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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many educators of all levels have developed an awareness of the need for a new objective in the goals of education. Educational goals have been emphasizing the production of fully functioning, mentally healthy, well-educated, vocationally successful individuals (19). Recent research findings indicate strongly that these goals are related to creativity. The new objective in the goal of education is to find a time and place in the curriculum for encouraging the development of the creative aspect of human beings.

Torrance (19) has stated that creative learning takes place when there is a problem to be solved. Creative learning involves the ability to sense problems, make guesses, test the guesses, retest and revise, draw a conclusion, and communicate the results. The creative student must have an innate interest in solving a problem or be stimulated to creative thought. The student should be encouraged to solve difficult problems instead of accepting an easy solution or the opinion of someone else.

According to Patrick (12) the ability to think creatively is not the gift of a few. Everyone has the capacity to think creatively to some extent. The capacity should be developed but many times it is inhibited or stamped out by tradition,
conformity, social expectations, and the pressures of facing reality.

How can teachers develop creative thinking? One plan of action is to formulate a curriculum with opportunities for creative behavior. This can be accomplished by providing assignments that call for original works, independent learning, experimentation, and projects to develop creative talents.

Critics of education have pointed out that too often teachers insist that pupils learn by the authoritarian method or accept statements at the truth because they have been proposed by authority. Many children develop a preference for learning by authority because they need only the ability for recognition and memory. Tap dance courses are often taught by the authoritarian method, and many students prefer this method because it requires only an imitation of the teacher's skills.

A traditional course outline in tap dance includes the knowledge of the origin and history of tap dance, basic terminology, fundamentals of rhythm and music, principles of design which apply to choreography, and methods of notating dances. Skills involved in a tap dance course include the ability to perform fundamental techniques, combinations, sample dances of several classifications, detect rhythm patterns, and develop original movement. Traditionally these skills are taught in a progression increasing in difficulty (8).
Fortunately, however, tap dance is particularly appropriate for the development of creative problem solving because it demands that the person use his physical as well as his mental and emotional abilities. If the hypothesis that when an individual can be creative in one aspect of living, he can be creative in others is true, then tap dance can make a meaningful contribution to an individual's life.

Creative activity arises out of emotional interaction between moving and feeling, and perhaps should be emphasized in all areas of education. There are a number of ways to emphasize creative development in a tap dance course. As basic techniques are taught, opportunities for problem solving may be presented to the students by assigning a specific number of counts or bars of music and specific basic techniques to be combined in an original composition. Another opportunity for creative work may be provided by teaching only the steps to a simple dance and requiring the class to provide the style. Students may be required to create or choreograph the last phrase of a dance that they have been taught, or they may choreograph an eight bar phrase in the middle of a pre-established dance. Finally, as the course draws to a conclusion, students should be capable and have the confidence to choreograph an entire dance, either in groups or individually.

The teacher should know and understand the best methods for teaching creative development. Therefore, he must decide which is most important in the total creative environment; skill, experience, or innate motor ability for creativity.
However, the ability to choreograph may not be related to teaching methods. Perhaps the ability to choreograph is related to motor creativity which is the capacity to use the body as a tool to solve problems. Another possibility is the relationship of choreography to the development of skill. One must have some basic skills in order to be successful in creating. Perhaps it is neither the teaching methods nor the attributes of motor creativity, but rather the development of skill that is necessary for the ability to choreograph.

The possibilities involved in the relationships of choreography indicate certain questions. Will students who possess basic creativity choreograph better, no matter how the course is taught? Will students with tap dance skill choreograph better? Or, will a group taught with an emphasis on creativity be more successful in choreography?

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to determine the relationship of motor creativity, tap dance skill, and experience in tap dance choreography to the ability to choreograph tap dances.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were to investigate the effect that tap dance skill has upon the ability to choreograph; the relationship between basic motor creativity and the ability to choreograph, and the effect that exposure to situations requiring creativity has on the ability to choreograph.
More specifically, the following null hypotheses were tested:

1. The true intercorrelations of motor creativity, tap dance skill, and the ability to create tap dance are zero.

2. There is no significant difference between the experimental and control groups on choreography ability.

3. There is no significant difference between the experimental and control groups on skill.

4. There is no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in motor creativity.

Definition of Terms

Many of the terms used in this study have multiple definitions. Creativity in itself has many definitions, Taylor (17) found some two hundred and fifty definitions. Tap dance books also vary slightly in defining various skills and techniques. Due to these variations, the following definitions were used in this study.

1. Creativity—ability to sense problems and exhibit fluent and original responses as solutions.

2. Motor creativity—ability to produce a variety of motor responses to a stimulus (20).

3. Tap dance skill—ability to perform basic techniques of tap dancing in the correct rhythm and style.
4. **Choreography experience**—past participation in the creation of a dance.

5. **Tap dance choreography**—the combination of ten specified tap skills into a dance which has the components of theme, rhythm, style, and difficulty. The ten tap skills are:

   a. **Shuffle**—a front brush followed by a back brush executed to the front, side, or back.

   b. **Flap**—a forward brush step; the step taking weight.

   c. **Heel drop**—a forceful dropping of the heel to the floor while the weight is placed on the ball of the same foot.

   d. **Dig**—a striking of the heel or toe on the free foot in any direction; this may or may not take weight.

   e. **Cramroll**—a movement employing steps and heel drops in a specific pattern.

   f. **Ball change**—a changing of the weight on the balls of the feet from one foot to the other executed forward or in place.

   g. **Scuff**—a brush of the heel; may be executed to the front or side.

   h. **Chug**—a forward movement accenting the heel drop; with the weight on one foot, force
the heel of the foot to the floor with exaggeration thus moving the foot forward approximately three inches.

i. Grapevine—a ballroom movement that has been adapted to tap consisting of a twisting of the hips and a traveling in any desired direction (16).

j. Turn—change direction, pivot around, or spin.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to college students enrolled in beginning tap dance classes at North Texas State University, spring semester, 1967. It was also limited in that tap dance skills were assessed only by scores determined by the researcher. The judges used for the choreography test were all from the same institution and there were no practice sessions provided for the judges. The study was further limited in that the experimental and control groups had different time lengths of class period. Students were not matched regarding the variables of rhythm, intelligence quotient, motor ability, balance and coordination. No effort was made to assess previous experience in choreography because most experience occurred when students were small children and little was remembered. This factor was evenly distributed among the experimental and controlled groups.
Sources of Data

The sources of data were the scores from tests administered. These tests included: a) Wyrick Motor Creativity Test (20), b) Tap Dance Skill Rating Form, and c) Tap Dance Choreography Rating Form.


CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

In order to understand the contribution of creativity to tap dance choreography, the literature that has discussed creativity in general terms was surveyed. Motor creativity, the concept of skill, choreography, and methods of teaching that have been designed to evoke creativity have also been surveyed.

Literature on the subject of creativity has been abundant since 1950 largely due to a wave of interest initiated by the research of Guilford (9) and Torrance's emphasis on the need for creativity in education. Getzels and Jackson have made contributions to the area of creativity and education which have sparked controversy among educators. Results of one study completed by Getzels and Jackson (7) examined the attitudes of teachers and students toward creative children. They further examined relationships of creativity to intelligence and found that intelligence did not correlate with creativity.

Other writers suggested that creativity should be discussed more in terms of the medium by which it is expressed. In attempting to determine the role of creativity in tap dance choreography, it was necessary to explore literature that discussed the effect skill might have on ability to create.
There has been little research in the area of motor skills and creativity, other than to compare these factors with intelligence.

The literature reviewed in this chapter is discussed under five topics: 1) Nature of Creativity, 2) Motor Creativity, 3) Skill, 4) Choreography, and 5) Stressing Creativity During the Teaching Process.

Nature of Creativity

Educators and researchers have discussed and defined creativity in many ways. It appears that creativity cannot be defined in a single word. There simply are too many types of behavior patterns expressed in the term creativity. Taylor, (24) for example, identified five "clusters" of definitions of creativity.

1. **Expressive creativity** is the notion of spontaneity and is not concerned with the product itself or with quality. This type of creativity may be illustrated by the expressiveness of young children brainstorming, and expressive psycho-drama.

2. **Productive creativity** has its emphasis on producing. The object produced requires a technological proficiency and a certain degree of mastery over the environment.

3. **Inventive creativity** emphasizes efficiency and ingenuity with materials and ideas. In this type of creativity the individual is capable of producing some new items, however, no new principle has been produced. Old ideas are combined in a new way.
4. **Innovative creativity** suggests that a substantial modification is made in an existing principle and requires a great deal of cognitive flexibility. An existing concept, is re-examined and then altered to a new concept.

5. **Emergentive creativity** is the highest creative level. The idea that emerges seems to be a discontinuity with existing sciences and arts and the product is so radically different that a new science or art develops around it.

Creativity may be viewed as a process rather than a product. Osborne (16) organized the process of creative thinking into seven steps: 1) orientation, 2) preparation, 3) analysis, 4) ideation, 5) incubation, 6) synthesis, and 7) evaluation. For Wallas (27) the creative process consists of four stages: 1) preparation, 2) incubation, 3) illumination, and 4) verification. The preparation stage of Wallas corresponds to the "orientation", "preparation", and "analysis" steps of Osborne in which the problem is investigated from all directions. The "incubation" or "ideation" stage serves to define the stage during which the individual is not consciously thinking about the problem. The "synthesis" or "illumination" stage is the appearance of a solution to the problem. All of the parts fall into a pattern or a whole. In the "evaluation" or "verification" stage the idea is tested and reduced to exact form. The psychoanalyst Kris (12, 13) described the process as consisting of two major phases, inspiration and elaboration. During the inspiration phase the creative
individual is described as "... driven; he is in an exceptional state. Thoughts or images tend to flow, things appear in his mind of which he never seemed to have known." The second phase, elaboration, is characterized by labor, concentration and endeavor. Stein (22) described the creative process as consisting of three major phases, hypothesis formation, hypothesis testing, and the communication of results.

Motor Creativity

There are many tests for creativity that have been constructed which depend on verbal skill or recall; however, investigators (19) have stressed that the creativity tests should rely on skills specific to the subject area. In other words, the purpose of the test should be to measure the creative attributes in individuals which are specific to the content area in which creativity is to be produced. Rusch, Reuben, Denny and Ives (19) devised a test to measure creativity in the area of dramatic arts. The subjects were sixth grade students matched on the basis of intelligence as measured by Kuhlman Finch, Reading Achievement as measured by the Iowa Every Pupil Test, and sex. Based on the assumption that tests requiring inventive or completion type answers are more significant than tests requiring selective responses, the subjects were asked to tell how many ways they could use certain materials commonly found in the dramatic arts field to portray a story. After the story had been related, the subjects were shown a piece of material and a piece of driftwood and then
asked to tell in how many ways these materials might portray the story. Fluency was measured by the number of responses given within the time limit, and redefinition was measured by the number of unusual usages given. One form of the test was administered in the fall and another form was administered in the spring. The dramatic arts tests and the Gestalt Transformation test of redefinition were administered concurrently and correlated positively.

The idea that creativity should be assessed in the specific content area has been utilized by dancers who have been involved in movement creativity. However, the evaluation of the activity involved has been dependent on the aesthetic or communicative success of the movement or the success of the product of the movement. Little research has been completed that attempts an assessment of creativity without these two limiting factors.

Withers (28) completed a study in 1960 that related directly to movement creativity and its measurement. The purposes of the study were to measure the creativity of modern dancers by the use of Guilford's verbal creativity tests, to design movement performance tasks, to construct a judge's evaluation sheet for evaluating the movement tasks, and to compare the findings of the verbal tests with the performance task ratings of the judges.

Eleven college graduates who were attending a three-week workshop in dance were used as subjects. They were administered
eight verbal tests designed to measure factors of creativity as described by Guilford: sensitivity to problems, spontaneous flexibility, adaptive flexibility, closure, originality, associational fluency, redefinition, and ideational fluency. The movement tasks were constructed in an attempt to measure factors of creativity such as those described by Guilford. The judges evaluation sheet included 1) overall creativity, 2) sensitivity to the problem—ability to see and understand the problem in terms of dance, 3) originality—ability to find unique, imaginative, fresh ideas of movement, 4) conceptual unity—ability to conceive, develop, and complete an idea, 5) penetration—ability to go beyond the obvious and give a depth of interpretation to the idea of movement, 6) appropriateness—ability to select specific movement suitable to the expression of the dance idea, and 7) technique—ability to use the body in a versatile manner.

The subjects were evaluated on three performance tasks:
1. Composition of a dance using Haiku poetry as a stimulus.
2. Composition of a movement phrase of dance technique.
3. Improvisation to a visual stimulus.

Withers found a significant correlation between the Plot Titles Test and performance rankings on originality, between the over-all creativity rankings and the technique rankings and between movement task number one and the total score of all three movement tasks.
Wyrick (29) recently completed a study in which she constructed a test of three items designed to measure motor creativity. Through statistical analysis the three items which were the best predictors of the total score derived from an original sixteen item creativity test were selected to comprise a motor creativity test. Motivators for the test consisted of a low balance beam, a ball, a hoop, and two parallel lines. The motivators were selected on the assumption that they would evoke a sizable range of responses, stimulate different types of movement, provide a problem that would minimize the element of fear, and stimulate responses that would not require the subject to focus on different aspects of movement. Each test was scored by summing the total number of responses made by the subject within a time period, and by determining the frequency of occurrence in the sample of each response.

Wyrick constructed the test in order to make a comparison between motor creativity, verbal creativity, motor ability, and intelligence among college women. No significant relationship was found between motor creativity and the other selected factors.

The Motor Creativity Test that Wyrick developed is an instrument which attempted to yield an objective measure of motor creativity. The test is based on the criteria of fluency and originality. These two factors correlated highly enough to enable the tester to derive a final score from a tally of motor responses on each test.
Nelson (15) completed a study in which she investigated the relationships between aspects of self-actualization, body and self-cathexis, bodily concern, motor creativity, and movement concept. Subjects for the study were four classes of freshmen women in the required physical education program and freshmen physical education majors. The Wyrick Motor Creativity Test was given individually and all other tests were administered during the class sessions. All tests were completed during the first two weeks of the Fall semester and were readministered in the same order in the Spring. Between the two administrations of the test, additional information was gathered concerning height, weight, grip strength, Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, and semester grade point averages.

Motor creativity was not significantly related to any of the main variables and was therefore considered a separate factor unrelated to any single variable in the study. An analysis of the results showed that self-regard, spontaneity, and inner-directedness each were significantly related to movement concept, body-cathexis, and self-cathexis. Self-acceptance was related significantly only to body-cathexis and bodily concern. Body-cathexis, self-cathexis, and movement concept were significantly related to each other.

Philipp (17) compared motor creativity with other types of creativity and motor skills. The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationships between motor creativity and verbal and figural creativity, and the relationship between motor
creativity and selected motor skills, growth factors, and intelligence. Sixty-five boys and girls in the fourth grade were selected as subjects. The age, weight, height, and intelligence scores, as measured by the Lorge-Thorndike Test were taken at the time of testing. Verbal and figural creativity were evaluated by means of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking and motor creativity was measured by the fluency scale of the Wyrick Motor Creativity Test. Motor skills selected for use in the study were 1) static balance, as measured by the ability to balance one foot lengthwise on a stick, eyes open, 2) static strength, as measured by a hand grip dynamometer, 3) explosive strength, as measured by the standing broad jump, and 4) agility, as measured by the zig zag run.

An analysis of the data showed that motor creativity did not appear to be significantly related to motor skills, intelligence, or the growth factors of age, weight, and height. Philipp concluded therefore, that motor creativity did not seem to be dependent upon skill performance, intelligence, or physical development. The results also showed that creativity was not a generalized factor among the children used in the study. A child who was capable of one type of creative expression was not necessarily capable of other types. However, a tendency toward generalization of creativity was found for girls but not for boys, indicating sex related differences in creative production. This conclusion might be questioned since
the balance beam, and the hoop might have been more familiar to girls than to boys, and potential sex association of the motivators was not considered by the researcher.

Skill

Skill, by definition, is coordinated movement. Cratty (3) states that it may be termed "Reasonably complex motor performance," and that it denotes an act of learning in which the performance is smoothed and executed with less effort. Skill may be a tool through which an individual creates movement.

Literature on the subject of tap dancing is profuse. Many books (1, 4, 14, 18, 21) include explanations of the tap dance terms, simple techniques, counting systems, and sample routines. Authors generally agree on what constitutes good skill in tap dancing.

Rhythm, and clear, distinct tap sounds are mentioned in all of the literature. The rhythm patterns and musical beat of a skilled tap dancer are even and regular. The ability to produce clear, distinct tap sounds is of particular importance to a tap dancer because the audible rhythmic sound is the unique factor of tap dancing. Ramsey (18, p. 11) and Mates (14, p. 22) included good posture as a must for skill. The perfect alignment of the body enables the dancer to maintain control over all of the body parts. Sauthoff (20) and Fletcher (6) agreed that tap dancing cannot be considered total or whole, without the use of body action, gestures, and facial
expressions. The projection of the tap dancer is as important to the total dance as the audible sounds. In the dance, this stylization is a type of visual rhythm. The tap dancer gives interpretation to rhythm by his ability to project through body action and expression.

No studies were found that explored the relationship of tap dance skill to creativity. One study did investigate the relationship of motor ability to creativity. In 1965 Stroup (23) investigated the relationship of motor ability to verbal creativity. In the study an attempt was made to determine whether a portion of the variance in creativity measures might be associated with motor skills. Subjects for the study were ninety-seven sixth grade boys. Tests administered in the study included Torrance's Circles, Product Improvement, Unusual Uses, and Consequences Test, and the Iowa Revision of the Brace Motor Ability Test. The motor ability test was administered one year after the administration of the verbal creativity tests. The Pearson product moment correlation statistic was used to compare the verbal test scores with the motor ability scores. No significant correlations were found. The negative results were attributed to 1) the one year interval between the administration of the verbal creativity tests and the motor ability test, 2) the failure of both types of test to measure accurately, and 3) the difference in muscle coordination required by the two types of test.
Choreography

The term choreography was first used with reference to ballet; however, every form of dance can be included in the definition of choreography as the art of dancing or of arranging dances. The literature revealed that every form of dance, including tap dancing, follows a fundamental form in choreography. Hungerford (11) listed four types of form to consider in creating tap dances: 1) motor, 2) rhythmic, 3) spatial, and 4) dramatic. The motor form was concerned with skills and techniques involved in tap dancing. The importance of rhythmic, spatial, and dramatic form was exemplified by Hungerford in that "laws" for these types of form were listed. In the construction of rhythmic form, repetition of sounds or cadence, and contrast or variation to the cadence were considered when choreographing a tap dance routine. The spatial form indicates the involvement of space used by the dancer. The dancer should be aware of this space and vary the position of the dance by changing the line of direction, eye focus, and level of the body. The dramatic form is concerned with the over-all impression the dance projects through unity, a main idea or theme.

Shipley (21) stated that a good tap dance should include the following elements:

1. Rhythm—the audible beat or tempo of the dance.
2. Shading—a variation of the rhythm accomplished by a temporary shifting of metrical emphasis or by varying the degrees in sound of tap accents.
3. Contrast--a variation of rhythm patterns in relation to one another.

4. Stylization--the dancer should employ body and arm movements which coordinate with the footwork.

5. Staging--the dancer should move through the space available, and vary the directions and patterns of the movement.

The elements Fletcher (6) considered as important in tap dance choreography related closely to those of Shipley. Both authors agreed that rhythm, shading, and contrast were significant in the arrangement of a dance. Fletcher, however, combined stylization and staging as one element concerned with "arranging parts for a pleasing or effective result." Fletcher also added the element of interpretation which was described as significance or mood. The idea was that a dance should tell a story, interpret an emotion, accentuate a mood or say something to the audience.

Thompson (25, p. 165) suggested to beginning choreographers that a good tap dance should contain simple, well-executed steps, phrasing, original combinations, and a good ending.

Stressing Creativity During the Teaching Process

The belief that individual creative ability is primarily controlled by the environment is upheld by Ferguson's (5) proposal and the primary abilities of an individual are generalized learned habits or skills, and produced by certain
kinds of practice. A consequence of this theory has been the belief on the part of many educators that creativity in children may be enhanced and developed by a special teaching method that is designed to stress creativity throughout the learning process. Opinions differ greatly, however, in that there are those who believe that creativity is more directly influenced by heredity. Guilford's (9) position is somewhere between these two extremes, with the belief that heredity probably does determine the limits within which development can occur, but that experience and learning may have a wide range within which to operate and produce results. If this hypothesis is true, education can do much to promote the development of creative thinking.

True (16) investigated the concept that a unique teaching process might enhance creativity. The three-fold purpose of this experiment was to investigate 1) the effects that exposure to creativity principles had upon idea production, 2) the relationship between quantity and quality of idea production, and 3) the relationship between intelligence and creativity. A group of two hundred freshmen students at the State University of Iowa were used as subjects. They were divided into experimental and control groups and administered a creativity pre-test. The experimental group was then exposed to a fifty-minute creativity presentation. This was followed by the administration of the creativity post-test to both the experimental and control groups.
An analysis of the results showed that exposure to the creativity principles had a positive effect on both the quantity and quality aspects of idea production. However, the degree to which an individual improved on the quantity aspect of idea production was directly proportional to his initial ability. A correlation of $r = 0.866$ was found to exist between the quantity and quality aspects of idea production. No significant correlation was found between intelligence and creativity, as measured in the study.

There has been one other study which involved an attempt to teach creativity and to measure whether or not a significant change took place as a result. Brown (2) was concerned with the development of creativity as evidenced by change in perception. Through experiences in a semester university course entitled "Elementary-School Procedure," an attempt was made to develop the creative self so that perceptions and consequent behavior would be significantly influenced by symbols or referents presented in a classroom climate. Mean gains of approximately eight and nine points for the experimental group on the sixty-two item Barron-Welsh Art Scale were effected. Analysis of covariance comparing test results of the experimental group with two control groups resulted in significant F-ratios. If the Barron-Welsh Art Scale can be assumed to measure creativity this attempt apparently met with some success.
Hallman (10) stated that creativity can be taught because "... the process of being creative is the process of developing oneself as a personality; it is the process of unfettering the chains of habit, routine, and repression. It is the process of shaping one's surroundings, of relating oneself and defining one's own existence. This is the central problem of creativity; it is also the central problem of education."
chapter bibliography


CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Selection of Subjects

Since the purpose of this study was to compare methods of teaching tap dance on the college level, the subjects for the study were freshman and sophomore college students who were enrolled in four beginning tap dance classes at North Texas State University, Spring semester, 1967. The selection of the subjects was based on the availability of these classes for testing.

The subjects participating in the testing program were uniformly dressed in the physical education uniform required by the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation for Women. In the tap dance phase of the testing program, the subjects wore tap shoes. In the motor creativity testing phase, the subjects were barefooted.

Description of Tests

Motor Creativity Test

The Motor Creativity Test was developed by Wyrick in 1966. It is the only test available which can be used for the purpose of testing motor creativity. The validity was established as face validity and the reliability coefficient for the test was reported to be .87. The test (Appendix A) consisted of
three parts, each part using a different motivator. A low balance beam, parallel lines, and a ball were used as motivators.

The beam item required the subject to move in as many different ways as possible from one end of the beam to the other, so that at some point in the moving the hips were higher than the head. The parallel line item required the subject to move in as many ways possible from one line to the other without walking, running, jumping, hopping, skipping, sliding, galloping, or leaping. The ball-wall item required the subject to move a rubber playground ball to the wall in as many ways possible either by striking or hitting the ball.

The subject was scored on the basis of the number of responses produced which met the restriction of the situation within a three-minute time period. The fluency of response score correlated sufficiently highly with the originality of response score to allow the sum of the fluency scores to serve as the motor creativity criterion score.

**Tap Dance Skill Test**

Tap dance ability or skill can be evaluated by the observance of the correct technique, rhythm, body style, and the projection of the subject (2, p. 11). Evaluation of technique and rhythm can be accomplished audibly, while body style and projection can be judged visually. The tap dance skill test (Appendix B) used in this study was designed by the researcher. The development of a rating scale enabled
the researcher to incorporate all elements of the skill test and produce an evaluation of the individual subject. The rating scale used in the test was selected on the basis of range. The five ordinal levels of the scale were 0-failure, 1-poor, 2-average, 3-good, 4-superior, and allowed an adequate range for evaluation.

**Choreography Ability Test**

The tap dance choreography test (Appendix C) was also designed by the researcher. Ten tap dance techniques were to be incorporated in a routine in any combination. The techniques were selected as a sampling of traditional beginning tap dance skills. A space was provided to check the techniques as they were performed and to total the number actually incorporated into the routine. A rating scale was also provided to evaluate the routine in terms of originality, rhythm, staging, styling, and interest to the viewer. The rating scale was selected because it allowed an adequate range of 0-failure, 1-poor, 2-average, 3-good, and 4-superior. A space was provided to rate five factors important in tap dance choreography. The five factors were 1) creative transitions and combinations, 2) correct rhythm, 3) has varied and interesting floor patterns, 4) style (use of arms, head, body, and 5) interest. These factors have been recognized as criteria for the evaluation of choreography by authors of tap dance literature (2, 4, 5). A space was provided for the total rating score where the minimum was zero and the maximum was
twenty. In order to emphasize the importance of the factors, the total score of the test was the technique total plus two times the rating total.

Method

Organization of Classes

The four beginning tap dance classes used in the study were divided into an experimental group and a control group. The control group was composed of three classes that met three times a week in the afternoon for one hour. The experimental class met in the afternoon twice a week for one and a half hours. The selection of the control and experimental classes was based on the scheduling of the classes.

Experimental class.--The experimental class received instruction in tap dance technique and tap dance routines. In addition to the lessons in tap technique and dance routines, experience was provided in choreography. The experimental class was afforded the opportunity to 1) combine various techniques in an original way, 2) create the styling for a routine, 3) present an original ending for structured routines that were taught, and 4) substitute an original step for one of the steps in each routine taught in class (Appendix D).

Control classes.--The control classes were taught traditionally with instruction in tap dance technique and tap dance routines (Appendix E). The control group was never provided the opportunity to experiment or to create with tap
dance skills acquired in the class until the final two weeks of class time.

Administration of Tests

Tests were administered to four beginning tap dance classes during the spring semester, 1967. All testing occurred in the North Texas State University Women's Gymnasium. The tests included the 1) Wyrick Motor Creativity Test, 2) Tap Dance Skill Test, and 3) Tap Dance Choreography Test.

Motor Creativity.--The Motor Creativity Test was administered by the researcher and one volunteer. Training sessions were held before the testing began to assure uniformity of method and scoring between the investigator and volunteer. Testing occurred for four weeks. Each subject was assigned a fifteen-minute appointment in addition to her regular physical education class period.

Room 117 was divided by wooden partitions into three testing areas. These areas were approximately ten feet by sixteen feet. In the first test area a low wooden balance beam was placed diagonally across the floor. Area two had two parallel lines six feet apart marked on the floor with tape. In test area three a restraining line was marked with tape eight feet from one of the side walls and four rubber balls were placed in a line beside the restraining line. Equipment, arrangement of the room and equipment, and presentation of test directions were standardized for each subject.
The test administrator sat in a chair facing the subject and recorded the number of responses for the allowed time period. As each test was completed, the subject and the test administrator moved to the next test area until all three tests had been completed. Each motor creativity test was administered immediately following the preceding one, since Wyrick (5) established that fatigue did not appear to be a factor.

Tap dance skill.--The tap dance skill level of each subject was assessed according to pre-established standards that are presented in the Tap Dance Skill Test (Appendix B). The researcher evaluated each subject individually, after each new technique was introduced. The students reviewed and practiced each technique for several class periods and then were tested. The students were rated on one technique each week until the end of the testing program. Tap dance skill was assessed at the beginning of the class period after a brief warm-up session. In alphabetical order the students performed the technique with music to a specific number of counts. The music was played continuously until all students had completed the test, one performing immediately after the other.

Choreography ability.--Choreography ability was tested at the end of the tap dance course during the regular physical education class period. Because of class scheduling the experimental group was tested throughout one class period and the control groups were tested throughout two class periods. Following a lecture and discussion on methods of choreography,
two weeks were allowed for the students to choreograph a routine. The subjects were informed by lecture that they were to choreograph a tap dance routine to sixty-four measures of music selected by the researcher. Ten specified tap dance techniques were to be incorporated into the routine in any combination. Students were aware that they would be scored by judges on the techniques included in the routine and on the five factors of choreography. Students did not know that they would rate each other until the day of the test. On the test day rating sheets were distributed. Each student received enough rating sheets to score all members of the group. The students received an explanation on scoring the techniques included in the routine and on scoring the overall impression of the dance in terms of the five factors of choreography. As each student volunteered to perform, the judges and class wrote her name on the top of one rating sheet. Rating sheets were collected at the end of the class period.

Treatment of the Data

The data were analyzed statistically. Scores consisted of one choreography score from the class, one choreography score from the judges, skill scores from a rating sheet, and the total motor creativity scores for each subject. Descriptive statistics, such as the mean and standard deviation, and intercorrelations of all scores were computed by the North Texas State University computer. Fisher's t-tests were computed by the investigator on a hand calculator.
Preliminary Analysis

Objectivity coefficients were computed among the three judge's rating scores of choreography. A Pearson product-moment was computed between the class and the judges' scores.

Test of Hypotheses

To determine whether relationships existed among motor creativity, skill, and choreography, the null hypothesis that the correlations were not significantly different from zero was tested. An intercorrelation matrix was computed and coefficients and t-ratios that were significant at the .05 level were accepted as basis for rejecting the hypotheses. Any coefficient that was both significant and substantial in magnitude might indicate the existence of a relationship.

To determine whether differences existed between the control and experimental group on the variables motor creativity choreography, and skill, a t-ratio for uncorrelated means was computed. The formula

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\text{SSE}_1 + \text{SSE}_2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{N_1}{N_1} + \frac{N_2}{N_2}\right)}}$$

taken from Guilford (3, p. 183) was used. Scores from each of the parameters choreography, motor creativity, and skill were tested. The null hypothesis that there was no significant
difference between scores from the control and experimental groups was tested and rejected at the .05 level of confidence.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The findings of this investigation were the result of a statistical analysis of the data. A correlation matrix was computed to determine relationships among the variables, and t-ratios were calculated to determine significant differences. Findings are summarized in Tables I, II, and III beginning on page forty.

Preliminary Analysis

The mean, standard deviation, and range of scores for the choreography ratings, skill, and motor creativity scores are presented in Table I. The scores of the three judges' ratings of choreography ranged from 5.0 to 48.0 with a mean score of 35.54 and a standard deviation of 6.88. The scores of the classes' ratings of choreography ranged from 9.0 to 46.0 with a mean score of 36.99 and a standard deviation of 6.09. Skill scores for each subject were determined by the investigator and these ranged from 1.0 to 5.2 with a mean score of 3.0 and a standard deviation of 1.0. Scores obtained from the beam test item of the Motor Creativity Test ranged from 1.0 to 22.0 with a mean score of 7.39 and a standard deviation of 4.79. Scores for the lines test item of the Motor Creativity Test ranged
### TABLE I

**CORRELATION MATRIX FOR CHOREOGRAPHY RATINGS, SKILL, AND MOTOR CREATIVITY SCORES N=79**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Class Ave.</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Beam</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Ball</th>
<th>Motor Cr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choreography judges</td>
<td>35.54</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>5-48</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choreography class</td>
<td>36.99</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>9-46</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1-5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>4-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(r > .22 = p < .05^a\)*

**\(r > .28 = p < .01^a\)**

\(^a^\)Values from Wallace and Snedecor's Table for 30 variables, 24 df (Guilford, 1965, pp. 508-581).
from 2.0 to 15.0 with a mean score of 7.49 and a standard deviation of 3.19. Scores for the ball test item of the Motor Creativity Test ranged from 0 to 22.0 with a mean score of 7.59 and a standard deviation of 4.75. The total Motor Creativity Test scores ranged from 4.0 to 42.0 with a mean score of 22.61 and a standard deviation of 8.69.

Objectivity coefficients were computed among the three judges' rating scores of choreography, and also between these ratings and those provided by the classes (Table II). The highest correlation between any two judges' ratings was that between Judge I and Judge II. The coefficient of correlation expressing the relationship between scores awarded by Judge I and scores awarded by Judge II was .81. The coefficient of correlation for Judge I and Judge III was .73, whereas the coefficient of correlation for Judge II and Judge III was .57. All objectivity coefficients were significant and ranged from a moderate to high magnitude. The means and standard deviations of the judges' and classes' ratings of choreography were very similar. The correlation between the classes' and the judges' ratings was computed and found to be .87.

An intercorrelation of motor creativity items was computed. These intercorrelations ranged from .12 to .32. The range of the intercorrelations of test items to total motor creativity was from .59 to .75. These coefficients are displayed in Table I.
TABLE II
INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG JUDGES' AND CLASS RATINGS OF CHOREOGRAPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Judge II</th>
<th>Judge III</th>
<th>Judges' Average</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge I</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge II</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rc > .22 = p < .05
**r > .28 = p < .01

Values from Wallace and Snedecor’s Table for 30 variables, 24 df (Guilford, 1965, pp. 508-501).

Tests of Hypotheses
Hypothesis I stated that the true intercorrelations of motor creativity, tap dance skill, and the ability to create tap dance is zero. The correlation matrix indicating these relationships is presented in Table I. In all comparisons a correlation coefficient greater than .28 was significant at the .01 level of confidence and a coefficient greater than .22 was significant at the .05 level. Neither the motor creativity item scores nor the total motor creativity scores was significantly related to the skill scores. The range of these
correlations was from .07 to .21. Skill did correlate significantly with the classes' ratings (.70) and with the judges' ratings (.68). Therefore, Hypothesis I was not rejected for motor creativity and skill; however, the hypothesis was rejected regarding the relationship between skill and choreography and the relationship between motor creativity and choreography. Although the correlation of motor creativity to choreography was significant, it was low in magnitude.

Hypotheses II, III, and IV stated that there would be no significant difference between the experimental and control groups on choreography ability, skill, and motor creativity. In Table III the means, standard deviations, and t-ratios for the choreography ratings of the judges and the classes, skill, and motor creativity, are presented for the experimental and control groups. The means and standard deviations of the experimental group were higher than the control group for choreography ability and motor creativity scores, however, the t-ratios revealed that there was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups on any of the variables. Hypotheses II, III, and IV, therefore, were not rejected.
TABLE III

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND t-RATIOS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON ALL VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>&lt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>37.71</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>36.72</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>&lt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>&lt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>&lt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aValues from the table of t-ratios for 78 df, (Garrett, 1966 p. 461).

Discussion

The means and standard deviations obtained in this study from the Motor Creativity Test were lower than those reported by Wyrick (13) and Nelson (7). Both of these studies also administered the Motor Creativity Test to college freshmen women. The mean score for motor creativity in Wyrick's study was 36.45 with a standard deviation of 16.70. The mean score for motor creativity in Nelson's study was 30.95 with a standard deviation of 12.70. As reported, the mean score for motor creativity in this study was 22.61 with a standard deviation of 8.69. Philipp (8) administered the motor creativity test to children and reported a mean score of 27.1 with a standard deviation of 11.4.
Relationships Among the Variables

In this study the correlation of motor creativity to tap dance skill was .10 and was not significantly related. In Wyrick's study the correlations of the motor creativity items and motor ability ranged from .02 to .21 and were not significantly related. Philipp found no significant relationship between selected motor skills and motor creativity. The range of correlation coefficients reported in her study was .27 to .28. Since Wyrick found motor creativity was not related to basic motor ability, and both Philipp's findings and those of this investigation found no significant relationship with specific skills, it appears that there is no relationship between the variables of motor creativity, motor ability, and skill. In addition, it appears that creativity in general has no relationship with motor ability, since Stroup (10) found no significant relationship between verbal creativity and a test of motor ability. These findings indicate further that there appears to be no relationship between motor creativity and skill, motor creativity and motor ability, verbal creativity and motor ability, or verbal creativity and motor creativity.

Skill did correlate highly with choreography when both the ratings of the judges and those of the classes were considered. An explanation regarding this high relationship might be derived from an examination of the judges' backgrounds in comparison to the classes' background. A survey of the
correlation among the three judges revealed that the correlation between Judge I and the classes ratings of choreography was .84, the correlation between Judge II and the classes ratings was .80, and the correlation between Judge III and the classes ratings was .70. Judges I and II were, at the time of this investigation, both teachers of tap dance. Judge II had studied under professional tap dancers and taught in professional studios, whereas Judge I had only studied and taught in educational institutions. Judge III was a professional performer and had studied under professional tap dancers for many years. Perhaps the lower correlation between Judge III and the classes' ratings is due to the difference in dance background, and therefore a difference in the attitude regarding what constitutes a good tap dance.

Another explanation of the relationship of skill and choreography might be that the choreography rating sheet might have placed more emphasis on skill than on basic motor creativity. Judges may have unconsciously placed more emphasis on the skill involved in the execution of correct rhythm and style rather than on the creativity involved in the choreography of the rhythm and style for the dance. Literature concerning the subject of tap dance tends to stress technique and rhythm involved in skill rather than creativity. Shipley (9) listed rhythm, shading, contrast, stylization, and staging as elements to be considered in the choreography of a tap dance,
but did not mention originality. Only one author stressed creativity in tap dance. Hungerford (6) titled her book *Creative Tap Dancing* and devoted an entire chapter to a discussion regarding creativity in tap dance.

Another possible explanation of the high relationship between choreography and skill is that perhaps the level of creativity needed to choreograph a tap dance routine from assigned techniques is so low that the production of new principles is not adequately stressed. In Taylor's (11) "clusters" of definitions of creativity, inventive creativity stresses efficiency of materials rather than production of a new principle. In relation to tap dance, the efficiency of skill rather than creativity in a routine is many times emphasized.

These findings, in light of the above discussion, lend credence to the possibility that the value of a tap dance in our society is in the display of skill rather than in the display of creativity. Perhaps the creative aspects of a tap dance are merely considered to be a vehicle to display skill.

Another possible reason for the correlation between choreography and skill is that the attitudes of the judges and students in the classes regarding creative individuals might be anagolous to the attitudes that teachers and administrators have toward creative students. According to Getzels and Jackson (3) these attitudes reflect a preference for high intelligence and conformity. Perhaps judges and students in this study unconsciously preferred the highly skilled performers to
the highly creative performers. The classes, even though they were on a beginning level, also tended to rate choreography in such a way that it related highly with skill. Since the correlation between the classes' ratings and the judges' ratings of choreography was .87, it appears that a class of beginning tap dancers is able to arrive at scores that are similar to those of professional judges.

Although motor creativity and ratings of choreography had intercorrelations of low magnitude, it was noted that in most instances the motor creativity test items correlated significantly only with the other motor creativity scores.

**Correlation of Experimental and Control Group Performances**

The finding that motor creativity and skill were not related was further substantiated by the failure of either the experimental group or the control group to significantly surpass the other on choreography scores. If motor creativity has been highly related to choreography, one might have hypothesized that the experimental group would surpass the control group on choreography. The fact that this did not occur verifies this lack of relationship. Skill and choreography, however, were highly related. One might wonder then, why the control group did not significantly surpass the experimental group, since the control group did not spend any class time on choreography experience.
Skill scores of the experimental and control groups, however, were not significantly different. Reasons for this lack of differences could be that on the beginning level skill cannot be developed to the extent that one group will exceed the other group. Also, the two classes were purposely kept together on lessons of skill; thus, the control group was not able to exceed the experimental group in number of skills learned. They had an opportunity to excel in quality of skills used.

The findings of this study therefore, do not substantiate those of True (12), Brown (1), and Hallman (5) regarding the development of creativity through the use of unique teaching methods that stress creativity. The positive findings of True and Brown could be due to the fact that students practiced the creativity tests or were familiarized with the instrument used to test creativity. Whereas, in this study the tests used to measure creativity were not similar to the creative projects that were practiced.

The motor creativity tests used in this study were not administered until the classes had had three months of tap dance instruction. If practice in creating tap dance routines does in fact develop motor creativity, one would expect that three months would be a time interval of sufficient magnitude to produce a significant difference between the two groups' means on the Motor Creativity Test.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purposes of the study were to investigate the relationships between motor creativity, tap dance skill, and tap dance choreography; and to determine whether beginning tap dance classes that were taught by a traditional or a creative approach would perform significantly different on tests of choreography, skill, and motor creativity.

The fluency scale of the Wyrick Motor Creativity Test was used to measure motor creativity. Tap dance skill and choreography ability were evaluated by means of special rating sheets that were designed by the investigator.

Seventy-nine freshmen and sophomore women enrolled in four beginning tap dance classes at North Texas State University, Spring semester, 1967, were selected as subjects. The classes were divided into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group received the traditional instruction in tap dance technique and tap dance routines, but frequent experience in choreographing tap dances was also provided. The control group was taught traditionally with instruction in tap dance technique and tap dance routines. No experience in choreography was provided.
The hypotheses were, in general, that the intercorrelations of the variables motor creativity, skill, and choreography ability would be zero, and that there would be no significant differences between the experimental and control groups on the variables.

The data were analyzed statistically. Intercorrelations of all scores were computed by the North Texas State University computer. Fisher's \( t \)-tests were computed by the investigator on a hand calculator.

Results of the data revealed that skill and motor creativity did correlate with choreography, but there was no relationship between skill and motor creativity. The results of the \( t \)-ratios upheld the hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the experimental and control group on choreography, ability, skill, and motor creativity.

Within the limitations findings for this study were
1. There was no relationship between skill and motor creativity in the subjects investigated.
2. There was significant and moderate to high relationship between tap dance skill scores and choreography ratings.
3. There was a relationship of choreography ratings and motor creativity although low in magnitude.
4. There was no significant difference in the means of the experimental and control group on choreography
ability even though the experimental group was provided experience in choreography throughout the semester.

5. There was no significant difference between the means of the experimental and control groups on tap dance skill.

6. There was no significant difference between the means of the experimental and control groups on motor creativity scores.

Conclusions

1. Skill seems to be the most important component in the choreography of tap dances on the beginning level.

2. Basic motor creativity as defined by Wyrick may be a necessary component of choreography since there was a significant but low relationship between choreography and motor creativity.

3. Experience in choreographing sections of tap dance routines does not seem to enhance a beginning classes' ability to choreograph tap dances that are of superior quality in terms of the criteria used in the evaluation of tap dances.

Recommendations for Further Study

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are presented.
1. A survey of professional tap dancers' attitudes toward the importance of creativity in a tap dance routine might provide valuable insight into methods of stressing choreography.

2. A study regarding the relationships between levels of skill and choreography ability might yield more information concerning the relationship of these two variables.

3. Relationships of tap dance skill, choreography ability, and motor creativity in small children should be investigated.

4. A study similar to this one that utilizes a pre- and post-test or analogous forms of the tests used might provide information into the development phase of the variables concerned.

5. A test should be developed to evaluate creative abilities of tap dancers.
APPENDIX A

Motor Creativity Tests Directions*

Beam Test
Move in as many different ways as you can from one end of the beam to the other, so that at some time in your moving your hips are higher than your head. Begin at one end of the beam, and move to the other end. When you reach that end, return to the original end in a different movement. You may use the beam, or the beam and the floor in combination. The only requirement is that at some point in your travel your hips should be higher than your head. Continue moving from end to end of the beam, each time in a different way, until the time is consumed. Do you have any questions? Ready? Begin.

Parallel Line Test
Move in as many different ways as you can from one line to the other, without walking, running, jumping, hopping, skipping, sliding, galloping, or leaping. Begin at line one and move to line two. Upon reaching line two, return to line one in a different way. Continue traveling between the lines, each time with a different movement, until the time is consumed. Remember, you may not walk, run, jump, hop, skip, gallop, slide, or leap. Do you have any questions? Ready? Begin.

Ball-Wall Test
Move a ball to the wall in as many different ways as you can, either by striking or hitting the ball. It makes no difference where on the wall the ball lands as long as it reaches the wall. Be sure to strike or hit the ball in a different way each time. You may not go over the restraining line. Accuracy is not important. Continue moving the balls to the wall until the time is consumed. Do you have any questions? Ready? Begin.

APPENDIX B

TAP DANCE SKILL TEST

The student was graded in the regular class period over all techniques taught throughout the semester.

Scores were based on the following:

- Technique correct
- Rhythm
- Body Style
- Projection

The following rating scale was used:

4 Superior
3 Good
2 Average
1 Poor
0 Failure
APPENDIX C

TAP DANCE CHOREOGRAPHY TEST

The experts and the class used the following rating sheet to determine scores:

Name ____________________________

Check technique if used:

_____ Shuffle
_____ Flap
_____ Heel drop
_____ Dig
_____ Cramroll
_____ Ball-change
_____ Scuff
_____ Chug
_____ Grapevine
_____ Turn

_____ Total

Rating Scale
4 Superior
3 Good
2 Average
1 Poor
0 Failure

Transitions and combinations are creative
Rhythm is correct
Has varied and interesting floor patterns
Style (use of arms, head, body)
Dance is interesting to watch

_____ Total (can be .20)

_____ Techniques
_____ Rating X's 2
_____ TOTAL SCORE
APPENDIX D

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Lesson 1

Skills
Toe tap
Toe tap, step
Heel tap
Heel tap, step
Tip
Tip, step
Combination (tip, heel, tap, step)
Toe drop
Heel tap, toe drop
Heel drop
Toe, heel drop
Shuffle
Shuffle, step
Three shuffles, step
Ball change
Shuffle, ball change
Seven shuffles, ball change, step
Flap

Review
All of the above

Lesson 2

Review
All of Lesson 1

Skills
Flap, heel drop
Flap, heel, heel
Grapevine (slow and double time)
Shuffle, hop, step
Flap, ball change
Flap, heel, tip

Lesson 3

Review
Lessons 1, 2

Skills
Right cramp roll
Sugar foot
Suzy-Q

Create
Individual-style the Sugar foot as many ways as possible

Lesson 4

Review
Lessons 1, 2, 3 thoroughly

Skills
Left cramp roll
Shuffle, hop, step, shuffle ball change
Step 1 of routine "Side by Side"

Lesson 5

Review
Lessons 1, 2, 3, 4

Skills
Steps 2 and 3 of "Side by Side"
Lesson 6

Review
Lessons 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Special emphasis on shuffle and flap combinations

Skills
Step 4 "Side by Side"
Scuff

Create
A two-count ending for "Side by Side" with partner

Test
Shuffle, step

Lesson 7

Review
Tap, shuffle, flap combinations, scuff, "Side by Side"

Skills
Nerve roll
Three step turns
foot work
arms
spotting

Test
Shuffle, hop, step

Lesson 8

Review
"Side by Side"
Three step turn
Combination of techniques arranged into a Warm-up Sequence

Skills
Dig (toe and heel)
Dig, step (toe and heel)
Waltz Clog, steps 1, 2, 3

Lesson 9

Review
Warm-up Sequence
Turns
"Side by Side"
Waltz Clog, steps 1, 2, 3

Skills
Waltz Clog, step 4
Essence Combination (brush, dig, step and brush back, ball change)
Hop, shuffle, step

Create
Small groups - six count ending for Waltz Clog

Test
Shuffle, ball change

Lesson 10

Review
Warm-up Sequence
Waltz Clog

Skills
Steps 1 and 2 of Soft Shoe

Test
Flap, heel, tip

Lesson 11

Review
Warm-up Sequence
Waltz Clog
Soft shoe, steps 1, 2

Skills
Soft Shoe, step 3
Lesson 12
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Waltz Clog
Soft Shoe, steps 1, 2, 3
Skills
Soft Shoe, step 4
Test
Waltz Clog

Lesson 13
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Soft Shoe
Skills
Double shuffle
Hop, shuffle, step,
shuffle, ball change
Create
Individual-Combination of
the following techniques
in any order to eight
counts: flap, step,
shuffle, ball change,
tip, hop
Test
Essence combination

Lesson 14
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Soft Shoe
Skills
Riff
Riff, step
Riff, heel, step
"Syncopated Clock" steps
1, 2, 3, 4
Create
Original Soft Shoe step

Lesson 15
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock" steps 1, 2, 3, 4
Soft Shoe (with original step)
Test
Hop, shuffle, step

Lesson 16
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock" steps 1, 2, 3, 4
Skills
Interlude, steps 5, 6 of
"Syncopated Clock"
Test
Soft Shoe

Lesson 17
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"
Skills
Progressive turns
Steps 7, 8 of "Syncopated Clock"
Create
Combination of the following
techniques in any order to
sixteen counts: ball change,
step, shuffle, flap, hop,
tap, clap
Lesson 18
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"
Create
An original step for
"Syncopated Clock"
Test
Cramprolls (right and left)

Lesson 19
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"
Skills
Cha-Cha steps 1, 2, 3

Lesson 20
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Cha-Cha steps 1, 2, 3
Skills
Steps 4, 5 of Cha-Cha
Test
"Syncopated Clock"

Lesson 21
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Cha-Cha
Skills
Steps 6, 7, 8 of Cha-Cha
Test
Riff

Lesson 22
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Cha-Cha
Create
Original step for Cha-Cha
Test
Hop, shuffle, step, shuffle, ball change

Lesson 23
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Cha-Cha
Skills
Lecture and discussion on
Choreography

Lesson 24
Review
Cha-Cha
Create
Individual routines

Lesson 25-26
Create
Individual routine
Test
Cha-Cha

Lesson 27
Create
Individual routines
Test
Progressive turns
Lesson 28
Choreography ratings

Lesson 29-30
Reviewed all dances, techniques
Discussed class notes

Lesson 31
Final Examination
APPENDIX E

CONTROL GROUP

Lesson 1
Skills
Toe tap
Toe tap, step
Heel tap
Heel tap, step
Tip
Tip, step
Combination (tip, heel, tap, step)
Toe drop
Heel tap, toe drop
Heel drop
Toe, heel drop
Shuffle

Review
All of the above

Lesson 2
Review
Lesson 1
Skills
Shuffle, step
Three shuffles, step
Ball change
Shuffle, ball change
Seven shuffles, ball change, step
Flap

Review
All of the above

Lesson 3
Review
Lessons 1, 2
Skills
Flap, heel drop
Flap, heel, heel
grapevine (slow and double time)

Lesson 4
Review
Lessons 1, 2, 3
Skills
Shuffle, hop, step
Flap, ball change
Flap, heel, tip

Lesson 5
Review
Lessons 1, 2, 3, 4
Skills
Right cramp roll
Sugar foot
Suzy-Q

Lesson 6
Review
Lessons, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Skills
Left cramp roll
Shuffle, hop, step, shuffle, ball change
Lesson 7
Review
Shuffle and flap combinations
Skills
Steps 1,2 to routine "Side by Side"

Lesson 8
Review
Tap, shuffle, and flap combinations
Skills
Scuff
"Side by Side" step 3
Test
Shuffle, step

Lesson 9
Review
All techniques
Steps 1,2,3 "Side by Side"
Skills
Step 4 "Side by Side"
Warm-up Sequence
Three step turn
Test
Shuffle, hop, step

Lesson 10
Review
"Side by Side"
Warm-up Sequence
Three step turn
Skills
Nerve roll

Lesson 11
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Turns
"Side by Side"
Skills
Dig (heel and toe)
Dig, step (heel and toe)
Waltz, Clog, steps 1,2

Lesson 12
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Turns
"Side by Side"
Waltz, Clog, steps 1,2
Skills
Essence combination (brush, dig, step, and brush back, ball change)
Waltz, Clog, steps 3,4
Test
Shuffle, ball change

Lesson 13
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Side by Side"
Waltz, Clog
Skills
Hop, shuffle, step
Test
"Side by Side"
Lesson 14
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Waltz Clog
Skills
Soft Shoe, steps 1, 2
Test
Flap, heel, tip

Lesson 15
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Waltz Clog
Steps 1, 2 of Soft Shoe
Skills
Soft Shoe, step 3

Lesson 16
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Waltz Clog
Soft Shoe, steps 1, 2, 3
Skills
Soft Shoe, step 4
Test
Waltz Clog

Lesson 17
Review
All techniques and routines
Soft Shoe

Lesson 18
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Soft Shoe
Skills
Soft Shoe Ending
Double shuffle
Hop, shuffle, step,
shuffle, ball change

Lesson 19
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Turns
Soft Shoe
Test
Essence combination

Lesson 20
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Soft Shoe
Skills
Progressive turns
Riff
Riff, step
Riff, heel, step

Lesson 21
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Soft Shoe
Skills
"Syncopated Clock" steps 1, 2
Test
Hop, shuffle, step
Lesson 22
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock" steps 1, 2
Skills
Steps 3, 4 "Syncopated Clock"
Test
Soft Shoe

Lesson 23
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"
Skills
Interlude and step 5
"Syncopated Clock"

Lesson 24
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"
Skills
Steps 6, 7 of "Syncopated Clock"

Lesson 25
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"
Skills
Step 8 of "Syncopated Clock"
Test
Cramp rolls (left, right)

Lesson 26
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"

Lesson 27
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"
Skills
Steps 1, 2 of Cha-Cha

Lesson 28
Review
Warm-up Sequence
"Syncopated Clock"
Cha-Cha, step 1, 2
Skills
Cha-Cha, steps 3, 4
Test
Riffs

Lesson 29
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Cha-Cha, steps 1, 2, 3, 4
Skills
Step 5 of Cha-Cha
Test
"Syncopated Clock"

Lesson 30
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Cha-Cha
Skills
Cha-Cha, steps 6, 7
Test
Hop, shuffle, step, shuffle, ball change
Lesson 31
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Cha-Cha
Skills
Cha-Cha step 8

Lesson 32
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Cha-Cha

Lesson 33
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Test
Cha-Cha

Lesson 34
Review
Warm-up Sequence
Skills
Lecture and discussion on Choreography
Test
Progressive Turns

Lesson 35-40
Individual routines

Lesson 41-42
Choreography ratings

Lesson 43-45
Reviewed all dance techniques, and class notes

Lesson 46
Final Examination
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