R. (2004). *The 8th Habit: From Effectiveness to Greatness*. New York: Free Press.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1976). Appendix I: Measuring mental ability: Lingered questions and loose ends. In B. D. Davis & P. Flaherty (Eds.), *Human Diversity: Its Causes and Social Significance*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

- Cronbach, L. J. (1990). *Essentials of psychological testing* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *The origin of species*. London: Murray.
- Darwin, C. (1872/1965). *The expression of emotions in man and animals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Das, J. P. (1994). Eastern views of intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human intelligence* (Vol. 1, pp. 387-391). New York: Macmillan.
- Davis, M. H., & Kraus, L. A. (1997). Personality and empathic accuracy. In W. Ickes (Ed.), *Empathic Accuracy* (pp. 144-168). New York: Guilford Press.
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, M. R. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 627-668.
- DePugh, D. L. (1987). Characteristics of successful senior high school choral directors in the State of Missouri: A survey of teacher self-perception and student and administrator assessment. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48(10A), 2568.
- Doyle, W. (1981). Research on classroom contexts. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(8), 3-6.
- Duke, R. A. (1999/2000). Measures of instructional effectiveness in music research. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 143, 1-49.
- Duke, R. A., Prickett, C. A., & Jellison, J. A. (1998). Empirical description of the pace of music instruction. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46(2), 265-280.
- Dunn, D. E. (1997). Effect of rehearsal hierarchy and reinforcement on attention, achievement, and attitude of selected choirs. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45 (4), 547-567.
- Dvorak, B. J. (1947). The new USES General Aptitude Test Battery. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 31, 373-376.
- Ebbinghaus, H. (1897). Uber eine neue Methode zur Prufung geistiger Fahigkeiten und ihre Anwendung bei Schulkindern. [Overview of a new method of the test of intellectual capacities and their application with school children]. *Zeitschrift fur angewandte Psychologie*, 13, 401-459.
- Educational Testing Service (1977). *Basic Skills Assessment Test: Reading*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

- Ekman, P. (1973). *Darwin and facial expression: A century of research in review*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1974). Nonverbal behavior and psychopathology. In R. J. Friedman & M. Katz (Eds.), *The psychology of depression: Contemporary theory and research* (pp. 3-31). Washington, DC: Winston & Sons.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1978). *Facial Action Coding System*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., & Hager, J. C. (2002). *The facial action coding system CD-ROM*. Salt Lake City, UT: Research Nexus.
- Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., & Tomkins, S. S. (1971). Facial Affect Scoring Technique: A first validity study. *Semiotica*, 3, 37-58.
- Ekman, P., & Rosenberg, E. (Eds.), (1997). *What the face reveals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1959). *The Maudsley Personality Inventory*. London: University of London Press.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1971). *Race, intelligence, and education*. London: Temple Smith.
- Ferguson, G. A. (1954). On learning and human ability. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 8, 95-112.
- Fiocca, P. D. H. (1986). A descriptive analysis of the rehearsal behaviors of selected exemplary junior high and middle school choir directors. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47(7A), 2361.
- Flanders, N. A. (1964). Some relationships between teacher influence, pupil attitudes, and achievement. In B. J. Biddle & W. J. Ellena (Eds.), *Contemporary research on teacher effectiveness* (pp. 196-231). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Flanders, N. A. (1966). *Interaction analysis in the classroom: A manual for observers*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan.
- Flynn, J. R. (2007). *What is Intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, M. E. (1982). Social cognition and social competence in adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 323-340.

- Ford, M. E. (1986). For all practical purposes: Criteria for defining and evaluating practical intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg & R. K. Wagner (Eds.), *Practical intelligence: Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world* (pp. 183-200). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, M. E., & Miura, I. (1983, August). *Children's and adults' conceptions of social competence*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, CA.
- Ford, M. E., & Tisak, M. S. (1983). A further search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 196-206.
- Forsythe, J. L. (1975). The effect of teacher approval, disapproval, and errors on student attentiveness: Music versus classroom teachers. In C. K. Madsen, R. D. Greer, & C. H. Madsen, Jr. (Eds.), *Research in Music Behavior: Modifying Music Behavior in the Classroom*. New York: College Teaching Press.
- Forsythe, J. L. (1977). Elementary student attending behavior as a function of classroom activities. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 25, 228-239.
- Fraser, B. J., Walberg, H. J., Welch, W. W., Hattie, J. A. (1987). Synthesis of educational productivity research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11, 145-252.
- Frederick the Great. (1981). *Anti-Machiavel*. (P. Sonnino, Trans.). Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Frederick the Great. (2005). Instructions to his generals (T. Phillips, Trans.). In M. A. Moore (Ed.). *The Art of War*. Birmingham, AL.: Sweetwater Press.
- Frederiksen, N. (1986). Toward a broader conception of human intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg & R. K. Wagner (Eds.), *Practical intelligence: Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world* (pp. 84-116). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fredrickson, W. E. (1992). Research on eye contact with implications for the conductor: A review of literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 11(1), 25-31.
- Friedman, H. S., Prince, L. M., Riggio, R. E., & DiMatteo, M. R. (1980). Understanding and assessing nonverbal expressiveness: The Affective Communication Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 333-351.
- Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. London: Macmillan.
- Galton, F. (1883). *An inquiry into human faculty*. London: Macmillan.

- Galton, F. (1888). Co-relations and their measurement, chiefly from anthropological data. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 45, 135-145.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic.
- Gesn, P. R., & Ickes, W. (1999). The development of meaning contexts for empathic accuracy: Channel and sequence effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 746-761.
- Gladwell, M. (2007, December 17). None of the above. *The New Yorker*, 83(40), 92-96.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Dell.
- Goleman, D. (2006). *Social Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Dell.
- Goodnow, J. J. (1986). Some lifelong everyday forms of intelligent behavior: Organizing and reorganizing. In R. J. Sternberg & R. K. Wagner (Eds.), *Practical intelligence: Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world* (pp. 143-162). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodstein, R. E. (1984). An investigation into leadership behaviors and descriptive characteristics of band directors in the United States. (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45(8A), 2433.
- Goody, E. E. (Ed.), (1995). *Social intelligence and interaction: Expressions and implications of the social bias in human intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goolsby, T. W. (1996). Time use in instrumental rehearsals. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 44, 286-304.
- Goolsby, T. W. (1997). Verbal instruction in instrumental rehearsals: A comparison of three career levels and preservice teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 21-40.
- Gough, H. G. (1964). *Manual for the California Psychological Inventory*. (Rev. Ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Grant, J. W., & Drafall, L. E. (1991). Teacher effectiveness research: a review and comparison. *Council for Research in Music Education Bulletin*, 108, 31-48.
- Grechesky, R. N. (1986). An analysis of nonverbal and verbal conducting behaviors and their relationship to expressive musical performance. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Madison-Wisconsin). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 2956A.
- Greer, R. D. (1980). *Design for music learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.



- Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Guilford, J. P., & Lacey, J. I. (Eds.). (1947). *Printed classification tests: Army Air Forces Aviation Psychology Research Program Reports*. Rep. No. 5. Washington, DC: GPO.
- Guilford, J. P., & Zimmerman, W. S. (1948). *The Guilford-Zimmerman Aptitude Survey*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sheridan Psychological Services.
- Hall, J. A. (1984). *Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hall, J. A. (2001). The PONS test and the psychometric approach to measuring interpersonal sensitivity. In J. H. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *Interpersonal Sensitivity: Theory and Management*. Mahwah, N. J.: Erlbaum.
- Hall, J. A., & Bernieri F. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Interpersonal Sensitivity: Theory and Management*. Mahwah, N. J.: Erlbaum.
- Hamachek, D. (1975). Characteristics of good teachers and implication for teacher educators. In M. Mohan & R. E. Hull (Eds.), *Teaching Effectiveness: Its Meaning, Assessment, and Improvement*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology.
- Hamann, D. L. (1995). Preservice teachers' teaching effectiveness and social skill development. *Southeastern Journal of Music Education*, 7, 1-12.
- Hamann, D. L., & Baker, D. (1995). *Survey of Teaching Effectiveness*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hamann, D. L., Baker, D. S., McAllister, P. A., & Bauer, W. I. (2000). Factors affecting university music students' perceptions of lesson quality and teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 48, 102-113.
- Hamann, D. L., Lineburgh, N., & Paul, S. (1998). Teaching effectiveness and social skill development. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46, 87-101.
- Hancock, C. B. (2003). An examination of preservice teaching intensity in relation to in-service teacher retention and attrition. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51, 166-178.
- Hartigan, J. A., & Wigdor, A. K. (1989). *Fairness in employment testing*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1943). *Manual for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. New York: Psychological Corporation.
- Hatsorf, A., Schneider, D., & Polefka, J. (1970). *Person perception*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 81-112.
- Hendel, C. (1995). Behavioral characteristics and instructional patterns of selected music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 43, 182-203.
- Hendricks, M., Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. (1969). Measuring creating social intelligence. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 42.
- Herrnstein, R. J. (1973). *IQ in the Meritocracy*. Boston: Atlantic-Little Brown.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Boring, E. G. (1965). *A source book in the history of psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press.
- Hodgins, H., & Zuckerman, M. (1990). The effect of nonverbal sensitivity on social interaction. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 24, 155-170.
- Hoepfner, R., & O'Sullivan, M. (1969). Social intelligence and IQ. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 28, 339-344.
- Hogan, R. (1969). Development of an empathy scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33, 307-316.
- Hogan, R., & Henley, N. (1970). *A test of the empathy-effective communication hypothesis* (Tech. Rep. No. 84). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools. (*Psychological Abstracts*, 1971, 46, Abstract No. 4893).
- Hunt, T. (1928). The measurement of social intelligence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 12, 317-334.
- Hunt, J. M. (1961). *Intelligence and experience*. New York: Ronald.
- Ickes, W. (1993). Empathic accuracy. *Journal of Personality*, 61, 587-610.
- Ickes, W. (Ed.). (1997). *Empathic Accuracy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Ickes, W. (2001). Measuring empathic accuracy. In J. H. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *Interpersonal Sensitivity: Theory and Management*. Mahwah, N. J.: Erlbaum.
- Ickes, W., Stinson, L., Bissonnette, V., & Garcia, S. (1990). Naturalistic social cognition: Empathic accuracy in mixed-sex dyads. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 730-742.

- Jastrow, J. (1891-1892). Some anthropological and psychologic tests on college students – A preliminary survey. *American Journal of Psychology*, 4, 420-427.
- Jellison, J. A., & Wolfe, D. E. (1987). Verbal training effects of teaching units: An exploratory study of music teaching antecedents and consequents. In C. K. Madsen & C. A. Prickett (Eds.), *Applications of Research in Music Behavior*. Tuscaloosa, AL.: University of Alabama Press.
- Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 39, 1-123.
- Jensen, A. R. (1980). *Bias in Mental Testing*. New York: Free Press.
- Jensen, A. R. (1998). *The g factor*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Johnson, C. M., & Memmott, J. E. (2006). Examination of relationships between participation in school music programs of differing quality and standardized test results. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 54, 293-307.
- Jones, K., & Day, J. D. (1997). Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive-social intelligence from academic intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 486-497.
- Jung, C. G. (1921/1971). *Psychological Types* (H. G. Baynes, Trans.; revised by R. F. C. Hull). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kagan, J. (1988). The meaning of personality predicates. *American Psychologist*, 43, 614-620.
- Kaiser, K. (1998). The effect of differentiated high versus low intensity on band musicians' evaluation of teaching effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(03), 764.
- Keating, D. K. (1978). A search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 39, 218-233.
- Kelly, S. N. (2000). Preservice music education student fears of the internship and initial inservice teaching experience. *Contributions to Music Education*, 27, 41-50.
- Kemp, A. E. (1979). *The personality structure of composers and performing musicians*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sussex.
- Kemp, A. E. (1982). Personality traits of successful music teachers. *Psychology of Music, Special Issue: Proceedings of the Ninth International Seminar on Research in Music Education*, 72-75.
- Kemp, A. E. (1996). *The Musical Temperament*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kerlinger, F. N. (1966). Attitudes toward education and perceptions of teacher characteristics: A *q* study. *American Educators Research Journal*, 3, 159-168.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1967). The factor structure and content of perceptions of desirable characteristics of teachers. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 27, 643-656.
- Kihlstrom, J. F., & Cantor, N. (2000). Social intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Intelligence* (pp. 359-379). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kipfer, B. A. (2005). *Roget's 21<sup>st</sup> Century Thesaurus in Dictionary Form*. New York: Bantam Dell.
- Knapp, M. L. & Hall, J. A. (2006). *Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA.: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Knudsen, C. W., & Stephens, S. (1931). An analysis of fifty-seven devices for rating teaching. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 9, 15-24.
- Kounin, J. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.
- Krueger, R. J. (1976). An investigation of personality and music teaching success. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 47, 16-25.
- Kuhn, T. L. (1975). The effect of teacher approval and disapproval on attentiveness, musical achievement, and attitude of fifth grade students. In C. K. Madsen, R. D. Greer, & C. H. Madsen, Jr. (Eds.). *Research in Music Behavior: Modifying Music Behavior in the Classroom*. New York: College Teaching Press.
- Lipsitz, J. D., Dworkin, R. H., & Erlenmeyer-Kimling, L. (1993). Wechsler Comprehension and Picture Arrangement subtests and social adjustment. *Psychological Assessment*, 5, 430-437.
- Machiavelli, N. (1984). *The Prince* (D. Donno, Trans.). New York: Random House.
- Maclin, J. P. (1993). The effect of task analysis on sequential patterns of music instruction. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41(1), 48-56.
- Madsen, C. K. (1982). The effect of contingent teacher approval and withholding performance on improved attentiveness. *Psychology of Music, Special Issue*, 76-81.
- Madsen, C. K. (1988). The relationship of teacher on-task to perceived teacher effectiveness. *Proceedings of the Current Issues in Music Education Symposium*, 13.
- Madsen, C. K. (1990). Teacher intensity in relationship to music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 104, 38-46.

- Madsen, C. K., & Alley, J. M. (1979). The effect of reinforcement on attentiveness: A comparison of behaviorally trained music therapists and other professionals with implications for competency-based academic preparation. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 16, 70-82.
- Madsen, C. K., & Duke, R. A. (1985a). Perception of approval/disapproval in music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 85, 119-129.
- Madsen, C. K., & Duke, R. A. (1985b). Observation of approval/disapproval in music: Perception versus actual classroom events. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 33, 205-214.
- Madsen, C. K., & Duke, R. A. (1987). The effect of teacher training on the ability to recognize need for giving approval for appropriate student behavior. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 91, 103-109.
- Madsen, C. K., & Geringer, J. M. (1989). The relationship of teacher “on-task” to intensity and effective music teaching. *Canadian Journal of Research in Music Education*, 30, 87-94.
- Madsen, C. K., & Kaiser, K. (1999). Pre-internship fears of student teaching. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 17, 27-32.
- Madsen, C. K., & Kelly, S. K. (2002). First remembrances of wanting to become a music teacher. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50, 323-332.
- Madsen, C. K., Standley, J. M., Byo, J. L., & Cassidy, J. W. (1992). Assessment of effective teaching by instrumental music student teachers and experts. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Behavior*, 10, 20-24.
- Madsen, C. K., Standley, J. M., & Cassidy, J. W. (1989). Demonstration and recognition of high and low contrasts in teacher intensity. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37, 85-92.
- Madsen, C. K., & Yarbrough, C. (1985). *Competency-Based Music Education*. Raleigh, N.C.: Contemporary Publishing.
- Madsen, K. (2003). The effect of accuracy of instruction, teacher delivery, and student attentiveness on musicians’ evaluation of teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51, 38-50.
- Madsen, K., & Cassidy, J. W. (2005). The effect of focus of attention and teaching experience on perceptions of teaching effectiveness and student learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53, 222-233.
- Madsen, Jr., C. H., & Madsen, C. K. (1998). *Teaching Discipline: A Positive Approach for educational development* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Raleigh, N.C.: Contemporary Publishing.

- Magill-Evans, J., Koning, C., Cameron-Savada, A., & Manyk, K. (1995). The Child and Adolescent Social Perception Measure. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 19, 151-169.
- Marlowe, H. A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, 52-58.
- Marlowe, R. H., Madsen, Jr., C. H., Bowen, C. E., Reardon, R. C., & Louge, P. E. (1978). Sever classroom problems: Teachers as counselors. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis*, 11, 53-66.
- Matsumoto, D., & Ekman, P. (1988). *Japanese and Caucasian facial expressions of emotion (JACFEE)* [Slides]. San Francisco, CA: Intercultural and Emotion Research Laboratory, Department of Psychology, San Francisco State University.
- Matsumoto, D., LeRoux, J., Wilson-Cohn, C., Raroque, J., Kookan, K., Ekman, P., et al. (2000). A new test to measure emotion recognition ability: Matsumoto and Ekman's Japanese and Caucasian Brief Affect Recognition Test (JABART). *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 24, 179-209.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-34). New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Intelligence* (pp. 396-420). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2002). *The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) Version 2.0*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Heath Systems.
- McClelland, D. C. (1973). Testing for competence rather than for "intelligence." *American Psychologist*, 28, 1-14.
- McCombs, B. L. (2003). Providing a framework for the redesign of K-12 education in the context of current educational reform issues. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(2), 93-101.
- McCombs, B. L. (2004). The learner-centered psychological principles: A framework for balancing a focus on academic achievement with a focus on social and emotional learning needs. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walber (Eds.), *Building academic success on social emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 23-39). New York: Teachers College Press.
- McCombs, B. L., & Whisler, J. S. (1997). *The learner-centered classroom and school: Strategies for increasing student motivation and achievement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- McDonald, F. J. (1976). Report on phase II of the beginning teacher evaluation study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 27(1), 39-42.
- McKean, E. (Ed.). (2005). *The New Oxford Dictionary* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. A. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, 40, 525-543.
- Mercer, J. R., Gomez-Palacio, M., & Padilla, E. (1986). The development of practical intelligence in cross-cultural perspective. In R. J. Sternberg & R. K. Wagner (Eds.), *Practical intelligence: Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world* (pp. 307-337). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (11<sup>th</sup> ed.). (2003). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Mills, C., & Hogan, R. (1978). A role theoretical interpretation of personality scale item responses. *Journal of Personality*, 46, 778-785.
- Moore, R. S. (1981). Comparative use of teaching time by American and British specialists. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 66-67, 62-68.
- Moore, R. S. (1987). Effects of age, sex, and activity on children's attentiveness in elementary school music classes. In C. K. Madsen & C. A. Prickett (Eds.), *Applications of research in music behavior* (pp. 26-31). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Moore, R. S., & Bonney, J. T. (1987). Comparative analysis of teaching time between student teachers and experienced teachers in general music. *Contributions to Music Education*, 14, 52-58.
- Moss, F. A., & Hunt, T. (1927). Are you socially intelligent? *Scientific American*, 137, 108-110.
- Myers, I. B. & McCauley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Napoles, J. (2007). The effect of duration of teacher talk on the attitude, attentiveness, and performance achievement of high school choral students. *Research Perspectives in Music Education*, 11, 22-29.
- Neisser, U. (1976). General, academic, and artificial intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg & D. Detterman (Eds.), *Human intelligence: Perspectives on its theory and measurement* (pp. 179-189). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Northcutt, C. A. (1991). *Successful Career Women: Their Professional and Personal Characteristics*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Nowicki, S. Jr. (1992). *Self-esteem and DANVA subtest scores*. Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, Atlanta.
- Nowicki, S. Jr., & Duke, M. P. (1992). The association of children's nonverbal decoding abilities with their popularity, locus of control, and academic achievement. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 153*, 385-394.
- Nowicki, S. Jr., & Duke, M. P. (1994). Individual differences in the nonverbal communication of affect: The Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy Scale. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 18*, 9-35.
- O'Sullivan, M. (1982). Measuring the ability to recognize facial expressions of emotion. In P. Ekman & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *Emotion in the human face* (pp. 281-317). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Sullivan, M., Guilford, J. P., & deMille, R. (1965). The measurement of social intelligence. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 34.
- Oehr, A. (1895). Experimentelle Studien zur Individual-psychologie. [Experimental studies to the individual-psychology]. *Psychologischen Arbeiten, 1*, 92-152.
- Okagaki, L., & Sternberg, R. J. (1993). Parental beliefs and children's school performance. *Child development, 64*, 36-56.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (2005). How job characteristics theory happened. In K. G. Smith & M. A. Hitt (Eds.), *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development*. Oxford: University Press.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Witcher, A. E., Collins, K. M. T., Flier, J. ., Wiedmaier, C. D., & Moore, C. W. (2007). Students perceptions of characteristics of effective college teachers: A validity study of a teaching evaluation form using a mixed-methods analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(1), 113-160.
- Oskamp, S. (1991). *Attitudes and opinions* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Overn, A. V. (1943). Teacher failure. In H. N. Rivlin (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Modern Education*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Peterson, J. (1925). *Early conceptions and tests of intelligence*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
- Piaget, J. (1972). *The psychology of intelligence*. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams.



- Plato. (1987). *The Republic*. (P. Shorey, Trans.). In E. Hamilton & H. Cairns (Eds.), *Plato: The collected dialogues*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pontious, M. F. (1982). A profile of rehearsal techniques and interaction of selected band conductors. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43(9A), 3351.
- Poplin, M., & Weeres, J. (1994). *Voices from the inside: A report on schooling from inside the classroom*. Claremont, CA: Institute for Education in Transformation at the Claremont Graduate School.
- Porter, A. C., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the Institute for Research on Teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 45(8), 74-85.
- Powell, M. (1978). Research on teaching. *The Educational Forum*, 43, 27-37.
- Price, H. E. (1992). Sequential patterns of music instruction and learning to use them. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 40, 14-29.
- Price, H. E. (1983). The effect of conductor academic task presentation, conductor reinforcement, and ensemble practice on performers' musical achievement, attentiveness, and attitude. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 31, 245-257.
- Price, H. E., & Yarbrough, C. (1993, January). *Effect of scripted sequential patterns of instruction in music rehearsals on teaching evaluations by college nonmusic majors*. Paper presented to the Southern Division of the Music Educators National Conference, Savannah, GA.
- Price, H. E. & Yarbrough, C. (1994/1995). Effect of scripted sequential patterns of instruction in music rehearsals on teaching evaluations by college nonmusic students. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 119, 170-178.
- Quetelet, M. (1849). *Letters on probabilities*. London: Layton.
- Riggio, R. E. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 649-660.
- Riggio, R. E. (1989). *Social Skills Inventory: Research edition*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Riggio, R. E. (2005). The Social Skills Inventory (SSI): Measuring nonverbal and social skills. In V. Manusov (Ed.), *The sourcebook of nonverbal measures: Going beyond words* (pp. 25-33). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Riggio, R. E., Aguirre, M., Mayes, B. T., Belloli, C., & Kubiak, C. (1997). The use of assessment center methods for student outcome assessment. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12, 273-288.
- Riggio, R. E., & Carney, D. R. (2003). *Social skills Inventory manual: Second edition*. Redwood City, CA: MindGarden.
- Riggio, R. E., Messamer, J., & Throckmorton, B. (1991). Social and academic intelligence: Conceptually distinct but overlapping constructs. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 12, 695-702.
- Riggio, R. E., & Riggio, H. R. (2001). Self-report measurement of interpersonal sensitivity. In J. H. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *Interpersonal Sensitivity: Theory and Management*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Riggio, R. E., Riggio, H. R., Salinas, C., & Cole, E. J. (2003). The role of social and emotional communication skills in leader emergence and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7, 83-103.
- Riggio, R. E., & Taylor, S. J. (2000). Personality and communication skills as predictors of hospice nurse performance. *Journal of Business and Personality*, 15, 347-357.
- Riggio, R. E., Widaman, K. F., Tucker, J. S., & Salinas, C. (1991). Beauty is more than skin deep: Components of attractiveness. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 12, 423-439.
- Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (Eds.). (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*. New York: Academic.
- Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 21, 95-103.
- Rosenberg, E. L., & Ekman, P. (2005). Coherence between expressive and experiential systems in emotion. In P. Ekman & E. L. Rosenberg (Eds.), *What the face reveals* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 63-85). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenshine, B. (1976). Recent research on teaching behaviors and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 27(1), 61-64.
- Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83, 335-351.
- Rosenthal, R., Hall, J. A., Archer, D., DiMatteo, M. R., & Rogers, P. L. (1977). The PONS Tests: Measuring sensitivity to nonverbal cues. In P. McReynolds (Ed.), *Advances in psychological assessment* (Vol. 4, pp. 179-221). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Rosenthal, R., Hall, J. A., DiMatteo, M. R., Rogers, P. L., & Archer, D. (1979). *Sensitivity to nonverbal communication: The PONS test*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rowan, B., Correnti, R., & Miller, R. J. (2002). What large-scale, survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from the Prospects study of elementary schools. *Teachers College Record*, 104, 1525-1567.
- Ruzgis, P. M., & Grigorenko, E. L. (1994). Cultural meaning systems, intelligence and personality. In R. J. Sternberg and P. Ruzgis (Eds.), *Personality and intelligence* (pp. 248-270). New York: Cambridge.
- Ryans, D. G. (1960). *Characteristics of Teachers*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Ryans, D. G. (1975). Teacher behavior can be evaluated. In M. Mohan & R. E. Hull (Eds.), *Teaching Effectiveness: Its Meaning, Assessment, and Improvement*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology.
- Ryans, D. G., & Wandt, E. (1952). A factor analysis of observed teacher behaviors in the secondary school: A study of criterion data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 12, 574-86.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185-211.
- Scheerens, J., & Bosker, R. J. (1997). *The foundations of educational effectiveness*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Schmidt, C. P. (1989a). Applied music teaching behavior as a function of selected personality variables. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37, 258-271.
- Schmidt, C. P. (1989b). Individual differences in perception of applied music teaching feedback. *Psychology of Music*, 17, 110-122.
- Schroeder, J. (1995). Interpersonal perception skills: self-concept correlates. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 80, 51-56.
- Seidel, T., & Shavelson, R. J. (2007). Teaching effectiveness research in the past decade: The role of theory and research design in disentangling meta-analysis results. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 454-499.
- Seligman, D. (1992). *A question of intelligence: The IQ debate in America*. New York: Birch Lane Press.
- Serpell, R. (1974). Aspects of intelligence in a developing country. *African Social Research*, 17, 576-596.

- Shannon, J. R. (1928). *Personal and Social Traits Requisite for High Grade Teaching in Secondary Schools*. Terre Haute, I.N.: State Normal Press.
- Sherill, M. H. (1986). *An analytical study of videotaped rehearsal and conducting techniques of selected junior and senior high school band conductors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester.
- Showers, C., & Cantor, N. (1985). Social cognition: A look at motivated strategies. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36, 275-305.
- Siebenaler, D. (1997). Analysis of teacher-student interactions in the piano lessons of children and adults. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 6-20.
- Siegmán, A. W., & Feldstein, S. (Eds.), (1995). *Multichannel integrations of nonverbal behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sims, W. L. (1986). The effect of high versus low teacher affect and passive versus active student activity during music listening on preschool children's attention, piece preference, time spent listening, and piece recognition. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 34, 173-191.
- Smith, B. O. (1971). *Research in teacher education*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Smith, K. G., & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.), (2005). *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development*. Oxford: University Press.
- Snyderman, M., & Rothman, S. (1988). *The IQ Controversy: The Media and Public Policy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Spearman, C. (1904). "General intelligence": Objectively determined and measured. *American Journal of Psychology*, 15, 201-292.
- Spearman, C. (1927). *The Abilities of Man*. New York: Macmillan.
- Speer, D. (1994). An analysis of sequential patterns of instruction in piano lessons. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 42, 14-26.
- Spencer, H. (1895). *The Principles of Psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Appleton.
- Spradling, R. L. (1985). The effect of timeout from performance on attentiveness and attitude of university band students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 33, 123-138.
- Stern, W. L. (1912). *Psychologischen Methoden der Intelligenz-Prüfung*. [Psychological methods of the intelligence-test]. Leipzig: Barth.

- Standley, J. M., & Madsen, C. K. (1987). Intensity as an attribute of effective therapist/client interaction. *Quodlibet, Summer*, 15-21.
- Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.), (2000). *Handbook of Intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Berg, C. A. (1986). Quantitative integration: Definition of intelligence: A comparison of the 1921 and 1986 symposia. In R. J. Sternberg & D. K. Detterman (Eds.), *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition* (pp. 155-162). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Sternberg, R. J., Conway, B. E., Ketron, J. L., & Bernstein, M. (1981). People's conceptions of intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 37-55.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Kaufman, J. C. (1988). Human abilities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 479-502.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Wagner, R. K. (Eds.). (1986). *Practical intelligence: Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stigler, S. S. (1986). *The history of statistics: The measurement of uncertainty before 1900*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stinson, L., & Ickes, W. (1992). Empathic accuracy in the interactions of male friends versus male strangers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 787-797.
- Taebel, D. K. (1980). Public school music teachers' perceptions of the effect of certain competencies on pupil learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 28, 185-197.
- Taebel, D. K., & Coker, J. G. (1980). Teaching effectiveness in elementary classroom music: Relationships among competency measures, pupil product measures, and certain attribute variables. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 48, 250-264.
- Taft, R. (1956). Some characteristics of good judges of others. *British Journal of Psychology*, 47, 19-29.
- Taylor, B. P. (1980). The relative importance of various competencies needed by choral-general music teachers in elementary and secondary schools as rated by college supervisors, music supervisors, and choral-general music teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41(07A), 2990.
- Teachout, D. J. (1997). Preservice and experiences teachers' opinions of skills and behaviors important to successful music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 41-50.

- Teachout, D. J. (2001). The relationship between personality and the teaching effectiveness of music student teachers. *Psychology of Music*, 29, 179-192.
- Terman, L. M. (1916). *The measurement of intelligence*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Terman, L. M., & Merrill, M. A. (1960). *Stanford-Binet intelligence scale*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, 140, 227-235.
- Thorndike, R. L., & Stein, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 34, 275-285.
- Thurman, V. L. (1977). A frequency and time description of selected rehearsal behaviors used by five choral directors. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 38(6A), 313A.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1931). Multiple factor analysis. *Psychological Review*, 38, 406-427.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1938). *Primary mental abilities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, R. L. (1965). Characteristics of beginning teachers: Their differential linkage with school-system types. *The School Review*, 73, 48-58.
- Tzu, S. (2005). *The Art of War* (T. Cleary, Trans.). Boston: Shambhala.
- Van-Dijk, D., & Kluger, A. N. (2001). *Goal orientation versus self-regulation: Different labels or different constructs?* Paper presented at the 16<sup>th</sup> annual convention of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Vernon, P. E. (1950). *The structure of human abilities*. London: Methuen.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wagner, M., & Struhl, E. (1979). Self-reported versus experienced elementary music educators in the use of teaching time. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 27, 113-125.
- Wagner, R. K. (1997). Intelligence, training, and employment. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1059-1069.
- Wagner, R. K. (2000). Practical Intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Intelligence* (pp. 380-395). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Waller, W. (1965). *The Sociology of Teaching*. New York: Science Editions.

- Wang, C. C., & Sogin, D. W. (1997). Self-reported versus observed classroom activities in elementary general music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 444-456.
- Ware, J. E., Jr., & Williams, R. G. (1975). The Dr. Fox effect: A study of lecturer effectiveness and ratings of instruction. *Journal of Medical Education*, 50, 149-156.
- Ware, J. E., Jr., & Williams, R. G. (1976). Validity of student ratings of instruction under different incentive conditions: A further study of the Dr. Fox effect. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 48-56.
- Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(1), 89-122.
- Wechsler, D. (1940). Nonintellective factors in general intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 37, 444-445.
- Wechsler, D. (1958). *The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- Wechsler, D. (1975). Intelligence defined and undefined: A relativistic appraisal. *American Psychologist*, 30, 135-139.
- Wedeck, J. (1947). The relationship between personality and "psychological ability." *British Journal of Psychology*, 37, 133-151.
- Wheeler, L. R. (1942). A comparative study of the intelligence of East Tennessee mountain children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 33, 321-334.
- Whitehall, D. C. (1970). *The application of Flanders' system of classroom interaction analysis to general classroom music teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.
- Wigdor, A. K., & Garner, W. R. (Eds.). (1982). *Ability testing: Uses, consequences, and controversies*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1973). *Personality and prediction: Principles of personality assessment*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Wilmington, S. C. (1992). Oral communication skills necessary for successful teaching. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 16, 5-17.
- Withall, J. (1949). The development of a technique for the measurement of social-emotional climate in classrooms. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 17, 347-361.

- Wink, R. L. (1970). The relationship of self-concept and selected personality variables to achievement in music student teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 18, 234-241.
- Witty, P. A. (1948). Evaluation of studies of the characteristics of the effective teacher. *Improving Educational Research*. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Wong, C.-M. T., Day, J. D., Maxwell, S. E., & Meara, N. M. (1995). A multitrait-multimethod study of academic and social intelligence in college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 117-133.
- Wubbenhorst, T. M. (1994). Personality characteristics of music educators and performers. *Psychology of Music*, 22, 63-74.
- Yang, S., & Sternberg, R. J. (1997a). Conceptions of intelligence in ancient Chinese philosophy. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 17, 101-119.
- Yang, S., & Sternberg, R. J. (1997b). Taiwanese Chinese people's conceptions of intelligence. *Intelligence*, 25, 21-36.
- Yarbrough, C. (1975). The effect of magnitude of conductor behavior on performance, attentiveness, and attitude of students in selected mixed choruses. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 23, 134-146.
- Yarbrough, C., & Hendel, C. (1993). The effect of sequential patterns on rehearsal evaluations of high school and elementary students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41, 246-257.
- Yarbrough, C., & Madsen, K. (1998). The evaluation of teaching in choral rehearsals. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46, 469-481.
- Yarbrough, C., & Price, H. E. (1981). Prediction of performer attentiveness based on rehearsal activity and teacher behavior. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 29, 209-217.
- Yarbrough, C., & Price, H. E. (1989). Sequential patterns of instruction in music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37, 179-187.
- Yarbrough, C., Price, H. E., & Bowers, J. (1991). The effect of knowledge of research on rehearsal skills and teaching values of experienced teachers. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 9, 17-20.
- Yarbrough, C., Price, H. E., & Hendel, C. (1994). The effect of sequential patterns and modes of presentation on the evaluation of music teaching. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 120, 33-45.



- Yerkes, R. M. (Ed.). (1921). *Psychological examining in the United States Army*. Memoirs, National Academy of Sciences, Vol. 15.
- Young, D., & Hester, J. P. (2004). *Leadership under Construction: Creating Paths toward Transformation*. Lanham, MD.: Scarecrow Education.
- Zuckerman, M., Koestner, R., & Driver, R. (1981). Beliefs about cues associated with deception. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 6, 105-114.
- Zuckerman, M., & Larrance, D. (1979). Individual differences in perceived encoding and decoding abilities. In R. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Skill in nonverbal communication* (pp. 171-203). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn, & Hain.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Name: Jay Allen Juchniewicz

Birthplace: Grand Rapids, Michigan

Date of Birth: 08/11/1978

Higher Education: The Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL  
Major: Music Education  
Degree: B.M.E. (2001)

The Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL  
Major: Music Education  
Degree: M.M.E. (2005)

The Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL  
Major: Music Education  
Degree: Ph.D. (2008)

Professional Experience: Jinks Middle School  
Panama City, FL  
2001-2003  
Band, Orchestra, Piano, General Music

Bay High School  
Panama City, FL  
2001-2003  
Band

East Carolina University  
Greenville, NC  
Fall 2008  
Assistant Professor, Instrumental Music Education