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ABSTRACT

An examination of content area reading strategies reveals a notable deficit in research in the practical application of these strategies to the instrumental music classroom. This study incorporates literacy strategies that have been used successfully in most other content areas within the music classroom. All of these strategies included a graphic organizer or other graphic representation.

Students used these strategies as a tool to give deeper consideration to their lesson books and sheet music as well as representing independent practice activities in a more meaningful (but still concrete) way. Students also completed a metacognitive assessment in which they assessed what strategies or elements of a strategy helped or hindered their understanding or performance.

Analysis of this data was done by assessing the depth of students' responses in the graphic organizers as well as the metacognitive assessments. The impact of these strategies on students' learning and the implications and future applications of such strategies is also explored.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Literacy should be a concern for everyone who works in schools – if it’s not, education is probably not the right place to pursue a career in music. Part of this disillusionment for music teachers, though, comes from the fact that we are nearly entirely neglected, or at best an afterthought, in books and articles addressing content area literacy.

Most content area reading texts attempt to address music and suggest ways in which strategies may be applied in the performing arts. The presentation of these ideas lacks credibility, however, because it shows no evidence of practical, in-field application. Music seems to be an afterthought, added by authors who realize that no professor will select a text for a course that does not address the needs of all content area teachers their institution trains. This leaves music teachers disappointed, unsure of, and often disillusioned with content area literacy and their role within the literacy goals of the school.

Literacy and social learning implications of student practice habits within the context of instrumental music for middle school-aged students will be addressed as there is a deficit in literature regarding use of basic content area literacy strategies within the music classroom. I noted my own responsibility in this regard, as I have taught an alternative education class that focuses on literacy strategies for accessing content, and yet I had not endeavored to truly employ these strategies in the context of band. The
strategies taught in this alternative education class specifically targeted the skills that foster more self-regulated, independent learning. Clearly, this is a goal regardless of content area. Indeed, this is the key to developing sustainable, productive at-home practice for music students. Student practice habits can be viewed as an independent music literacy activity—much like reading outside of the classroom in the language arts curriculum.

Because “Reading and writing are social acts” (Graves, 1991, p. 13), literacy cannot be addressed without considering the context in which it is taught. This context can be positively impacted by Responsive Classroom (RC), an ideology and approach to working with students that emphasizes the social aspects of learning. This includes relationships between the child and teacher, the child and peers, the child and the content, and how the adults in a building interact.

As a practitioner of Responsive Classroom, working in two buildings using RC school-wide and two other partially RC buildings, Responsive Classroom will have an inherent, if not obvious, impact on the findings of this study. Moreover, many elements of RC are underrepresented in music classrooms—social skills are much like literacy skills: basic and essential to success but too often neglected outside the elementary or Language Arts classroom. Certain aspects of RC will prove especially relevant, however, since RC is a way of interacting with students, its impact hopefully will be seen and felt in every aspect of my classroom observations. It is the contextual framework for all teaching and learning in this study.
School District

This study occurred in four schools in a unified district of 5,711 students in grades PreK-12 (WINSS, 2008). The district encompasses a small city as well as several small, rural communities. Schools involved in the study included three elementary schools and one junior high school.

School A

School A is an elementary school serving students in 4-year-old kindergarten through sixth grade. School A is in the city, between a residential and commercial area. School A is a short distance from two of the major industrial areas of the city.

Student Population

The official student population for School A is 464 (WINSS, 2008), however, there is a high level of transience among the families served by this school. According to School A’s charter school application, the transiency rate is 40%. Because of this, 464 is a rather soft number. There is no official data available regarding the highest point in the student population, however, anecdotally, School A had around 500 students at one point in the school year.

Poverty. School A is known within the district for high poverty levels. During this study, 57.8% of students qualify for free and reduced lunch according to WINSS (2008). While this number is very high, it is extraordinarily low for School A. This data is based on the third Friday count; according to School A’s charter application (written in the middle of the
year), 68% of students receive free and reduced lunch. This discrepancy is undoubtedly due to the high level of transiency at School A. Additionally, this number is still rather low: there have been years in which over 70% of students receive free and reduced lunch.

**Ethnicity.** The population of School A is mostly Caucasian (83.4%), with 6% of students being of Asian descent (WINSS, 2008). Most of the Asian students are Hmong. There are small populations of Black (4.5%), Hispanic (3.9%), and American Indian (2.2%) students (WINSS, 2008). Again, these numbers are affected by the high transiency rate and the school's charter indicates that 21% of students are from minority groups.

**Disability.** Seventeen percent of students at School A are identified as having disabilities (WINSS, 2008). School A houses one of the district's three elementary emotional/behavioral disturbances (EBD) programs, as well as offering services for learning disabilities.

**Students included in study**

This study included between twenty and twenty-five sixth grade band students at School A. This subgroup included mostly Caucasian students as well as students from American Indian and Hispanic heritages. Students with learning disabilities (LD) and emotional/behavioral disturbances (EBD) were part of this group. Students with gifted intellectual abilities were also included in this study.

School staff are not privilege to information regarding individual students' free and reduced lunch status, however, at least one quarter of the
students borrowed instruments from the school due to financial issues, and several others acquired instruments from family and friends.

**School B**

School B is an elementary school serving students in kindergarten through sixth grade. School B is in a rural community approximately ten miles northeast of the city. Agriculture is a significant part of this community (particularly dairy), as is the industry from the nearby city.

**Student Population**

The official student population for School B is 143 (WINSS, 2008).

**Poverty.** Twenty-eight percent of students at School B applied and qualified for free and reduced lunch. There is a general feeling among staff that this is underreported due to rural pride.

**Ethnicity.** The population of School B is 97.9% Caucasian (WINSS, 2008). There are small populations of students from Black (1.4%) and American Indian (0.7%) heritages (WINSS, 2008).

**Disability.** Fourteen percent of students at School B are identified as having disabilities (WINSS, 2008).

**Study Group**

This study included fifteen sixth grade band students at School B. This subgroup was made up entirely of students from Caucasian heritages. Students with learning disabilities (LD) were part of this group. Students with gifted intellectual abilities were also included in this study. Two students borrowed school instruments due to financial need. One other student had a
family instrument but openly discussed her family’s difficult financial situation.

School C

School C is an elementary school serving students in four-year-old kindergarten through sixth grade. School C is in a rural community approximately fifteen miles northwest of the city. Agriculture is a significant part of this community, with many cranberry marshes and farms in the surrounding area. Much of the student population is involved in agriculture in some way.

Student Population

The official student population for School C is 96 (WINSS, 2008).

Poverty. Twenty-four percent of students at School C receive free and reduced lunch.

Ethnicity. The population of School C is 99% Caucasian and 1% Hispanic (WINSS, 2008).

Disability. School C has identified 10.4% of its students as having disabilities (WINSS, 2008).

Study Group

This study included seven sixth grade band students at School C. This subgroup was made up entirely of students from Caucasian heritages. Students with learning disabilities (LD) were part of this group. Students with gifted intellectual abilities were also included in this study. There were no obvious poverty issues at School C.
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**Junior High School**

The Junior High School in this study is one of two junior high schools in the district, serving students in grades 7-9. Schools A, B, and C all feed into the Junior High. One other elementary school sends all of its students to the Junior High. Another elementary school sends around half of its students to this Junior High. Both groups are from the outer portions of the city.

**Teaching Context**

I co-teach and teach lessons at the junior high school, working with another band teacher with three groups.

**Student Population**

The official student population for the Junior High is 572 (WINSS, 2008).

*Poverty.* The Junior High has 30.6% of its students receiving free and reduced lunch.

*Ethnicity.* The population of the Junior High is 90.6% Caucasian and 4.9% Asian (WINSS, 2008). Most of the students of Asian descent are of Hmong heritage. There are small populations of students from Black (1%), Hispanic (2.1%), and American Indian (1.4%) heritages (WINSS, 2008).

*Disability.* The Junior High has identified 19.4% of its students as having disabilities (WINSS, 2008).

**Study Group**

This study included approximately fifty-four seventh grade band students and twenty-seven eighth grade band students. This subgroup was
made up primarily of students from Caucasian heritages as well as students from Black, Hispanic, and Hmong heritages.

Students with learning disabilities (LD), emotional/behavioral disturbances (EBD), and cognitive disabilities (CD) were part of this group. Students with gifted intellectual abilities were also included in this study.
CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH QUESTIONS

How can literacy tools be used to improve music literacy?
I will implement various literacy activities, with a particular emphasis on graphic organizers, and examine the effects of their use on student comprehension and performance.

How can meaningful independent music literacy activities be supported?
Graphic organizers can be used in place of practice logs. I have found that by asking students to record their at-home practice, the skill I was reinforcing was writing down minutes rather than actual practice or meaningful music learning. The aim of all student assignments is to provide students a more substantial means of reflecting improved music literacy achieved through practice. Graphic organizers will serve as evidence of performance-based skills as well as a reinforcer and reference for the students. Students will use these organizers to acquire, demonstrate, and record understanding of new skills as well as practice time. The replacement of practice logs will be evaluated for performance benefits.

What is the synergy of music literacy activities and Responsive Classroom?
Meaningful learning is fundamentally tied to social interaction. In music, this is especially true. Music literacy activities and the social curriculum will be inextricably enmeshed throughout the study.
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

Professional literature regarding Responsive Classroom and literacy has been drawn from professional development books, textbooks, professional journals, and online resources from professional organizations and sites offering teaching materials.

Researching Responsive Classroom was a natural part of this literature review: it is my conviction, and the conviction of the schools I teach in, that the way in which children learn is integral to what they retain, how engaged they will be, and what academic risks they are willing to take. Responsive Classroom is and has been part of my teaching for three years now, and I eagerly pursued resources to justify this method.

Additionally, I did an extensive investigation of available literacy strategies. Drawing from these resources allowed me a range of options for this study as well as generating resources that I have incorporated into lesson plans I use next year.

This literature review explores several areas and sub-areas in greater depth: Responsive Classroom, the scope of literacy within the music classroom, Constructivism and the characteristics of literacy, independent practice, modeling, and literacy strategies. Literacy strategies will include accessing prior knowledge, vocabulary organizers, problem solving and planning, organizational frames and graphic organizers, comparing and contrasting, and informal writing.
Responsive Classroom

Because music teachers are not necessarily perceived as "regular" teachers by students, particularly young students, and because instrumental music classrooms are inherently structured so differently academically and physically, music teachers need to be all the more cognizant of how students are engaged in pro-social classroom behaviors. Elliot (1993, p. 34) states:

There is an empirical and practical rationale for educators to invest time in teaching children prosocial behaviors such as cooperation, assertion, self-control, responsibility, and empathy. Increases in these behaviors clearly result in decreases in problem behaviors and increases in academic performances for most students.

Music teachers cannot be exempt from promoting these prosocial behaviors. Riley (2007, p. 22) points out, "In order to ensure that students are responsible and caring learners, all aspects of the school community need to be involved." This inclusion of all teachers is beneficial both to the students and to the mission of specialist teachers.

Teachers using a specific method of social instruction, Responsive Classroom, were found to rate themselves as more effective with this approach than without (Rimm-Kaufman, 2006). Origins (2006) identifies the seven basic principles of Responsive Classroom:
1. The social curriculum is as important as the academic curriculum.

2. *How* children learn is as important as *what* they learn.

3. The greatest cognitive growth occurs through social interaction.

4. There is a specific set of social skills that students need in order to be successful academically and socially. [*author’s note:* the acronym for this is CARES – Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility, Empathy, and Self-Control]

5. Knowing the children we teach individually, culturally, and developmentally is as important as knowing the content we teach.

6. Knowing the parents of the children we teach is important to knowing the children.

7. How the adults at school work together to accomplish their mission is as important as individual competence.

While these principles have a range of implications, significant practices associated with Responsive Classroom include (but are not limited to) “interactive modeling,” “positive teacher language,” and “collaborative problem solving” (Origins, 2006). These seven principles also lead teachers in “organizing classrooms in ways that foster social interaction, independence, and productive learning” (Rimm-Kaufman, 2006, p. 4).
Faber, Mazlish, Nyberg, and Templeton (1996, p. 131, 138) elaborate on positive teacher language in problem-solving: “Resist the urge to evaluate their suggestions,” “Write down all ideas – without evaluating,” and “Together decide which ideas you don’t like, which you do, and how you plan to follow through.” This empowers students to solve the problem themselves, with support from an adult rather than having someone else solve it for them. This is one means of fostering independence.

Furthermore, positive teacher language is cautious of praise. “Children become very uncomfortable with praise that evaluates them. They push it away. Sometimes they’ll deliberately misbehave to prove you wrong” (Faber, Mazlish, Nyberg, & Templeton, 1996, p. 170). Children need to hear that what they have done has been noticed rather than evaluated: “…the kind of praise that a child can ‘take in’…comes in two parts. First, the adult describes what the child has done…Second, the child, after hearing his accomplishment described, praises himself” (Faber, Mazlish, Nyberg, & Templeton, 1996, p. 170). Faber, Mazlish, Nyberg, and Templeton (1996, p. 174) justify this method: “We want to give our children the kind of emotional nourishment that will help them become independent, creative thinkers and doers. If we train them to constantly look to others for approval, what message are we sending them?” This is not to say that teachers should never offer a word of praise, but it should always be accompanied by a description of what the child did. A similar approach can be used for discipline; rather than simply telling a child what they are doing is wrong or
naughty, a teacher can describe the actions of the child. This prevents the child from feeling that they are being evaluated and also gives them the tools to use self-evaluation or self-control.

Children must feel free from evaluation and judgment by their peers: Responsive Classroom advocates extensive, daily community building in traditional elementary classrooms. While daily activities with the sole purpose of building community are beyond the time constraints of most specialists, making time for building community can head off problems and build a community of support. Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 169) offer suggestions for building community in classrooms. These suggestions include creating an environment in which students feel safe to take academic risks; Rimm-Kaufman (2006, p. 11) determined through her study:

Children exposed to more Responsive Classroom practices appeared to be less fearful and anxious than their counterparts who were not so exposed. Specifically, children taught according to the Responsive Classroom approach appeared to be less worried or nervous about trying new things.

Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 169) also advocate providing choices and an opportunity to take responsibility – this sentiment is very key to Responsive Classroom. Furthermore, teachers should connect learning to students' lives and larger issues. The classroom should be organized so that students can work together cooperatively, with “…class time for book clubs, on books from a classroom library” (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004, p. 201); this
strategy has a potential correlation to solo and ensemble, in which students may select a piece to be performed by an ensemble of their choosing. Finally, students should be read to aloud, a concept addressed in greater depth in the literacy section of the literature review.

"Language is social in nature" (Heller, 1999, p. 14). By association, then, literacy must be social in language. Therefore, it is logical and natural that literacy, in whatever content area it arises, be taught in a social manner. Graves (1991, p. 13) concurs, "Reading and writing are social acts." Moreover, "...we live enmeshed in a rich sociocultural fabric. Most of what we know we have learned from others, in one way or another" (Wiggins, 2007).

"Writing is usually conceived of as an individual activity, but in the real world many excellent pieces of writing...are group-written" (Moore, Moore, Cunningham, & Cunningham, 2003, p. 193). Schools should be reflections of the real world, and thus writing can be a group activity. Moreover, Gallagher (2004, p.104-6) asserts providing for student collaboration increases reading comprehension.

Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p.167) cited a study of 28,000 6th through 8th graders by Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago. This study found that classes with "high 'social support'" achieved a 1.67 grade equivalency on standardized math tests and a 1.42 in reading, versus 0.93 and .056 in classes with low social support. Social support was defined as teachers relating subject to students'
personal interest, listening, knowing the students, and believing in students. Social support, however, is not limited to how the teacher interacts with the students but also how students interact with one another. In classes with high social support, peers treat each other with respect, work together to solve problems, and help each other learn. As Elliot (1995, p. 34) points out, "The social functioning of a class remains to be an important prerequisite or corequisite to successful academic performances of children."

Rimm-Kaufmann (2006, p. 9) found that the Responsive Classroom method, a method in which the primary goal is "...to integrate social and academic learning so that children function as respectful members of a community and learn at their best" (thus clearly providing high social support), yielded a "small but statistically significant" increase in math and reading scores. Rimm-Kaufman (2006, p. 14) concluded that there was association (although not yet enough information to conclude causation) between Responsive Classroom and improved academic performance. Elliot's 1993 study (p. 33), however, was somewhat firmer in its conclusions:

The Responsive Classroom...was found to be associated with significantly greater gains in students' social and academic functioning than in students from a comparison school where no social problem-solving or social skills curriculum was operating.

This study included three schools, all in the same community with similar student populations. One school used Responsive Classroom and two had
no explicit social skills instruction. Elliot (1993, p. 15) found that the school using RC had a 21% gain in students exhibiting improved academic competence, compared to 9% and 5% at the other two schools. While this study cannot prove that Responsive Classroom specifically is responsible or better than other social curricula, it does support the study cited by Daniels and Zemelman (2004), which concluded that classrooms with high social support experienced greater academic gains than those without.

While no one wants to “teach to the test,” a method like Responsive Classroom yields so many positives that increased test scores are almost a happy accident rather than the primary goal. In an earlier study, Elliot (1993, p. 18) found that:

...the Cooperative Learning component of the curriculum correlated strongest with the problem behavior ratings. It was found that in classrooms where a teacher frequently used the Cooperative Learning component, a higher percentage of students were reported to have below average problem behavior ratings (which is good).

Such a finding relates to an RC strategies such as “Instead of denying feelings, put the feelings into words” (Faber, Mazlish, Nyberg, & Templeton, 1996, p. 27-28). This allows a student to deal with feelings rather than dwell on them, thus likely preventing the kind of escalation that often leads to problem behaviors. Moreover, while some educators have concerns that Responsive Classroom is too focused on younger students, Elliot (1993, p.
15) concluded that "students in the upper elementary level subgroups experienced larger positive changes than did the younger students."

Perhaps these academic gains resulting from social changes are a result of how classroom time can now be spent. Rimm-Kaufman (2006, p. 12) found that RC teachers "offered better-quality feedback to children and provided more opportunity for concept development than comparison teachers" (probably as a result of describing rather than evaluating), "offer more emotional support for learning," and spent more time on "...instruction that required students to analyze and make inferences and less time teaching basic skills." This is likely because "...students exposed to the entire RC approach were observed to exhibit significantly less problem behavior than their peers with limited exposure to the approach" (Elliot, 1995, p. 33). This indicates that attending to the teaching of prosocial skills may ultimately allow teachers more time to address content.

Additionally, while some studies found there was not enough information to conclude that academic gains are a direct result of the use of Responsive Classroom, the findings of Elliot's (1995, p. 17) study are much more conclusive:

In summary, the effects of The Responsive Classroom approach on the social behavior of students was statistically tested and the major trend observed in the mean data was determined to be significant at a level very unlikely to occur by chance alone. Thus, the differential results between the RC
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[Responsive Classroom] and NRC [non-Responsive Classroom] groups of students at the K-3rd grade level is very likely due to the difference in instructional activities included in The Responsive Classroom approach.

As a staff member at a diverse school with a significant percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch, Elliot's (1999, p. 5) point is particularly worthy of note:

Parents, regardless of socioeconomic level or racial/ethnic group membership, overwhelmingly rated The Responsive Classroom approach as "acceptable" or "highly acceptable." Whether they had a child in an RC classroom or not, they consistently indicated they would like their child's teacher to use the approach.

Elliot's (1995) previous study also found that parental reactions to Responsive Classroom were not influenced by income or racial or ethnic group. This is logical as there are a multitude of benefits to students in a school or classroom employing Responsive Classroom methods. For example, Elliot (1999, p. 28) found that "The social skills taught and reinforced in The Responsive Classroom approach seem to function as academic enablers, resulting in improved scores on achievement tests."

Rimm-Kaufman's (2006, p. 7) research accounted for free and reduced lunch (poverty), and "Factoring this into the analysis helped us understand the inclusiveness of the Responsive Classroom approach — its ability to
improve educational outcomes for all children, regardless of the circumstances governing their home lives.” Moreover, Responsive Classroom was found to have “worked as well for children ‘at risk’ for school failure...as for those children who were not at risk” (Rimm-Kaufman, 2006, p. 11).

This is logical when RC strategies and philosophical shifts like those suggested by Faber, Mazlish, Nyberg, and Templeton (1996, p. 212) are employed: “Every child needs to be seen as a ‘learner’ and encouraged to experience the joy of intellectual discovery and the satisfaction of making progress – however fast or slow.” They assert that some students come into our classroom stuck in “roles” – smart, slow, lazy, etc. We can help these children succeed by “put[ting] students in situations where they can see themselves differently.” This is central to Responsive Classroom and literacy strategies may give students such an opportunity to see themselves and their learning in music in a different light.

Elliot (1995, p. 26) ascertained from parent interviews that children felt more positively about school when Responsive Classroom was used:

When asked to characterize their “Child’s reaction to school this year,” parents with a child in a classroom where the RC approach was in full use most frequently selected the descriptor “Very Positive,” whereas parents with a child in a classroom using only the Morning Meeting [one component of Responsive Classroom] selected the term “Slightly Positive.”
Rimm-Kaufman (2006, p. 12) confirmed this, finding that students in classrooms using Responsive Classroom felt more positively about school. This is particularly important in the age group (grades six through eight) to be addressed in my study. Swafford and Bryan (2000) point out:

A distinct characteristic of middle school students is that they strive to become autonomous and, as a result, shift their allegiance from adults to peers. Accordingly, they are very social and rely on their peers for approval, social experiences, values, behaviors, attitudes, and companionships. They develop interpersonal skills that will serve them throughout their lives. Further, they develop a sense of themselves as members of a group and begin to understand how their behavior affects others.

This makes the middle school years critical to students' social development; thus, our acknowledgement, explicitly and instructionally, of prosocial behaviors is still as important, if not more important, than it is for elementary students. While Elliot (1995, p. 17) points out, "The Responsive Classroom instructional approach does influence elementary [it. mine] students' social behavior in measurable and practically meaningful ways," an understanding of the developmental and emotional needs of middle school students must lead us to the conclusion that embracing a social way of functioning in our classrooms is still critical. Swafford and Bryan (2000) go on to suggest that teachers of middle level students are well advised to adopt "...instructional
strategies that capitalize on the unique developmental characteristics of early adolescents...[including] opportunities for them to interact positively with peers and teachers."

Riley (2007, p. 22) points out, "To be a truly Responsive Classroom, the practices need to transcend the classroom to all aspects of the school." This leads to familiarity, routine, and comfort that allows students to thrive no matter whose room they are in.

Responsive Classroom represents the climate in which students will experience all literacy strategies. This atmosphere sets the stage for the academic risks literacy strategies may require of students. Responsive Classroom creates a setting in which these strategies may be implemented more successfully and without undue anxiety for students.

**Narrowing the Scope of Literacy within the Music Classroom**

Content area literacy in instrumental music is likely to mean different things to different people. Indeed, there are many valid interpretations. Reading and composing music are certainly related to being literate in music; however, these are not what I will be addressing. This is not to say that music composition is not important, or that we don't want our students to read music; we do want these things. However, these topics have been addressed and more or less agreed upon. As music teachers, we all have our own strategies to teach students to read music notation, and there is little disagreement that we want this for our students. Composition tends to be touchier; many music teachers want it for their students but don't
necessarily take the time to teach it— but as a group most tend to accept and believe that this is something we should be doing.

For my purposes, content area literacy in instrumental music is more akin to the kind of content literacy strategies that we use across the curriculum that are not necessarily commonly used or embraced by the music community. Thomas (1996, p. xi) points out, “Language is the unifying element and the medium through which we teach all subjects.” I will explore how we can create opportunities for students to better process the information they acquire in our music classrooms, through whatever incarnation that material is presented in.

Horning (2007) offers a definition of “critical literacy” that lends itself well to literacy in music classrooms: “Critical literacy is best defined as the psycholinguistic processes of getting meaning from or putting meaning into print and/or sound, images, and movement, on a page or screen, used for the purposes of analysis, synthesis and evaluation…” This definition provides for the multiple formats of information students must process in music as well as identifying an overarching purpose for literacy across disciplines: analysis, synthesis, and evaluation—notably, the three highest levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy.

Knipper and Duggan (2006, p. 462) describe reading and writing as “reciprocal processes.” With this in mind, content area literacy strategies that include both reading and writing seem most effective in achieving maximum student understanding. McConachie et al (2006, p. 8) advise, “To
develop complex knowledge in any discipline, students need opportunities to read, reason, investigate, speak, and write about the overarching concepts within that discipline." We can give our students opportunities for deeper and more meaningful knowledge and understanding by engaging them in more of these tasks in the music classroom, particularly reading and writing.

Although in music we strive to keep our unique educational identity, we need to engage students in meaningful content area literacy strategies in music for students' sake. This means we are not first and foremost teachers of music but teachers of people.

Knipper and Duggan (2006) present various ideas for writing activities, but these activities do not fit within even the physical structure of a music classroom. Moreover, after clarifying writing-to-learn as opposed to learning-to-write, they present activities, such as a biopoem, which certainly seem more in keeping with teaching writing rather than using writing to teach content. Additionally, after identifying writing-to-learn as an informal activity that does not go through multiple revisions or seek to deliver a finished product in the way teaching the writing process does, they present a rubric that includes an introduction and a conclusion. This is certainly not the informal writing that I am familiar with in writing to clarify ideas and better understand content. In a survey of preservice content area teachers by Alverman and Phelps (2002) regarding content literacy preparation, music specialists were not even included. Music teachers have been neglected and it's showing.
McConachie et al (2006, p. 8) advise, “Disciplinary literacy is based on the premise that students can develop deep conceptual knowledge in a discipline only by using the habits of reading, writing, talking, and thinking which that discipline values and uses.” However, in music, nothing we do is really comparable, and perhaps that’s because we haven’t put the energy into literacy and not because the strategies available to us don’t “fit.” We’ve been offered no music-specific examples to draw from and we’ve chosen not to find our own.

Constructivism and Characteristics of Literacy

“One person cannot make another learn. Knowledge is not passed on or transferred. Learning is something that individuals do, most often with the help and support of other people.” (Wiggins, 2007) Literacy strategies are a means of helping and supporting learners.

According to Wiggins (2007),

In a constructivist music classroom, students would have opportunities to construct their own understanding of the dimensions, multidimensions, and metadimensions of music through interaction with "real-world" music (as opposed to music contrived to teach a particular concept) by performing, creating, and listening.

This is a well-intentioned beginning but does not go far enough. Our interactions with music must not simply include opportunities for “performing, creating, and listening,” but also processing these experiences in a concrete
way that resembles what students do in other classrooms in our schools. This process will hopefully be synergetic: students' familiarity and comfort in these strategies will give them a firmer grounding in music. Simultaneously, some students will be more comfortable in music and thus more successful in subsequently applying these strategies in other content areas. I realize that some music teachers will object to music in support of other content areas, but in a truly successful school, every content area will support others, because we are teaching whole human beings and not fragments of them.

Buehl (2001, p. 5) expands on this constructivist theory, "...a reader constructs meaning from a text rather than merely reproducing the words on the page. Meaning is something that is actively created rather than passively received." Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 23) concur: "Reading is an active, constructive process." Moreover, Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 24) offer a list of thinking strategies effective readers use to construct meaning: Visualize, Connect, Question, Infer, Evaluate, Analyze, Recall, and Self-Monitor.

Graves (1991, p. 27-28) offers characteristics of students who enjoy lifelong literacy:

✓ Chooses books independently
✓ Responds orally and in writing and reflects relevance
✓ Shares books and knows how to talk about them
✓ Uses reading and writing to learn
✓ Knows what s/he wants to learn
✓ "Can state plans about what she wants to read and write next"
✓ Knows when to get help
✓ Understands power of writing
✓ "Can state how she best learns"

These characteristics have clear parallels in music. Translating Graves' (1991) ideas to music, students who will enjoy lifelong musicianship should be able to select appropriate repertoire, employ practice strategies that help them learn, get help when necessary, and plan what they want to work on next. Further extrapolating from Graves (1991), lifelong musicians will talk and write about the music they play or experience, sharing music with others. Lifelong musicians will understand how to use musical exercises to improve their skills. These musicians can also connect to certain times, places, and people through music, with an understanding of the power of music.

Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 59) add to this list: lifelong readers read something "comfortable, fun, interesting" everyday. That is to say, students read something that is easy and simply enjoyable everyday. This has a very direct relationship to the music students experience on a daily basis – at least one thing students play should be easily accessible and enjoyable every day. Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 59) further expand on this: "...research shows that students' reading improves most when no more than 10% of material in a text is difficult for them to understand."
Independent Practice

Yet how do we help students become independently musically literate? That is to say, what supports can be or are offered to students when they practice at home? Braunger, Donahue, Evans, and Galguera (2005, p. 24) describe teachers’ roles in literacy as, “helping students gain insight into their own reading processes as a means of gaining strategic control over these processes.” This can certainly be applied to music. Literacy strategies may be used to help students engage in more meaningful and long-lasting independent music practice by allowing them to identify the processes and strategies they are employing. Literacy strategies function not only as strategies unto themselves but as a means of illuminating other strategies the student is engaging in. This will hopefully lead to “deliberate practice—those activities that have been found most effective in improving performance” (Ericsson, K.A., Krampe, R.Th., and Tesch-Römer, C., 1993, p. 367).

A popular trend in music education has always been practice logs. Practice logs are simply a record of when and how long a student has practiced and are often an empty exercise. I have reevaluated my own use of practice logs because I questioned whether the behavior I was encouraging was practicing or writing it down. This is not to say that teachers of other content are exempt from this practice: language arts teachers have been guilty of this as well, with reading logs that ask for little more. Allen (2000, p. 267) proposes an Independent Reading Log that could
translate to a more substantial version of a practice log as well. Allen's log includes, date, title and author, pages read, and a response guide. The key here is the response guide, which offers sentence starter suggestions like “I'm wondering...”, “I remember...”, “I'm thinking that...”, “I feel sorry for...”, “I connected to...”, “Can you believe...”, “When I read ______ I...”, and “I was reminded of...” (Allen, 2000). This focuses the log more on thinking and less on recording time.

Gallagher (2004, p. 7) writes, “If we simply assign reading instead of teaching students how to read, we'll get poor reading.” Similarly, if we simply assign exercises for practice, we will get ineffective practice. As music teachers, we need to give students the skills necessary to practice effectively and a more appropriate means of documenting that practice. Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 16) write, “effective teachers help struggling kids by modeling their own mental processes.”

The Role of Modeling

Music teachers can model their own thinking during practice. Readence, Bean, and Baldwin (1995, p. 254) describe this as the “think aloud technique.” Teachers demonstrate the process and verbalize the thoughts and decision-making occurring in their minds as they do this. This means teachers must show how they cope when they encounter struggles and “share with your students your own passion for reading about your subject, as well as your struggle as a student and a reader” (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004, p. 114). Teachers mustn't hide difficulties, but rather,
show students that these struggles are natural and surmountable (Gallagher, 2004). This is because "students... need to recognize that this confusion is natural and necessary" (Gallagher, 2004, p. 63).

Graphic organizers may be a meaningful way for students to represent and record practice. Heller (1999, p. 181) states, "The ability to articulate what one knows and does not know about any subject is crucial to language development and concept formation." It is a hindrance to our students' learning not to engage in verbal or written expressions of what they do and do not know.

Moreover, graphic organizers can be referenced later to review skills that were practiced. Graves (1991, p. 49) suggests that we show students the "durable power of writing" by looking back on previous writings and bringing out and using notes again. Gammill (2006) concurs: "Writing creates a permanent record of a student's thoughts and attitudes, a record one can return to as one learns and grows."

As students complete literacy activities that incorporate writing, they not only create their greater depth to their current understanding but accumulate resources which they may reference to clarify and connect to future learning. Additionally, Wallace, Pearman, Hail, and Hurst (2007, p. 49) point out, "Students often find graphic organizers easy to use and supportive in their overall writing and comprehension." Use of graphic organizers will not cause undue academic strain or stress for students; indeed, they provide an easy and clear way for students to organize and plot
out their thinking and learning. According to Moore, Moore, Cunningham and Cunningham (2003, p. 175), "Writing is thinking you do with a pen, pencil or word processor.....you use some or all of the thinking processes as you write. Students who write about what they are learning are engaged in thinking."

Finally, research has found that practice through simple repetition limits our capacity for improvement. According to Ericsson, Krampe, and Tesch-Römer (1993, p. 367):

When laboratory training is extended over longer time periods, studies show that providing a motivated individual with repeated exposure to a task does not ensure that the highest levels of performance will be attained. Assessment of subjects' methods shows that inadequate strategies often account for the lack of improvement.

Therefore, providing an array of strategies that students can draw from may improve the results of our students' practice efforts. ERIC (2002, p. 5) supports this hypothesis:

Students are able to move from novice to proficient performance in content area literacies by being engaged in complex academic literacy tasks with support from the teacher and peers and with the teacher making explicit the knowledge and problem-solving skills teachers call upon as readers in their disciplines.
Literacy Strategies

The Responsive Classroom context, the scope and characteristics of music literacy, and the role of independent practice and modeling have been established. Strategies are needed to further explore and encourage music literacy.

"If people learn by constructing their own understanding of their experiences, then teaching is essentially a process of designing experiences and providing support for learners as they actively and interactively engage in those experiences" (Wiggins, 2007). Literacy strategies provide support and tools that allow students to interact with the materials they encounter in our classrooms rather than being the recipients of these materials. These strategies not only allow students to more easily construct and retain meaning from these materials and interactions but to carry these strategies on in the future and continue to be literate in music for a lifetime.

Moreover, Ericsson, Krampe, and Tesch-Römer (1993, p. 367) cite:

Early investigators of extended skill acquisition in typing (Book, 1925b; Dvorak et al., 1936) and other perceptual-motor skills (Kao, 1937) carefully monitored improvements in performance and collected verbal reports on subjects’ cognitive processes. These studies revealed subjects' active search for methods to improve performance and found that changes in methods could often be related to clear improvements.
Since the playing of wind instruments clearly involves a motor skill, it is reasonable to assume that students using specific methods (or strategies) are likely to improve more efficiently than those who are not. Since our students are not adults (as the subjects in these surveys were) and may lack the background to find their own methods or strategies, teachers should suggest strategies to select from and provide opportunities for students to investigate these strategies.

Adler (2004) indicates that there are seven key strategies that have a firm scientific basis for improving student comprehension. These include monitoring comprehension, metacognition, graphic and semantic organizers, answering questions, generating questions, recognizing story structure, and summarizing. According to Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 248), even the National Reading Panel, a conservative group, agrees that “use of graphic and semantic organizers” “have a solid scientific basis.”

Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 30), like many, identify the three stages of reading as before, during, and after; however, they take this distinction further by identifying the elements of each stage. Tasks in the before reading stage include setting purposes, activating prior knowledge, developing questions, and making predictions. The during reading stage involves sampling text, visualizing, hypothesizing, confirming/altering predictions, and monitoring comprehension. After reading, readers should engage in recalling and retelling, evaluating, discussing, rereading, applying, and reading more.
A variety of literacy strategies will be explored. The broader categories these strategies fall into include accessing prior knowledge, vocabulary, problem solving and planning, graphic organizers and organizational frames, compare and contrast, and informal writing. The following chart highlights the strategies to be considered as well as some possible uses. Strategies used as part of the study are marked by an asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Strategy</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose or Application</th>
<th>Notes and Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*K-W-L</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Transfer of knowledge to new concepts. Review of old material prior to presentation of new material.</td>
<td>Very common and thus familiar and comfortable for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-K-W-L-Q (Allen, 2000, p. 136)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Generation and transfer of background information and prior knowledge to new concepts. Review and application of old and new material.</td>
<td>Builds background (B) through read-alouds and encourages students to ask questions based on what they have learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you know about...? (Beers &amp; Howell, 2003)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Share prior knowledge with others. Clarify or correct prior knowledge discrepancies.</td>
<td>Students collaboration is built into the activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*My Own Perspective (Beers &amp; Howell, 2003)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Reflect thoughts and attitudes prior to an experience and after the experience (a concert, for instance).</td>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In With the Old, Out with the New (Beers &amp; Howell, 2003)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Transfer of knowledge to new concepts. Review of old material prior to presentation of new material.</td>
<td>Nearly identical to KWL, but different wording may keep activity fresh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Spotlights and Anticipation Guides (Gallagher, 2004, p. 39-41)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Focus on perception may be useful when learning music from different cultures or time periods.</td>
<td>Students consider prior knowledge in terms of agreement and disagreement with controversial topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Alouds (Allen, 2000, chap. 9)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Create prior knowledge through reading of children's books.</td>
<td>Reading children’s books to older students can be motivating and builds community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking My Understanding (Beers &amp; Howell, 2003)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Connect prior knowledge with media being used. Students then determine questions they still have.</td>
<td>Students identify concepts they already knew as they participate in a literacy activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections, Points, and Questions (Beers &amp; Howell, 2003)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Make connections between information being acquired and old information.</td>
<td>Similar to KWL but emphasizes new information and questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready-Set-Go-Whoa! (Beers &amp; Howell, 2003)</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Access prior knowledge, anticipate what will be learned, and reflect on surprises.</td>
<td>Similar to KWL but asks students to anticipate what they think they will learn rather than what they want to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequential Roundtable Alphabet</strong> (Buehl, 2001, p. 165)</td>
<td><strong>Prior Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Students think of single, alphabetical words that they associate with a topic to generate a broad base of prior knowledge.</td>
<td>Could be used later in literacy tasks as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary Overview Guide</strong> (Buehl, 2001)</td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Define and create a “clue” for single vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Best for just a few vocabulary words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List-Group-Label</strong> (Daniels &amp; Zemelman, 2004, p. 142-143)</td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Students generate and sort a list of vocabulary.</td>
<td>Good for lots of vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sort and Select</strong> (Beers &amp; Howell, 2003)</td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Generate and group vocabulary. Identify why vocabulary belongs in a certain category.</td>
<td>Expands on List-Group-Label by asking students to identify why they grouped vocabulary the way they did.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Just Checkin’</strong> (Beers &amp; Howell, 2003)</td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary, Compare and Contrast</strong></td>
<td>Compare the characteristics of several vocabulary words or concepts.</td>
<td>Effective with a small amount of vocabulary from a similar category (e.g., tempi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary Word Map</strong> <em>(Writing A-Z, 2008)</em></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Explore a word in great depth.</td>
<td>Best for thorough examination of one word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word Questioning</strong> <em>(Allen, 2000, p. 276)</em></td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Explore a word or concept in great depth.</td>
<td>Best for thorough examination of a single word or concept. Differs from Vocabulary Word Map in that it is applicable to a broader concept as well as a vocabulary word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Looking at Our Options</strong> <em>(Allen, 2000, p. 164 &amp; 271)</em></td>
<td>Problem Solving and Planning</td>
<td>Identify a problem, options, and consequences.</td>
<td>Greater consideration is given to possible solutions than establishing facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem and Solution</strong> <em>(Writing A-Z, 2008)</em></td>
<td>Problem Solving and Planning</td>
<td>Identify details of the problem, implement and evaluate a solution, and adjust.</td>
<td>Reevaluation and modification of a solution is included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PMI</strong> <em>(Col, 2008)</em></td>
<td>Problem Solving and Planning</td>
<td>Name “plusses”, “minuses”, and “implications” or “interesting things” about solutions to problems or challenges.</td>
<td>Intended as an aid to decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order It!</strong> <em>(Beers &amp; Howell, 2008)</em></td>
<td>Organizational Frame/Graphic Organizer</td>
<td>Organize events or information sequentially.</td>
<td>Music is generally organized sequentially, presenting a potential application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **The Sum of the Parts**  
(Beers & Howell, 2008) | Organizational Frame/Graphic Organizer | Analyze components of a whole. | Analysis is part of the top half of Bloom’s Taxonomy as well as being part of “critical literacy” as defined by Horning (2007). |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Y-Chart**  
(Col, 2008) | Organizational Frame/Graphic Organizer | Determine what an experience or concepts looks like, sounds like, and feels like. | Often used to discuss pro-social behaviors in RC. |
| **Who Are the “Big Players”?**  
(Beers & Howell, 2003) | Organizational Frame/Graphic Organizer | Recognize the “key person”, their “contributions”, and make “connections.” | Provides perspective on how individuals contribute to a larger entity (like a musical work). |
| **Snow Globe or Time Capsule**  
(Gallagher, 2004, p. 139) | Organizational Frame/Graphic Organizer | Visually represent a different place or time period. | Particularly applicable to music from other cultures or periods. |
| **Ingredient List**  
(Gallagher, 2004, p. 136) | Organizational Frame/Graphic Organizer | Think of the components of a whole more metaphorically. | Very simple and efficient. |
| **Analogy Graphic Organizer**  
(Buehl, 2001) | Compare and Contrast, Prior Knowledge. | Establish similarities and differences between a new and old concept. Select relationship categories the similarities and differences fall into. | This strategy also taps prior knowledge. |
| **Analogue Guide**  
(Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 1995) | Compare and Contrast | Consider the structure and function of a concept and draw a comparison (analogy) to something from everyday life. | Connects content-specific ideas to ordinary things. |
| **Frayer Model**  
| (Buehl, 2001, p. 56) | **Compare and Contrast** | List "essential characteristics", "nonessential characteristics", "examples", and "nonexamples." | Rather than comparing and contrasting two things in depth, the Frayer model asks students to explore one concept in depth by comparing and contrasting it in less depth to many things. |
| **What it is and What it's Not**  
| (Beers & Howell, 2003) | **Compare and Contrast** | Define the concepts. List its characteristics, what it is, and what it's not. | Nearly identical to the Frayer Model, the language used may be simpler for some students. |
| **Concept Attainment**  
| (Allen, 2000, p. 197 & 280) | **Compare and Contrast** | Identify the concept and its definition, characteristics, nonexamples, examples, connections to similar concepts, and resources for more information. | Still similar to the Frayer Model, Concept Attainment asks for greater depth and detail and seems more appropriate to students who have become more proficient in graphic organizers. |
| **Agree/Disagree**  
| (Beers & Howell, 2003) | **Compare and Contrast** | Identify a central topic or statement and generate reasons to strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement. | A subjective version of the Frayer Model. |
| **Cubing**  
(Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 1995) | **Informal Writing** | A topic is identified and students write about the topic in a specific way in short spurts. Students first describe the topic, then compare it, associate it, analyze it, apply it, and argue for or against it. | **Moves progressively through Bloom’s Taxonomy.** |
| **Possible Sentences**  
(Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 1995) | **Informal Writing, Vocabulary** | Write one sentence using two randomly selected vocabulary words. | **Students collaborate by verifying the accuracy of each other’s sentences.** |
| **Conversation Logs**  
(Gallagher, 2004, p. 120-1) | **Informal Writing** | Communicate ideas with students in other class periods. | **Student collaboration is essential to this activity.** |
| **Pass the Paper**  
(Beers & Howell, 2003) | **Informal Writing** | Generate questions and receive answers, comments, and more questions from other students. | **Student collaboration is essential to this activity.** |
| **Alphabet Soup**  
(Beers & Howell, 2003) | **Informal Writing** | Compose sentences beginning with randomly drawn letters about a particular topic. | **Could be presented as a game.** |
| **The Five W’s and H For...**  
(Beers & Howell, 2003) | **Informal Writing** | Organize information about who, what, where, when, why, and how into a grid. | **Visually somewhat difficult to follow and more appropriate to students with more experience with graphic organizers.** |
| **How Sure Are You?**  
(Beers & Howell, 2008) | **Informal Writing/Problem Solving and Planning** | Pinpoint information or skills that are tentative, comfortable, and confident. | **Strategy is metacognitive: students must consider what they know and what they don’t.** |
Accessing Prior Knowledge

"Because comprehension is essentially a mental construction of what is on the page based on what is already known, then the background knowledge of the reader is a primary determinant of how a text will be understood" (Buehl, 2001, p. 5). This makes accessing a student’s prior knowledge an essential tool in helping students create understanding from the text, music, or other content they encounter.

The K-W-L (Buehl, 2001) is an easily adapted graphic organizer. With three columns – Know, Want to Know, and Learned – the K-W-L addresses multiple stages of reading. Students activate prior knowledge by identifying what they already know, plan and anticipate what they are going to learn, and reflect on the new knowledge they have acquired, creating a future resource for themselves when they need to review what was studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know</th>
<th>Want to Know</th>
<th>Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The K-W-L enjoys popularity across content areas, probably because, according to Heller (1999, p. 122), “Prior knowledge and understanding of text structures facilitate comprehension and composition.” Gallagher (2004, p. 27) concurs: “When we read something new, we are much more likely to understand if we see connections that make it relevant.” Gallagher (2004, p. 30) also comments that connections to past experiences create resonance for the learner and this can be achieved by frontloading the students’ learning experience. Time spent frontloading can be “a solid investment of time because of the buy-in it generates in the results.”

As the K-W-L requires students to consider prior knowledge, students have already accessed the information they need to construct meaning from the new material. Without accessing that previous experience, students are at a nearly insurmountable disadvantage in creating meaning from new material.

There are many variations on the K-W-L. Gallagher (2004, p. 43-45) extends the K-W-L to a K-W-L-R, with “R” representing research students pursue after reading. Allen (2000, p. 136) found the K-W-L difficult to implement and thus extended it to address more of the students’ pre- and postreading needs in greater depth. This lead to the B-K-W-L-Q. This includes the traditional K-W-L but builds background on the topic before asking students to brainstorm their prior knowledge. This was done using read alouds. Allen’s (2000, p. 136) B-K-W-L-Q wraps up by adding “What
new questions do I have?” after students consider what they learned. This generates curiosity and direction for future study and investigation.

Beers and Howell (2003) also offer several variations on the K-W-L. One such option is “What do you know about...?” This organizer is fairly strictly a prereading activity. Students identify “What I Know or Think I Know” in a top box. Then students log “What Others Know or Think They Know.” This is an opportunity for students to access prior knowledge, discover connections and discrepancies between their experiences and those of their classmates, and ultimately affirm or dispel previously held ideas.

In “My Own Perspective” (Beers & Howell, 2003), students evaluate a position statement on a topic with which there is likely not to be consensus. Students indicate whether they agree or disagree before reading (or, in the case of music, practicing, discussion, rehearsal, or an activity). Students then record “Thoughts BEFORE Reading.” After students read, they record their “Thoughts AFTER Reading.” This is similar to the K-W-L in that students consider information before and after a literacy task, but the students view the information in a more evaluative, subjective manner.

“In With the Old, Out with the New” (Beers & Howell, 2003) is more similar to a K-W-L. “In With the Old, Out with the New” is a three-column graphic organizer. In the first column, students brainstorm old knowledge (“Old Knowledge”); in the second, they ask questions they have about the topic (“Questions”); in the third, students chronicle new knowledge (“New Knowledge”). This strategy is nearly identical to a K-W-L, but slightly
different wording may prevent the widely applicable strategy from feeling mundane.

Theme Spotlights and Anticipation Guides are another prereading activity intended to help students access prior knowledge (Gallagher, 2004, p. 39-41). In both activities, students may rate level of agreement or disagreement with various statements prior to reading. The Theme Spotlight is simply more focused on one major theme (Gallagher's example was the nature of evil, preparing students to read about Jekyll and Hyde). In music, this might be about students' perceptions of other cultures when we are working on multicultural music.

Allen (2000, chap. 9) advocates the use of read alouds in building literacy skills for struggling students, even at older levels (Allen's work is intended for teachers of grades 4-12). In a read aloud, someone else is responsible for decoding the text: this gives students the opportunity to build mental models without wrestling with the text. This allows students to access or even CREATE prior knowledge to carry into subsequent tasks. Gallagher (2004, p. 45) also suggests the use of film clips to draw on or build and generate prior knowledge.

Read alouds are not only enjoyable and useful in generating prior knowledge, they are supported by research. Anderson et al are quoted from their 1985 work: "The single most important activity for building the knowledge required for eventual success in reading" (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004, p. 238). Additional studies show increased motivation and
achievement in secondary students (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004). Daniels and Zemelman (2004, p. 238) go on to point out, "...we all love a good story, and hearing it together opens up a lot of opportunities to reflect and relate as a group." They subsequently suggest, "Read aloud from engaging and powerful writing in your field. Reading aloud evokes the sense of a group gathered around the fire to hear the stories that hold them together as a community" (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004, p. 238).

"Checking My Understanding" (Beers & Howell, 2003) takes the idea of connecting new and prior knowledge a step further. Another three-column graphic organizer, "Checking My Understanding" asks students to distinguish "Things I Read That I Already Know," "New Things I Learned," and "Questions I Still Have." This organizer has many possible applications in the instrumental music environment. For example, students could use this when a new piece is introduced, discussed, and sight-read in class. This graphic organizer would also be an effective alternative to a practice log for creating a more meaningful record of independent practice endeavors.

Helping students to identify what questions they still have is crucially important. According to Gallagher (2004, p. 65), "Poor readers have less tolerance for getting lost", while a good reader will keep going and "trust that the confusion will eventually clear. When reading is truly not "good enough," the reader must "figure out where their comprehension is breaking down" (Gallagher, 2004, p. 67). Gallagher (2004, p. 67) supports this philosophy with comprehension self-scoring. Students go through text (or, in the case of
band, music), rating each section on a scale from 1 to 10, one being complete confusion and 10 being total understanding. This helps students identify what sections require significant help (perhaps from a teacher) and which could be managed with another strategy. This could really help students to self-advocate in music lessons and save time for only the parts of music that truly require attention and additional support.

"Read! Listen! Conclude!" is a multi-stage graphic organizer spanning several stages of the literacy process (Beers & Howell, 2003). First, students write "Notes from Reading," then "Notes from Class Discussion," then "My Key Learnings." Thus students are recording the ideas of others and pinpointing the concepts they consider most important.

"Connections, Points, and Questions" is designated as a "during-reading" strategy (Beers & Howell, 2003) and bears some resemblance to a K-W-L. "Connections, Points, and Questions" is a three-column organizer with sections for "Connections: This matches something I already knew!", "Most Important Points: These are the main ideas of the reading.", and "Questions I Have: I'm still not sure I understand this, or I need more information." In the case of music, this might translate to individual practice time, perhaps in place of a traditional practice record, or to process and record ideas in a rehearsal or class discussion of a newer concept.

A four-column variation on a K-W-L is "Ready-Set-Go-Whoa!" (Beers & Howell, 2003). "Ready-Set-Go-Whoa!" is helpfully self-descriptive as well as an effective graphic organizer for focusing one's grasp of material. In
“Ready”, students ask themselves, “What do I already know about this topic?” In other words, they are readying themselves to undertake the topic at hand. In “Set”, students question, “What do I think I will learn?” This sets the stage and anticipates the material to be examined. In “Go”, students consider, “What new information did I learn?” “Whoa” is an opportunity for students to identify, “What questions do I still have about this topic?” “Ready-Set-Go-Whoa!” is exceptional because, in addition to being an effective graphic organizer, it provides a way of remembering an effective sequence of steps in approaching a literacy task (consider prior knowledge, anticipate, review what’s been learned, identify persisting questions).

Buehl (2001, p. 165) presents the Sequential Roundtable Alphabet is presented as an opportunity for brainstorming prior knowledge. This strategy involves a grid with each letter of the alphabet in its own square. Students then brainstorm what comes to mind about a topic by each letter of the alphabet. I think this strategy could also be applied to later stages of learning. For example, as we are working on a piece of music or concept, we could use this format to summarize and present some of the ideas that have come up through our preparation or study. This would create a lasting record.

**Vocabulary Organizers**

The Vocabulary Overview Guide is a unique way of organizing and thinking about vocabulary. Vocabulary Overview Guides contain a space for
the vocabulary word, a clue, and the definition (Buehl, 2001). An example in music might look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Andante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clue:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like “andar” in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A slow, walking tempo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This format could be extended with more lines for multiple definitions, and additional word sections for other vocabulary words would be put on the same page.

“List-Group-Label” is a strategy for organizing a larger quantity of vocabulary (Daniels & Zemelman, 2004, p. 142-143). In this activity, the class or the teacher generates a list of 20-25 vocabulary. The students then categorize the words into several groups. Finally, students assign a label to the groups. I could see asking students to “List-Group-Label” basic terms for tempos, dynamics, articulations, or expression markings.

“Sort and Select” gives students a particular format for categorizing vocabulary words (Beers & Howell, 2003). Although identified as a prereading activity, this activity would fit at any point when students need to refine understanding of vocabulary words. Students (or the teacher) begin by listing vocabulary words at the top of the organizer. Students then sort the words into categories. The students then identify the category that the
groupings of words they've created fit into ("I put the above in these categories:"). Finally, and saliently, students complete sections beneath each category, clarifying "because..." – i.e., why the groupings and categories were selected.

"Just Checkin" is another vocabulary graphic organizer but is more appropriate to more in-depth consideration of just a few vocabulary words (Beers & Howell, 2003). This organizer uses a grid with vocabulary words listed at the top of several columns [in Beers & Howell's (2003), 3 columns contain vocabulary words]. Running along the left side is a fourth column labeled "characteristics." Each row going down has a specific characteristic that is to be discussed in the box corresponding to the vocabulary word. For example, in music, it might look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Concepts/Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tempo that is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tempo that's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very different</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A piece we play at this tempo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing A-Z's (2008) Vocabulary Word Map is an organizer that asks students to thoroughly examine one word. This organizer includes the word, the dictionary definition, a synonym, an antonym, other forms of the word, "word used in a sentence or phrase from the book", and "word used in an original sentence." The map is presented like this:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Antonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary definition</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms of the word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word used in a sentence or phrase from the book
(Pg. No. ___)

Word used in an original sentence
```

"Word Questioning" is another organizer for a comprehensive study of one word (Allen, 2000, p. 276). This strategy includes knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, thus addressing all levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. These thinking skills are accessed in this layout:
Problem Solving and Planning

Beers and Howell (2003) offer an array of graphic organizers in *Reading Strategies for the Content Areas*. These organizers are classified as prereading, during-reading, and postreading activities; however, in the context of music education, it will be necessary to think about these
strategies differently and make the necessary adaptations to reap the potential benefits of these powerful tools.

One such organizer is "The Real Problem Is..." (Beers & Howell, 2003). In this organizer, students first brainstorm (and record) "The facts as we know them..." in a bubble at the top. Then, students use these facts to synthesize, "So the real problem is:“, and fill in the lines provided. The section for the problem is followed by arrows leading to three squares labeled "A solution might be..." Students generate possible solutions and then evaluate their suggestions in "But the consequences are..." Here is an example of this organizer:
This strategy could work well for engaging students in devising a plan of attack for addressing musical problems. This would also put the responsibility for correcting any problems back on the students.

Allen (2000, p. 164 & 271) offers another organizer for problem-solving, “Looking at Our Options.” This organizer lacks a place to establish facts but provides more room for options and consequences. It looks more or less like this:
The "Problem and Solution" organizer is more straightforward (Writing A-Z, 2008). This organizer includes who, what, where, when, and why, as well as the results of an attempted solution. It looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution

Attempted Solution: Result:

Final Solution

This organizer allows students to attempt the proposed solution before evaluating it.

Students may consider their efforts, difficulties, and solutions in Allen's "Assessment: Continuous Learning" (2000, p. 288). It allows students
to self-assess and discover what was successful and how they overcame obstacles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I tried to...</th>
<th>But I had difficulties...</th>
<th>I discovered that...</th>
<th>So then I decided to...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another way students can consider consequences is the PMI (Col, 2008). The PMI stands for plusses, minuses, and interesting things or implications, depending on what students are considering. It is a three-column organizer. Col (2008) offers more extensive graphic organizers for situations in which more than two options are being considered, with boxes for the plusses and minuses of each scenario, referring to these as “Decision Making Graphic Organizers.”

When using “The Real Problem Is…” (Beers & Howell, 2003), “Looking at Our Options” (Allen, 2000), or the PMI (Col, 2008), it is important that students acknowledge positive facts about the situation as well as negative ones. This information should be noted in the “facts” section of “The Real Problem Is…” or perhaps brainstormed before tackling the PMI or “Looking at Our Options”. This is because “…before we can even consider making changes, we need to believe that there is more right with us than
wrong and that we have the power to fix whatever is wrong" (Faber, Mazlish, Nyberg, & Templeton, 1996). These organizers have the potential to be very empowering for music students as long as we acknowledge what we already do well.

The “End – of – Week Check – in” (Allen, 2000, p. 287) would translate easily from an independent reading log to an independent practice log. In this chart, students identify what they accomplished and learned over the week, still need help with, and want to spend more time on. It allows students to reflect and plan ahead. It looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Things I accomplished this week</th>
<th>I learned</th>
<th>I still need help with...</th>
<th>I'd like to spend more time learning about...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This satisfies several concerns in a practice tool. First of all, it is ongoing but, as a weekly chart, the primary emphasis is on the practice rather than the act of writing it down. Moreover, it is not simply writing down practice
time but considering one's practice and progress over a more substantial time period.

**Organizational Frames and Graphic Organizers.**

"Order It!" is a graphic organizer that helps students organize "important steps or events" (Beers & Howell, 2003). "Order It!" is simply a series of 6 boxes connected by arrows. This was intended as a "during-reading activity" but would work well with the many sequential processes in playing a musical instrument. More advanced players would benefit from writing out the events in a piece of music they are playing so as to achieve improved balance between melody and accompaniment parts.

"The Sum of the Parts" is not sequential like "Order It!" and is designated as a prereading activity, but it may be useful in similar situations (Beers & Howell, 2003). In "The Sum of the Parts," students (or the teacher) identify parts or components, then provide a description and details. I could foresee using this organizer when studying music with distinct sections; for example, we often study theme and variations, and each variation would be particular part. Anne McGinty’s (multiple) folk trilogies also lend themselves to this format, since each of the three folksongs she presents are distinct, separate sections. This strategy is cohesive with the way students learn. According to Brooks and Brooks (1999, p. 47), "When concepts are presented as wholes...students seek to make meaning by breaking the wholes in to parts that they can see and understand." "The Sum of the Parts" (Beers & Howell, 2003) honors this constructivist view of learning.
Students are presented with the whole and given a means, structure, and support to break it into parts that they are able to understand and create meaning from for themselves.

I had never previously considered the Y-chart for covering academic content. The Y-chart is simply a circle divided into thirds, labeled “looks like”, “sounds like”, and “feels like” (Col, 2008). I have often used Y-charts for describing behaviors we want during certain activities—“how is it going to look, sound, and feel when we are having silent writing time?” Y-charts could also be used, however, to investigate a concept or even just a vocabulary word in detail. For example, if we used a Y-chart for a piano dynamic, students might describe what my conducting looked like, how loudly we played, and what it felt like to create that dynamic. I could see this graphic organizer as being very useful in making students aware of conducting gestures.
“Who Are the ‘Big Players’?” is a more concise way of determining who is responsible for what (Beers & Howell, 2003). In this three-column organizer, students identify the “key person”, their “contributions”, and then makes “connections.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Person</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is perhaps a more visually attractive and accessible way for music students to identify who is doing what. Helping students realize who has the melody is critical to achieving balance as a group. Students can delve deeper by considering what purpose each part serves in the larger perspective of the piece.

The “snow globe” and “time capsule” are metaphorical graphic organizers (Gallagher, 2004, p. 139). Both of these organizers are proposed to help students consider setting (time and place) in the context of reading literature; however, this could be easily applied to give consideration to
music that comes from or represents a particular place or time period. Both can be used for students to draw or write and may be used to lead in to more formal writings. Here is an example of a snow globe that could be used in music:

Another visual metaphor graphic organizer proposed by Gallagher (2004, p. 136) is the ingredient list. An ingredient list is simply a list of what goes into a process or product that the students are studying. This is very simple and really doesn't require much of an organizer, but it does provide a different (and metaphoric) way of thinking about a topic. There is value in this metaphoric perspective.
Comparing and Contrasting

The Analogy Graphic Organizer (Buehl, 2001) offers an opportunity for students to compare and contrast a new concept with a concept with which they are familiar. The two concepts to be addressed (the new and the familiar) are identified at the top, then two columns of boxes are provided, one for similarities and one for differences. Finally, arrows from each column lead to one large box identified as "Relationship Categories," in which students list "categories that made up the basis for the comparison." The organizer looks like this:

Buehl (2001, p. 27) identifies advantages of this graphic organizer as an opportunity for students to connect new concepts with "related experiences"
and background", improve understanding of new concepts by connecting
them to familiar concepts, and practice organizing compare and contrast
summaries.

The Analogical Guide may also help students draw comparisons
(Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 1995). In the Analogical Guide, students
name the “structure”, “function”, and “analogy”. Readence, Bean, & Baldwin
(1995, p. 165) offer the example of a cell wall, whose function is to support
and protect, which is analogous to factory walls. In music, an example might
be rondo form, its function is repetition, and it is analogous to the redial
button on a phone.

Another graphic organizer presented by Buehl (2001, p. 56) is the
Frayer Model. In the Frayer Model, one large rectangle is divided into four
sections and an oval is in the center. The oval contains the topic, and the
four sections are labeled “Essential Characteristics”, “Nonessential
Characteristics”, “Examples”, and “Nonexamples”. The Frayer Model looks
like this:
Beers and Howell (2003) offer an organizer similar to the Frayer model called "What it is and What it's Not." In this strategy, students are presented with a similar graphic, but the squares are labeled "definition," "characteristics," "what it is," and "and what it's not." "What it is and What it's Not" may be more straightforward in the language it uses to identify the boxes and thus more readily accessible to more students.
“Concept Attainment” (Allen, 2000, p. 197 & 280) also resembles the Frayer model. Allen (2000) presents “Concept Attainment” in the following format:
A more subjective variation on the Frayer model is “Agree/Disagree” (Beers & Howell, 2003). Students consider a central topic or statement and, in four surrounding boxes, identify reasons to “Strongly Agree”, “Agree”, “Disagree”, and “Strongly Disagree.” This seems related to the Frayer model but intended for subjective ideas rather than concrete information.

**Informal Writing**

Not all effective literacy strategies require a graphic organizer. Moore, Moore, Cunningham, and Cunningham (2003, p. 183) point out, “Much school writing is limited to a few forms – paragraphs, stories, letters, poems, and reports. Actual writing, however, contains countless forms.” Gammill (2006) also speaks to the value of informal writing:

> Informal writing allows students to organize their thoughts and draw conclusions about information. Using comprehension strategies like K-W-L charts and reading journals also puts students at ease. Informal writing affords the opportunity for deep reflection without fear of punitive response from a teacher. K-W-L charts and reading journals are assessed for content and to measure learning; they are not graded for grammar and spelling, so by their very nature they create a "safe" writing zone for students.

This view supports the use of graphic organizers (like the K-W-L) along with other informal writing activities, while also reflecting a more student-centered, progressive, and constructivist view of learning and writing.
Gammill (2006) goes on to say just that: “Primarily, writing to learn is an effective tool in helping students become active instead of passive learners, and the classroom becomes student centered rather than teacher centered.”

There are many writing opportunities within content areas that operate outside the realms of traditional school writing. One such strategy is cubing (Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 1995). In cubing, students delve deeply into a topic by describing it, comparing it, associating it, analyzing it, applying it, and arguing for or against it. This strategy moves through the various levels of thinking presented in Bloom’s Taxonomy. It also engages students in writing as a means of gaining greater understanding and mastery of a topic.

Readence, Bean, and Baldwin (1995) propose another informal writing strategy called “Possible Sentences”, which is useful in internalizing vocabulary. In “Possible Sentences”, students generate a list of key terms. The teacher may then write the terms on cards and have students draw two at random, or, if it needs to be simplified, students may select their own terms. Students then write a sentence using the two words. The students share these sentences, with the teacher recording them on the board (whether they are accurate or not). Students then investigate the sentences created by others and verify their accuracy. The class then makes revisions to the sentences recorded on the board. Students may then be given the opportunity to write down the sentences for themselves.
Conversation logs are another opportunity for writing (Gallagher, 2004, p. 120). Conversation logs are intended for students studying the same materials in different class hours. For these logs, students are paired or grouped with students in different class periods. Students then carry on a written dialogue with students from other classes, writing questions and comments to share.

An easy graphic organizer, informal writing opportunity, and cooperative activity is “Pass the Paper” (Beers & Howell, 2003). “Pass the Paper” is a two-column organizer with the left column labeled “Questions” and the right side labeled “Answers.” Students write questions about a given topic, then pass the paper to another person in the group. The next person is to answer the first question on the list and pass it on. The next person answers the second question, and so on. I would modify this by allowing students to offer any answers or information they may know as well as by allowing subsequent students to add follow-up questions. I believe this would create greater depth and breadth to the information the students would share and acquire.

Students have an opportunity to think more creatively about a topic in “Alphabet Soup” (Beers & Howell, 2003). Students draw up to 10 letters randomly. Students may then write their letters on Alphabet Soup sheet, then write sentences that begin with that letter related to a particular topic. While the graphic portion of this activity (there is a grid with one column for letters and one for sentences) is minimal, it does lend a particular structure
and asks students to think of statements regarding a topic with some
direction as well as creativity. Moreover, this is a structured, safe, easy, and
fun way to engage students in informal writing in the music environment.

Another opportunity for students to engage in informal writing exists
in "The Five W's and H For..." (Beers & Howell, 2003). This graphic
organizer is a table with who, what, where, when, why, and how at the top of
6 columns, followed by 5 rows beneath. The instructions indicate that
students are to "act as newspaper reporters to ensure that they have the
details for the event they are reading about" (Beers & Howell, 2003, p.69). It
is also suggested that some details on the chart may be filled in to assist the
students. I find these instructions rather confusing but conceive of this
graphic organizer as a potentially good way for students to sort out sections
of a piece. For example, we are working on *Theme and Variations* by
Timothy Broege (1999), which is a theme, 3 variations, and a recapitulation.
Theme would be the what, "the beginning" would be where, "clarinets and
low brass, then everyone else" would be the who, and so on and so forth.
Finally, students may engage in informal writing and metacognition in “How Sure Are You?” (Beers & Howell, 2003). “How Sure Are You?” gives students an opportunity to consider what they know and what they don’t know in graphic form. The “How Sure Are You?” chart is presented by Beers & Howell (2003, p. 88) like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Pencil Facts</th>
<th>“I’m not too sure about this.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Ink Facts</td>
<td>“I’m pretty certain these are true.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Stone Facts</td>
<td>“I know for sure that these are true.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students may write in prose or more informally in lists as these are both valid forms in informal writing. Moreover, the metacognitive aspects of this activity are strong and help pinpoint concepts students do and do not need teacher intervention to understand or execute successfully.
Moore, Moore, Cunningham, and Cunningham (2003, p. 177) point out, "Informal writing can take just a few minutes but can help students focus on what they know, what they don't know, and what they think." These simple strategies can help students find greater clarity with a minimal time commitment.

**The Need for Variety**

It is important to give students access to a variety of graphic organizers and literacy strategies so that they have the means with which to become independent learners. According to Buehl (2001, p. 7):

Students need to discover which learning strategies work best for them and when to apply them. Classroom strategies that guide students in assessing the learning situation, setting their own purpose, choosing the most effective actions, and evaluating their success lead to more self-sufficient individuals capable of becoming lifelong learners.

Wallace, Pearman, Hail, and Hurst (2007, p. 51) expand, "Teachers should be encouraged to vary their graphic organizers and the ways they use them to make sure all students have the strategies they need to be successful."

**Conclusion**

Literature regarding the rationale and manifestations of Responsive Classroom was explored. Responsive Classroom served as the context and philosophical lens through which literacy strategies have been viewed and employed.
There is a void in literature specifically addressing content area literacy in music; however, writings regarding content area literacy as well as those regarding musical practice were investigated. This literature presents the opportunity to merge strategies from a variety of areas within education.
CHAPTER 4: PROCEDURE FOR CONDUCTING RESEARCH

The procedure for conducting research includes an overview of the research methodology and rationale. The methodology also describes the practical application of seven literacy strategies used in instrumental music (band) classes with grades six through eight.

Research Methods

Qualitative research is distinguished by a number of features. First, in qualitative research, the research does not try "...to manipulate conditions to isolate variables"; rather, the context of the research is considered and the observations understood within an identified, real-world context (Johnson, 2005, p. 7). This research design makes qualitative research particularly useful in education as the expectation is to adapt to situations rather than adapt situations to suit one's instructional needs and desires. This is also particularly relevant to my circumstances as I teach in several very distinct and interesting settings. While qualitative data cannot accurately be generalized beyond its specific setting, the itinerant nature of my situation makes my inquiries helpful in a greater range of settings. There is no "observer effect" as I am already a part of the classroom "landscape" (Bogdon & Biklen, 2003). Students' experiences were only impacted to the extent they are when I try anything new with them; the fact that I am analyzing their homework as data did not affect their experience.

It is important to note that qualitative research cannot begin with "specific questions to answer or hypotheses to test" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003,
Keeping this in mind, the key questions I developed have evolved as my research progressed and my focus has adjusted based on my observations and increased understanding. This is typical of qualitative research.

Johnson (2005, p. 61) defines qualitative research as being "systematic," with a plan for what information will be collected, when, how, and how often. I proceeded by asking my music students to complete literacy tasks beginning in early March and continuing through the final two and a half months of school. This process included band students in grades six through eight at four schools. I selected my means of data collection from a list offered by Johnson (2005, p. 62). I chose to use student products/performances, personal checklists and performance rating scales, metacognitive surveys, and a research journal. I used at least two of these collection methods to "triangulate" the data, or give it more validity by looking at the subject - one point of the triangle - from two perspectives – different data, or the other two points of the triangle (Johnson, 2005, p. 83). I then applied inductive analysis to the data by "creat[ing] order by organizing what is observed into groups" (Johnson, 2005, p. 83). Because I work with a teaching partner at the junior high level, each step in this study was witnessed or participated in by him as well. Because we have both been trained in Responsive Classroom, have experienced building-level training in literacy strategies, and because I have communicated extensively with him
about this study, his participation adds increased credibility and reliability as well.

**Pilot Study**

In preparation for this study, I created a pilot lesson. As students transitioned from book 1 to book 2 (seventh grade) or book 2 to book 3 of *Essential Elements 2000*, our band method book, I asked students to compare and contrast the contents of the two books using a Venn diagram. I also asked them to consider the unique and similar challenges and practice implications that the two books presented. Through this study, I discovered some research biases I may bring. I was surprised to note that, while many more seventh graders (almost all) turned in their Venn diagrams, very few mentioned much about the books beyond the superficial (e.g., color of the cover). Only about two-thirds of the eighth graders turned in their Venn diagrams; however, almost all mentioned musically significant ideas about the new text (e.g., rhythms, scales, important layout features). I was very surprised because of the personality of the eighth grade band, and this was not the result I expected from them. If one band was going to be more superficial, I expected it would be the eighth graders. This was an obvious bias I was bringing to the study and was able to identify as a result of the pilot. While there will not be an observer effect in the students' reactions to me, because I am a regular part of the classroom environment, I do bring to my research my own prior knowledge of the students.
This pilot provided important information about the structure of the
Venn diagram assignment in my attempts to explain why the groups were so
different. All students had the same number of school days before the
assignment was due; however, eighth grade had a three day weekend.
Since I want these activities to be tied to actual playing and practice and not
simply paperwork for the sake of paperwork, and many students are only
able to get their instruments home during the weekends, most assignments
were given over a time frame that included a weekend. Therefore, for all
students participating, comparable assignments were given over a time
period including a weekend. Sixth grade students do not have the option to
leave their instruments at school; therefore, assignments that were unique to
sixth grade classes were be given over a time period that did not necessarily
include a weekend. This pilot was valuable in developing further depth and
perspective regarding the methodology used in this research study.

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

The University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point Institutional Review Board
approved this study on February 14, 2008. Approval was necessary
because subjects are minors. Because there is no threat to subjects
(students) and all activities are normal educational practice, signatures from
building principals were obtained and further permissions from parents or
guardians of students were determined to be unnecessary.
The IRB submission is available for review in Appendix A. Names of schools, principals, and my teaching partner have been omitted for the privacy of students.

**Student Activities**

The following are the activities students undertook as part of this study. The activities are presented chronologically, rather than by activity category, to demonstrate the progression students experienced.

When the same activity was presented to multiple groups, such as the three elementary bands or two seventh grade bands, the same language and methodology was used with each group unless otherwise noted.

Seven strategies will be presented: a K-W-L (prior knowledge), Five W's and H (informal writing), So the Real Problem Is (problem solving), My Own Perspective (compare and contrast), Order It! (graphic organizer/organizational frame), How Sure Are You? (independent practice/informal writing), and The Sum of the Parts (independent practice/organizational frame). Each activity was accompanied by a metacognitive assessment with the exception of Order It! and Five W's and H.

**Metacognitive Assessments**

After completing each of the activities outlined, students completed a metacognitive assessment regarding what they learned and how they learned it. The elementary students had a slightly different assessment,
including two yes or no questions (Appendix B). The junior high students completed an assessment with entirely short answer questions (Appendix C).

**K-W-L**

I decided that the K-W-L would be a good strategy to start the seventh graders with because it was reasonably familiar to most of us. Moreover, we were fast approaching the point at which the students needed to learn 6/8 time. I approached this by first warming the groups up twice using judicious questions about the time signatures, their meaning, and the rhythms in relation to the time signatures (2/4, 3/4, 4/4, and 2/2). I passed out the K-W-L and asked students to consider and record what they already knew about time signatures in the "K" column. Students had several minutes to do this, with time ending when it was clear the students were done (when they got restless). Then, students moved into their cooperative groups or "houses." In their houses, students shared what they knew about time signatures. Then, students had time to go through the book and predict what they might want to learn or may need help with.

Students then reconvened as a class to share what they knew and wanted to know. We discussed what 6/8 means – that there are six beats per measure and the eighth note gets the beat. We discussed the rhythmic implications of the eighth note getting the beat as well as grouping the six eighth notes in two groups of three and how that feels different.
We then practiced clapping and counting as well as playing the 6/8 exercises in our book (Essential Elements 2000, book 2). Students then completed the “L” column to document what they learned that day as well as several subsequent days of review. Students completed a metacognitive survey or reflection on how they had learned 6/8 and handed it in with the completed K-W-L.

Students were given the metacognitive assessments to complete with the K-W-L. Students turned in their K-W-Ls and metacognitive assessments together approximately two weeks after we started working on 6/8. Students completed the metacognitive assessments independently.

Within the next few weeks, students had small group lessons to practice and review 6/8 time. We started out reviewing 6/8 through discussion and writing on the board. I played along with at least portions of all lessons except for one oboe lesson.

I assessed the students’ understanding as a group. The criteria used for the assessment were six beats in a measure, eighth note gets the beat, dotted quarter note gets three beats, pulse is steady, beats one and four are the strongest beats, and proper 6/8 feel. I recorded my assessments in a table as a check (they got it), check plus (really good), check minus (they had some trouble), or a brief description such as “rushing” or “eventually.”

The Five W’s and H For...

This activity was used at School A. It was not used at Schools B and C because it was unsuccessful at School A.
At School A, this activity was used to look at the different sections of *Theme and Variations* by Timothy Broege. Measure numbers were written in for the students under “where” to indicate the different sections of the piece. We began talking about who played during the theme and writing it in, what it was (the theme), how long it lasted, and when it occurred (the beginning). I guided students through this portion with the intention of discussing other sections of the piece in this manner, but even working as a group, the students were very frustrated and confused. There was preoccupation with what to write down rather than what was happening. We did not complete the rest of the chart, nor did the students complete a metacognitive assessment for this activity.

*So the Real Problem Is...*

This strategy was considerably less thought out in its implementation and came to me as something of a “Eureka!” moment. I was planning the last few weeks before our district-wide combined bands concert (which is primarily a showcase for the sixth graders), I decided I could use “So the Real Problem Is...” (Beers & Howell, 2004) to help the 6th grade students plan what we need to accomplish in the final 2 weeks of preparation for the big concert and how we might go about doing it for themselves.

I devised this plan at about 2:20 and piloted it at Elementary A during the 3 p.m. class (on a Friday afternoon). There was some initial confusion and protest at homework for band, but once they realized that I did expect them to do the work but that there was an explanation of how to do it
forthcoming they settled down. I reminded them that if they were confused, that was all the more reason to be quiet and listen so that I could help them become unconfused. I also told them up front that there weren’t right answers, that I just wanted them to give this some thought as they practiced over the weekend, and that it would be very, very easy if they chilled out and let me give them instructions. I had one who wanted to argue about having homework in band (she often does argue) and I told her we could do it at 3:35 (the end of the school day) and that ended her protests.

We worked on the “facts” and the “the real problem is” sections together and the solutions and consequences sections were their homework for Tuesday (the next band). I did tell the students that they could have one “silly” solution of the three, to give them in fantasy what they can’t have in reality as How to Talk so Kids Can Learn advocates (Faber, Mazlish, Nyberg, & Templeton, 1996). I also told the students that if they wanted to do more than one problem, they could have an extra sheet(s) and do them for extra credit.

I introduced the assignment in the same way at schools B and C, but I had to wait until the following Monday. School C was also displaced by a book fair, and we practiced in the janitor’s closet, then used the white board in the gym, so we were a little out of sorts. The due date for schools B and C was Thursday.

Once students turned in their solutions, I read them and referenced their suggestions when we worked in class. I did this at all three schools.
Students at Schools A and B completed the metacognitive assessment individually several weeks later. School C did the metacognitive assessment as a group.

My Own Perspective

"My Own Perspective" (Beers & Howell, 2004) is a pre- and postreading strategy in which students record their feelings or beliefs prior to experiencing a text and after reading. Obviously, this required some creativity to make work in the music classroom. I handed out the sheet to Elementary School A on the day of the combined bands concert and asked them to record what they were thinking and feeling about playing with nearly 600 students. Then, the first class day after the concert, I gave the students time to reflect on and record their thoughts and feelings after the concert. We then shared our reflections orally as a group.

Due to a crisis at the high school, Elementary Schools B and C did both sections reflectively, completing both the before and after sections the day after the concert. It was not as the strategy was intended, but it still seemed worthwhile. The first day after the combined bands concert (which happened to be the very next day at both of these schools), I gave students time to write in both the before and after columns, then we shared our reflections with the group.

School A did the metacognitive reflection as a group discussion about a week after the activity. Schools B and C completed the metacognitive assessment individually.
Order It!

"Order It!" (Beers & Howell, 2004) was more difficult to implement because I was not the lead teacher on the piece we used it on. I had worked with the eighth grade band when my teaching partner (and the conductor) was out, and we had worked on balance and blend issues (which he had worked on with them before). I noticed while I was pulling students for lessons that he was working on the same issues, and the students still didn’t know who had the melody.

I discussed this with the students and presented "Order It!" as an opportunity for them to help themselves hear the most important parts. The piece was long enough that I did back-to-back copies of "Order It!" I also indicated the measure numbers for the different sections to help students know when things changed. We talked about what they were to do and then simply reminded them periodically when they worked on the piece.

This piece was prepared for the students' final concert in late May. As such, we didn’t collect it until very late. As the year wound down, things grew busy, and in cleaning out the room, most students threw away their copies of "Order It!" We did not score them down for this because the end of the year was rather disorganized. In light of this, instead of giving the students the full metacognitive assessment, I simply had them answer three questions: whether or not they’d finished "Order It!", if they felt that the activity had helped them play or understand better, and if they felt that the group played better as a result of the activity.
Independent Practice

Both the seventh and eighth grade bands prepared auditions at the end of the school year to determine seating in the bands for next year. Students were given organizers to plan and implement their practice of these audition materials. Both groups received these the day before the Memorial Day weekend, with auditions beginning the following week. When students returned from the holiday weekend, they were told to keep their organizers until after they had auditioned, in case they needed information from it. The students also received the metacognitive assessments to complete and turn in with the organizers after their auditions.

How Sure Are You?

The seventh grade band completed the organizer “How Sure Are You?” (Beers and Howell, 2004) in place of a practice log. Due to my elementary schedule, I was unable to present it to one of the two seventh grade bands, so I wrote down everything I needed my colleague to say. The categories were “In Pencil”, “In Ink”, and “In Stone.” For the purposes of practice, I clarified these (or had my colleague clarify) that these were issues the students needed help with, skills they needed reassurance on, and items they were confident in. On Tuesday, students had an opportunity to seek clarification or reassurance. Performance assessments or auditions (we called them both) began on Wednesday, with students turning in organizers and metacognitive assessments as they auditioned.
Eighth grade students considered different musical performance elements prior to their auditions using "The Sum of the Parts" (Beers and Howell, 2004). I filled in several components for wind-playing students: the required etude, major scales, chromatic scale, and tone. For percussionists, I wrote a note (and explained) that I wanted them to consider what elements of a percussion audition they felt were important and that I may use their ideas in scoring the auditions.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

Results for the seven strategies or organizers are also presented chronologically to show the evolution and transformations that occurred through this study.

Results include details regarding completion of graphic organizers, reflections obtained through metacognitive assessments, as well as anecdotal observations from the activities. Some strategies – the KWL and the independent practice organizers – lent themselves well to formal performance assessments, both through lessons and auditions. This information is also included. The Five W's and H, So the Real Problem Is, My Own Perspective, and Order It! did not include performance assessments because their primary purpose was reflection or analysis of organization. The learning targets for these activities were more dispositional and reasoning oriented, aligning with the use of a variety of targets (knowledge, reasoning, skill, performance, and disposition) the district is working towards.

Know-Want to Know-Learned (KWL)

Of the thirty-one students in one section of seventh grade band, twenty-nine turned in their KWLs. Of twenty-two students in the other section (including one student who is habitually truant), thirteen turned in their KWLs. Of the twenty-nine completed KWLs in the first section, twenty were detailed, five offered vague details, three included superficial or very
limited information, and one did not make any sense. In the other section, ten of the thirteen KWLS were detailed and three were superficial.

Performance Assessment

Students had small group lessons including exercises in 6/8 time. There were seven lesson groups in the first section and six in the second section. In the first section, all seven groups demonstrated understanding and ability to execute assessment criteria with basic or better proficiency (being able to do it or being able to do it well). In the second section, the saxophone and trumpet groups demonstrated basic or better proficiency in all categories, but the other four groups experienced difficulty in one or more assessment areas that required more substantial coaching.

The following chart is a reproduction of what I used to assess understanding and performance of 6/8 time with lesson groups. A check simply means that the group showed understanding or executed the performance task successfully. A check plus means the group was very successful and performed especially well or showed understanding more promptly. A check minus means the group took a little more time to show understanding or had more difficulty performing.
### Chapter 5: Results

#### Section 1
- Flutes: 5 students
- Clarinets: 7 students
- Saxes: 4 students
- Oboe: 6 students (one new)

#### Section 2
- Flutes: 3 students
- Clarinets: 4 students
- Saxes: 4 students
- Horn: 1 student (I didn't play)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 beats per measure</th>
<th>Eighth note gets the beat</th>
<th>Dotted quarter = 3 beats</th>
<th>Pulse is steady</th>
<th>Beats 1 &amp; 4 are strongest beats</th>
<th>Proper 6/8 feel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (-) eventually</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓- (rush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 1
- Trumpets: 7 students
- Low brass: 4 students
- Percussion: 4 students

#### Section 2
- Trumpets: 1 student
- Low brass: 1 student
- Percussion: 1 student (separate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 beats per measure</th>
<th>Eighth note gets the beat</th>
<th>Dotted quarter = 3 beats</th>
<th>Pulse is steady</th>
<th>Beats 1 &amp; 4 are strongest beats</th>
<th>Proper 6/8 feel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓- (rush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓- (rush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓- (rush)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 1
- Trumpets: 7 students
- Trumpets: 4 students
- Percussion: 1 student (separate)

### Percussion
- Trumpets: 3 students
- Trumpets: 3 students
- Percussion: 3 students

#### 6 beats per measure
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓

#### Eighth note gets the beat
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓

#### Dotted quarter = 3 beats
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓

#### Pulse is steady
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓

#### Beats 1 & 4 are strongest beats
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓

#### Proper 6/8 feel
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓

### Section 1
- Flutes: 5 students
- Clarinets: 7 students
- Saxes: 4 students
- Oboe: 6 students (one new)

#### Section 2
- Flutes: 3 students
- Clarinets: 4 students
- Saxes: 4 students
- Horn: 1 student (I didn't play)
Metacognitive Assessment

The metacognitive portion of this activity, which also served as student feedback for the strategy, yielded notable results.

Question 1: “The thing that helped me the most was...because...”

In the first class section, the most common responses to “The thing that helped me the most was...because...” was playing, with eight students mentioning this. Three other students mentioned playing “Row Your Boat” specifically. Two students mentioned the KWL itself, one noting that it allowed him or her to ask questions. Three also felt that working in cooperative groups was helpful, two said that someone else helped them, and three responded “teacher(s)”. Three students mentioned clapping and three listed talking. Two students indicated that their solo and ensemble music helped. One student mentioned the book and one mentioned drawing a divided pie to represent the beat.

In the later section, six of the thirteen students mentioned playing, two mentioned group work, one mentioned clapping, one mentioned making a chart of the rhythm, and one mentioned explaining. One student specifically noted that she or he had an easier time understanding when other kids explained.

Question 2: “I would like to spend more time on...”

Students had more consistent responses to the question “I would like to spend more time on...” In the first section (with 28 responses), fourteen students indicated that they wanted to spend more time on 6/8. Seven
students mentioned that they wanted to spend more time playing. Three need more time on time signatures and notes in general. Two students stated they would like to spend more time on cut-time, and one each mentioned counting and triplets.

The second section of seventh grade band (thirteen responses) had similar responses but greater variety. Five students wrote that they need more time on 6/8 time and five mentioned cut-time. One student noted common time (4/4) and one indicated 2/4 time. Two students felt we need to work on breathing and starting together as a band when we play. One student mentioned theory, one said note names, one noted counting, and one specified triplets.

Question 3. "It didn’t help me when we...because...”

Question 3 yielded conflicting results. In the first section, five students mentioned clapping, while one student said it was difficult when we played without clapping first. Four students found it unhelpful when we talked about 6/8. Quite a few students – seven in all – mentioned that playing “Jolly Good Fellow” wasn’t helpful, one specifically noting that the pick-up note was confusing. Three students mentioned playing “Row Your Boat” wasn’t helpful: one because it was too slow, one because it was too easy, and one didn’t specify why. Two students felt that playing in general was unhelpful. One student indicated cut-time. One student said talking about 6/8 in a mathematical way did not help him or her because he or she is not good at
math. Two students felt that we did not review 6/8 soon enough. Two students said there was nothing that did not help them.

The later section of seventh grade band was somewhat more unified in their feelings. Five students felt that working in groups did not help them. Three students noted that any time spent not playing was unhelpful to them, however, two other students felt that playing at this stage wasn’t useful to them. One student mentioned the book, one student found the KWL ineffective, and one did not find what was written on the board to be valuable.

**Question 4.** "I still don’t understand/am having trouble with ______ and I think it might help me to..."

One of the most common answers in the first section was nothing, that they understood so far. Six students answered in this way. Six other students indicated that the review of cut-time preceding 6/8 was still troublesome. Five students found 6/8 to be difficult, and two noted more generally time signatures. Four students mentioned counting while two mentioned rhythms, a similar response. One student noted that his solo included 32\(^{nd}\) notes in 6/8 time, and one wrote notes.

No students in the second section considered themselves proficient in all areas; no one wrote that there was nothing that they didn’t understand. One student found time signatures challenging, while five specified 6/8 and three specified cut-time. Two students expressed annoyance that 6/8 and cut-time are used and questioned why they are needed at all. One student
was very specific and said that he or she doesn’t understand the bottom number in the time signature. More randomly, one student struggles with high notes and one with triplets.

**Question 5.** “I understand/am good at _______ really well because…”

The 4/4 time signature was a very popular answer. Nine students in the first section wrote this, with one writing ¾ time. Five students felt good about 6/8 time, one cut-time, one time signatures in general, and one very specifically the bottom number of a time signature. One student identified “Row Your Boat” as a point of strength. Two students felt they were good at everything, and one at sixteenth notes. Three students wrote “notes” and one answered “fast beats.”

Eight of the thirteen students responding in section two listed 4/4 as something they do well. One student said they understand the top number, and one felt good about time signatures overall. One student said flats and sharps, and two selected scales.

**The Five W’s and H For…**

There is very limited data for this activity. The students that turned in this activity had only written down what we did together in class. I did not do the metacognitive component to this activity because it was so confusing and frustrating for the students that I didn’t want to spend any more time on it than we already had. The verbal feedback from the students was very negative and noted a great deal of frustration.
The Real Problem Is...

Students brainstormed facts and problems collaboratively. Students generated solutions and the possible consequences outside of class but were allowed to collaborate if they so chose. Specific suggested solutions and consequences were not formally analyzed as the effects of the activity were more significant than the actual written responses in the activity.

Metacognitive Assessment

Metacognitive responses at the elementary level did not lend themselves to summary: students were making an effort to express their thinking, but there were not easily identifiable trends as the initial problem solving activity was not as concrete as the KWL for 6/8.

Question 1. “The thing that helped me the most was...because...”

Highlights from school A were “individual help” and “when you talked over where we are and you said what to work on.” Several students left this blank and one wrote a question mark. At school B, one student wrote, “hearing the problems because then I could work on it practicing” and another said “it made me remember what we did wrong.” School C decided that everyone agreeing on what we do well and what problem are helped us improve, and this helped us figure out what we needed to work on.

Question 2. “I would like to spend more time on...”

School A wanted to spend more time on their favorite songs. School B had no clear responses. School C selected learning new notes and more book songs as top priorities.
Question 3. “It didn’t help me when we...because...”

School A found talking and “worksheets” (presumably “So the Real Problem Is...” and the metacognitive assessment) unhelpful. School B had no clear response. School C concurred that writing it down and “not doing anything” weren’t of use.

Question 4. “I still don’t understand/am having trouble with ______ and I think it might help me to...”

Schools A and B had no response to this question. School C’s response was new notes and high notes.

Question 5. “I understand/am good at ________ really well because...”

None of the elementary schools provided meaningful answers to this question.

Question 6. “I think we (as a group) improved because of this activity.”

Nine students at school A felt that the group improved, while one student circled no. Ten students at school B noticed improvement, one circled no, and one wrote in “kinda.” At school C, three students felt there was improvement and the others did not express a clear opinion.

Question 7. “It helped me make sense of my own thoughts/feelings.”

School A’s results were the same as they were for question 6, with nine students choosing yes and one saying no. The student selecting no wrote “I don’t even know what you’re talking about.” School B had a similar response: eleven student picked yes and one no, with the comment “it does
not make sense to me." School C disagreed: only three students shared an opinion, one of whom felt the activity helped and two feeling it did not. Others claimed not to have thoughts or feelings.

**My Own Perspective**

Students expressed thoughts and feelings in this section. Common feelings prior to the concert were anticipation, apprehension, and anxiety. Common themes after the concert were relief and pride. Some students drew pictures or used metaphors like “deer in the headlights.”

**Metacognitive Assessment**

Once again, the elementary students struggled more with the metacognitive component, and responses were less abundant and clear.

*Question 1. “The thing that helped me the most was...because...”*

In our discussion at school A, the general feeling was that this activity was helpful in making the students feel better playing in front of people. Students mentioned it made them feel more calm, relieved, more comfortable, and it made it easier not to shake. At school B, students felt that it helped them to realize what they liked about the concert and how well they played. It also helped the students to know what to expect and not to be nervous. School C struggled to with understanding this question and several expressed that they didn't get it. Another student liked hearing what other people thought.
**Question 2.** "I would like to spend more time on..."

School A found the sheet confusing and thought it could be modified to be more clear and specific to music. School B wanted to spend more time on sheet music, and school C had no comment.

**Question 3.** "It didn’t help me when we...because..."

School A didn’t have anything specific on this question. School B had mixed reviews: some students didn’t like doing “My Own Perspective” because “I couldn’t remember.” What that may mean is unclear. Other students felt that playing with the large group was not helpful because of tempo discrepancies. School C only had two comments: one, that the “worksheets” didn’t help our playing, and that talking about the concert made someone more nervous.

**Question 4.** "I still don’t understand/am having trouble with ______ and I think it might help me to..."

School A reached a consensus of nothing. School B felt performing needed more attention. School C did not answer.

**Question 5.** "I understand/am good at ______ really well because..."

School A felt they were good at not being nervous with “lots of people staring.” Two people at school B said they were good at the notes because they practice. A student at school C echoed that he or she was good at playing the flute because he or she practices a lot.
Question 6. "I think we (as a group) improved because of this activity."

At school A, eight students answered yes and four answered no. At school B, twelve students answered yes and one answered "kinda." At school C, five students answered yes ("because we're more confident) and one student answered both.

Question 7. "It helped me make sense of my own thoughts/feelings."

At school A, two students answered yes and four answered no. A lot of students abstained. At school B, twelve students answered yes, and one answered no. At school C, four students answered yes and one answered no.

Order It!

The data for this activity is less plentiful but still interesting. The students did folder and locker clean out before I was able to collect the sheet "Order It!", so we just did a quick survey of the class to find out how many students did the activity and what they thought. Because the context of this activity was altered and the data is so limited, the conclusions are tentative and may not generalize.

Eight students said that they had filled in the sheet and sixteen said they had not. Of the eight students that completed the sheet, four said that it helped them personally, two said it did not, and two said that it "kind of" helped. Three of these students felt that it helped the group as a whole, four felt it did not, and one felt that it kind of helped. Students that felt that it
helped had strong feelings, writing that it made everyone listen and think about what others are playing.

Many of the students that did not do the sheet did not respond to whether or not they felt it helped them or the group. Several did, which makes sense because they were part of the activity whether they filled in the sheet or not. One student felt that it helped him or her personally, and two felt that it did not. However, four students felt there was an improvement in the group as a result of the activity, and one replied that it "sort of" helped the group.

Independent Practice

How Sure Are You? and The Sum of the Parts both preceded auditions for seating for the 2008-2009 school year. Therefore, performance assessment was a primary aim for the students as well. Data regarding audition results is included by referring to what third of their respective section students were seated in: top, middle, and bottom. Specific seating results are not included in the interest of student privacy.

How Sure Are You?

Only twenty students across both sections of seventh grade band turned this in. Because this was the "practice record" prior to the audition, it was logical to consider these organizers in the context of how the students did on the auditions. Of the twenty students who turned in "How Sure Are You?", nine of them auditioned in the top third of their sections, seven were seated in the middle, and four were in the bottom third of their sections.
Of the nine students who finished high in their sections, five submitted very detailed organizers. Students work was classified as detailed if it included specific aspects of the piece/scales for the audition. For example, students in this category listed things such as “how to play Bb high and low,” “how to play Db,” “do you want us to repeat #109,” “The Db in #109 is really high for me,” “playing in front of other people by myself,” accidentals, posture, dynamics, and percussion stickings. Of the seven students who auditioned into the middle of their sections, three submitted detailed organizers. Of the four students at the bottoms of their sections, only one used detail in his or her organizer.

The remaining four students who were seated high in their sections all had informative but not terribly specific organizers. These organizers generally mentioned specific exercises (Concert Bb scale, #109, etc.) but did not list specific elements that they wanted to work on or felt good about. Three students seated in the middle of their sections turned in this type of work, and two who were seated in the bottom of their sections executed the assignment in this way.

One student from the group who were seated in the middle of their sections and one student from the group in the bottom of their sections turned in organizers that were superficial or vague. Examples of this kind of work included “I’m playing the right music” or “some note fingers.” Answers were vague and could not lead to constructive questions or help.
Metacognitive Assessment

Unfortunately, not all of the students who turned in “How Sure Are You?” turned in the metacognitive portion of the assignment as well. Interestingly, several students who did not turn in “How Sure Are You?” did turn in the metacognitive assessment. Only twelve students turned in the metacognitive assessment: of these twelve, four were seated high in their sections, three of which turned in “How Sure Are You?” Two of the three were very detailed in their organizers, while one mentioned exercises but did not offer more specific details.

Five students who were seated in the middle of their sections turned in the metacognitive activity, four of whom also turned in “How Sure Are You?” Two of these four had detailed responses, one mentioned exercises, and one was superficial.

Four students seated low in their sections turned in the metacognitive sheet. Three of these students also turned in “How Sure Are You?”: two had detailed responses and one mentioned exercises.

Question 1. “The thing that helped me the most was...because...”

All four students seated high in their sections answered this question in detail. Four of the students seated in the middle of their sections answered this in detail, while one answered unintelligibly. One student seated towards the end of his or her section answered this question in detail, while two answered superficially.
Question 2. “I would like to spend more time on...” All but one student answered this question in detail. The remaining student was vague and seated in the bottom of his or her section.

Question 3. “It didn’t help me when we...because...” Three of the students high in their sections answered this in detail, while one left it blank. One student seated in the middle of his or her section answered in detail, one answered “assignment”, one answered “everything helped me”, and two gave unclear answers. Of the three students seated low in their sections, two answered in detail and one answered “nothing” (everything helped him or her).

Question 4. “I still don’t understand/am having trouble with ______ and I think it might help me to...” All students seated high in their sections, four students seated in the middle of their sections, and two seated low in their sections gave detailed responses. One student seated low in his or her section responded “IDK” (I don’t know), and one student seated in the middle of his or her section left this question blank.

Question 5. “I understand/am good at ______ really well because...” All four students seated high in their sections answered this answer in detail, four of the students seated in the middle of their section answered in detail (one in a great deal of detail), and two of the students seated low in their sections answered in detail. One student seated low in his or her section responded “IDK” (I don’t know), and one student seated in the middle of his or her section left this question blank.
Chapter 5: Results

The Sum of the Parts

Nine of the twenty-seven students in eighth grade band turned this sheet in. One answered very superficially. One answered with some detail, but more or less superficially. Seven students submitted detailed, specific responses. All of the students that submitted detailed responses were seated in the top or upper middle of their sections.

Metacognitive Assessment

Seven students turned in the metacognitive assessment; not all were the same as the students that turned in “The Sum of the Parts.” All of the responses to the metacognitive survey were very specific and detailed but were not necessarily about the audition or the practice record but instead band in general.

Question 1. “The thing that helped me the most was...because...”
Students listed teacher help, practice room time, and “when we talked about it in class other people had questions that I didn’t think of.”

Question 2. “I would like to spend more time on...” Students listed chromatic scale and fingerings, different time signatures, 6/8 and cut-time, sectionals, and big group rehearsals.

There were no relevant responses to questions three through five.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

Results from this research lead to a variety of conclusions, as related to each activity. Conclusions and observations are organized chronologically by activity, followed by a summary of the overarching findings.

**Know-Want to Know-Learned (K-W-L)**

The KWL was a very successful first foray into using graphic organizers to teach new content. While there are always going to be students who are unhappy doing paperwork, it is notable that several students specifically mentioned the KWL as helpful to them in learning 6/8. Moreover, this gave students a durable written reference for the future, demonstrating, as Graves (1991, p. 49) notes, the "durable power of writing."

The performance assessment component added credibility to the value of this written exercise. The majority of students in the first section (twenty-nine of the thirty-one students) turned in their KWLs, and every lesson group in that class period demonstrated at least a basic understanding and proficiency in 6/8, despite having struggled more to play it as a large group initially. In the second section, only thirteen students (out of twenty-three) turned in KWLs, and only two of the six lesson groups had quick success in 6/8. The other groups got it with considerable review.

Another interesting aspect of the lesson group assessment is that every lesson group, in both class sections, demonstrated a cognitive, theoretical understanding of 6/8, whether they were able to execute the
performance tasks associated with it or not. This speaks to the information recorded on the K-W-Ls.

It is also worth noting that there were students who liked or didn’t like every step in this process, reinforcing an awareness that information needs to be presented in a variety of ways to reach a variety of learners. For instance, several students found group work frustrating, noting that people in their groups did not help or didn’t have any new information to bring to the table. Meanwhile, other students cited group work as one of the most helpful aspects of learning 6/8, noting that they learn better from other students. Interestingly, some of the most vocal students for and against group work were in the same cooperative group.

The Five W’s and H For...

This activity was unsuccessful. This graphic organizer is far too complicated for sixth graders and quite possibly too complicated in its layout in a classroom without desks. Students had a hard time figuring out where information was supposed to go on the chart, even with a great deal of guidance. Students also expressed confusion as to what each of the question words meant in the context of music.

The students were very frustrated. In the future, I would focus on only one or two aspects of the piece at a time with this age group. Additionally, it would be necessary to connect all of the question words to pieces of music more consistently before then asking them to write it down, particularly in a chart rather than prose, which may have proved simpler.
The Real Problem Is...

This strategy was highly successful, particularly at school A, where our most significant problems were limited instrumentation and people being responsible for their parts. Students immediately implemented strategies we had talked about; for example, one student brought in his sister to cover the flute part within a few days. Students made greater efforts to get to class on time and waited to leave for patrol duty until they absolutely had to. Most of all, students were highly aware of how much time we had and what we needed to accomplish. This strategy created a sense of ownership. Writing it down and turning it in was not fully necessary, and the metacognitive assessment did not really add to the activity as I would have liked. This may not be a typical literacy strategy; however, it is an excellent use of a graphic-organizer for problem-solving and creative thinking. The literacies that this best addressed were listening and speaking, although these were not literacy skills I set out to address.

My Own Perspective

The students and I usually discuss about how they feel about the big concert before and after we perform; this was just a matter of writing it down. I don't know how much the chart I used helped the cause; I think it may have caused more confusion. I think concert anticipation and reflection is a great opportunity for informal writing, but I don't think that any special graphic aid is necessary. The graphic may have caused students to shift their focus to the format rather than the writing.
**Order It!**

Although disastrously executed in terms of data collection, this organizer made a real, noticeable change in how the ensemble played the music. Interestingly, many of the students that did not even write down what they were hearing noticed that the change was happening. Perhaps a better way of using this organizer would be to divide the class: half are responsible for writing down what they're hearing, and half are responsible for seeing if it makes a difference. This would allow the students to write things down without worrying about playing, too.

**How Sure Are You?**

"How Sure Are You?" was the most interesting data as it was linked to a significant performance assessment: student auditions. The most interesting aspect of the data is that the students who were seated highest in their sections, with a few outliers, wrote down the most details about what they were and were not good at. More interesting still, these students had more details in the "In-Pencil Facts" – or things they needed to double check – than any other group. The conclusion I draw is that these students self-monitored better and were able to seek the help they needed from teachers (my co-teacher and me) at school after they had practiced.

The implications of this finding are tremendous: students could come into lessons and rehearsal with specific items that THEY feel they need to work on. This would move towards a more student-directed, constructionist
learning environment where students would take ownership for their own learning.

An activity like "How Sure Are You?" also yields a great return on the time investment. Because students will self-assess and come into lessons or rehearsals knowing what they need help on, teachers may save some of time spent listening and assessing what the students can't yet do — students will come in and direct this conversation. The teacher will not have to guess what students need; the students will already have considered what is and is not working and will be able to help themselves get the kind of help they need.

This added efficiency will make success come more quickly, and at the middle school level, this is important in keeping students motivated. Students at this age do not like to spend any extra time failing. As teachers, we don't want to spoon feed them — we want them to become independent, self-sufficient learners. By teaching them strategies to be successful more quickly, we are giving them tools to be independent without making them suffer more failure than is truly necessary.

The Sum of the Parts

The results to "The Sum of the Parts" as a practice log were similar to those of "How Sure Are You?"

One interesting aspect of the metacognitive portion of this activity was that all of the students were very detailed, but none of them were fully focused on The Sum of the Parts specifically. These students have been
well-trained in self-assessment, but perhaps in a more general way. As the students mature, it would be valuable for students to become more able to assess specific aspects of their performance or work. One point of concern is that students offered minimal or no response to things they do well and things they don't understand.

Despite this deficit, there was an overall increase in levels of sophistication between the seventh graders and the eighth graders. This is particularly notable as the eighth grade class as a group (school-wide) is known for a general immaturity, even in comparison to the seventh graders. The sophistication the eighth graders in my study showed is notable from an assessment perspective: these students showed a level of understanding and sophistication of understanding in their writing that is not necessarily apparent in their behavior and, thus, often not apparent in their playing. This provides insight into what these students are truly capable of as well as the difference between their concept attainment and their task execution.

The metacognitive survey also highlighted the value placed by students on social interactions, both with peers and teachers. Students specifically noted that other students ask questions that they sometimes don't think of. Additionally, the students said they valued help from the teachers. Students also appreciated practice room time, which can be independent or collaborative; I would imagine both types were thought of.
General Conclusions Regarding the Use of Graphic Organizers in Music

Overall, the use of graphic organizers proved generally worthwhile. Clearly, some were more effective than others. Had these activities not been for a study, doing a written metacognitive assessment as well as a graphic organizer would generally be excessive. The quantity of writing when both elements are used was more than was truly necessary or helpful in every instance except for the K-W-L, where both writing exercises yielded meaningful, specific responses. In other instances, doing both writing activities took too much time away from playing. This is problematic in two ways: first, in a performance class, most time should be spent performing. Second, students enrolled in these classes choose to be there because they want to play; time spent on other tasks beyond what is truly necessary seems to cause frustration and reduce motivation.

This time commitment leads to another conclusion: use of these organizers as practice logs was an excellent investment of time as very little class time was needed to explain and assign the organizer. Moreover, at-home practice was already an expectation, so this assignment is not a new burden, it’s a tool for making an activity students already participate in more efficient and more lasting.

The use of graphic organizers as practices logs would carry nicely into the elementary setting as well; however, extensive use of these organizers at the elementary level seems less feasible unless a great deal of
time is allotted to elementary instrumental music. In my teaching situation, we have band three times a week for a half an hour. Two organizers in one quarter was too much, particularly at the end of the school year.

Finally, the end of the year is a difficult time to use written work like this in the music classroom. One of the great values of writing is its durability, and at the end of the school year, it is very difficult to model this to students and use their written work later in the year. With the exception of the organizers used as practice logs, organizers proved more meaningful earlier in the school year and gradually declined in value as the end approached.

Research Questions

The initial research questions were addressed in a variety of ways throughout the study and yielded various conclusions.

*How can literacy tools be used to improve music literacy? How can meaningful independent music literacy activities be supported?*

Graphic organizers proved valuable in improving students' understanding of a variety of musical concepts. However, the greatest improvement was in independent music literacy: graphic organizers served as a meaningful means of representing and encouraging practice outside of school that supported further learning in school.
Chapter 6: Discussion

What is the synergy of music literacy activities and Responsive Classroom?

Responsive Classroom addresses the social nature of learning. One of the seven guiding principles of RC is “The greatest cognitive growth occurs through social interaction” (Origins, 2006).

Elementary activities were inherently social: students collaborated to problem-solve and shared thoughts and feelings regarding musical performance. This can only occur in a learning community in which students feel secure – the kind of community created by the language and community-orientation that Responsive Classroom fosters. The activity that did not encourage community – “Five W’s and H” – was distinctly unsuccessful.

While activities at the junior high school level were less inherently social, the very nature of junior high school students is inherently social and thus social behaviors were inextricably intertwined with academic ones. Students noted this in their metacognitive activities: they wanted more time to practice with friends, more sectionals where peers lead each other, and more time to play together.

Moreover, the core value in the organizers for independent practice is that students can determine what kind of help they need, and pursuing that help can only happen in a positive learning community. It does not happen in a class of detachment among peers. The social and community values of Responsive Classroom are necessary for literacy activities to be effective.
because they require some level of risk on the part of the students. According to Rimm-Kaufman's study (2006, p. 11), "children taught according to the Responsive Classroom approach appeared to be less worried or nervous about trying new things." Responsive Classroom created a context in which literacy strategies can be effective and engaging.
CHAPTER 7: IMPLICATIONS

More research is needed in this area. Due to the small number of students and informal application, further study is needed to add reliability to the results. Replication of this study may prove useful.

More important than formal research is that music teachers embrace their role as educators of whole people and attend to students social and literacy needs as well as their musical needs. Formal research could prove beneficial, but at this point, anecdotal evidence of the positive effects of use of literacy strategies in music would be worthwhile.

Research addressing how we transfer the skills and knowledge demonstrated through organizers and literacy activities into task execution – musical performance – is also needed. The K-W-L showed a particular need for this: while students understood the concepts, not all were able to play those concepts accurately. This is a common problem in music, but the use of graphic organizers seems like a possible starting point in a solution. More research is needed regarding the next steps in using graphic organizers to solve the knowledge versus performance quandary.

Use of vocabulary graphic organizers has not been explored yet. Investigation and practice in this area is needed as students encounter a great deal of specialized vocabulary in the music classroom. Prior knowledge plays a clear role in all learning, and this needs to be incorporated more extensively into the music classroom.
In the coming school year, graphic organizers will be incorporated into each lesson and practice assignment. This will include a variety of organizers from all categories. Informal writing, particularly collaborative informal writing, will also be prominent.

**Future Questions for Research**

1. How can concept attainment and task execution be better united? In other words, how can we move students from understanding a concept to being able to play it?
2. How can literacy activities be incorporated into community building activities drawn from Responsive Classroom?
3. How much time is ideal for literacy activities that support performance as balanced with time spent actually playing?

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, literacy activities and graphic organizers can provide a useful tool in helping students access musical concepts, knowledge, and performance. Students may use these tools to organize practice and become more self-sufficient, assertive learners. This may help students and teachers be more efficient by guiding students in asking questions that yield success. It is necessary to engage students in these literacy activities regularly, balancing duration of these activities with experiences in musical performance.
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APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL FORM

University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Protocol for Original Submissions

A complete protocol must be submitted to the IRB for approval prior to the initiation of any investigations involving human subjects or human materials, including studies in the behavioral and social sciences.

If the research does not involve vulnerable subjects such as minors or inmates, send 6 copies of (1) the completed protocol; (2) project abstract; and (3) samples of informed consent forms to the IRB chairperson. PROTOCOLS LACKING ANY ONE OF THESE THREE ELEMENTS WILL NOT BE APPROVED. In addition, copies of questionnaires or interview questions MUST be attached. If the research does involve subjects that may be considered vulnerable, please send 12 copies.

PLEASE TYPE
Project Title: Literacy Strategies in the Instrumental Music Responsive Classroom

Principal Investigator: Abigail Kreisa

Department: Education – Rank: Graduate Student

Campus Mailing Address: 3180 Dan’s Drive, Stevens Point, WI 54481

Telephone: 715-341-7669 E-mail address: akreisa@charter.net or akrei456@uwsp.edu

Faculty Sponsor (if required): Leslie McClain
(Faculty sponsor required if investigator is below rank of instructor.)

Expected Starting Date: March 3, 2008 Expected Completion Date: May 30, 2008

Are you applying for funding of this research? Yes □ No X □

If yes, what agency? ____________________________________________

Please indicate the categories of subjects to be included in this project. Please check all that apply.

□ Normal adult volunteers □ Minors (under 18 years of age)
□ Incarcerated individuals □ Mentally Disabled
□ Pregnant women □ Other (specify)

(Faculty Member) I have completed the “Human Subjects Protection Training” (available at http://www.uwsp.edu/special/irb/start.htm) and agree to accept responsibility for conducting or directing this research in accordance with the guidelines.

(Signature of Faculty Member responsible for research)
Proposal Abstract

Write a brief description of the purpose of the proposed research project. (100-200 words)

In examining content area reading strategies, both in a graduate course and as part of professional development in my teaching position, I noted a deficit in research in the practical application of these strategies to the instrumental music classroom. My intention is to apply strategies that have been used successfully in most other content areas, with a particular emphasis on graphic organizers, within the music classroom. Students will use these strategies as a means for giving deeper consideration to their lesson books and representing independent practice activities in a more meaningful (but still concrete) way. I will then analyze the depth of students' responses on these activities as well as lead students in metacognitive activities that require them to consider their own learning. I will reflect on and write about the effects of these strategies on students' learning in the instrumental music classroom. These findings will be reported in my Master's thesis and potentially shared at professional conferences and in professional journals.

Please complete the following questions for all research.

1. Describe the characteristics of the subjects, including gender, age ranges, ethnic background, health/treatment status and approximate number.

Subjects will be students presently participating in bands that I teach. These include students in sixth grade band at three elementary schools and seventh and eighth grade band students at one junior high.

Subjects are both male and female, ranging in age from 11 to 14 years old. Subjects will be primarily Caucasian, as well as students of Hmong, African-American, and Hispanic descent.

Subjects have not been selected for or discriminated against based on health/treatment status as it is not relevant to the study. My awareness of health conditions is only for the safety of the students in my classroom and has not affected regular instruction.
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Indicate how and where your subjects will be obtained. Describe the method you will use to contact subjects.

Students are already enrolled in band class which I teach either as primary instructor or as the lesson instructor.

2. What are you going to ask your subjects to do (be explicit) and where will your interaction with the subjects take place?

Subjects will use traditional literacy tools, particularly graphic organizers, to summarize, categorize, and process musical material and musical practice. These materials are related to school-wide content area literacy goals at the junior high level. Materials will be presented as class work, homework, or in place of a practice log.

My interaction with the subjects will take place at four different schools as a part of my regular teaching load.

4. Will deception be used in gathering data? Yes No X-

If yes, describe and justify.

5. Are there any risks to subjects? Yes No X-

If yes, describe the risks (consider physical, psychological, social, economic, and legal risks) and include this description on the informed consent form.

6. What safeguards will be provided for subjects in case of harm or distress? (Examples of safeguards include having a counselor/therapist on call, an emergency plan in place for seeking medical assistance, assuring editorial rights to data prior to publication or release where appropriate.)

Subjects are students in school and have access to counselors. Moreover, while ideally all students will complete homework, realistically, they may not. Part of my reflection in this study will be related to how many students choose to complete the assigned material; students who find homework truly distressing simply won’t complete it or turn it in.

7. What are the benefits of participation/involvement in this research to subjects? (Examples include obtaining knowledge of discipline, experiencing research in a discipline, obtaining course credit, getting paid, or contributing to general welfare/knowledge.) Be sure to include this description on the informed consent form.

Subjects in this study will improve their musical practice and study habits. Moreover, subjects will have an opportunity to use commonly used literacy tools in a different setting. This may benefit students who struggle with literacy tasks outside of music but excel in band: they may be able to carry over skills acquired through this instruction and practice. Students who enjoy the structure of traditional literacy activities will hopefully experience greater confidence and security in their skills in band through the use of the tools presented in this study.

8. Will this research involve conducting surveys or interviews? Yes No X-

If yes, please attach copies of all instruments or include a list of interview questions.
9. If electronic equipment is used with subjects, it is the investigator's responsibility to determine that it is safe, either by virtue of his or her own experience or through consultation with qualified technical personnel. The investigator is further responsible for carrying out continuing safety checks, as appropriate, during the course of the research. If electronic equipment is used, have appropriate measures been taken to ensure safety? Yes X No

Subjects (students) may or may not use computers equipped with SmartMusic software as part of independent practice experiences. These are standard school (or home) computers and should present no safety issues when used correctly.

10. During this research, what precautions will be taken to protect the identify of subjects and the confidentiality of the data?

No subjects (students) will be identified. Specific artifacts (homework) will only be viewed by me and, in the case of junior high students, the other teacher I work with. For the purpose of this study, these artifacts will be looked at in terms of group trends rather than individual responses. Subjects will also engage in metacognitive activities geared at reflecting on and summarizing their own learning. No subjects will be identified by name. If a specific statement obtained from metacognitive activities is necessary to elaborate on my findings, it will be attributed to “a student from [school pseudonym].”

Schools will be identified as the Junior High, Elementary A, Elementary B, and Elementary C. This will be done both for the purpose of anonymity but also to acknowledge the grade level that these findings are from as this may be relevant.

11. Where will the data be kept throughout the course of the study? What provisions will be taken to keep it confidential or safe?

Data will be in my possession. Materials completed by the subjects will be scored as necessary (both for the study and for grading as their homework) and placed in the students’ cumulative band portfolios (already in use). Copies will be made if needed and will be kept with my thesis materials at my home.

12. Describe the intended use of the data by yourself and others.

The intended use of the data is to explore what literacy strategies may improve student success in the instrumental music classroom and increase the efficacy of students' independent music practice (literacy) activities.

13. Will the results of the study be published or presented in a public or professional setting? Yes X No

If yes, what precautions will be taken to protect the identity of your participants? State whether or not subjects will be identifiable directly or through identifying information linked to the subjects.

Subjects will be protected through the use of pseudonyms for their respective schools as well as no references to specific students (subjects).
14. State how and where you will store the data upon completion of your study as well as who will have access to it? What will be done with audio/video data upon completion of the study?

Raw data (completed homework) will be kept in the students' (subjects') band portfolios. The students and parents will have access to these materials, as well as the music teachers in the district as needed for individual instruction of these students. When students finish junior high, they will receive their portfolios to keep.

Other data will be kept with my thesis materials, most likely in a file cabinet in my home.

A completed protocol must include a copy of the Informed Consent Form or a statement as why individual consent forms will not be used.
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15. Please identify personnel assisting in conducting this research project. Include students or others who will be carrying out or directly supervising the carrying out of the research.

Name: *****************
Position: Instrumental Music Teacher
Campus Phone: 
Campus Address: *****************

Please note: Everyone having contact with human subjects must have reviewed the “Guidelines for Human Subject Research” (available at http://www.uwsp.edu/special/irb/start.htm). The principle investigator assumes responsibility for ensuring this requirement has been met.

16. Complete the section below if you will obtain access to all or some of the subjects through cooperating institutions not under the University of Wisconsin's control. Use the following format for each institution with responsibility for human subjects participating in this activity:

Name of official: *****************
Title: Principal
Name and address of institution: *****************

Subject Status: (wards, residents, employees, patients, etc) Students
Number of subjects: 80 Age Range of subjects: 12 - 14

Name of official: *****************
Title: Principal
Name and address of institution: *****************

Subject Status: (wards, residents, employees, patients, etc) Students
Number of subjects: 20 Age Range of subjects: 11-12
Name of official: **************
Title: Principal
Phone: 
Name and address of institution: ******************** and ******************

Subject Status: (wards, residents, employees, patients, etc) Students
Number of subjects: 22
Age Range of subjects: 11-12

17. If subjects from another institution are involved, and approval was obtained from a legally constituted IRB at that institution, please attach a copy of the approval. (Please note that this does not release you from the obligation to obtain approval from the UWSP IRB for Human Subjects.)

A completed protocol must include a copy of the Informed Consent Form or a statement as to why individual consent forms will not be used.
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APPENDIX B: METACOGNITIVE ASSESSMENT (ELEMENTARY)

Name:_________________ Date:_______________ Hour:_____

Please think about what you learned, how you learned it, and how you feel about your learning in regards to the activity in question.

1. The thing that helped me the most was...because...

2. I would like to spend more time on...

3. It didn’t help me when we...because...

4. I still don’t understand/am having trouble with ________________ and I think it might help me to...

5. I understand/am good at _______________ really well because...

6. I think we (as a group) improved because of this activity: YES NO
   If not, why?

7. It helped me make sense of my own thoughts/feelings. YES NO
   If not, why?
APPENDIX C: METACOGNITIVE ASSESSMENT (JUNIOR HIGH)

Name: __________________ Date: _____________ Hour: _____

Please think about what you learned, how you learned it, and how you feel about your learning in this activity.

1. The thing that helped me understand the best was...because...

2. I would like to spend more time on...

3. It didn’t help me when we...because...

4. I still don’t understand ______________ and I think it might help me to...

5. I understand ______________ really well because...