379
N81d
No. 4249

STUDENT INTERPRETATIONS OF TEACHER VERBAL PRAISE
IN SELECTED SEVENTH AND EIGHTH
GRADE CHORAL CLASSES
DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Ouida O. Taylor, B.S., M.A.

Denton, Texas

December, 1995

379
N81d
No. 4249

STUDENT INTERPRETATIONS OF TEACHER VERBAL PRAISE
IN SELECTED SEVENTH AND EIGHTH
GRADE CHORAL CLASSES
DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Ouida O. Taylor, B.S., M.A.

Denton, Texas

December, 1995

Taylor, Ouida O., Student interpretations of teacher verbal praise in selected seventh and eighth grade choral classes. Doctor of Philosophy (Music Education), December 1995, 202 pp., 15 tables, references, 77 titles.

This study investigated the effect familiarity with a teacher had on student interpretations of teacher verbal praise in seventh and eighth grade choral ensembles. A stimulus tape was constructed of 16, 30-second videotaped clips containing verbal praise of four teachers. Teachers identified their intent in the use of praise in each example. Students ($n = 80$) from the four choirs responded to the tape by labeling the praise in each clip as deserved or as one of three types of instructional praise (i.e., praise to encourage, to send a message to other students, or to seek student cooperation). Comparisons were made between choirs in labeling the praise. Comparisons were made also between each teacher's stated purpose in praising and the interpretations of choirs familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher.

Choirs who were unfamiliar with the teacher differed from the teachers' own students in interpreting the praise: Students who knew a teacher labeled the praise as deserved in five clips, but unfamiliar choirs thought the praise served an instructional purpose. In four clips, choirs differed in their interpretations of the type of instructional praise.

df

Students familiar with a teacher recognized their teacher's intent in praising in 12 of 16 clips. In some situations, familiarity with a teacher and context made a difference in detecting the teacher's purpose for praising. In five clips where teachers identified the praise as deserved, students unfamiliar with the teacher and context thought the praise was intended to encourage students. Students across choirs were particularly sensitive to a teacher's use of praise to send a message to other students.

Students are keen observers of teacher praise. Findings suggest students discriminate between praise directed at the performance and praise used for instructional purposes, suggesting that observation instruments that rely on a single label for praise might miss important information. Findings support the importance of determining how teachers intend praise to serve and how students interpret the behavior.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the members of the committee for the time spent critiquing this work. I am especially indebted to my mentor, Dr. Hildegard Froehlich, for sharing her expertise in classroom interaction, and for the hours spent in lively discussions of many of the points this document has attempted to address. Special thanks is due Dr. Harry Price, University of Alabama, for his encouragement, which was so instrumental in helping me to complete this project. Finally, I wish to recognize the contribution made by my husband, Dr. Samuel E. Taylor, Baylor College of Dentistry. He not only shared his considerable knowledge of research design, but also provided unending patience and encouragement that would not let me fall short of reaching this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of Study	
Purpose of the Study	
Problems	
Research Questions	
Definitions	
2. RELATED LITERATURE	11
Student Perceptions of Praise	
Praise as an Observation Category	
Teacher Uses of Praise	
Construction of Classroom Meaning	
Methodology Issues	
Summary	
3. METHODOLOGY	52
Participants in the Study	
Materials	
Data Gathering Procedure	
Data Analysis	
4. RESULTS	76
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, and DISCUSSION	100
APPENDIX	109
REFERENCES	193

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Pool of Praise Examples As Classified By Teachers	59
2. Distribution of Types of Praise Across Teachers	60
3. Teacher Order Seen By Each Choir	63
4. Interpretation of Praise as Deserved or Instructional by Choirs Familiar or Unfamiliar With Teacher 1	78
5. Interpretation of Praise as Deserved or Instructional by Choirs Familiar or Unfamiliar With Teacher 2	79
6. Interpretation of Praise as Deserved or Instructional by Choirs Familiar or Unfamiliar With Teacher 3	80
7. Interpretation of Praise as Deserved or Instructional by Choirs Familiar or Unfamiliar With Teacher 4	81
8. Clips Containing Differences in Interpretations of Praise as Deserved	82
9. Major Contributors to Differences in Labeling of Instructional Praise	83
10. Relation Between Ability Level and Interpretations By Students Familiar With Teacher 1, Clip 2	85
11. Region of Rejection for a Number of Trials	87
12. Test For Significance of Intensity of Student Decisions	90

13. Consistency of Agreement With Teacher's Stated Intent by Students Within Each Choir	92
14. Language Identified by Teachers as Deserved Praise.....	94
15. Language Identified by Teachers as Instructional Praise	95

CHAPTER I

STUDENT INTERPRETATIONS OF TEACHER VERBAL PRAISE
IN SELECTED SEVENTH AND EIGHTH
GRADE CHORAL CLASSES

Teachers are encouraged to provide positive feedback to students as a way to reinforce desired student academic and social behavior in secondary music performance classes (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1985; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Music education research informs teachers that student attitudes in choral rehearsals are more positive toward the teacher and the class when the teacher is more approving than disapproving (Murray, 1973; Yarbrough, 1973). Similarly, student attentiveness has been shown to improve when teachers incorporate praise, or positive feedback, in their teaching (Price, 1989; Yarbrough & Price, 1989).

The benefits that teachers are told to expect from positive feedback in music performance classes frequently are based on information provided by researcher-trained adult observers. The adult judges categorize teacher approving behavior as it is defined a priori by the researcher. These investigations often focus on the commonalities among classrooms, and the meaning assigned to the behavior remains invariant across classrooms.

Behavioral observations by researcher-trained adults are the most common and widely accepted method used by music education researchers to evaluate classroom processes and interactions between students and teachers. Recently, educational researchers have chosen to utilize students as the source for information about the classroom. This shift in methodology is in part due to assumptions in the literature that behaviors acquire particular meanings within the contexts in which they occur, making single or universal meanings unlikely (Babad, 1990a; Bronfenbrenner, 1976; Brophy, 1983; Mishler, 1979). Other researchers suggest that familiarity with a specific context can lead to meanings that may be inaccessible to outsiders (Walker & Adelman, 1976; Weinstein, 1983). Thus, investigators involved in non-music classroom research increasingly argue that it is the students' understanding and interpretation of the teacher's praise that most directly reflect the outcomes of the behavior (Babad, Bernieri, & Rosenthal, 1991; Collins & Greene, 1990; Lamb, Suomi, & Stephenson, 1979; Mishler, 1979).

Researchers who rely on students to investigate praise in non-music settings have shown that praise is not uniformly positive and may have unintended effects (Brophy, 1983; Meyer, 1982; Morine-Dersheimer, 1982). Students report that teacher expectations of the abilities of students in a class are revealed in the teacher's praise (Babad, 1990, 1990a; Horn, 1985). Students also appear to understand that, although a teacher may praise a student when it is deserved, there

are occasions when the teacher's praise is not intended for the ostensible recipient. Rather, as the students perceive it, praise serves a 'teacher purpose', or as a way for the teacher to instruct other students (Brophy, 1981; Morine-Dersheimer, 1982).

Teacher praise in secondary performance classes has not been investigated from the student's perspective. If context familiarity does influence student interpretations, then students who have a history with a particular teacher would be expected to possess perspectives about the classroom interactions that are unavailable to adult judges and students unfamiliar with the teacher. Therefore, before instructional principles regarding the use of praise can be effectively applied by teachers in secondary performance classes, plausible explanations are needed regarding student understandings of teacher praise within and across specific contexts.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to investigate student interpretations of teacher verbal praise. Specifically, the teacher's stated intent in the use of praise was compared with the interpretations of students familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher and specific rehearsal setting.

Background of Study

Investigations of teacher praise in non-music settings demonstrate that a relationship exists between contextual influences and the meaning that classroom participants assign to the teacher's behaviors. Information obtained from students

familiar with the classroom's salient contextual features reveal that (a) praise is given to students of low ability as a reward for high effort (Horn, 1985), and (b) praise given after a simple task is an indication that the recipient is of low ability (Meyer, Bachmann, Bierman, Hampelmann, Ploger, & Spiller, 1979). Student perceptions of lowered ability are further intensified when the teacher's praise is excessive in contrast to the feedback given another student who performs the same task equally well (Meyer, 1982). On some occasions, praise may serve simply as a transition signal; a way for the teacher to indicate that a task is completed and that another is to begin (Good, Cooper, & Blakey, 1980; Brophy, 1981; Morine-Dersheimer, 1982; Emmer, 1988).

In most instances, students with high ability appear to accept that the praise they receive is deserved. However, students reason that teachers also praise high achievers in an attempt to inform the class about what the teacher regards as correct performance (Emmer, 1988; Morine-Dersheimer, 1982). Morine-Dersheimer (1982) compared the perceptions teachers ($n = 6$) and second through fourth grade students ($n = 165$) had of the teachers' use of praise. She reported that, generally, students who had better reading achievement levels perceived the praise they received was deserved because their response was correct. Poorer readers tended to view the teacher's praise as "instructional." This meant that teachers used praise either to make students feel good or to call attention to a behavior or performance teachers wanted students to model. Unlike the students, only one teacher reported

she gave praise because it was deserved, while the other five teachers in the study reported they used praise for instructional purposes.

Morine-Dershimer (1982) investigated the perceptions these same students had of praise in their home and play settings. She found the children were more likely to perceive praise in these settings to be deserved and directed at them personally. The influence of context may be one explanation for the difference in the students' perceptions of the praise-giver's intent at home and at school.

Researchers who attempt to explain how context affects the development of meaning have reasoned that students take in the entire classroom context when interpreting teacher behavior. The interaction of a multitude of classroom variables, therefore, might influence the development of students' expectations and self-evaluations (Bronfenbrenner, 1976; Mishler, 1979). Further, it is suggested students may see and interact with variables present in their classroom in a way that might be clear only to the members of that setting (Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1981; Brophy, 1979, 1983, 1985; Dusek, 1985; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Marshall & Weinstein, 1984; Rosenthal, 1987). Brophy (1979) emphasized that classrooms operate as systems, and he added, "It is the totality of the classroom environment that determines in large part how specific events are interpreted" (p. 734). If these views are correct, then they suggest that familiarity with the context would result in interpretations of teacher behaviors by participants that are

different from those of nonparticipant adults and students. Only one study was found that tested this premise.

Clark and Creswell (1979) compared the perceptions of class participants to the perceptions of nonparticipants. Results showed the two groups did not perceive the affective qualities of the teachers' ($n = 5$) nonverbal behavior similarly: The teachers' facial expressions were positive according to their 9th grade students ($n = 35$), but the nonparticipant graduate education majors considered the expressions to be negative. The researchers found a high degree of agreement among the members of each group. Clark and Creswell (1979) decided that the differences between participants' and nonparticipants' perceptions were likely due to contextual factors. Thus, they concluded that those familiar with certain contextual situations may not perceive a communicative act in the same way as outsiders not familiar with the context. However, the age difference of the two groups, and the exposure of the adult judges to educational and curriculum research, made it difficult for the researchers to attribute the variance entirely to the influence of context. To support the hypothesis that meaning of behavior is context-related and not merely due to differences in levels of educational experience, comparisons are needed between students who are members of a specific class and students unfamiliar with the context of that class.

The findings of other studies suggest that students are keen observers and are able to use classroom information to make discriminating judgments about the

ability of their peers (Babad, Bernieri, & Rosenthal, 1989; Brattesani, Weinstein, & Marshall, 1984; Marshall & Weinstein, 1986; Weinstein & Middlestadt, 1979). One of the most prolific uses of student perceptions has been in detecting teacher expectations for high and low achieving students. These investigations, referred to as teacher differential studies, address the effect teacher expectations have on student learning and attitude (Marshall & Weinstein, 1986; Babad, 1990). The methodologies in these studies focus on the perceptions students have of teacher behaviors such as praise, calling on students, or questioning, to see if students detect teacher bias in the way the behaviors are applied to hypothetical 'good', or 'not so good' students. Findings consistently show that students accurately discern a teacher's expectations for high or low achievers, particularly through teacher affective behaviors (Babad, 1990; Brattesani, Weinstein, & Marshall, 1984; Marshall & Weinstein, 1986; Weinstein, 1983; Weinstein & Middlestadt, 1979; Weinstein, Marshall, Sharp, & Botkin, 1987).

Studies that utilize students to obtain information about the instructional behaviors in the classroom suggest that the presence of certain teacher behaviors may not be as important as the students' acknowledgement and understanding of the purpose for which those behaviors are used. Student achievement level also appears to be an important mediator of the effects of teacher praise.

In light of the information from investigations of praise in non-music settings, information now is needed about praise in music instructional settings. A

first step is to test the premise that in music, too, student interpretations of teacher behavior are dependent upon context familiarity. In following the model set by non-music research, one approach would be to determine how students interpret a music teacher's praise when they are familiar with the teacher. That assessment then would need to be compared to the judgments of students unfamiliar with that teacher. In addition, a distinction would need to be made between the interpretations of teacher praise by high and low achieving music students. To study context-dependent student judgments of teacher praise in music classrooms could lead to new insights about music students' understandings of teacher praise as deserved and instructional.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate student interpretations of teacher verbal praise in selected seventh and eighth grade choral music classes.

Problems

1. To determine differences in interpretations of teacher praise as deserved or instructional between students familiar or unfamiliar with a specific rehearsal setting.
2. To determine differences in interpretations of teacher praise as deserved or instructional between high and low achieving students familiar or unfamiliar with a specific rehearsal setting.

3. To determine each teacher's intent in providing deserved or instructional praise.
4. To identify agreement between teacher intent and student interpretation of praise as deserved or instructional.

Research Questions

1. Are there statistically significant differences in the labeling of teacher verbal praise as deserved or instructional between students in choirs familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher?
2. Are there statistically significant differences between students in choirs familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher who label teacher verbal praise as (a) providing encouragement, (b) sending a message that this is the behavior the teacher would like students to model, or (c) seeking to gain student cooperation or participation?
3. Are there statistically significant differences between high and low achieving students familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher in interpreting teacher verbal praise as deserved or instructional?
4. What is the strength of intent behind the teacher's instructional praise?
5. Is there a statistically significant difference between the teacher's intent and the interpretations of students familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher?
6. Is there a statistically significant difference between the teacher's intent and the interpretations of high and low achieving students familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher?

7. Are there discernible commonalities in the teacher's language intended as deserved or instructional praise?

Definitions

Praise: Any observable positive teacher verbal response to a student performance or behavior.

Deserved Praise: Praise that is contingent on student performance or behavior.

Instructional Praise: Praise that is more directly controlled by the teacher so as to serve a teacher purpose. Consistent with studies in non-music settings, three classifications of instructional praise are considered in this investigation (Morine-Dersheimer, 1982; Brophy, 1981):

1. Praise intended to encourage a student.
2. Praise not intended for the recipient, but directed at other students to inform them that this is the kind of performance or behavior the teacher wants them to model.
3. Praise intended to gain cooperation from a student in an effort to have student participate more in the class.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

The American Heritage Dictionary (1982) defines praise as, “an expression of warm approval or admiration” (p. 973). We might assume such a well-meaning message to have decisive, straightforward benefits in the classroom. However, praise in the classroom appears to be a complex phenomenon with benefits that are neither consistent nor uniform.

In this chapter, praise is examined from several perspectives. First, studies that address student perceptions of teacher praise are reviewed in order to understand how unintended effects can occur as students monitor teacher praise within the framework of classroom tasks and student effort. Next, music education research that utilizes praise as an observational category is reviewed to provide an understanding of how researchers expect praise to operate in secondary music classrooms. How teachers intend to use praise also will be discussed. A discussion follows of how meanings are constructed by classroom participants to provide an explanation for the position that behaviors operationally defined by music education researchers may not reflect the meaning participants hold of the

teacher's behavior. Finally, methodological issues pertinent to this investigation will be addressed.

Student Perceptions of Praise

In social interaction, direct communications of how one estimates another person's ability are rare. One might expect a teacher who assumes a student to be of low ability to refrain from overtly conveying this assumption (Blumberg, 1972). But, unintentionally, the teacher's hidden estimation of the student can lead to specific reactions toward the student's performance (Babad, 1990a; Brophy & Good, 1974; Meyer, 1982). Relying on counselors or teachers to provide lists of high and low achievers, researchers have found student perceptions of teacher praise correlate with teacher expectations for a student's ability (Cooper, 1977; Cooper & Baron, 1977; Weinstein, Marshall, Brattesani, & Middlestadt, 1982). Students vicariously experiencing their teacher's praise in the classroom are able to extract information about a recipient's ability from the teacher's comments.

As students observe interactions between the teacher and other students, awareness of task difficulty can affect student interpretations of classroom praise. For example, excessive praise for the completion of a task almost anyone could do is an indication to students that the teacher considers the recipient of the praise to have low ability (Meyer, Bachmann, Bierman, Hempelmann, Ploger, & Spiller, 1979). According to the researchers, students apparently reason that classmates

of low ability need extra encouragement, and that teachers praise these students in an effort to meet that need.

Even when different students successfully complete tasks that are equal in difficulty, a teacher's response to the students' performances can convey messages about ability levels. In an investigation in a German high school, students (grades eight and nine) were provided with a hypothetical scenario in which two students correctly solved identical math problems (Meyer, 1982). The teacher in the scenario praised one student but gave neutral feedback to the other. Meyer reported the eighth and ninth grade high school students interpreted the teacher's behavior as evidence that the praised student had low ability. The student who had received a neutral, "Yes, that's the correct answer, XXXX," was considered smarter.

In the same study, Meyer (1982) also found that when two students successfully completed the same task and one was criticized and the other praised, students expected the praised student to solve fewer problems in future trials. Although under laboratory conditions, the researcher consistently demonstrated that the teacher's responses to the performances did convey information to students about the ability of other students. We cannot assume these same results would occur under more natural classroom conditions.

As students experience praise within the framework of task difficulty and effort, interpretations become even more complex (Meyer, 1979, 1982). For

example, students report that if the task is simple and a student's ability level is perceived to be high, presumably little effort is necessary to arrive at a solution. If the task difficulty is held constant at an easy level, and the ability is perceived to be low, success is unlikely, even if the student expends maximum effort. If the task is very difficult and the student is thought to have high ability, high effort will yield success. But, if a student of lower ability is given a difficult task, students appear to reason that no amount of effort will result in success. Thus, if students know the difficulty level of a task, and a teacher's use of praise suggests the extent to which the outcome can be ascribed to effort, then students' cognitive structures allow conclusions about how the acting student's ability is estimated (Meyer, 1979, 1982).

In a study conducted in a laboratory environment, Barker and Graham (1987) asked students and an actor-teacher to act out researcher-developed scenarios that were videotaped and shown to students between the ages of four and twelve. In the scenes, two students were portrayed as either succeeding or failing at a task. When a student was successful, the actor-teacher provided either praise or neutral feedback. When the student failed the task, blame or neutral feedback was given.

Subjects viewing the tape were asked to judge the effort and ability of each targeted child. When praise followed a successful completion of the task, all subjects inferred the praised student was the one who had made the most effort.

Unlike the younger students, however, sixth grade students indicated they weighed the teacher's praise in the context of student effort and the difficulty of the task. They concluded that the praised student had low ability.

Although much of the information about how students interpret praise is derived from experimental studies conducted in laboratory settings, Horn (1985) reported that even in natural classroom situations, teacher praise can have unintended effect. In Horn's investigation, junior high softball players with poor skills received a significantly higher proportion of praise from the coach than did more skillful athletes. The coach intended the praise to encourage the students. Yet, the excessive amount of positive feedback given the poorer players was negatively correlated with increases in their perceptions of competence. Even though the teacher had good intentions, extra praise communicated lower expectations to the students, rather than encouragement. The monitoring of information by students not only had unintended effects, but it suggests that as students monitor classroom behavior, it allows them to compare themselves to others (Brophy, 1979).

It would appear from these investigations that when students have access to classroom information like task difficulty and student effort, the teacher's praise can reveal information about a student that the teacher would be expected to attempt to conceal from others in the class. Also, as students' school experiences accumulate, their interpretations of classroom praise change.

Effect of Student Developmental Differences on Interpretation of Teacher Praise

Blumenfeld, Pintrich, Meece, and Wessels (1982) reported, that after controlling for gender and socioeconomic differences between second and sixth grade subjects, second graders used the frequency of teacher praise to affirm previously held high opinions of their abilities. The young students appeared to ignore other factors and take the teachers' praise at face value. But the researchers found that older students (sixth grade) took ability and task difficulty into account and perceived the teachers' praise as an indication that the student recipients had lower ability.

Similarly, Meyer (1982) reported students in grade three regarded the recipient of praise as having higher ability, regardless of task difficulty. But in the same study, Meyer found that students in grades eight and nine weighed the difficulty of the task as they decoded the teacher's estimation of student ability.

In another study designed to explore age differences in understanding teacher appraisal actions, students ($n = 123$) in grades 1-6 viewed videotaped sequences of teachers behaving differently toward two students who had performed equally well (Lord, Umezaki, & Darley, 1990). The teacher in the sequence said to one student after his performance, "Did you really try? I think you could be trying harder. I'd like you to do better next time" (p. 193). To the other student, whose performance was identical to the first, the teacher said, "This is a good test for measuring your reading ability. Keep up the good work" (p.

193). The researchers had intended the messages to imply that the teacher considered the score for the first student to be a failure, but the same score for the other student was seen as a success. The students who viewed the videotapes were asked to determine which student the teacher liked better and which one the teacher considered smartest. Children of all grade levels agreed that the teacher liked the student best whose score was attributed to ability, but they disagreed about which student the teacher regarded as smarter. Eighty-six percent of students in grades five and six thought the smarter student was the one whose score was attributed by the teacher to lack of effort (e.g., "Did you really try?"). The students in the lower grades indicated just the opposite: The smarter student was the one to whom the teacher had said, "This is a good indication of your reading. Keep up the good work."

These results, taken together, suggest that young students apparently use a "linear relation" rule that performance equals praise equals ability. As students get older, their awareness of other classroom factors such as effort and ability influence their responses to the teacher's positive behaviors.

Summary

As seen through the eyes of students, praise in the classroom is a complex phenomenon. Its effects are not uniformly positive, and under certain conditions, it may adversely affect the students' self-perceptions of ability. As students

become more sensitive to task differences, even generous praise for performance of an easy task can lead to perceptions of lower ability.

High and low achievers have different classroom experiences (Brophy, 1988; Cooper & Good, 1983; Weinstein, 1983). It can be argued that high achievers participate more actively in the classroom, doing the kinds of things that are likely to elicit praise from the teacher. Students in non-music classes report that high achievers receive teacher praise because it is deserved (Morine-Dersheimer, 1982). But students also report that low achievers, perhaps because of their poor performance records, get teacher praise that is intended to instruct (Horn, 1985; Brophy, 1988). Often, instructional praise is not intended solely for the recipient. Instead, students report this praise can function as a way to get a point across to others in the class. In some situations, instructional praise can be seen as a teacher response to a student's need for encouragement, further reinforcing the differences in student ability levels among classroom participants (Morine-Dersheimer, 1982).

Where students all do the same task, outcomes can be readily compared and those comparisons applied to perceptions of ability (Rosenholtz & Wilson, 1980). In middle school choral classes where the whole class is often engaged in the same activity, right and wrong answers automatically become public and comparable knowledge. For students just beginning their choral ensemble experiences, unintended effects from teacher praise could be particularly damaging.

Praise as an Observation Category in Music Education Research

Educational psychologists and others who advise teachers have recommended praise as a readily available source for behavior modification (Becker, Madsen, Arnold, & Thomas, 1967; Madsen & Madsen, 1974). Essentially, teachers are informed that the rate or frequency of desired student behaviors can be increased if the teacher's praise is made contingent upon the behaviors (Madsen & Duke, 1985; Madsen & Yarbrough, 1985). The more the relationship between the praise and the behavior being praised is clear to the student, the more likely it is that the praise will reinforce the behavior.

Information about the effect of positive teacher behavior in music classrooms is often based on information obtained through the systematic observations of many classrooms. Systematic observation is a research methodology designed to obtain information about classroom behaviors that have been operationally defined by the researcher. An operational definition is a rule that specifies the kinds of observations used and the way numbers are derived from the observations (Kane, 1982). The researcher specifies the events to be recorded and the procedure the observer is to use (Medley, 1982). This method is characterized by the use of sequenced time periods in which the observer is instructed to "observe" and "record" in specifically timed intervals. This allows a

meticulous documentation of the classroom behavior under investigation such that the researcher not only is able to determine the frequency of occurrence, but the point in time that the behavior occurred in the lesson.

Music education researchers who use this procedure see it as a way to understand the relationship between characteristics of teacher behavior and student social or academic behaviors (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1985; Price, 1989). When the behaviors of all participants in the classroom are under investigation, the researcher can relate specific teacher behaviors with the behavior of a sub-set of students.

In systematic observation studies, the frequency of occurrence is the primary means of quantifying data. The individual frequency of the behavior is converted into percentages or proportions of the total. Researchers conclude that the proportions reflect the relative rate of each occurrence in a given classroom (Boyle & Radocy, 1987).

This methodology relies on adults recognizing categories of behaviors as they are defined by the researcher. The researchers train the observers so that they consistently recognize the behavior and record their observations utilizing a record-observe schedule, usually 10-second observe followed by 5-second record. The researchers frequently report a high consensus among observers.

The effect that the behavior has on the students is inferred from the observations. That is, if the teacher is observed to be positive and the students are

on-task, and the same students are observed to be off-task when the teacher is more negative, then the researcher infers that positive teacher behavior in that instance functioned to reinforce on-task behavior.

In recent years the studies have focused on praise as it is used in natural classroom situations. In the initial investigations, however, teacher praise was experimentally manipulated by music education researchers to allow for a more accurate measure of its effect. In one of the earliest investigations of approval and disapproval behaviors, two music scores were taught to a band under two opposing conditions (Madsen & Madsen, 1970). In one treatment, one of the pieces was taught with the director using only disapproval; the second piece was taught to the same band with the same director, but only approving comments were used. The researchers reported that the performance level reached in 33 minutes with disapproval was equaled in just 19 minutes using approval.

Murray (1973) continued the investigation of conductor approving and disapproving behaviors in an effort to relate the presence of these behaviors to student attentiveness, attitude and performance in secondary choral rehearsals. Murray defined approval as, “any observable (aural or visual) endorsement of appropriate rehearsal behavior: verbal approvals, smiles, signals indicating approval” (Murray, p. 167). Disapproval was defined as, “any observable (aural or visual) reprimand of inappropriate rehearsal behavior: verbal disapprovals, frowns, sarcasms, signals indicating disapproval” (p. 167). Adult observers

utilized these definitions to categorize the teachers' behaviors, and the occurrences of the behaviors were counted.

Two weeks prior to the experiment, the experimental conductor and the two regular directors of six high school mixed choruses received copies of music the researcher had determined to be short and easy enough for high school choruses to perform adequately after 15 minutes of rehearsal. Additionally, Murray determined that the selections were unfamiliar to the directors and their students.

Two days prior to the experimental rehearsal for each group, two observers attended a rehearsal for 15 minutes in order to acclimatize students and the director to the presence of both the observers and the video equipment. At the same time, the observers collected data to determine the director's natural use of approval and disapproval behaviors. The researcher asked each director to end the 15- minute rehearsals with a performance of a piece that would be the best indicator of the students' performance ability. Thus, a base was obtained for later comparison of each choir's performance in the experimental conditions.

Each choir rehearsed under two conditions, with their regular teacher and with the experimental conductor. When the experimental conductor rehearsed the choir, his behavior was manipulated so that ratios of either 80% approval to 20% disapproval or 20% approval to 80% disapproval were maintained. The experimental conductor could give the comments at any time during the rehearsal; however, all responses had to be contingent on student behavior. The ratio of

approval to disapproval behavior was controlled by providing a feedback chart that indicated the frequency of each type of response. The chart, which was placed in the back of the room, was flipped after each response, allowing the experimental conductor to maintain the desired ratio. At the end of each rehearsal, each choir sang an uninterrupted performance of the selection. An audiotape of the performances in random order was prepared so that a panel of experts could evaluate each performance.

Two observers made assessments of student on-task and off-task behavior. The researcher reported that agreement among observers ranged from $r = .90$ to $r = 1.00$. When disagreement occurred between the two observers, the researcher repeated the interval of the rehearsal (on videotape) in which the disagreement occurred until agreement was reached.

Reliability of observations of teacher responses was calculated between the responses recorded by one observer during the experiment and the responses recorded by each conductor (of his own behavior) from videotape recordings. Again, very high agreements were reported with an average of $r = .96$ for the 15-minute rehearsals.

Murray found no significant difference in musical performance ratings among the experimental conditions. However, four of the six choruses did receive their highest performance ratings under the 80% approval condition although one choir received its highest rating under the 80% disapproval condition. Similarly,

no significant difference was reported in student attentiveness among the experimental conditions: On-task behavior was very high (97%) throughout the investigation. There were significant differences in student attitudes among the experimental conditions. Five of the choirs rated the music and the rehearsal highest under the 80% approval condition.

Four days after the experiment, the student participants viewed the videotape recordings made of the experiment. Although students were not included as observers in the original research problem, the students reported to the researcher that on several occasions when students had made mistakes in singing, the experimental conductor had followed these mistakes with approval comments. Murray reported that the adult observers had reported no errors of either approval or disapproval. Was this an indication that the operational definition of approval behavior was not the same as understood by the students? Did the agreement between observers not accurately reflect the reliability of the behavior? Murray had been very precise in specifying the behaviors to be observed, and this specificity had produced high agreement between observers. But had important aspects of teacher approval and disapproval behavior been neglected? Clearly, the students' careful monitoring of the feedback information indicated they were not just passive participants in the classroom.

Yarbrough (1973) also made use of adults trained as observers to assess teacher behaviors in secondary choral ensembles. The purpose of the study was to

investigate the effect of magnitude of conductor behavior on performance, attentiveness, and attitude of students in mixed choruses. Four choruses (one university and three high school choirs) were rehearsed under three conditions: (1) with their regular conductor, (2) with a high-magnitude conductor, and (3) with a low-magnitude conductor.

Yarbrough undertook this investigation because previous studies had reported that musical performance improves regardless of the ratio of approvals and disapprovals, or any other kinds of rewards. However, she noted that student attitude and attentiveness were positively affected by high approval behaviors. Yarbrough observed that the magnitude or intensity of reinforcement had not been accounted for in previous investigations. Thus, she manipulated the conductor's behavior in order to vary the magnitude of the behavior so that the effect of these variations on student attitude, attentiveness, and performance could be studied.

The teacher-conductor behaviors included by Yarbrough were: eye contact; closeness (proximity); volume and modulation of voice; gestures; facial expression; and rehearsal pace. For each of the behaviors, operational definitions of high and low magnitude were provided a priori by the researcher. For example, facial expression in the low-magnitude condition consisted of a neutral mask; no frowns and no smiles. High magnitude included a face that reflected sharp contrasts between approval and disapproval. The researcher instructed that approval was to be expressed by grinning, laughing aloud, raising eyebrows, and

widening eyes. Disapproval was expressed by frowning, knitting of the brows, pursing lips, and narrowing of the eyes. Similar descriptions were provided for each behavior included in the investigation. Generally speaking, low magnitude could be characterized as bland, expressionless behavior. High magnitude was simply more of the particular behavior.

The conductor was free to give contingent (deserved) approval and disapproval responses at any time. However, a ratio of 50% approval to 50% disapproval was maintained. The rate of responses was controlled using a flipchart prompter located in the back of the room, out of sight of the chorus members. Care was taken to select music unfamiliar to the students but within the performance level of the choirs. The experiment was conducted during regularly scheduled rehearsal times.

Three observers, trained by the researcher, viewed videotapes three times for each of the two observation forms. Using the Choral Rehearsal Observation Form developed by the researcher, observers recorded (1) total number of students observed and number of students off-task, (2) teacher approvals and disapprovals, and (3) teacher and student activity during the final viewing. Reliability was determined in 25% of the cases. Average reliability was $r = .84$.

For the Music Conductor Observation Form, observers recorded (1) activity, body movement, and conducting gestures; (2) eye contact and facial expression, and (3) speech speed, voice pitch, and volume. Four observers were

used for the Music Conductor Observation Form, and the average reliability was $r = .83$.

Yarbrough reported that the magnitude of the conductor behaviors had no significant effect on the performance, attentiveness, and attitude of the students. There was a significant difference in mean attitude ratings toward the experimental conductor between the high and the low magnitude condition, but regardless of the high or low condition, 55% of students in this study rated the experimental conductor high.

In Yarbrough's study, approving and disapproving teacher behavior had no effect on student attentiveness, performance, or attitude, even though the frequency of approvals was greater under the high-magnitude condition. Teacher approval did not function as expected by the researcher even though care was taken to ensure that the teacher's behavior was contingent (i.e., given in response to desired student behavior).

Price (1981) manipulated ensemble directors' behaviors in order to apply three treatments to a non-auditioned college band. In Treatment A, the conductor presented a neutral, mask-like face, and gave directions to the ensemble about where they were to play in the music but provided no feedback or academic information. Treatment B consisted of 50% performance time and 50% teacher talk that contained no feedback. As in the previous treatment condition, the conductor portrayed a neutral, mask-like face. Treatment C consisted of the same

ratio of performance time and teacher talk, but care was taken to insure that the conductor provided feedback in a ratio of 80% approval comments to 20% disapproval. Unlike the other two treatment conditions, the conductor in treatment C was coached to ensure that his face appropriately reflected the verbal reinforcement, and that a sharp contrast was made between approval and disapproval. Expert judges determined that the performance of the ensemble under treatment C was significantly better (Kendall Coefficient of Concordance $W = .757$) than under either of the two other treatment conditions. Students participating in the study indicated a more positive attitude toward the music and the director under the approving condition.

Unlike previous studies in which the teachers' behaviors were manipulated, Yarbrough and Price (1981) videotaped and analyzed the natural classroom behaviors of six ensemble directors (three band, one orchestra, and two choirs) and their students. The researchers utilized adult observers to determine the frequency of approvals and disapprovals during performance and nonperformance times. Results indicated that four of the six directors used more approval behavior during performance, but they were more disapproving during nonperformance times.

In a similar, but broader, investigation by Yarbrough and Price (1989), experienced ensemble directors from four states were videotaped while each teacher conducted and taught their respective choir or band. Using systematic observations by adult judges, the researchers determined the band directors were

more disapproving than approving by a ratio of two to one. Choral directors were about equal in the use of the two behaviors, with 41% approving comments to 59% disapprovals. An analysis of the time indicated that the total time spent in approving or disapproving comments comprised only 6% to 8% of the total class time. Thus, the researchers concluded it was unlikely that these teachers were utilizing the behaviors to reinforce either student performance or social behavior.

Although music teachers at the secondary level do not appear to make extensive use of praise, or positive comments, there is evidence that teachers consider approving behavior to be an important component of effective teaching (Fiocca, 1986; Price, 1989). Experienced teachers and graduate students viewed 48 excerpts of rehearsal transcripts and were asked to evaluate each excerpt (Price, 1989). The highest-rated excerpts were those that included complete teaching cycles. A complete cycle consisted of (1) specific information about how to perform a musical task, (2) student/s performance of that task, and (3) teacher-provided positive feedback. Segments including approval feedback were rated significantly higher than those with disapproval feedback. Subsequent investigations have corroborated the findings in favor of complete teaching cycles that were predominantly positive (Yarbrough & Price, 1989; Price, 1992).

Summary

Music education research has focused on a single use of praise. That is, praise has been investigated as a positive response on the part of the teacher to a

desired academic or social student behavior. The purpose of these investigations has been to determine if the appropriate application of praise would modify student behavior. Early results were encouraging in terms of positive effect on student attitude and attentiveness, but the effect on performance that one might expect from contingent praise has remained elusive.

The results from the investigations reported above are important. However, the infrequent use of praise and the failure of teachers to incorporate specific, contingent praise (i.e., specific comments that include reference to what was being praised) has led some researchers to suggest that praise may not function as expected in secondary music classes (Yarbrough, 1973; Madsen & Duke, 1993). This assumption may be correct, but because information suggests that single meanings of praise are unlikely within a context-bound classroom, an exploration of praise as participants interpret it would seem beneficial. Rather than a single consideration of praise contingent on performance or behavior, would students and teachers recognize that praise is integrated with teacher efforts to instruct the students?

Teacher Uses of Praise

Teachers use praise infrequently: There are results from studies that indicate praise occurs only five or fewer times per hour (Heller & White, 1975; Thomas, Presland, Grant, & Glynn, 1978; White, 1975). Heller and White (1975)

have shown that by the seventh grade, teachers make little use of praise in the classroom. Further, the rate of praise of good or correct answers relative to the opportunity to praise such answers does not correlate significantly to achievement gains or losses (Emmer, 1988). It appears that an individual student in a typical classroom would receive praise so infrequently as to make it unlikely the student would rely on this behavior to reinforce performance.

If praise is not used by teachers to reinforce student behaviors, how do they use it? Brophy (1981), in an effort to derive implications for teaching, critically reviewed investigations of teacher praise conducted prior to 1980. It should be noted that direct data were not cited by Brophy. Rather, inferences about the functions of teacher praise were drawn from observational studies and numerous discussions with teachers. Brophy concluded that praise could serve as a reinforcement of correct behavior, but it appeared to serve other functions as well.

Just as indicated by students in Morine-Dersheimer's (1982) study, Brophy (1981) reported that teachers use praise to encourage students, particularly underachievers. As an illustration, Brophy described a classroom scene in which a cooperative student who was slow to learn a task was given praise by the teacher, who took pains to be particularly patient and attentive to the student. Brophy suggested also that teacher praise intended to encourage students is unlikely to contain reference to the specific performance. It may even follow poor or incorrect performance.

Another use of praise identified by Brophy is one in which teachers praise to deliver a message to other students about what the teacher considers correct behavior, or as a way to get a point across to others in the class. Brophy explains that these situations typically begin with, "I like the way . . . " A teacher, for example, might say, "I like the way XXXX's desk is clean" (p. 17). The message is clearly not intended to commend the student with the clean desk, but to inform those students with untidy desks that the teacher would like them cleaned.

Brophy also indicates that teacher praise can be used as a way to establish rapport with a student, often one who is uncommunicative, or not participating. Although it is not possible to know if the subjects in Morine-Dershimer's (1982) study had in mind this same use of praise, the author reported students recognized that teachers use praise as a way to get a student's attention. Morine-Dershimer did not code this use of praise as either instructional or deserved, but it seems reasonable that teachers might see efforts to secure more on-task behavior from students as a teacher responsibility, and consequently intend this praise to serve an instructional purpose.

Teachers of music performance ensembles have not been asked how they use praise. Information provided by secondary music teachers has been limited to whether or not they consider teaching segments that contain praise to be examples of effective teaching (Madsen & Alley, 1979; Price, 1989). However, in an unpublished study by Froehlich (1992), secondary music teachers ($n = 7$) indicated

in interviews conducted by the researcher and a student assistant that they did recognize they used praise in several different ways.

The purpose of Froehlich's study was to ask teachers to identify desirable instructional activities in their own teaching. Teachers were videotaped as they taught classes of their choosing. Each teacher reviewed the videotapes to identify segments that were examples of their best teaching. Teachers were interviewed in an effort to categorize the reasons for their choices. An analysis of transcripts of the audiotaped interviews revealed situations in which teachers appeared to use praise for different reasons.

For example, while observing the videotape of a choral teacher as she instructed a small voice class, the interviewer noticed that the teacher had praised a student whose performance was not correct. Without calling attention to the student's performance, the interviewer remarked that the teacher appeared to make an effort to be positive with her students. The teacher referred to the same incident in the videotape and explained that the student was "... a good kid who really tries hard," and the teacher wanted to, "... encourage the student."

In a middle school, a teacher was asked to explain why he had praised his beginning band class. He indicated that they were good students who did not get a lot of attention elsewhere and they needed to hear that, "... they are doing okay, even though they really aren't all that good."

In a different situation, two high school choral students were observed to be off-task during the videotaping of their class. The teacher ignored the behavior, and instead, began a discussion with the two students about the upcoming college football recruiting season. The teacher repeatedly praised the students for their success in athletics. Although this incident was not discussed with the teacher, it seemed to the interviewer that the teacher was seeking the cooperation of the students by recognizing and praising their achievements in a different school activity.

While these are interesting observations, it is important to point out that the teachers in these vignettes did not select these episodes as examples of their best teaching. Rather, it was the interviewer who identified the behaviors as positive, and called them to the teachers' attention. It is unknown if these teachers intended the praise to function differently in the various situations. If familiar and unfamiliar students observed these incidents, would they have interpreted the praise differently? For example, would the students in the beginning band class have recognized that their teacher praised them because he felt the students needed the encouragement? Would students have interpreted the praise as encouragement if they did not know the teacher? Would high achievers have felt that, if the teacher were speaking to them, the praise would have been given because their performance deserved it? Would students have agreed with the adult observing the

off-task behavior that the high school choral director was using praise to secure the cooperation of the singers?

Students familiar with a teacher have a long-term perspective of classroom interactions between the teacher and students. A comparison of the interpretations between students familiar and unfamiliar with a teacher would provide an opportunity for the verification of the results obtained through the use of adult observers.

Construction of Classroom Meaning

In social interaction, people act or respond toward language and gestures as they perceive them, and perception is in part affected by expectations held about both the situation and the other participants. The contextual grounding of the meaning of human action and language is essential to our everyday understanding of our behavior and that of others (Cooper, 1989). Similarly, within each classroom, teachers and students interpret language and gestures based on the knowledge they have of the context in which the behaviors occur.

A referential system is constructed over time by participants and is an important component of classroom communication (Dixon, Cruz, Green, Lin, & Brandts, 1992). For example, a teacher might refer to a past event ("Remember yesterday when we . . . "; "What did I tell you . . . "), or act in ways that indicate prior understandings ("Do you think that's the way we behave in the lunch line?").

As a result of their past experiences, members of a class bring certain expectations to a new event. This enables them to interpret and then act on the new events. To an outsider, someone not normally a part of a specific classroom, even someone trained to observe closely the interactions within a specific context, understandings between members of the class may remain hidden. This was the case in a qualitative investigation conducted by Collins and Green (1990).

The researchers entered a fourth-fifth grade classroom in which the teacher and students had just engaged in a social study unit that focused on Native Americans. The teacher's objective had been that the students understand life among the Native Americans to have similarities and differences across regions. The teacher had assigned the students to one of four different groups (e.g., Plains, Southwest, etc.), and each group of students constructed lists of issues they wanted to explore. The lists were later used to compare life among the tribes across regions.

After completing the Native American unit, the teacher told the students that they were to work on a science unit about mealworms. The students were asked to think back to the Native American studies and try to recall the basic needs of the tribesman. Students were told to collect the answers within their groups and to compile a list. The lists included things like, food, water, heat, and weapons. The students were then instructed to make connections among the words (i.e., heat was associated with food).

Earlier, the teacher had informed the researcher that he wanted the students to develop their own interrelationships between the needs of insects and the needs of humans. The teacher had initiated this goal by establishing a link between the earlier social study unit and the present science unit. When a student asked if they were studying mealworms or Indians, the teacher simply responded that it was a good question.

Finally, the students began a unit to explore how their own bodies were designed to deal with food and growth. Students were instructed by the teacher to use the way they had learned to investigate topics in each of the prior units. Categories were developed by the class, and students individually responded to the teacher's directive to, "Map out your initial thinking on these categories" (p. 74). Some students used the categories and wrote sentences about them, others drew diagrams to indicate what they would study, and a few simply identified the areas of the body they would like to investigate. Because different responses occurred, the researchers concluded that there must be different ways of thinking about and interpreting the task.

The researchers indicated they had difficulty determining what the students were to do at the final unit on the body, despite the fact they had been present for the Native American unit and portions of the science unit. Only by exploring their detailed observation notes to determine the requirements for participation, and by completing an analysis of the interactions between the teacher and students were

the researchers able to determine the content themes and identify what the students were to do.

The researchers concluded that meanings and understandings were constructed in the classroom as students and teacher monitored what was said in order to understand what was required and how things were interpreted. Clearly, prior knowledge was necessary in order for the students to understand the links being made by the teacher from past units to ones in the present and future. This information was not obvious to the researchers, even though they had spent considerable time in the classroom.

Students in the study also understood and responded to cues that were unavailable to the researchers. The teacher, for example, paused at a particular point in the introduction of a unit and the students immediately began asking questions. Nothing in the other observations of life in this classroom suggested to the researchers that questions at this point were appropriate, but the teacher fielded and responded to the questions, leading the researchers to observe students clearly understood questions were allowed and expected. The researchers suggested that only through interactions over time and in similar situations could students have obtained this knowledge.

An explanation for how this understanding occurs is offered by researchers in the Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (1992):

..a class is a cultural group that lives together in particular times and spaces. As part of this life, members develop: a history; ways of interacting with each other; understandings of what is possible to do; what something means within the group; and ways of perceiving, interpreting, and evaluating the actions of other members. Life in the institutional space called classroom, therefore, must be viewed as interconnected, dynamic, and continually subject to change and transformation as the group affiliates over time (p. 31).

There are occasions where particular words take on meanings that arise out of the ongoing interactions between teachers and students. This point is illustrated by an example taken from a study conducted by Edwards and Mercer (1987) in British junior schools (ages 8-10). In the investigation, Edwards and Mercer observed a teacher who was engaged in a pottery lesson in which the pupils learned how, by using an additional long piece of clay, to join together the two hemispherical halves of what would become an enclosed hollow pot.

The teacher made a clay pot along with the students, and used terms to identify specific steps in the process, or to refer to the materials used. The teacher's act of constructing the clay pot was not a simple activity to be copied by the students. Rather, as the researchers interpreted it, her talk was designed to draw attention to specific aspects of the activity, to see to it that students acquired a shared vocabulary. For example, at various points in the lesson, the teacher called on the students to identify by name the specific tasks in which she was engaged. When mistakes occurred, she corrected the mistake by restating the term that she expected the students to use.

However, as the lesson proceeded, one of the students referred to the long piece of clay used to join the halves together as the “belt.” At the time, the use of the word belt appeared unimportant to the researchers, but in subsequent lessons they observed that 'belt' was used by pupils and teacher to refer to the additional piece of clay. Thus, an ordinary term, introduced by a student, was used in a particular way and became the identifying term. As explained by the researchers,

What began as a physical context of joint activity later came to serve as a shared mental context of experience and understanding. Having gone through the demonstration together, and having established how to talk about it, teacher and pupils could begin to exchange understandings with words alone. The joint activity and discourse of the past became a shared mental context for the present (p. 80).

These examples, taken from qualitative investigations of classroom life, point to the importance of understanding the meaning behaviors hold for the participants in specific classrooms. Students have a perspective of classroom events that may not be available to adults. Adult observers might expect a teacher comment such as, “You've done very well,” to be praise. However, student interpretations of such statements, affected by past experiences as well as expectations about the recipient and the praise-giver, might result in meanings that are not available to outsiders.

Methodology Issues

Two rather different methodological orientations reviewed for this investigation have in common their interest to explain teacher praise in the classroom. To investigate teacher praise, music education researchers focus on the commonalities among classrooms (Boyle & Radocy, 1987). Praise is treated by these investigators as an observational category whose meaning, for the purposes of their investigations, remains invariant across classrooms, irrespective of interaction partners. These researchers rely on a methodology in which they socialize adults to the role of researcher and train them to become detached and objective judges. Questions are raised about the objectivity of their observations because the judges are exposed to large amounts of behavior and information (Babad, Bernieri, & Rosenthal, 1989).

Taking the view that behaviors acquire particular meanings within specific contexts, researchers focus on the relationships within a particular class. Typically, they rely on a methodology that treats students as discerning observers of other students and teachers. Results from their investigations, conducted in non-music settings, indicate the meaning of praise is dependent on many factors, including the recipient's perception of the praiser's intent (Emmer, 1988). Research conducted from the students' perspective has shown that praise does not have consistent or uniform effects on its recipients.

Students, as observers, possess particular perspectives and orientations to praise as it occurs between other students and the teacher in repeated interactions. Even though students are an important source for information, concern is raised about the accuracy of measures taken of student perceptions.

Accuracy has been a concern in social perception investigations for some time (Cronbach, 1955; Funder, 1987; Kenny & Albright, 1987; Kruglanski, 1989). The issue is whether one can differentiate people based on their ability to know the social world around them. When the subjects are school-age students, the question is whether they can indicate their impressions of teacher behaviors in a way that would allow the data to be compared to other measures of classroom behaviors.

Accuracy is defined as consensus between a judgment and a criterion (Kruglanski, 1989). The criterion is generally some established standard. The most commonly cited measure of teacher praise in music education research literature is whether or not it functions as contingent (deserved) praise.

A comparison between student judgments regarding teacher praise and praise as it is identified in music education research would provide utilitarian accuracy -- students either agree or disagree with this adult view. If information reported in the literature is correct, views of the subjective students are expected to be idiosyncratic. A single measure would not allow a partitioning of student views (Funder, 1987). One way to obtain such a measure would be to determine if correspondence existed between the students' understandings of their teacher's

deserved and instructional praise and the teacher's self-knowledge of praise.

Agreement between student judgments and the teacher's intended use of praise in a specific teaching situation would satisfy that students are uniquely responsive to this information.

Pre-existing expectations might cause a student to view the traits associated with praise in relation to other teachers. For the purposes of this investigation, it is essential that the traits of teacher praise be distinguishable from other teacher characteristics or behaviors, and that student judgments reflect their ability to discriminate between teachers. One way to ensure that this occurs is to reduce the amount of information to which all judges are exposed.

Focusing on specific segments of class time that contain teacher praise minimizes the exposure to other potentially biasing behaviors. All subjects would have equal access to teacher praise that is grounded in brief, relatively context-free samples of teacher behavior (Babad, Bernieri & Rosenthal, 1987, 1989; Babad, 1990).

Influenced by doctor-patient and courtroom behavior research, Babad and his associates reasoned that vast amounts of information are contained in a few seconds of human behavior. They designed a study to demonstrate that differential expectancy effects would be detectable from extremely brief samples of context-minimal teacher behavior (Babad, Bernieri & Rosenthal, 1989). Data consisted of judges' ratings of very brief clips of teacher verbal and nonverbal

behavior in separate channels (i.e., face, body, audio, written transcripts) when talking about and talking to students about whom the teacher had high and low expectations. The question was whether the teachers' expectations would be revealed in differential treatment toward high and low expectancy students, and if those effects could be diagnosed from brief (10-second), relatively context-free samples of the teachers' behaviors?

Babad, Berneiri, and Rosenthal (1989) considered two components of context in developing the context-minimal measure: (1) length of judges' exposure to teacher behavior, and (2) separation of channels. The exposure to the teacher's behavior is very long in the more traditional, natural classroom observations. Some argue that this obscures the judgments made about specific segments of behavior. By separating channels, and reducing exposure to multiple information, Babad and his associates reasoned that the judges could focus on specific behaviors.

Teacher tendencies toward biased behavior were determined before the experiment began. All teachers ($n = 11$) were videotaped in the classroom as they taught the entire class. The teachers were filmed again immediately after the end of the class period as they talked to and about students for whom they held high and low expectations. The students were never seen on the videotapes.

Thirty-six clips were selected from the channels and the two conditions (talking to and about). The clips were set in a fixed randomized order to be viewed and rated by the 15 undergraduate psychology majors.

The analysis of data revealed that the judges' ratings of brief samples of behavior revealed expectancy effects, and their magnitude equaled expectancy effects found in full context observations (Harris & Rosenthal, 1985). The teachers' views toward the students were detectable in the smallest bits of teacher behavior and clearly detected by the judges. As the researchers pointed out, the teachers were facing the camera throughout the experiment and undoubtedly attempted to put on their best behavior. The adult judges were exposed to research information regarding transmission of information through behavior, but they were unfamiliar with the teachers. If this information was acquired through brief glimpses, what might the accumulating effect be on students exposed to the teacher's behaviors over the course of a year?

In a follow-up to this investigation, Babad and his associates showed the videotapes from the previous investigation to fourth, seventh, and tenth grade students who were unfamiliar with the teachers (Babad, Bernieri, & Rosenthal, 1991). Students were told that the teachers were instructing two former students. The researchers provided the student-judges with descriptions of the hypothetical students. One was characterized as a "good student," but the other student was described as "not-so-good." The researchers were interested to see if the student-

judges could correctly distinguish between the teachers' regard for the two students who were never seen or heard on the videotape. Using information gleaned from the brief glimpses (10s clips) of the teachers' verbal and non-verbal behaviors, students were exceptionally accurate in their determinations. All F values were significant and the effect magnitudes were substantial, clearly indicating that the teacher's conduct gave sufficient information to rate the high-expectancy student as more excellent than the low-expectancy student.

Babad and his associates showed that minimal-context measures are accurate. Subsequent investigations corroborate the remarkable accuracy of judgments that are based on brief observations (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1992).

In the meta-analysis conducted by Ambady and Rosenthal (1992), the researchers addressed the accuracy of predictions based on short observations (under 5-minutes) of expressive behavior. A meta-analysis is the combining of results of independent experiments for the purpose of integrating their findings (Rosenthal, 1984; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1986). An important outcome of meta-analysis is a significance level that gives the probability that a set of studies exhibiting the reported results could have been generated if no real relationship existed. The results from the Ambady and Rosenthal meta-analysis are reviewed to support the benefits to the present investigation of the use of an approach that controls the exposure of familiar and unfamiliar student judges to minimal amounts of teacher behavior.

Ambady and Rosenthal (1992) investigated the results of studies in which segments of behavior 300 seconds or less in length were used. Included in the review were studies that had (1) experimentally or objectively defined, clear behavioral criteria, or (2) criteria that were ecologically valid and commonly used in everyday decisions about people. Student ratings of teachers were included among the ecologically valid criteria because this is one of the primary means for making decisions about teacher performance.

Of the 44 studies that met the criteria for inclusion in the investigation, those reported between 1970 - 1990 comprised 95.5% of the sample. The median number of subjects was 32 and the number ranged from two to 271. The median number of judges per study was 37; the number ranged from two to 446.

The results showed a positive effect size for accuracy in predictions. The mean effect size for accuracy of judgment from all segments of behavior under 300s was 0.39. A 95% confidence interval suggests a likely range of effect sizes to be from .34 to .48. The researchers reported that the significant effect size indicates that people can accurately predict from small segments of behavior.

Other findings reported by Ambady and Rosenthal included: (1) neither the number of judges, subjects, nor their gender was significantly related to accuracy, and (2) judgments from brief segments of behavior (under 30s) may be as accurate as judgments from longer (up to five minutes) segments. The combined effect sizes obtained from studies conducted in laboratory settings was .32, while those

studies in which subjects' behaviors occurred naturally had an effect size of .47. Finally, there were no significant differences between the effect sizes of studies in which nonverbal behaviors were rated ($r = .45$) and those that included verbal and nonverbal behaviors ($r = .35$).

Ambady and Rosenthal reported that the predictions made from brief glimpses of behavior were as accurate as those reported in other studies that have attempted to predict criterion variables. Ambady and Rosenthal indicate it cannot be concluded that the use of brief samples is a better approach than traditional, more lengthy methods. However, the practical benefits of the time needed to administer the measure are important, particularly when the measure is to be administered during regularly scheduled class times. The other clear advantage to this investigation is that brief segments of behavior provide a measure of control for context effect by equalizing the judges' exposure, while still maintaining a high degree of accuracy among judges. An additional advantage is that the briefness of the segments and the restriction to the specific behavior maintains the focuses of the seventh and eighth grade students.

One final methodological concern was the classification of students as high or low achievers. The interest in this investigation was not on how others viewed a student's ability, but what effect student self-awareness of ability in a choir might have on interpretations of teacher praise. Weinstein and Middlestadt (1979) report that student self-concept of ability affects expectations students have of teacher

behaviors. Brophy (1979) reports that students use classroom information to compare themselves to others in the class. Morine-Dersheimer (1982) reported elementary age students identified as high achievers reported the praise they received was deserved, but low achievers reported the praise they received was instructional. Although untested in music classes, this information suggests that if choir students believe the praise they receive is instructional, then they might interpret this as an indication of lower ability. Students who receive deserved praise might use this to confirm they have high ability. Therefore, it was assumed a relationship might exist between student interpretations of praise as deserved or instructional and student self-determination of ability.

Summary

Students are keen observers of the classroom, possessing a perspective that is both acute and collective. Students are sensitive to nuances of teacher behavior that may not be detectable by an outside observer (Babad, 1987; Brophy, 1985; Dusek, 1985; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985). Research findings also suggest that the accumulating effect of teachers' behaviors on students might result in conclusions that are different from those reached by researchers (Babad, 1990; Clark & Creswell, 1979; Morine-Dersheimer, 1982). Researchers who investigate classroom processes and participants argue that it is the students' understanding and interpretation of the teachers' activities that most directly reveal the outcomes

of the teachers' behaviors (Babad, 1990; Brophy, 1985, 1988). Therefore, the growing trend in educational research has been to view the classroom through students' eyes, rather than the researchers'.

Praise has been meticulously examined in secondary music ensembles. Music education researchers argue that praise reinforces desired student academic or social behaviors (Madsen & Madsen, 1974; Madsen & Yarbrough, 1985). But if the understandings that students in music rehearsals have of teacher praise are the same as those reported in non-music classes, then teacher praise may not serve as intended. Further, if context affects the meaning of behavior, familiarity might result in different interpretations across classrooms, making it even more difficult to accept that the application of praise has invariable results. Therefore, before instructional principles regarding praise, or positive comments, can be effectively applied in seventh and eighth grade choral ensemble classes, plausible explanations are needed regarding student understandings of praise within and across specific contexts.

Specifically, this study will explore the effect familiarity with context has on the interpretation of teacher praise by seeking information about the following questions: (1) Does student familiarity with a specific teacher lead to interpretations of the teacher's praise that are different from students unfamiliar with the specifics of a rehearsal setting? (2) Is there a relationship between student

self-awareness of ability in a choir and interpretations of teacher praise as
deserved or instructional?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate student interpretations of teacher verbal praise in selected seventh and eighth grade choral performance classes. Two assumptions revealed by the review of literature were considered in the design of this study. They were (1) familiarity with context affects the understanding that students have of their teacher's verbal praise, and (2) student self-awareness of ability in choir influences interpretations of teacher praise as deserved or instructional. These assumptions suggested the investigation of teacher verbal praise through the use of a context-minimal method, where students observed brief (30-second) videotaped examples containing praise. The brief clips were taken from rehearsals conducted by three middle school directors and one junior high choral director. The four teachers also provided explanations of their intent in the use of praise in each videotaped example. This reliance on teachers for information about their praise differed from previous investigations, which had used outside observers to make judgments about teacher behaviors.

Research Questions

1. Are there statistically significant differences in the labeling of teacher verbal praise as deserved or instructional between students in choirs familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher?
2. Are there statistically significant differences between students in choirs familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher who label teacher verbal praise as praise to (a) provide encouragement, (b) send a message that this is the behavior the teacher would like students to model, or (c) seek to gain student cooperation or participation?
3. Are there statistically significant differences between high and low achieving students familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher in interpreting teacher verbal praise as deserved or instructional?
4. What is the strength of intent behind the teacher's instructional praise?
5. Is there a statistically significant difference between the teacher's intent and the interpretations of students familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher?
6. Is there a statistically significant difference between the teacher's intent and the interpretations of high and low achieving students familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher?
7. Are there discernible commonalities in the deserved and instructional praise language used by teachers?

Participants in the Study

Teachers

Three middle school directors and one junior high choral director volunteered to participate in this study. The middle school teachers had taught middle school choirs for more than eight years. The junior high school choral teacher had five years of teaching experience at the junior high level. The teachers, all female, taught in three different suburban school districts, and had been in their current positions for a year or longer. In addition to being experienced, the teachers were positively recommended by their supervisors, and favorably regarded by choral directors in the area.

All teachers agreed to be videotaped while they conducted two rehearsals of a choir of their choosing. The only stipulation was that students in the choir be in the seventh or eighth grade. The rehearsals were videotaped on consecutive days, or no more than two days apart. This condition appealed to teachers and administrators because participation was limited to a few hours, and was confined to one week. The taping on consecutive days was intended to increase the likelihood that a teacher's verbal praise would be similar across both days.

Students

Students enrolled in the videotaped classes were asked to volunteer for the project. This condition was imposed by the school districts, and it is possible this

might have affected the representativeness of the sample. Required parent consent and student assent forms were secured from all participants (Appendix C).

Data were collected from 80 students, 35 in seventh grade and 45 in the eighth grade. All but seven of the students participating in this study had two years or more experience in school choirs.

For the purpose of this investigation, subjects were classified as high or low achievers based upon their perceptions of their own ability in a choir. Fifty students indicated that, in comparison to others in their choir, they were "far above average" or "above average," and usually received high grades in all subjects (all A's, or A's and some B's). These students were labeled high achievers. Thirty students considered themselves "average" or "below average" in choir and reported lower report card grades ("mostly B's" or below) than their classmates. These students were classified as low achievers.

Materials

Collection of Samples of Teacher Verbal Praise

Reports in the literature suggest that, in music rehearsals, teachers devote only 6% of the class time to praise or approving behavior (Yarbrough & Price, 1989). Therefore, to obtain enough verbal praise to construct a stimulus tape, teachers were videotaped while conducting two rehearsals of a choir of their choice.

Praise was defined as any observable verbal positive teacher behavior given in response to a student performance or behavior (Madsen & Yarbrough, 1981). Performance was not limited to singing: It also applied to occasions when a student expressed a good or a right idea. Praise of student behaviors associated with choral technique, such as sitting or standing correctly, was also included.

Each of the eight videotapes was systematically observed by the researcher for the purpose of categorizing teacher verbal behavior as praise. Cycles of 10-second observe and 5-second record were used. This procedure intentionally replicated the approach used in systematic observations of music classrooms, since investigations of teacher praise in performance ensembles are the established standard in music education. The approach ensured that the behavior about which students and teachers would subsequently make decisions was the same as that traditionally identified by trained adult observers in previous music education research (Murray, 1973; Yarbrough, 1973; Price, 1981).

Verification ($\kappa = .91$) of the researcher's categorizations was determined for 25% of the cases. Two adult observers, unfamiliar with the teachers and uninformed about the purpose of the investigation, viewed each clip. One of the observers was a former secondary choral director. The other adult was not a teacher, but had participated as a student in secondary school choral programs. The adult observers indicated on a form provided whether or not the teacher's

verbal behavior was praise (see Appendix A). Consistency of agreement was computed by dividing total agreement by total agreement plus disagreement.

Sixty-four segments of verbal praise were randomly chosen and transferred to a master tape. Each teacher was represented by 16 examples, eight from each day. The examples from each day appeared sequentially on the videotape.

Teacher categorizations of praise as deserved or instructional. Teachers viewed their 16 examples out of view of students. The task was explained with emphasis given to the following points: (1) We know very little about how music teachers use praise, and (2) the four uses of praise included in this investigation were based on information from non-music classes, but this did not mean that all teachers used praise in all four ways.

Statements referring to each type of praise were read, and teachers indicated their familiarity with the four types of praise. No difficulty was found with the wording of any statements and no additional clarification seemed necessary.

Using a prepared form, teachers were instructed to select the one statement from the four that best reflected intent in the use of praise in each situation (see Appendix B). The statements from which teachers selected were:

- (1) The student/s performance or behavior was good and deserved to be praised;
- (2) I wanted to provide encouragement to the student/s;

(3) I liked what the student/s did, and I wanted the other students to know that this is what I consider a good performance or good behavior, and

(4) The praise in this situation is intended to get the student/s to cooperate, or to participate more in the class.

Teachers indicated the intensity of their decisions by the use of a rating scale that ranged from one (somewhat likely) to seven (very likely).

The researcher made a final review of the videotaped examples and the teachers' decisions about each example. The purpose was to identify any examples that contained extraneous behavior that might confuse students, and any examples that had received weak ratings from the teacher. This review resulted in the removal of thirteen examples from further use and reduced the pool of praise segments from 64 to 51 (see Table 1).

In five of the examples that were removed, teachers had assigned ratings of less than five (on a scale of 1 - 7) indicating either uncertainty about the decision, or an inability to recall why the praise had been given. If the teacher was unsure, comparison with the students' understandings would be of little use. It is important to note that it was not necessary to remove any examples because teachers disagreed with the adult observers' labeling of the verbal behavior as praise.

Table 1

Pool of Praise Examples As Classified By Teachers

Teacher:	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
Deserved	6	2	7	6	21
Encourage	4	4	7	2	17
Send a Message	-	2	0	3	5
Cooperate or Participate	4	3	0	1	8

Note. (-) indicates examples of this type of praise were eliminated from the original 64. With the exception of Teacher 3, teachers recognized all four types of praise in their teaching.

Asking teachers to indicate their intent in the use of praise in the examples served several purposes. First, the teachers' decisions about the behaviors verified that the four types of praise included in this study were recognized by the teachers and were present in these selected classrooms. This also ensured that the behaviors should be familiar to students participating in the study. These examples, identified by teachers rather than the researcher, became the material from which the teacher praise stimulus tape was constructed. Thus, the teachers' identifications of types of praise made a comparison possible between the teacher's

stated intent in the use of praise in each example with student interpretations of these same examples.

Selection of examples of praise. Stratified random selection was used to choose 16 examples, eight deserved and eight instructional, from the pool of fifty-one examples of verbal praise. Two examples of deserved praise were selected from among each teacher's videotaped clips. The remaining eight instructional praise examples were proportionally divided among (a) praise intended to encourage (5 clips); (b) praise intended to get a student to cooperate or participate in the class (2 clips), and (c) praise intended to send a message about a student behavior or performance the teacher would like other students to model (1 clip). Table 2 shows the distribution of the four types of praise across teachers.

Table 2

Distribution of Types of Praise Across Teachers

	Clip	1	2	3	4
Teacher 1		E	D	C	D
Teacher 2		D	C	E	D
Teacher 3		E	D	D	E
Teacher 4		D	D	M	E

Note: D = Deserved; E = Encourage; C = Cooperate or participate; M = Send a message.

Preparation of Videotaped Clips

The 16 examples, four for each teacher, chosen for use in the stimulus tape were edited to reduce the length of each example to 30 seconds. Ambady and Rosenthal (1992) had shown that 30 seconds was sufficient time to accurately interpret behaviors. Thus, each teacher was represented on the stimulus tape by four, 30-second examples of verbal praise behavior.

The amount of time taken by each teacher to deliver a praise comment was expected to be different. It was important, however, to ensure that the length of exposure to each teacher's behavior was consistent across all teachers. This was accomplished by scrolling back through the frames from the end of the teacher's praise comment until a counter indicated that 30 seconds had elapsed. The segment was cut at that point and transferred to another tape. Each teacher's prepared clips were placed in fixed random order.

To ensure that students responded to the examples in correct order, visual identifiers and prompts were included. A title that identified each teacher by number (i.e., TEACHER 1, TEACHER 2, etc.) appeared at the beginning of each teacher's set of four clips. Each clip was identified by number as EX 1, 2, 3, or 4. Visual prompts to OBSERVE and RECORD appeared at the beginning and end of each example.

A pilot of this instrument indicated a 20-second segment was sufficient time to record decisions. During the RECORD period, a brightly colored visual graphic

appeared on the screen to create interest and hold the students' attention to the task. A different graphic was used with each teacher.

Assembly of the Teacher Praise Stimulus Tape

The teacher praise stimulus tape was assembled so that student-judges saw all clips for a given teacher before moving to the next set of clips (Babad, Bernieri, & Rosenthal, 1989, 1991). The rationale for this decision was based on the assumption that each teacher is a constant. If clips of teachers were mixed, between-teacher effects would be confounding, and would interfere with the student-judges' precision in making decisions about each teacher.

The master tape contained four different teacher orders, so that each choir saw a different order (see Table 3). No teacher appeared last on more than one occasion, and only Choir 1 saw its teacher first. Since two teachers (Teacher 2 and Teacher 4) chose to be videotaped as they taught a Tenor-Bass choir, and two teachers (Teacher 1 and Teacher 3) chose their Treble-Girls' choirs, the order alternated between types of choirs to decrease the possibility that students' decisions would be influenced by comparisons between choirs.

The stimulus tape was 20 minutes long. Taking into consideration the time needed to give directions and distribute materials, this length permitted students to view the videotape and complete the questionnaire within a single, 45-minute class period.

Table 3

Teacher Order Seen by Each Choir

	<u>Teacher Order</u>			
Choir 1	1	2	3	4
Choir 2	4	1	2	3
Choir 3	2	3	4	1
Choir 4	3	4	1	2

Teacher Questionnaire

A questionnaire (see Appendix B) was designed to secure three kinds of information: (1) The teacher's stated intent in the use of verbal praise in 16 randomly chosen segments containing teacher behavior identified by two adult observers as praise; (2) the importance attributed by teachers in this study to the use of praise in situations associated with deserved or instructional praise, and (3) the number of years each teacher had taught at the middle school/junior high level, as well as the number of weeks during the current school year each teacher had taught the students who participated in the study. A description of each section follows.

Section I: Teachers' stated intent in the use of praise. The review of related literature revealed that students recognize that teacher praise can serve

instructional purposes, or it can be directed at a good performance. Although experienced music teachers report that they make use of praise and consider it important, little else is known about how these teachers intend to use praise. In a pilot of this study, two experienced teachers viewed six, 30-second videotaped examples of verbal praise randomly chosen from videotapes made on two consecutive days as they taught a choir of their choosing. The teachers categorized the praise as deserved or as one of three instructional uses of praise. Results indicated that both teachers recognized all four uses of praise, and neither teacher expressed any difficulty with the wording of the statements. Therefore, for this study, using the same procedure and statements, each teacher identified her intent in the use of praise in 16 examples randomly chosen from videotapes of her rehearsals.

Section II: Importance teachers attribute to use of deserved and instructional praise. It is established in the literature that teachers use praise. From the pilot study and conversations with teachers, they appear to recognize that praise can have different uses. How important, however, is it to teachers to use praise in situations associated with the use of deserved and instructional praise?

This question was addressed in a limited way by asking teachers in this study to respond to statements designed to reflect teaching situations in which a teacher might be expected to give praise because it is deserved or to serve some instructional purpose. Two statements referred to deserved praise, and five

referred to instructional praise. For example, two statements attributed the student/s performance to effort or ability. The teacher was asked, “How important is it to praise . . . (A) to provide support to students when they try,” and “How important is it to praise . . . (E) a poor performance if it is the best the student/s can do.”

Two statements were examples of what Brophy (1981) described as praise that is not for the recipient but, rather, is intended for the audience. For example, teachers were asked how important it is to (F) “Praise good behavior as a way to let other students know what the teacher expects,” and the importance to (G) “Praise a good performance so that other students can learn from it.”

Two statements referred to situations associated with deserved praise. In these, the teacher was asked, “How important is it to you to . . . “ (C) Praise students when the performance deserves it, or when they have a good/right idea, and (D) Praise students for good behavior. Teachers responded to the statements by using a rating scale that ranged from one (Not very important) to seven (Very important).

Section III. Demographic information. This section determined the number of years each teacher had taught secondary choral students. Teachers also provided information that allowed a determination of the length of time spent with the students in the videotaped choirs in this school year.

Student Questionnaire

Questioning students about teacher praise required special consideration. First, it was important that students were asked about a behavior with which they were familiar. Second, it was necessary that students recognized the fact that teachers made different uses of praise.

These concerns were first addressed in interviews of students who were in the same grades (seventh and eighth) as those who were to participate in the study. The students were asked to describe incidents in which teachers used praise. Initially, the students indicated that teachers used praise very seldom, but when they were asked to think of a time that a teacher might have praised some student other than themselves, the students were able to provide several examples. All four uses previously identified in the literature were mentioned by the students (i.e., to encourage; because it is deserved; a way to let other students know how the teacher wants everybody to do things, and to get students to participate more). To illustrate the latter use, the students described a student in a history class who did not like to participate in class. The student sat in the back of the room to avoid being called on by the teacher. The students had observed that the teacher would frequently say “good stuff” to the student as a way to make him feel the teacher liked him so that he would want to be more involved in the class.

Although prompted, the students were unable to recall any additional uses of praise. Therefore, it was concluded that the types of praise identified in the

literature as deserved and instructional were familiar to middle and junior high school students.

The wording of statements to which students responded had been tested in a pilot study. Students had no difficulty understanding the types of praise referred to in each of the statements. Interviews of the students also confirmed that the brevity of the videotaped examples had not made the scenes seem unnatural. Students in the pilot study had expressed no problems with the time allowed for them to make decisions about each clip.

Section I: Interpretations of teacher praise. The first section of the questionnaire determined a student's interpretations of a teacher's praise in each of the 16 clips. This information was used to address the question of whether familiarity with a teacher and specific context results in understandings of the teacher's behaviors that are different from those of students unfamiliar with the teacher. Students were asked to respond as if the teacher were speaking to them. The rationale was that the choices revealed interpretations of the teacher's praise as students experienced it. Students responded to the question by selecting the one statement from among four that fit their interpretation of the praise in that clip or example. The statements from which students chose were:

1. You deserved it because your performance or behavior was good.
2. The teacher wanted to encourage you.

3. The teacher liked what you did, but praised you because she wanted the other students to behave or perform the same way.

4. The teacher is trying to get you to be more cooperative, or to participate more.

Students used a scale that ranged from one (Somewhat likely) to seven (Very likely) to indicate the intensity of the choice. A low rating assigned to a choice suggested a low degree of confidence in the decision. The reverse was true for high ratings.

Section II: Socialization and ability level. The second section collected information about the student's age, grade level, years of experience in school choirs, and the length of time the student had been in the present choir class. The number of years students in grades seven or eight have been exposed to school music rehearsals were not expected to be the same. This information was used to describe the subjects, and permitted the exploration of the effect, if any, that experience in school choirs had on student interpretations.

Self-awareness of student ability in a choir was also determined. The interest in this investigation was to determine what effect a student's self-perception of classroom status might have on his or her interpretations of teacher praise - not on how others viewed the student's ability. Therefore, the students were asked, "As a student, how do you compare to others in this class?" Students selected from responses that ranged from "Far above average" to "Far below

average.” Further identification of a student's academic standing was determined by asking, “Usually, what grades do you get on your report card?”

Data Gathering Procedure

Seventh and eighth grade choral students who volunteered for this project viewed the prepared teacher praise stimulus tape during their regularly scheduled class time. At the time they viewed the tape, students had been in their respective choir classes for six months. The tape consisted of four clips of each teacher, one teacher with whom students were familiar and three teachers they did not know. Teachers were not present while the students viewed the tape.

Students were provided a form on which to indicate decisions about each teacher's use of praise (see Appendix B). A poster-size replica of the form was used to explain the task to the students. Attention was first called to a highlighted question on the page which asked,

“If this teacher were speaking to you, how likely is it that this praise
would have been given to you because . . . “

Students were instructed to select one statement from among the four that would provide the best answer to the question. Each statement was briefly explained through researcher-created hypothetical situations which students were told involved similar-age students in non-music classes. References to choir classes were avoided to prevent the inadvertent description of a scene that might have

appeared in one of the videotaped clips. For example, a description of a student known to teenage neighbors of the researcher was used to illustrate teacher praise intended to get a student to cooperate, or to participate more in the class. The students had explained that this was not a bad student, but simply one who did not want to be called on in the history class. The teacher's praise directed at this student was described by the teenagers as likely to be given for ". . . almost anything; even reasons that have nothing to do with the history class. The teacher is just trying to get him to take part in the class, or to be more 'with it'."

To explain praise given by the teacher to send a message, or to call attention to a behavior that the teacher wanted other students to model, students were asked to recall a time in elementary school when a teacher might have said, "I like the way XXXX cleans her desk." The students were asked if they knew why the teacher had praised "XXXX"? The students' answers indicated they understood the teacher's praise was intended to get all other students to clean their desks. The researcher emphasized that this did not mean the teacher didn't like what the student did, but used this as an opportunity to send a message to others in the class about what the teacher liked.

The use of hypothetical situations continued in the explanation of the rating scale. Referring to a similar, but different, videotape, it was explained that a "student helper" was certain that a teacher had praised students in a clip because the performance was so good that it deserved to be praised. The student in this

scenario had assigned a very high score (" . . . a 6, or 7") to the decision. The vignette continued, however, with another student who was less sure about the teacher's praise. After making a decision, this student had assigned a low mark (" . . . a 1, 2, or 3") indicating less certainty about the teacher's use of praise in the example.

After responding to the teacher praise stimulus tape, students completed the last page of the questionnaire, which collected demographic information and determined the student's typical grades and self-assessment of ability as a choir student. This investigation was interested in school choir experiences only, so a final question determined the number of years a student had participated in school choirs. Students were instructed to count the present year as one year, and to include choir experience, if any, in the fifth and sixth grade.

Data Analysis

The design of this study reflects the assumptions from the literature that students in a class possess unique understandings of the specifics of their rehearsal setting, and that student self-awareness of ability might result in different interpretations of the teacher's praise. Data were collected to provide information about the interpretations of each teacher's praise and were analyzed on the class level and by student ability level. Each subject responded to the four clips of each teacher, with each clip independent of all others. Nominal data were generated.

The first concern in this study was to determine if students in choirs unfamiliar with a teacher differed from the teacher's own students in labeling her praise as deserved or instructional. This analysis was independent of the teacher's stated intent. It was necessary to collapse the responses of students into the categories of interest, deserved and instructional, and to separate students by choir. This resulted in 4 X 2 contingency tables. A 4 X 3 contingency table was constructed to determine if students familiar or unfamiliar with a teacher differed in their interpretations of the purpose the instructional praise was to serve.

Traditionally, concern is raised about the expected cell frequency in contingency table analyses, but statisticians have shown through simulation studies that the average expected frequency is a more important consideration (Roscoe & Byars, 1971; Roscoe, 1975). Their findings suggest the chi-square test of independence with more than one degree of freedom is robust with respect to Type I errors; they report no situations in which the tests of independence were systematically liberal (Roscoe & Byars, 1971, p. 759). Roscoe and Byars (1971) recommend an average expected frequency of six provides a good approximation at the .05 level. This recommendation was followed in interpreting significant chi-squares in those analyses in which 20% of cells had expected cell frequencies less than five.

The literature suggests students with different abilities interpret praise differently. Students were sorted according to self-awareness of ability in a choir,

and responses were organized to provide a distribution across the four clips of each teacher by students within each choir. This information is shown in Appendix D, Tables D9 - D12. To determine if students within a choir differed in their interpretation of the teacher's praise as deserved or instructional, data were collapsed into 2 X 2 contingency tables and chi-square tests of independence conducted (Appendix D, Tables D13 - D16). To see if a relationship existed between ability and high and low achievers' interpretations of praise as deserved or instructional across choirs, a 2 X 2 contingency table of analysis was used. Collapsing the data this way revealed clips where a relationship was found to exist, but it was necessary to follow with a more detailed analysis to reveal the contributors to the significant chi-square. Data were also sorted into 2 X 3 contingency tables to see if differences within choirs occurred in labeling according to an instructional purpose (i.e., encourage, send a message, or cooperate).

To further test the premise that familiarity with some teacher results in unique understandings of the teacher's praise, the interpretations by students within a choir were tested to see if the number agreeing with the teacher's stated purpose for praising in a clip was greater than would be expected to occur by chance alone. In a case where the variable of interest has only two possible values or outcomes, binomial distribution is the only appropriate test (Dowdy & Wearden, 1983).

The binomial distribution is one of probability. The Binomial Distributions Test makes it possible to test the probability of y successes where the number of trials is n and the probability of success on a single trial is π .

The probability that students would agree with the teacher in this investigation was one in four (0.25), since there were four interpretations possible for each clip. Thus, the null hypothesis was $H_0: \pi = 0.25$. The alternative hypothesis was $H_a: \pi \neq 0.25$. The rejection level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$, and since this was a two-tailed test, the null hypothesis was rejected if an outcome with a probability of less than 0.025 occurred at either side of the distribution.

It was possible also that the number of unfamiliar students interpreting the praise as intended by the teacher would be greater than expected by chance alone. To determine if that occurred, the Binomial Distributions Test was applied to the decisions of the unfamiliar choirs. In clips where significant agreement with the teacher was found in familiar choirs, but not in one or more unfamiliar choirs, a chi-square test was conducted to see if the differences were statistically significant.

Although the probability of a particular outcome can be determined through statistical software programs, it is possible to determine if the number of students agreeing with a teacher falls beyond the region of rejection by simply consulting a Binomial Distributions Table (Dowdy & Wearden, 1983). Tables were used in

this study because of the ease of this approach where data were compared across four choirs and 16 examples (Schlaifer, 1961, pp. 355-360). Other descriptive information was used to assist in the interpretation of data. Independent t -tests were conducted to determine if the intensity of the decisions by students unfamiliar with the teacher were different from those of students who knew the teacher. Finally, a descriptive analysis of the language used by teachers in clips of deserved and instructional praise was used to explore for commonalities, or any distinctive characteristics.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter begins with the report of analyses of the (1) labeling of teacher praise as deserved or instructional by choirs familiar or unfamiliar with each teacher, and (2) labeling of the praise in relation to student self-awareness of ability in the choir. The initial analyses were independent of what the teacher intended by the praise. The report continues with the results from analyses to determine agreement between the teachers' stated purpose in using praise and the students' interpretations of praise. Finally, a qualitative analysis of teacher language is provided to determine if commonalities existed in deserved and instructional praise.

Interpretations of Teacher Praise as Deserved Or Instructional By Choirs Familiar or Unfamiliar With a Teacher

Two questions were associated with this problem. First, were there statistically significant differences between students in choirs familiar or unfamiliar with a teacher in the labeling of teacher praise as deserved or instructional? Second, were there statistically significant differences between

students in choirs familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher in the labeling of teacher verbal praise as (a) providing encouragement, (b) sending a message that this is a behavior the teacher would like students to model, or (c) seeking to gain student cooperation or participation?

As shown in Tables 4 - 7, data were organized to provide a distribution of responses to each teacher's four clips by students within each choir. Reflected in the same tables, responses by students within each choir were organized under the two categories of interest -- deserved and instructional. The instructional category consisted of three types: (1) praise to encourage; (2) praise to send a message, or (3) praise to get students to cooperate. Contingency tables of analyses were constructed from these data to determine if the labeling of the praise as deserved or instructional was related to familiarity with a teacher. These analyses are found in Appendix D, Tables D1 - D4.

Significant Differences Between Choirs in Labeling of Praise As Deserved or Instructional

Significant differences occurred between choirs in labeling the praise in five clips. Table 8 shows that in all five clips, students familiar with the teacher had labeled the praise as deserved. Choirs unfamiliar with the teacher labeled the praise as instructional. Generally, choirs who did not know a teacher believed the praise was intended to encourage the students. For example, more students in

Table 4

Interpretation of Praise as Deserved or Instructional by
Choirs Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher 1

	Clip	1	2	3	4
Teacher Intent		E	D	C	D
Familiar Choir (1) (n=18)					
<u>Deserved</u>		5	10*	6	14*
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		13*	6	9	4
Send a message		0	2	1	0
Cooperate		0	0	2	0
Unfamiliar Choir 2 (n=17)					
<u>Deserved</u>		4	4	5	9*
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		8	5	7	4
Send a message		0	8	1	2
Cooperate		5	0	4	2
Unfamiliar Choir 3 (n=25)					
<u>Deserved</u>		7	10*	4	16*
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		17*	11	17	7
Send a message		1	2	0	1
Cooperate		0	2	4	1
Unfamiliar Choir 4 (n=20)					
<u>Deserved</u>		5	2	2	5
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		12*	11	8	13
Send a message		2	5	2	2
Cooperate		1	2	8	0

Note: (*) indicates number of students agreeing with teacher's stated intent is greater than would be expected to occur by chance. Thus, $\pi \neq 0.25$.

Table 5

Interpretation of Praise as Deserved or Instructional by
Choirs Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher 2

	Clip	1	2	3	4
Teacher Intent	D	C	E	D	
Familiar Choir (2) (n=17)					
<u>Deserved</u>	8	5	1	13*	
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage	2	12	5	2	
Send a message	6	0	11	0	
Cooperate	1	0	0	2	
Unfamiliar Choir 1 (n=18)					
<u>Deserved</u>	4	4	1	16*	
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage	10	12	0	2	
Send a message	3	1	16	0	
Cooperate	1	1	1	0	
Unfamiliar Choir 3 (n=25)					
<u>Deserved</u>	13*	10	3	20*	
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage	8	12	2	4	
Send a message	4	0	19	1	
Cooperate	0	2	1	0	
Unfamiliar Choir 4 (n=20)					
<u>Deserved</u>	8	4	1	14*	
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage	7	14	1	6	
Send a message	2	0	10	0	
Cooperate	3	2	8	0	

Note: (*) indicates number of students agreeing with teacher's stated intent is greater than would be expected to occur by chance. $\pi \neq 0.25$.

Table 6

Interpretation of Praise as Deserved or Instructional by
Choirs Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher 3

Teacher Intent	Clip	1	2	3	4
		E	D	D	E
Familiar Choir (3) (n=25)					
<u>Deserved</u>		7	20*	20*	1
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		13*	5	4	18*
Send a message		0	0	1	1
Cooperate		5	0	0	5
Unfamiliar Choir 1 (n=18)					
<u>Deserved</u>		1	12*	13*	0
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		13*	5	4	14*
Send a message		1	1	1	1
Cooperate		3	0	0	3
Unfamiliar Choir 2 (n=17)					
<u>Deserved</u>		2	12*	5	2
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		12*	5	8	7
Send a message		0	0	2	2
Cooperate		3	0	2	6
Unfamiliar Choir 4 (n=20)					
<u>Deserved</u>		2	12*	10*	0
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		14*	5	4	8
Send a message		2	2	3	6
Cooperate		2	1	3	6

Note:(*)indicates number of students agreeing with teacher's stated intent is greater than would be expected to occur by chance. $p \neq 0.25$.

Table 7

Interpretation of Praise as Deserved or Instructional by
Choirs Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher 4

	<u>Clip</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Teacher Intent		D	D	M	E
Familiar Choir (4) (n=20)					
<u>Deserved</u>		16*	10*	1	7
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		3	5	1	10*
Send a message		0	4	14*	0
Cooperate		1	1	4	3
Unfamiliar Choir 1 (n=18)					
<u>Deserved</u>		15*	11*	2	8
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		3	6	0	10*
Send a message		0	0	12*	0
Cooperate		0	1	4	0
Unfamiliar Choir 2 (n=17)					
<u>Deserved</u>		2	6	2	8
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		10	8	1	6
Send a message		3	3	12*	3
Cooperate		2	0	2	0
Unfamiliar Choir 3 (n=25)					
<u>Deserved</u>		11*	20*	5	15
<u>Instructional</u>					
Encourage		13	5	0	9
Send a message		1	0	17*	1
Cooperate		0	0	3	0

Note: (*) indicates number of students agreeing with teacher's stated intent is greater than would be expected to occur by chance. $\pi \neq 0.25$.

Choir 4 than would be expected by chance alone thought Teacher 1 used the praise in Clip 4 to encourage the students. Choir 2 labeled a clip of deserved praise by two teachers (Teacher 3 and Teacher 4) as praise to encourage.

Table 8

Clips Containing Differences in Interpretations of Praise as Deserved

1. Teacher 1, Clip 2 (D)	$\chi^2 = 10.2415,$	$p < .02$
2. Teacher 1, Clip 4 (D)	$\chi^2 = 11.8933,$	$p < .008$
3. Teacher 3, Clip 3 (D)	$\chi^2 = 12.7478,$	$p < .006$
4. Teacher 4, Clip 1 (D)	$\chi^2 = 24.9507,$	$p < .001$
5. Teacher 4, Clip 2 (D)	$\chi^2 = 9.1909,$	$p < .03$

Note: $df = 3$

Significant Differences in Labeling of Different Types of Instructional Praise

Data were sorted into 4 X 3 (4 choirs by 3 types of instructional praise) contingency tables (see Appendix D, Tables D5 - D8). Although this sorting resulted in a number of cells with an expected frequency less than five, the advice of Roscoe and Byars (1971) was followed in interpreting the significant chi-squares that occurred in four clips. The standardized residuals identifying major contributors to those differences are shown in Table 9. In three clips -- clip 1 of Teacher 1, clip 4 of Teacher 3, and clip 4 of Teacher 4 -- students familiar with the teacher had labeled this as praise intended to encourage students. Unfamiliar choirs (Choirs 2 & 4) labeled the praise either as praise to send a message, or as praise intended to seek student cooperation. The one other clip (clip 3 of Teacher

2) where a significant difference was noted is interesting because eight students in Choir 4, more than would be expected by chance alone, labeled this as praise to get students to cooperate. The teacher's own students thought this praise was used to send a message.

Table 9

Major Contributors to Differences in Labeling of Instructional Praise

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Clip</u>	<u>Choir</u>	<u>Send a Message</u>	<u>Cooperation</u>
1	1	2		3.2
2	3	4		3.4
3	4	4	2.1	
4	4	2	2.3	

Differences In Labeling of Teacher Praise as Deserved Or

Instructional Between High and Low Achieving Students

Familiar or Unfamiliar With a Teacher

Students were sorted according to their perceptions of ability in a choir and labeled as high or low achievers. Responses by the two groups were organized to provide a distribution across the four clips of each teacher. This information is

shown in Appendix D, Tables D9 - D12. The first question addressed the relationship between ability and interpretation of praise as deserved or instructional by students familiar with a teacher. The second question addressed differences in the labeling of the praise across choirs between students of different abilities. The final question was designed to determine if a relationship existed between ability and the labeling of the three types of instructional praise. Generally, as shown by Tables D12 - D20 in Appendix D, there were few differences among the two groups of students.

Differences Due to Achievement Level in Interpretations of Praise as Deserved or Instructional

One clip, clip 2 of Teacher 1, was found to contain significant differences in the labeling of the teacher's praise as deserved or instructional. As shown in Table 10, students in this choir who considered themselves to be above average labeled this as deserved praise, but all five students who considered themselves to be less able in the choir than their classmates thought this was instructional praise.

Table 10

Relation Between Ability Level and Interpretations of Praise By Students FamiliarWith Teacher 1 in Clip 2

	HA	LA	ROW
<u>TOTAL</u>			
Instructional Praise	3	5	8 44.4
Deserved Praise	10		10 55.6
Column Total	13 72.3	5 27.8	18 100.0

Fisher's Exact Test, $df = 1$ ($p < .007$).

Differences In Interpretation of Different Types of Instructional Praise Due toAchievement Level

No significant differences were found between the two groups of students in their responses to instructional praise. The literature had suggested that students of lower ability had a tendency to label praise as instructional, but no pattern was noted that indicated these students differed from their classmates in their response to instructional praise.

Identification of Agreement Between Teacher Intent and
Interpretations of Choirs Familiar and Unfamiliar With the
Teacher

Tables 4 - 7 include the teacher's stated purpose in the use of praise in each clip. The question was whether there were statistically significant differences between the teacher's intent in the use of praise and the interpretations of choirs familiar and unfamiliar with the teacher. It was necessary to determine (1) if the number of students familiar with the teacher who agreed with the teacher's stated intent in the use of praise in each clip was greater than would be expected to occur by chance alone, and (2) if the number of students unfamiliar with the teacher who agreed with the teacher's stated intent in the use of praise in each clip was greater than would be expected to occur by chance alone.

As explained in Chapter III, there were two possible outcomes -- students agreed or disagreed with the teacher's stated intent in providing praise in each clip. The Binomial Distributions Test was the only possible test. Tables were consulted to determine the most likely outcome.

The null hypothesis was $H_0: \pi = 0.25$. The alternative hypothesis was $H_a: \pi \neq 0.25$. The rejection level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$, and since this was a two-tailed test, the null hypothesis was rejected if an outcome with a probability of less than

0.025 occurred at either side of the distribution. The region of rejection for each number of trials and the relative probability is presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Regions of Rejection for a Number of Trials

Number of Trials	Probability	Region of Rejection	π
(Choir 1) 18	0.25	0, 9	$\geq .025$
(Choir 2) 17	0.25	0, 8	$\geq .025$
(Choir 3) 25	0.25	0, 10	$\geq .025$
(Choir 4) 20	0.25	0, 9	$\geq .025$

Examples in which the number of students who interpreted the praise as intended by the teacher was greater than would be expected to occur by chance alone is indicated by an asterisk in Tables 4 - 7. In these instances, the null hypothesis that the number would not differ from $\pi = 0.25$ was rejected.

Agreement Between Teacher Intent and Interpretations of Students Familiar With Teacher

Information in Tables 4-7 shows that the number of students whose interpretations were in agreement with their teacher's stated intent in the use of praise in 12 of the 16 clips was greater than would be expected to occur by chance.

In seven of the twelve, students recognized that their teacher intended the praise as deserved. In four clips, students understood their teachers intended the praise to encourage the students. In one clip, students clearly discerned that the praise was not directed at the student recipient, but was used by the teacher to send a message to the rest of the choir.

In three clips where students had failed to recognize the specific intent, the teachers used the praise in one clip to encourage students and, in two clips, to gain student cooperation. Students familiar with the teacher had no difficulty recognizing it as instructional praise, but they could not agree on the specific nature of the praise.

Agreement Between Teacher Intent and Interpretations of Students Unfamiliar With Teacher

In thirteen clips, the number of students in one or more choirs unfamiliar with the teacher who agreed with the teacher's stated intent was greater than would be expected to occur by chance. Eight of the thirteen clips were intended as deserved praise, four were intended as encouragement praise, and one was used by the teacher to send a message to students. It was of particular interest that Choir 3 recognized the praise of Teacher 2 as deserved, but that the teacher's own students thought the praise served an instructional purpose.

Significant Difference Between Teacher Intent and Interpretations of Students
Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher

In the previous analyses, student responses were examined independent of what the teacher had intended in the use of praise. Five examples, or clips, were identified where choirs had significantly differed in labeling the praise as deserved or instructional. A reexamination of student responses to the praise in those examples indicated that, as intended by the teacher, choirs familiar with the setting had identified the behavior as deserved. One or more choirs unfamiliar with the teacher labeled the praise as instructional. Thus, significant differences occurred between choirs familiar and unfamiliar in matching their interpretations of the praise as the teacher had intended in five clips.

The intensities of student decisions were examined to see if students familiar with a teacher were more confident in their interpretations than were students unfamiliar with the teacher. Mean responses of each choir across the four clips for a teacher were calculated. Independent *t*-tests were conducted after satisfying that the assumption of homogeneous variances (i.e., *F* test of homogeneity of variance) had been met for each of the two samples tested (Table 12).

Table 12

Test for Significance of Intensity of Student DecisionsTEACHER 1

Choir Familiar (1)			
	N	MEAN	σ
1	72	5.681	1.098

Choirs Unfamiliar					
	N	MEAN	σ	F	t*
2	68	5.117	1.228	1.25	2.86*
3	100	5.470	1.159	1.11	1.20
4	78	5.013	1.274	1.35	3.42*

TEACHER 2

Choir Familiar (2)			
	N	MEAN	σ
2	68	5.559	1.320

Choirs Unfamiliar					
	N	MEAN	σ	F	t*
1	72	5.569	.917	2.07	-.05
3	100	5.120	1.192	1.23	2.24*
4	79	5.032	1.588	1.45	2.17*

TEACHER 3

Choir Familiar (3)			
	N	MEAN	σ
3	100	5.690	1.161

Choirs Unfamiliar					
	N	MEAN	σ	F	t*
1	72	5.667	.979	1.41	.14
2	68	5.147	1.427	1.51	2.71*
4	80	4.912	1.361	1.38	4.13*

TEACHER 4

Choir Familiar (4)			
	N	MEAN	σ
4	80	5.925	1.134

Choirs Unfamiliar					
	N	MEAN	σ	F	t*
1	72	5.674	1.160	1.05	1.35*
2	68	4.618	1.246	1.21	6.68*
3	99	5.727	1.170	1.06	1.14

Note: (*) $p < .03$. A pooled estimate of variance was used in all cases. Degrees of freedom are the sum of the N's, minus 2.

Significant differences were found in eight of the twelve comparisons: Students familiar with a teacher were more confident in their judgments about the teacher's praise than were students unfamiliar with the teacher. The tenor-bass choirs emerged as the least secure in decisions made about unfamiliar teachers.

Identification of Agreement Between Teacher Intent and Interpretations of High and Low Achievers in Choirs Familiar and Unfamiliar With the Teacher

Student perceptions of ability in the choir did not emerge in previous analyses as an important factor in the students' labeling of praise as deserved or instructional. It also did not appear to influence student recognition of a teacher's intent in the use of praise. No clips were found in which agreement with the teacher was significantly different between students labeled as high or low achievers.

Consistency of Student Observers

The reliance on students as participant observers of teacher verbal praise within their choir class was an important factor in this investigation. The consistency of agreement among subjects familiar with a teacher and the teacher's stated intent in the use of praise was therefore important. This was computed by dividing total agreement within each choir by total agreement plus total disagreement, and is reported in Table 13 (Brophy & Good, 1962).

Table 13

Consistency of Agreement With Teacher's Stated Intent By Students Within EachChoir

	<u>r</u>
Choir 1 $\frac{39}{39+33}$	$r = .54$
Choir 2 $\frac{26}{26+42}$	$r = .38$
Choir 3 $\frac{71}{71+29}$	$r = .71$
Choir 4 $\frac{50}{50+30}$	$r = .625$

The range of coefficients suggests that choirs differed in their ability to judge the intent of praise. The consistency of agreement among students in Choir 3 was particularly high. Choir 2, in comparison with all other choirs, was the least able to agree on their teacher's purpose in praising. The selection of examples of praise for the stimulus tape may have had a bearing on this: A look at Table 1 in Chapter III shows that, as Teacher 3 classified randomly chosen segments of her praise, only deserved and encouragement praise was identified. Thus, Choir 3 saw only two types of their teacher's praise. This raises a question about whether or not the consistency of agreement in other choirs might have been higher if the

selection process had been designed to ensure that types of praise seen by students were proportional to a teacher's typical use of praise.

Commonalities of Language In Deserved and Instructional Praise

A transcription of the clips is found in Appendix D. Language used by teachers as deserved and instructional praise is shown in Tables 14 and 15. In the qualitative analysis, no commonalities were found across teachers in the language used in deserved and instructional praise. However, each type of praise had distinctive and important characteristics.

Deserved Praise

In the clips of deserved praise, teachers described performances as excellent, gorgeous, beautiful, and incredible. Although the wording was not the same, these clips were similar in that the delivery was intense and enthusiastic. There is a noticeable lack of specificity with the exception of clip 2 of Teacher 1. Here the teacher congratulated the students for “. . . getting all the way through that page!” However, references to musical elements of the performance were not found in clips intended by teachers to recognize good performances.

Table 14

Language Identified by Teachers as Deserved Praise

	Clip 2	Clip 4
Teacher 1	Yes,altos!	Way to go! You got all the way through that page. Give yourselves a pat on the back!
	Clip 1	Clip 4
Teacher 2	Excellent! Two for XXXX.	Way to go!
	Clip 2	Clip 3
Teacher 3	I like very much how you did that. You did that beautifully. I don't remember but one time, the first time we looked at this, to do that and you have got it. That's great.It gives me Goose bumps.	Ah! What an improvement. Give it to them (All applaud). You sounded like a high school choir. My goodness, do it again. I want to hear that again. It was gorgeous.
	Clip 1	Clip 2
Teacher 4	It's so gorgeous, guys!	By the way. That was incredible. Do that again.

Note: (XXXX) indicates a student name was used.

Table 15
Language Identified by Teachers as Instructional Praise

Encourage

Clip 1

Teacher 1 You did better.
 You didn't all
 stop and go,
 "Augh!" that time.
 That's progress.

Clip 3

Teacher 2 Excellent tenors! I
 heard some brave soul -
 XXXX, could it be you?

Clip 1

Teacher 3 That was a lot better.

Clip 4

That is a hard
 jump, but you
 are getting it
 well.

Clip 4

Teacher 4 You held your pitches
 very well, guys.

Cooperate

Clip 3

Teacher 1 Let's pat ourselves
 on the back for a
 good first page, and
 a good half of the
 second page.

Clip 2

Teacher 2 Excellent! It's
 amazing what you can do
 with a little confidence
 behind you.

Send a message**Clip 3**

Teacher 4 XXXX, good. Great,
 thank you. XXXX...
 I mean... XXXX, that
 is all I have thought
 about since yesterday.
 You might just as well
 stand down here (Teacher
 indicates where she stands
 behind the music stand).

Note: (XXXX) indicates a student name was used.

Instructional Praise

In contrast to deserved praise, instructional praise was more expansive and more specific as teachers appeared to make an effort to associate the praise with the object of the praise. For example, one teacher who intended to encourage her students said, "You held your pitches very well guys." Encouragement praise was characterized also by references to improvement; "You did better"; "That's a hard jump, but you are getting it well." However, one clip of deserved praise (Clip 3 of Teacher 3) also contained references to an improved performance. This may have confused students in Choir 2 who associated this comment with encouragement.

The wording in encouragement praise also appears to make clear that the praise refers to the students -- not to a musical performance; "You didn't all stop."; "...some brave soul."

Two teachers tended to use the same wording, even though they intended the praise to serve different purposes. However, even though the repetitive use of certain words was observed, both teachers elaborated on the reason for the praise. For example, Teacher 2 frequently used the word “Excellent” to denote a variety of purposes. But, after saying “Excellent” in a clip of praise seeking student cooperation, Teacher 2 proceeded to imply by her comment that the reason the performance was good was due to a higher level of confidence among the students; “...amazing what you can do with a little confidence behind you.” Similarly, Teacher 1 used, “Let’s pat ourselves on the back,” in a clip she designated as deserved praise and also in a clip of praise intended to gain student cooperation. However, there was one difference: In praise to get students to cooperate, Teacher 1 specified what they were praised for; “...a good half the first page, and a good half of the second page.”

Finally, the praise used by Teacher 4 to send a message, or to inform the group about a student’s behavior that the teacher regarded as good or correct, was particularly clear to all choirs. In this clip, the teacher asked a student what the choir should do to improve its performance. The teacher’s reaction made it clear that the student’s analysis of problem spots was so like the teacher’s that the student might very well take the teacher’s place. Students across choirs recognized that the teacher’s recognition of this student’s presentation was not

intended for the student, but was used by the teacher to send a message to other students.

A final observation is offered which illustrates how students dealt with the complexities of praise in different context, and indicates also how observant and attentive students in this study were to teacher praise. As data were entered after each choir completed the viewing of the stimulus tape, it became apparent that choirs, familiar and unfamiliar, confused praise used by teachers to seek student cooperation with praise intended to encourage students. The last choir to respond to the stimulus tape was interviewed in an effort to better understand how these two types of praise were understood by students.

This informal and unstructured interview was prefaced by a question about what difficulties, if any, students had in deciding why teachers had praised. The only problem the students mentioned was to separate praise intended to get students to cooperate from praise used by the teacher to provide encouragement. Students were asked to describe, or discuss, the two types of praise. The ensuing discussion made it clear that students separated praise to encourage from praise seeking student cooperation. As one student explained, praise to encourage was “. . . a kind thing the teacher is doing. In cooperate praise, the teacher means for you to do what she wants! Kindness has nothing to do with it, and sometimes it is said in a sarcastic way.” When the student was asked if he really meant to use the word “sarcastic”, he quickly replied, “I know sarcasm when I hear it!” Other

members of the choir laughed at his point, but when asked, students indicated they agreed with their classmate's description of the difference between the two types of praise.

In reviewing the responses of this choir, it was interesting to note that, of all choirs, this one came closest to recognizing an unfamiliar teacher's effort to use praise to gain student cooperation. In the clip, the teacher's praise ("Let's pat ourselves on the back . . .") is qualified by a reference to good work on one page and half of another page. It is not clear if students attended to the fact that the teacher qualified the praise, or if they reacted to the way it was said, but clearly students were discriminating observers.

Validity

Generally, validity is associated with the question, "Does the test measure what it claims?" In this investigation, the emphasis was not to determine if students would recognize a particular teacher behavior as praise, but rather, would familiarity with a teacher result in differences in the ability of students to recognize the purpose the teacher intended the praise to serve? All items in the stimulus tape were randomly drawn from among representative samples identified by each teacher as one of four types of praise. Thus, teachers not only verified that the clips contained praise, but that each clip contained a specific type of praise. Thus, the content validity of the measure was provided by the teachers who participated in the study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, and DISCUSSION

Summary

This study investigated student interpretations of teacher verbal praise in selected seventh and eighth grade choral classes. Student interpretations were examined to determine if familiarity with a teacher affected students' labeling of praise as (a) deserved, (b) to encourage, (c) to send a message to other students, or (d) to seek student cooperation. The influence of familiarity was investigated several ways. First, the responses of choirs unfamiliar with a teacher were examined to see if they differed from the familiar choir's labeling of the examples of praise. Next, data were analyzed to determine if the number of students in choirs familiar or unfamiliar with a teacher who detected the teacher's specific intent in praising were greater than would be expected by chance alone. Finally, student interpretations were examined to determine if interpretation of praise might be related to student perceptions of their ability in choir.

Videotapes of four choral teachers (3 in middle schools and 1 in a junior high) who volunteered for this project were systematically observed by the

researcher for the purpose of categorizing teacher positive verbal behavior as praise. Praise was defined as a positive teacher verbal response to a student performance or behavior. From the videotapes, randomly selected examples of researcher-defined praise were extracted and viewed by each teacher. Teachers categorized their praise in the examples according to the purpose the praise was intended to serve. That is, teachers identified the praise as deserved or one of the subcategories of instructional praise. The teacher identified examples provided the material for a stimulus tape.

Stratified random selection was used to secure equal numbers of examples of deserved and instructional praise. To equalize the exposure of students to information about a particular teacher and rehearsal setting, each videotaped example was reduced to a 30-second clip. The finished videotape consisted of 16 clips, four for each teacher. The clips were random ordered within each teacher.

Seventh and eighth grade choral students ($n = 80$), familiar or unfamiliar with each teacher, viewed the stimulus tape and categorized the praise as they interpreted its use within each specific context. Students responded to each clip as if the teacher were speaking to them and classified the behavior as deserved or as instructional. Instructional praise was subdivided as praise to encourage, to get student/s to cooperate, or as a way to send a message to other students.

The initial analyses of data were made without regard to how the teacher intended to use the praise. The interest was to determine if students unfamiliar

with a teacher and rehearsal would label the praise the same as students who knew the teacher. All praise followed student performances, but results suggested that students separated praise directed at the performance (deserved) from praise that served an instructional purpose. In five clips, students who knew the teacher labeled the praise as deserved, but students in one or more choirs unfamiliar with the teacher labeled the praise as instructional. In eight clips, the choirs were in agreement that the nature of the praise was instructional, but they did not agree on the specific instructional purpose: In four clips, students who knew the teacher identified the praise as an effort to provide encouragement, but students unfamiliar with the teacher thought the praise was used either to send a message or to get students to be more cooperative. Thus, the choirs did differ in their judgments of the praise, and those differences were significant in nine of the 16 clips.

Familiarity as a factor in interpreting teacher praise was further tested by determining if the number of students in each choir who interpreted the praise as the teacher intended was greater than would be expected to occur by chance alone. Results indicated students who knew the teachers were able to detect the specific purpose for the praise in 12 of 16 clips. In 13 of the 16 clips, a significant number of students in one or more of the choirs unfamiliar with the teacher also were able to discern the teacher's purpose for praising. However, significant differences were found in five clips. Familiarity with the teacher did not make as much difference as expected but, generally, students familiar with a teacher were more

confident in their decisions about their teacher's praise than students unfamiliar with the teacher.

With few exceptions, students in all choirs were sensitive to a teacher's praise that was not intended for the recipient but, rather, was used to call attention to a behavior the teacher wanted others to know about. Instructional praise intended by the teacher to gain the cooperation of students was misinterpreted by students across choirs.

The literature suggests that high and low achievers differ in their interpretations of praise. In this study, however, student perceptions of their ability in choir did not result in different responses to teacher praise. It may be that student self-determination of ability in music ensembles is not comparable to the traditional academic labeling of students as high and low achievers. It is possible, too, that students in choral classes are more similar than students in non-music classes. Volunteer participation might have affected the outcome, in that students who considered themselves to be strong choral students might have participated in greater numbers. The importance of this question suggests that more study is warranted.

Language in clips of deserved and instructional praise were not similar across teachers. However, the four types of praise were distinguishable by different characteristics. For example, the wording and delivery of deserved praise were intense and enthusiastic, but there was a noticeable absence of specificity, or

references to musical elements. Instructional praise, on the other hand, appeared more controlled and deliberate, as if teachers wanted to make clear the message was directed at a student need.

In summary, as students in selected seventh and eighth grade choral classes interpreted it, praise served different teacher purposes in music rehearsals. Students recognized that praise was not always directed at the performance but, rather, the performance provided the teacher with an opportunity to use praise for instructional purposes. Further, the results suggested that praise did not have uniform meaning to all students across all situations. Students in this investigation were discerning observers of teacher praise as deserved or instructional but choirs as a whole were not homogeneous in their ability to interpret teacher praise.

Conclusions

Familiarity In Interpretation of Teacher Praise

There is an assumption in the literature that familiarity with a context may result in understandings that are unavailable to outsiders (Collins & Green, 1990; Mishler, 1979). If so, interpretations of a teacher's praise by students within the choir would be expected to differ from interpretations of choirs unfamiliar with the teacher. Although not conclusive, this study's results seem to support that notion. Familiarity with a teacher made a difference in certain situations: Students familiar with a teacher agreed that the praise directed at their performance was deserved,

but students unfamiliar with the rehearsal context interpreted the praise as serving an instructional purpose. Where familiarity appeared to influence interpretations, students connected the praise to their performance, even though the teachers' language did not contain references to musical elements of the performance.

Although this investigation did not attempt to determine what students attend to in making their judgments, one explanation is offered which might account for the ability of students familiar with the teacher to detect deserved praise. The wording used by teachers suggested the performance pleased them. Students, knowing a teacher's expectations for 'good' performance, might reason that, if the performance met the teacher's standards, then the praise was deserved. If this reasoning is correct, it suggests that investigations concerned with praise as a reinforcer of musical performance should take into account the performance expectations of participants in choral ensembles.

Students unfamiliar with a teacher tended to label praise used by the teacher to recognize a good performance as praise to encourage. Students may have reasoned that the performance was not yet "good enough" and the teacher used praise as a way to encourage students to continue working. This suggested explanation should be verified by students and teachers.

Students as Observers

Reports from investigations of teacher praise in non-music classes suggest that students recognize praise is sometimes directed at the performance, but other

times it is directed at an instructional need (Morine-Dershimer, 1982; Brophy, 1981; Emmer, 1988). Consistent with these reports, seventh and eighth grade choral students in this study were able to discriminate between their teachers' deserved and instructional praise. Further, even exposed to only brief glimpses of an unfamiliar teacher and rehearsal, students dealt with the diversity of contexts and were remarkably able to recognize different purposes for praise.

Interpretations in each clip generally settled around praise as deserved or instructional, but decisions within choirs were not unanimous. What was understood as deserved praise by some students was interpreted by others as praise to encourage. Praise intended by teachers to get students to cooperate was interpreted by students as efforts to provide encouragement. The disparities of interpretations suggest that praise does not mean the same thing to all students. This is consistent with data from non-music sources (Babad, 1990a; Morine-Dershimer, 1982). Some students in the study by Morine-Dershimer (1982) interpreted the praise as deserved, but other students thought the praise was used to make students feel good.

The ability of choirs to interpret praise was not homogeneous. Although students were similar in age and in choral experience, one class (Choir 3) was particularly discerning in identifying their teacher's intent. Another choir not only had trouble interpreting the praise of unfamiliar teachers but, also, responses to its own teacher were not ordered in two clips. More study across a variety of choirs

is needed, but if choirs are not homogeneous in their response to praise, questions are raised about the results of investigations that focus on the commonality of teacher praise, and treat it as if it means the same thing across classrooms.

Discussion

The results from this study cannot be generalized beyond the four teachers and their students. However, observations of the same clips of teacher verbal praise by different, but similar choirs, did provide insight into how praise was understood by these choral students. Further, by focusing on teachers and their students, the design provided information about how participants within a choir make sense of praise in particular contextual situations.

Students are keen observers of the classroom. Although students in this study differed in their ability to interpret praise, data suggests students discriminated between teacher praise directed at a deserving performance and praise directed at an instructional need. To use students as observers of the music classroom, further study is needed on a broader scale, across a variety of classrooms. In addition, more work is needed to understand how students in music classes might label instructional praise. Labels used in this study were provided by students in non-music classes. Because the praise examples, with one exception, followed musical performances, it seems important to investigate how

music students might understand instructional praise in relation to performance expectations.

Within the limitations described, data suggest the importance of investigating praise in the choral rehearsal by determining how teachers intend it to function, and how their students interpret its use. Reliance on an observation instrument that treats praise as if it has uniform meaning is questioned in light of data to suggest that, as students interpret it, disparate meanings are possible.

APPENDIX A
OBSERVATION FORMS

CHORAL MUSIC TEACHER PRAISE

TEACHEREX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____EX _____
Praise _____ No praise _____

OBSERVER _____ DATE _____

TOTALS: NP _____ P _____

Reliability _____

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRES

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

You have been asked to participate because I am interested in the information you can provide. Your answers will be combined with answers from lots of other students.

This is not a test. There are no right answers; I just want to know how you feel about these things. No one at your school will know which answers are yours. Please answer each question sincerely and honestly.

1. Place an X in the space next to the statement that best completes this statement...

"If this teacher were speaking to you, how likely is it that this praise would have been given to you because...

2. Circle the number that indicates How likely it is, or how sure you are of your decision.

TEACHER:

EX 1

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SOMEWHAT				VERY		
LIKELY				LIKELY		

_____ 1. you deserved it because your performance or behavior was good.

_____ 2. the teacher wanted to encourage you.

_____ 3. the teacher liked what you did, but praised you because she wanted the other students to behave or perform the same way.

_____ 4. the teacher is trying to get you to be more cooperative, or to participate more.

EX 2

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SOMEWHAT				VERY		
LIKELY				LIKELY		

_____ 1. you deserved it because your performance or behavior was good.

_____ 2. the teacher wanted to encourage you.

_____ 3. the teacher liked what you did, but praised you because she wanted the other students to behave or perform the same way.

_____ 4. the teacher is trying to get you to be more cooperative, or to participate more.

SAMPLE

EX 3

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SOMEWHAT					VERY	
LIKELY					LIKELY	

_____1. you deserved it because
your performance or behavior
was good.

_____2. the teacher wanted to
encourage you.

_____3. the teacher liked what
you did, but praised you because
she wanted the other students
to behave or perform the same way.

_____4. the teacher is trying
to get you to be more
cooperative, or to
participate more.

EX 4

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SOMEWHAT					VERY	
LIKELY					LIKELY	

_____1. you deserved it because
your performance or behavior
was good.

_____2. the teacher wanted to
encourage you.

_____3. the teacher liked what
you did, but praised you because
she wanted the other students
to behave or perform the same way.

_____4. the teacher is trying
to get you to be more
cooperative, or to
participate more.

Some information about you.

1. How old are you? (Circle one)

12 13 14 15 16

2. What grade are you in? (Circle one)

7 8 9

3. Usually, what kinds of grades do you get on your report card? (Circle one)

Mostly A's	Mostly A's & B's	Mostly B's	Mostly B's & C's	Mostly C's
---------------	---------------------	---------------	---------------------	---------------

Mostly
C's & D's

4. As a student, how do you think you compare to others in this class? (Circle one)

Far above average	Above average	Average	Below average	Far below average
----------------------	------------------	---------	------------------	----------------------

5. How many years have you been in school choirs? Count this year as 1 year. (Circle one)

1 2 3 More than 3

6. How long have you been in this class (Circle one)

Since the first day of this school year.	Less than 6 weeks
---	-------------------

7. What is the name of your school? (Please print)

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

All teachers praise, or say positive things to their students. It appears that teachers use praise for different reasons in different teaching situations. Four purposes have been identified in non-music classes, but we know very little about how choral music teachers intend to use praise.

As you view these 16 randomly selected segments taken from your videotapes, please select the statement that you feel best identifies your intent in praising the student, or students, in each situation. Use the response scale below to indicate the intensity of your decision.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SOMEWHAT				VERY LIKELY		

EX.#

_____ 1. The student/s performance or behavior was good and deserved to be praised.

_____ 2. I wanted to provide encouragement to the student/s.

_____ 3. I liked what the student/s did, and I wanted the other students to know that this is what I consider a good performance or good behavior.

_____ 4. The praise in this situation is intended to get the student/s to cooperate, or to participate more in the class.

EX.#

_____ 1. The student/s performance or behavior was good and deserved to be praised.

_____ 2. I wanted to provide encouragement to the student/s.

_____ 3. I liked what the student/s did, and I wanted the other students to know that this is what I consider a good performance or good behavior.

_____ 4. The praise in this situation is intended to get the student/s to cooperate, or to participate more in the class.

EX.#

_____ 1. The student/s performance or behavior was good and deserved to be praised.

_____ 2. I wanted to provide encouragement to the student/s.

_____ 3. I liked what the student/s did, and I wanted the other students to know that this is what I consider a good performance or good behavior.

_____ 4. The praise in this situation is intended to get the student/s to cooperate, or to participate more in the class.

EX.#

_____ 1. The student/s performance or behavior was good and deserved to be praised.

_____ 2. I wanted to provide encouragement to the student/s.

_____ 3. I liked what the student/s did, and I wanted the other students to know that this is what I consider a good performance or good behavior.

_____ 4. The praise in this situation is intended to get the student/s to cooperate, or to participate more in the class.

II. Usually, how important is it to you to do each of the following. Use the rating scale below and place a number in the blank to indicate your response.

Not very important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very important

_____ A. Provide support to students by praising them when they try.

_____ B. Use praise as a way to encourage students to participate more.

_____ C. Praise students when the performance deserves it
or when they have a good/right idea.

D.Praise students for good behavior.

_____ E.Praise a poor performance if it is the best the student/s can do.

_____ F. Use praise of student good behavior as a way to let other students know what you expect from them.

_____ G.Praise a good performance so that other students
can learn from it.

Some information about you

1. Your name _____
Last First

2.Your school _____

3. How long have you taught choral music? (Circle one)

Less than 1 year	1-2 years	3 -7 years	8 + years
---------------------	--------------	---------------	--------------

4. How long have you taught middle school/ junior high choral music?

Less than 1 year	1-2 years	3 -7 years	8 + years
---------------------	--------------	---------------	--------------

5. How long have you taught this choir class?
From _____ to _____.
Date term Today's date
began

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO TEACHERS

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

LETTER TO PARENTS

STUDENT ASSENT FORM

LETTER TO TEACHERS

Dear XXXX,

Your help is needed in a music education research project that will be conducted in your district. The purpose of the study is to investigate the responses of middle school and junior high school choir students to the praise of familiar and unfamiliar teachers. Attached to this letter is a consent form on which an outline of the procedure is provided.

As you can see, the project involves a limited amount of class interruption. Participants in the project are asked to (1) agree to be videotaped two times as they conduct their choir during its regularly scheduled class time, and at a later time, (2) to set aside one class hour so that data can be collected from the students in that choir. The videotaping is expected to take place in September or early October, and the collection of student data is expected to occur in January or February. You are asked also to complete a brief (5-minute) questionnaire that ask for your views about praise in choral rehearsals.

Students will be asked to volunteer. Those who agree will participate by (1) viewing a videotape that will consist of brief clips randomly selected from the videotapes of their teacher and those of three unfamiliar teachers, and (2) completing a questionnaire as they view the tape. Students will see a total of two minutes of each teacher.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board, and the appropriate administrative officials in your district. Teachers, students, and schools will not be identified in the videotape or in any report of this study. When the project is completed, you will have an opportunity to decide what is to be done with the tapes of your teaching.

If you are interested in participating, please complete the enclosed consent form and return it to me in the envelope provided. If you need more information, please call. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Ouida Taylor
XXX/XXX-XXXX

USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
TEACHER INFORMED CONSENT

NAME : _____

1. I hereby agree and give consent to participate in the music education research project that requires

a. the taping of a total of two rehearsals.

b. the setting aside of one class hour during which students will complete a questionnaire as they view a videotape consisting of brief clips of teachers rehearsing middle school choirs.

c. the completion of a brief (5-minute) questionnaire.

I understand that the videotapes of my teaching will be held in the possession of the researcher until the end of this investigation. At that time, I will have an opportunity to indicate if I would like the tapes destroyed, or to sign a written statement that the researcher may use the tapes provided I am informed of their specific use.

I have seen an explanation and understand the nature of this project. I understand the benefits to be expected. I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. With my understanding of this, having received this information and satisfactory answers to the questions I have asked, I voluntarily consent to participate in this project.

DATE

SIGNATURE

LETTER TO PARENTS OF STUDENTS

Dear Parents,

A music education research project is to be conducted at XXXXX. The project is designed to study how 7th and 8th grade choir students respond to teacher praise.

During their regularly scheduled choir time, students will view a brief videotape that consists of examples obtained from lessons taught by their teacher and other teachers that the students do not know. Students will complete a questionnaire as they view the tape. The questionnaire does not ask the students to compare the teachers, or to make decisions about the teachers' effectiveness. The goals of the study are simply to determine how student responses to praise by their teacher differ from their responses to an unfamiliar teacher.

According to guidelines under which all research is conducted, parents must give their consent for the students to participate. The students must also assent, which means that they acknowledge that their participation is voluntary, and that they have heard an explanation of the project.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board, and the appropriate administrative officials in your district. Information provided by students will be treated confidentially. Student identity is not determined so it will be impossible to know how any student answers. The teacher's identity and the school name will not be used in any final reports of this study. Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate will in no way affect your child's standing in his/her class.

Should you have any questions or desire further information, please call me at XXX-XXXX. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ouida Taylor

Please indicate your willingness to have your child participate in this project by completing one of the statements below and returning this letter to your child's choir teacher as quickly as possible.

I do grant permission for my child, _____
to participate in this project.

I do not grant permission for my child, _____
to participate in this study.

Parent/Guardian's signature _____

STUDENT ASSENT FORM

My participation in this project has been explained, and I have had an opportunity to ask questions. I understand that answers I provide will not be shared with anyone at my school. I have been informed that my participation does not affect my grade in this class in anyway. I also understand that my participation is voluntary.

I, _____, agree to participate in this study that will take place during my regularly scheduled choir time by...

1) viewing a videotape that contains brief scenes of choral teachers as they teach choirs.

2) completing a questionnaire that ask only for my impressions.

DATE

SIGNATURE

APPENDIX D
DATA
DATA ANALYSES
TRANSCRIPTION

SPSS/PC+ The Statistical Package for IBM PC

ACHIEVE: 1 = High Achiever; 2 = Low Achiever

GRADE: 1 = 7TH Grade; 2 = 8TH Grade

EXPERIENCE: 1 = 1 Year; 2 = 2 Years; 3 = 3 Years; 4 = More than 3 years

EXAMPLE: 1 = 1st clip; 2 = 2nd clip; 3= 3rd clip; 4= 4th clip

INTENT (Teacher's Intent): 1 = Deserved; 2= Encourage; 3= Send a message; 4= Cooperate

STINTERP (Student interpretation): 1=Deserved; 2=Encourage; 3= Send a message; 4= Cooperate

STPRVAL (Value assigned by student to indicate how sure of decision)

STUDENT SCHOOL ACHIEVE GRADE EXPERNCE TEACHER EXAMPLE INTENT STINTERP STPRVAL

101	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	5.0
101	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	2	5.0
101	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	1	5.0
101	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	6.0
101	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	2	6.0
101	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	5.0
101	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	5.0
101	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	2	5.0
101	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	5.0
101	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
101	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	6.0
101	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
101	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
101	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	6.0
101	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
101	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	1	6.0
102	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	6.0
102	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	1	3	4	1	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	1	4	1	2	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	6.0
102	1	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	5.0
102	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	2	4	1	2	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	6.0
102	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	6.0
102	1	2	2	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	3	4	2	4	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	4	1	1	1	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	7.0
102	1	2	2	2	4	3	3	3	6.0
102	1	2	2	2	4	4	2	1	7.0
103	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	1	6.0
103	1	2	2	4	1	2	1	2	6.0
103	1	2	2	4	1	3	4	2	5.0
103	1	2	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
103	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	1	5.0
103	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	1	5.0
103	1	2	2	4	2	3	2	3	6.0
103	1	2	2	4	2	4	1	1	5.0

103	1	2	2	4	3	1	2	2	6.0
103	1	2	2	4	3	2	1	2	4.0
103	1	2	2	4	3	3	1	1	7.0
103	1	2	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
103	1	2	2	4	4	1	1	1	5.0
103	1	2	2	4	4	2	1	2	5.0
103	1	2	2	4	4	3	3	1	4.0
103	1	2	2	4	4	4	2	2	6.0
104	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	6.0
104	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	5.0
104	1	1	2	2	1	3	4	2	5.0
104	1	1	2	2	1	4	1	1	6.0
104	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	6.0
104	1	1	2	2	2	2	4	1	6.0
104	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	6.0
104	1	1	2	2	2	4	1	1	5.0
104	1	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
104	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	1	4.0
104	1	1	2	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
104	1	1	2	2	3	4	2	3	5.0
104	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	1	6.0
104	1	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	6.0
104	1	1	2	2	4	3	3	1	4.0
104	1	1	2	2	4	4	2	2	5.0
105	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
105	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	7.0
105	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	2	4.0
105	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	3.0
105	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	1	7.0
105	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	5.0
105	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	5.0
105	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
105	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	3	6.0
105	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	2	6.0
105	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	2	6.0
105	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	4	4.0
105	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	2	5.0
105	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	2	6.0
105	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	4	4.0
105	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	1	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	7.0
106	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	2	4.0
106	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	2	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	1	5.0
106	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	3	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	5.0
106	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	5.0
106	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	2	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0

106	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	2	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	7.0
106	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
106	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	1	5.0
107	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	7.0
107	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	1	7.0
107	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
107	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	4	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	5.0
107	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	7.0
107	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
107	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	1	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	7.0
108	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	1	7.0
108	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	2	5.0
108	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	7.0
108	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	3.0
108	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	5.0
108	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	5.0
108	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
108	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	2	5.0
109	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
109	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	5.0
109	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	1	7.0
109	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
109	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	2	4.0
109	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	5.0
109	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	5.0
109	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
109	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	5.0
109	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	2	6.0
109	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	2	5.0
109	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	7.0
109	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
109	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	6.0
109	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	4.0
109	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	2	5.0

110	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	1	5.0
110	1	2	2	4	1	2	1	2	4.0
110	1	2	2	4	1	3	4	1	4.0
110	1	2	2	4	1	4	1	1	6.0
110	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	2	5.0
110	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	2	4.0
110	1	2	2	4	2	3	2	3	3.0
110	1	2	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
110	1	2	2	4	3	1	2	2	4.0
110	1	2	2	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
110	1	2	2	4	3	3	1	3	7.0
110	1	2	2	4	3	4	2	2	5.0
110	1	2	2	4	4	1	1	1	7.0
110	1	2	2	4	4	2	1	1	7.0
110	1	2	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
110	1	2	2	4	4	4	2	2	6.0
111	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	4.0
111	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	6.0
111	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	2	3.0
111	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	2	4.0
111	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	2	6.0
111	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	6.0
111	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	4.0
111	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
111	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	1	3.0
111	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	5.0
111	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	6.0
111	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
111	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	7.0
111	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	7.0
111	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	4.0
111	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	1	1.0
112	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
112	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	6.0
112	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	2	5.0
112	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
112	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	3	5.0
112	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	6.0
112	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	7.0
112	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	5.0
112	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	4	5.0
112	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
112	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	5.0
112	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	7.0
112	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	2	5.0
112	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
112	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	2	6.0
113	1	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	5.0
113	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	5.0
113	1	1	2	3	1	3	4	2	6.0
113	1	1	2	3	1	4	1	2	6.0

113	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	3	4.0
113	1	1	2	3	2	2	4	2	6.0
113	1	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	6.0
113	1	1	2	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
113	1	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	6.0
113	1	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	4.0
113	1	1	2	3	3	3	1	2	6.0
113	1	1	2	3	3	4	2	2	7.0
113	1	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	5.0
113	1	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	5.0
113	1	1	2	3	4	3	3	4	6.0
113	1	1	2	3	4	4	2	1	3.0
114	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	2	6.0
114	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	2	6.0
114	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	4	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	6.0
114	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	2	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	4	6.0
114	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	7.0
114	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	4	6.0
114	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	4	6.0
114	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	2	5.0
115	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	5.0
115	1	2	2	4	1	2	1	3	4.0
115	1	2	2	4	1	3	4	2	5.0
115	1	2	2	4	1	4	1	1	6.0
115	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	2	4.0
115	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	1	4.0
115	1	2	2	4	2	3	2	3	5.0
115	1	2	2	4	2	4	1	1	5.0
115	1	2	2	4	3	1	2	2	5.0
115	1	2	2	4	3	2	1	1	5.0
115	1	2	2	4	3	3	1	1	6.0
115	1	2	2	4	3	4	2	2	5.0
115	1	2	2	4	4	1	1	2	4.0
115	1	2	2	4	4	2	1	2	5.5
115	1	2	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
115	1	2	2	4	4	4	2	2	5.0
116	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
116	1	2	2	4	1	2	1	3	4.0
116	1	2	2	4	1	3	4	3	7.0
116	1	2	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
116	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	2	7.0
116	1	2	2	4	2	2	4	1	7.0
116	1	2	2	4	2	3	2	3	7.0
116	1	2	2	4	2	4	1	1	4.0

116	1	2	2	4	3	1	2	2	7.0
116	1	2	2	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
116	1	2	2	4	3	3	1	1	6.0
116	1	2	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
116	1	2	2	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
116	1	2	2	4	4	2	1	2	7.0
116	1	2	2	4	4	3	3	3	7.0
116	1	2	2	4	4	4	2	2	7.0
117	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
117	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	5.0
117	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	4	4.0
117	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	6.0
117	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	3	5.0
117	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	7.0
117	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	6.0
117	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
117	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	4	4.0
117	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
117	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	7.0
117	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	4.0
117	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
117	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	7.0
117	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
117	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	1	2.0
118	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	1	5.0
118	1	1	2	4	1	2	1	2	4.0
118	1	1	2	4	1	3	4	4	5.0
118	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	6.0
118	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	2	5.0
118	1	1	2	4	2	2	4	4	5.0
118	1	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	6.0
118	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
118	1	1	2	4	3	1	2	4	5.0
118	1	1	2	4	3	2	1	2	6.0
118	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	4.0
118	1	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
118	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	5.0
118	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	2	6.0
118	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	4	6.0
118	1	1	2	4	4	4	2	2	6.0
201	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	4.0
201	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	5.0
201	2	1	1	3	1	3	4	1	4.0
201	2	1	1	3	1	4	1	3	6.0
201	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	7.0
201	2	1	1	3	2	2	4	1	7.0
201	2	1	1	3	2	3	2	3	7.0
201	2	1	1	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
201	2	1	1	3	3	1	2	2	6.0
201	2	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	6.0
201	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	4.0
201	2	1	1	3	3	4	2	2	5.0

201	2	1	1	3	4	1	1	2	6.0
201	2	1	1	3	4	2	1	3	5.0
201	2	1	1	3	4	3	3	1	6.0
201	2	1	1	3	4	4	2	2	4.0
202	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	4	3.0
202	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	4.0
202	2	2	1	1	1	3	4	1	6.0
202	2	2	1	1	1	4	1	2	6.0
202	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	6.0
202	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	2	5.0
202	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	3.0
202	2	2	1	1	2	4	1	1	5.0
202	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	4	3.0
202	2	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	4.0
202	2	2	1	1	3	3	1	2	3.0
202	2	2	1	1	3	4	2	4	2.0
202	2	2	1	1	4	1	1	4	2.0
202	2	2	1	1	4	2	1	2	4.0
202	2	2	1	1	4	3	3	3	5.0
202	2	2	1	1	4	4	2	1	6.0
203	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	6.0
203	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	5.0
203	2	2	1	2	1	3	4	1	2.0
203	2	2	1	2	1	4	1	2	6.0
203	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	7.0
203	2	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	5.0
203	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	7.0
203	2	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	6.0
203	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	2.0
203	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	6.0
203	2	2	1	2	3	3	1	2	6.0
203	2	2	1	2	3	4	2	2	1.0
203	2	2	1	2	4	1	1	1	4.0
203	2	2	1	2	4	2	1	2	4.0
203	2	2	1	2	4	3	3	3	3.0
203	2	2	1	2	4	4	2	1	6.0
204	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	4.0
204	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	4.0
204	2	2	1	2	1	3	4	1	5.0
204	2	2	1	2	1	4	1	4	6.0
204	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	5.0
204	2	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	6.0
204	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	5.0
204	2	2	1	2	2	4	1	4	4.0
204	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	6.0
204	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	2	6.0
204	2	2	1	2	3	3	1	2	5.0
204	2	2	1	2	3	4	2	1	6.0
204	2	2	1	2	4	1	1	2	5.0
204	2	2	1	2	4	2	1	1	2.0
204	2	2	1	2	4	3	3	3	5.0
204	2	2	1	2	4	4	2	2	5.0

205	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	6.0
205	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	6.0
205	2	2	2	2	1	3	4	2	3.0
205	2	2	2	2	1	4	1	2	7.0
205	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	5.0
205	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	6.0
205	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2.0
205	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	2	4.0
205	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	4.0
205	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	4.0
205	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	4.0
205	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	4	4.0
205	2	2	2	2	4	1	1	2	5.0
205	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	3	2.0
205	2	2	2	2	4	3	3	3	5.0
205	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	4.0
206	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	5.0
206	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	5.0
206	2	1	1	2	1	3	4	2	6.0
206	2	1	1	2	1	4	1	3	4.0
206	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	7.0
206	2	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	4.0
206	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	7.0
206	2	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	4.0
206	2	1	1	2	3	1	2	4	5.0
206	2	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	3.0
206	2	1	1	2	3	3	1	4	7.0
206	2	1	1	2	3	4	2	3	4.0
206	2	1	1	2	4	1	1	4	4.0
206	2	1	1	2	4	2	1	2	3.0
206	2	1	1	2	4	3	3	3	6.0
206	2	1	1	2	4	4	2	2	4.0
207	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	7.0
207	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	4.0
207	2	2	1	1	1	3	4	4	3.0
207	2	2	1	1	1	4	1	2	7.0
207	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	7.0
207	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	1	1.0
207	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	2	7.0
207	2	2	1	1	2	4	1	4	3.0
207	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	4	7.0
207	2	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	6.0
207	2	2	1	1	3	3	1	1	4.0
207	2	2	1	1	3	4	2	2	7.0
207	2	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	4.0
207	2	2	1	1	4	2	1	1	2.0
207	2	2	1	1	4	3	3	3	6.0
207	2	2	1	1	4	4	2	2	5.0
208	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	4	6.0
208	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	1	3	4	4	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	1	4	1	4	7.0

208	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	4	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	2	2	4	2	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	2	3	2	3	6.0
208	2	1	1	3	2	4	1	2	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	3	1	2	2	5.0
208	2	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	4	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	3	4	2	2	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	4	1	1	3	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	4	2	1	3	5.0
208	2	1	1	3	4	3	3	3	7.0
208	2	1	1	3	4	4	2	3	6.0
209	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	4.0
209	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	5.0
209	2	1	1	2	1	3	4	4	5.0
209	2	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	6.0
209	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	3	6.0
209	2	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	6.0
209	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	5.0
209	2	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	6.0
209	2	1	1	2	3	1	2	2	6.0
209	2	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	4.0
209	2	1	1	2	3	3	1	2	5.0
209	2	1	1	2	3	4	2	3	4.0
209	2	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	6.0
209	2	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	4.0
209	2	1	1	2	4	3	3	3	6.0
209	2	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	6.0
210	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	5.0
210	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	5.0
210	2	2	1	2	1	3	4	4	3.0
210	2	2	1	2	1	4	1	1	5.0
210	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	5.0
210	2	2	1	2	2	2	4	1	5.0
210	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	5.0
210	2	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	6.0
210	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	5.0
210	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	6.0
210	2	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	6.0
210	2	2	1	2	3	4	2	1	5.0
210	2	2	1	2	4	1	1	1	4.0
210	2	2	1	2	4	2	1	2	4.0
210	2	2	1	2	4	3	3	2	4.0
210	2	2	1	2	4	4	2	1	5.0
211	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	2	5.0
211	2	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	6.0
211	2	1	1	4	1	3	4	2	4.0
211	2	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	6.0
211	2	1	1	4	2	1	1	3	5.0
211	2	1	1	4	2	2	4	2	6.0
211	2	1	1	4	2	3	2	2	6.0
211	2	1	1	4	2	4	1	1	5.0

211	2	1	1	4	3	1	2	2	6.0
211	2	1	1	4	3	2	1	2	4.0
211	2	1	1	4	3	3	1	1	5.0
211	2	1	1	4	3	4	2	2	7.0
211	2	1	1	4	4	1	1	2	5.0
211	2	1	1	4	4	2	1	2	6.0
211	2	1	1	4	4	3	3	1	5.0
211	2	1	1	4	4	4	2	1	6.0
212	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	2	5.0
212	2	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	5.0
212	2	1	1	4	1	3	4	2	4.0
212	2	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	4.0
212	2	1	1	4	2	1	1	3	7.0
212	2	1	1	4	2	2	4	2	6.0
212	2	1	1	4	2	3	2	3	6.0
212	2	1	1	4	2	4	1	1	5.0
212	2	1	1	4	3	1	2	2	5.0
212	2	1	1	4	3	2	1	2	5.0
212	2	1	1	4	3	3	1	2	5.0
212	2	1	1	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
212	2	1	1	4	4	1	1	2	6.0
212	2	1	1	4	4	2	1	2	6.0
212	2	1	1	4	4	3	3	3	4.0
212	2	1	1	4	4	4	2	2	5.0
213	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	5.0
213	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	5.0
213	2	1	1	3	1	3	4	2	2.0
213	2	1	1	3	1	4	1	1	4.0
213	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	6.0
213	2	1	1	3	2	2	4	2	3.0
213	2	1	1	3	2	3	2	3	5.0
213	2	1	1	3	2	4	1	1	7.0
213	2	1	1	3	3	1	2	2	2.0
213	2	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	6.0
213	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	7.0
213	2	1	1	3	3	4	2	4	6.0
213	2	1	1	3	4	1	1	2	4.0
213	2	1	1	3	4	2	1	1	3.0
213	2	1	1	3	4	3	3	3	5.0
213	2	1	1	3	4	4	2	1	6.0
214	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	6.0
214	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	5.0
214	2	2	1	2	1	3	4	2	5.0
214	2	2	1	2	1	4	1	1	6.0
214	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	7.0
214	2	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	7.0
214	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	7.0
214	2	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	6.0
214	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
214	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	7.0
214	2	2	1	2	3	3	1	2	5.0
214	2	2	1	2	3	4	2	4	3.0

214	2	2	1	2	4	1	1	2	5.0
214	2	2	1	2	4	2	1	1	4.0
214	2	2	1	2	4	3	3	3	3.0
214	2	2	1	2	4	4	2	3	4.0
215	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	1	6.0
215	2	1	1	4	1	2	1	2	6.0
215	2	1	1	4	1	3	4	2	5.0
215	2	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
215	2	1	1	4	2	1	1	3	6.0
215	2	1	1	4	2	2	4	1	5.0
215	2	1	1	4	2	3	2	2	6.0
215	2	1	1	4	2	4	1	1	7.0
215	2	1	1	4	3	1	2	2	6.0
215	2	1	1	4	3	2	1	1	7.0
215	2	1	1	4	3	3	1	3	7.0
215	2	1	1	4	3	4	2	4	6.0
215	2	1	1	4	4	1	1	3	5.0
215	2	1	1	4	4	2	1	2	4.0
215	2	1	1	4	4	3	3	3	5.0
215	2	1	1	4	4	4	2	1	6.0
216	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	4	5.0
216	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	7.0
216	2	2	1	1	1	3	4	1	5.0
216	2	2	1	1	1	4	1	1	7.0
216	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	5.0
216	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	1	6.0
216	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	5.0
216	2	2	1	1	2	4	1	1	7.0
216	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	4.0
216	2	2	1	1	3	2	1	2	6.0
216	2	2	1	1	3	3	1	3	5.0
216	2	2	1	1	3	4	2	2	7.0
216	2	2	1	1	4	1	1	2	5.0
216	2	2	1	1	4	2	1	1	4.0
216	2	2	1	1	4	3	3	4	3.0
216	2	2	1	1	4	4	2	3	2.0
217	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	5.0
217	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	4.0
217	2	1	1	3	1	3	4	3	4.0
217	2	1	1	3	1	4	1	1	6.0
217	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	3	5.0
217	2	1	1	3	2	2	4	2	4.0
217	2	1	1	3	2	3	2	3	4.0
217	2	1	1	3	2	4	1	1	5.0
217	2	1	1	3	3	1	2	2	5.0
217	2	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	5.0
217	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	2	5.0
217	2	1	1	3	3	4	2	4	6.0
217	2	1	1	3	4	1	1	3	3.0
217	2	1	1	3	4	2	1	2	4.0
217	2	1	1	3	4	3	3	4	4.0
217	2	1	1	3	4	4	2	1	6.0

301	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	5.0
301	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	5.0
301	3	2	1	1	1	3	4	2	5.0
301	3	2	1	1	1	4	1	1	6.0
301	3	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	5.0
301	3	2	1	1	2	2	4	2	4.0
301	3	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	4.0
301	3	2	1	1	2	4	1	1	6.0
301	3	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	5.0
301	3	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	6.0
301	3	2	1	1	3	3	1	1	7.0
301	3	2	1	1	3	4	2	2	5.0
301	3	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	7.0
301	3	2	1	1	4	2	1	1	7.0
301	3	2	1	1	4	3	3	3	4.5
301	3	2	1	1	4	4	2	1	5.5
302	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	4.0
302	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	4.0
302	3	2	1	2	1	3	4	2	4.0
302	3	2	1	2	1	4	1	2	3.0
302	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	4.0
302	3	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	5.0
302	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	.0
302	3	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	6.0
302	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
302	3	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	6.0
302	3	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
302	3	2	1	2	3	4	2	2	4.0
302	3	2	1	2	4	1	1	2	7.0
302	3	2	1	2	4	2	1	2	7.0
302	3	2	1	2	4	3	3	3	7.0
302	3	2	1	2	4	4	2	1	7.0
303	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	6.0
303	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	6.0
303	3	2	1	2	1	3	4	2	4.0
303	3	2	1	2	1	4	1	1	6.0
303	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	4.0
303	3	2	1	2	2	2	4	1	7.0
303	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	7.0
303	3	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	5.0
303	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
303	3	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	7.0
303	3	2	1	2	3	3	1	2	5.0
303	3	2	1	2	3	4	2	2	5.0
303	3	2	1	2	4	1	1	2	7.0
303	3	2	1	2	4	2	1	1	6.0
303	3	2	1	2	4	3	3	3	5.0
303	3	2	1	2	4	4	2	1	4.0
304	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	6.0
304	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	6.0
304	3	2	1	2	1	3	4	2	4.0
304	3	2	1	2	1	4	1	2	5.0

304	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	4.0
304	3	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	5.0
304	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	7.0
304	3	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	6.0
304	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
304	3	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	5.0
304	3	2	1	2	3	3	1	2	5.0
304	3	2	1	2	3	4	2	2	6.0
304	3	2	1	2	4	1	1	2	7.0
304	3	2	1	2	4	2	1	1	6.0
304	3	2	1	2	4	3	3	3	5.0
304	3	2	1	2	4	4	2	1	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	1	3	4	2	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	6.0
305	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	6.0
305	3	1	1	2	2	2	4	1	6.0
305	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	6.0
305	3	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
305	3	1	1	2	3	4	2	2	6.0
305	3	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	4	2	1	2	5.0
305	3	1	1	2	4	3	3	1	6.0
305	3	1	1	2	4	4	2	2	5.0
306	3	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
306	3	1	2	4	1	2	1	2	6.0
306	3	1	2	4	1	3	4	4	3.0
306	3	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
306	3	1	2	4	2	1	1	3	4.0
306	3	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	4.0
306	3	1	2	4	2	3	2	3	7.0
306	3	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
306	3	1	2	4	3	1	2	1	5.0
306	3	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	7.0
306	3	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	7.0
306	3	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
306	3	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	5.0
306	3	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	6.0
306	3	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
306	3	1	2	4	4	4	2	1	5.0
307	3	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	5.0
307	3	1	2	4	1	2	1	2	6.0
307	3	1	2	4	1	3	4	4	4.0
307	3	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
307	3	1	2	4	2	1	1	3	3.0
307	3	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	5.0
307	3	1	2	4	2	3	2	4	6.0
307	3	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	3.0

307	3	1	2	4	3	1	2	1	5.0
307	3	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
307	3	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	7.0
307	3	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
307	3	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
307	3	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	4.0
307	3	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	7.0
307	3	1	2	4	4	4	2	2	5.0
308	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	3	5.0
308	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	4.0
308	3	2	1	2	1	3	4	2	5.0
308	3	2	1	2	1	4	1	4	3.0
308	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	4.0
308	3	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	5.0
308	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	4.0
308	3	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	6.0
308	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2.0
308	3	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	3.0
308	3	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
308	3	2	1	2	3	4	2	4	1.0
308	3	2	1	2	4	1	1	1	7.0
308	3	2	1	2	4	2	1	1	7.0
308	3	2	1	2	4	3	3	1	7.0
308	3	2	1	2	4	4	2	1	7.0
309	3	1	1	4	1	1	2	2	7.0
309	3	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	5.0
309	3	1	1	4	1	3	4	2	5.0
309	3	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
309	3	1	1	4	2	1	1	1	5.0
309	3	1	1	4	2	2	4	4	4.0
309	3	1	1	4	2	3	2	2	6.0
309	3	1	1	4	2	4	1	3	6.0
309	3	1	1	4	3	1	2	4	5.0
309	3	1	1	4	3	2	1	1	6.0
309	3	1	1	4	3	3	1	1	7.0
309	3	1	1	4	3	4	2	2	5.0
309	3	1	1	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
309	3	1	1	4	4	2	1	2	5.0
309	3	1	1	4	4	3	3	1	6.0
309	3	1	1	4	4	4	2	3	6.0
310	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	7.0
310	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	7.0
310	3	2	2	2	1	3	4	2	5.0
310	3	2	2	2	1	4	1	1	7.0
310	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	5.0
310	3	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	6.0
310	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	4.0
310	3	2	2	2	2	4	1	1	5.0
310	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	4	6.0
310	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	6.0
310	3	2	2	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
310	3	2	2	2	3	4	2	2	4.0

310	3	2	2	2	4	1	1	1	6.0
310	3	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	7.0
310	3	2	2	2	4	3	3	3	7.0
310	3	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	5.0
311	3	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	7.0
311	3	1	2	3	1	2	1	4	5.0
311	3	1	2	3	1	3	4	2	7.0
311	3	1	2	3	1	4	1	2	7.0
311	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	6.0
311	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	2	7.0
311	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	5.0
311	3	1	2	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
311	3	1	2	3	3	1	2	4	6.0
311	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	6.0
311	3	1	2	3	3	3	1	1	7.0
311	3	1	2	3	3	4	2	4	6.0
311	3	1	2	3	4	1	1	3	5.0
311	3	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	6.0
311	3	1	2	3	4	3	3	4	5.0
311	3	1	2	3	4	4	2	2	6.0
312	3	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	1	3	4	2	6.0
312	3	1	2	3	1	4	1	2	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	1	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	2	4	1	1	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	6.0
312	3	1	2	3	3	3	1	1	7.0
312	3	1	2	3	3	4	2	2	6.0
312	3	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	6.0
312	3	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	6.0
312	3	1	2	3	4	3	3	3	5.0
312	3	1	2	3	4	4	2	1	5.0
313	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2.0
313	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	5.0
313	3	1	1	2	1	3	4	2	2.0
313	3	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	5.0
313	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	4.0
313	3	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	5.0
313	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	6.0
313	3	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	5.0
313	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	2	6.0
313	3	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	6.0
313	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	5.0
313	3	1	1	2	3	4	2	2	4.0
313	3	1	1	2	4	1	1	1	6.0
313	3	1	1	2	4	2	1	2	4.0
313	3	1	1	2	4	3	3	3	3.0
313	3	1	1	2	4	4	2	2	1.0

314	3	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	6.0
314	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	5.0
314	3	2	2	1	1	3	4	1	4.0
314	3	2	2	1	1	4	1	1	5.0
314	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	6.0
314	3	2	2	1	2	2	4	1	5.0
314	3	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	5.0
314	3	2	2	1	2	4	1	1	6.0
314	3	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	7.0
314	3	2	2	1	3	2	1	1	7.0
314	3	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	7.0
314	3	2	2	1	3	4	2	2	7.0
314	3	2	2	1	4	1	1	2	6.0
314	3	2	2	1	4	2	1	1	6.0
314	3	2	2	1	4	3	3	1	6.0
314	3	2	2	1	4	4	2	1	6.0
315	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	7.0
315	3	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	6.0
315	3	2	2	3	1	3	4	2	7.0
315	3	2	2	3	1	4	1	2	7.0
315	3	2	2	3	2	1	1	2	5.0
315	3	2	2	3	2	2	4	1	4.0
315	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	5.0
315	3	2	2	3	2	4	1	1	4.0
315	3	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	4.0
315	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	7.0
315	3	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	6.0
315	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	3	6.0
315	3	2	2	3	4	1	1	1	7.0
315	3	2	2	3	4	2	1	1	6.0
315	3	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	7.0
315	3	2	2	3	4	4	2	2	6.0
316	3	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	1	3	4	2	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	1	4	1	1	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	2	1	1	3	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	2	2	4	2	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	2	3	2	3	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	2	4	1	1	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	3	1	2	4	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	3	2	1	2	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	3	4	2	2	5.0
316	3	1	1	3	4	1	1	2	6.0
316	3	1	1	3	4	2	1	1	4.0
316	3	1	1	3	4	3	3	4	4.0
316	3	1	1	3	4	4	2	2	5.0
317	3	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	6.0
317	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	5.0
317	3	1	1	3	1	3	4	1	5.0
317	3	1	1	3	1	4	1	2	5.0

317	3	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	6.0
317	3	1	1	3	2	2	4	2	6.0
317	3	1	1	3	2	3	2	1	5.0
317	3	1	1	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
317	3	1	1	3	3	1	2	1	7.0
317	3	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	7.0
317	3	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	5.0
317	3	1	1	3	3	4	2	2	7.0
317	3	1	1	3	4	1	1	2	6.0
317	3	1	1	3	4	2	1	1	7.0
317	3	1	1	3	4	3	3	1	7.0
317	3	1	1	3	4	4	2	1	6.0
319	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	6.0
319	3	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	6.0
319	3	1	2	2	1	3	4	1	5.0
319	3	1	2	2	1	4	1	2	5.0
319	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	5.0
319	3	1	2	2	2	2	4	4	4.0
319	3	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	6.0
319	3	1	2	2	2	4	1	2	6.0
319	3	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
319	3	1	2	2	3	2	1	1	6.0
319	3	1	2	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
319	3	1	2	2	3	4	2	4	4.0
319	3	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	7.0
319	3	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	.
319	3	1	2	2	4	3	3	3	6.0
319	3	1	2	2	4	4	2	1	5.0
320	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	7.0
320	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	3.0
320	3	1	1	2	1	3	4	4	5.0
320	3	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	6.0
320	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	5.0
320	3	1	1	2	2	2	4	1	5.0
320	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	6.0
320	3	1	1	2	2	4	1	2	4.0
320	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	4	4.0
320	3	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	5.0
320	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	6.0
320	3	1	1	2	3	4	2	2	7.0
320	3	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	3.0
320	3	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	5.0
320	3	1	1	2	4	3	3	4	5.0
320	3	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	5.0
321	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	5.0
321	3	1	2	2	1	2	1	4	6.0
321	3	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	4.0
321	3	1	2	2	1	4	1	3	5.0
321	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	6.0
321	3	1	2	2	2	2	4	1	7.0
321	3	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	6.0
321	3	1	2	2	2	4	1	1	7.0

321	3	1	2	2	3	1	2	1	7.0
321	3	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	5.0
321	3	1	2	2	3	3	1	1	6.0
321	3	1	2	2	3	4	2	2	4.0
321	3	1	2	2	4	1	1	2	7.0
321	3	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	7.0
321	3	1	2	2	4	3	3	3	7.0
321	3	1	2	2	4	4	2	1	7.0
322	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	7.0
322	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	6.0
322	3	1	1	2	1	3	4	1	7.0
322	3	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	7.0
322	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	3.0
322	3	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	2.0
322	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	5.0
322	3	1	1	2	2	4	1	2	4.0
322	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	5.0
322	3	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	6.0
322	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	3	7.0
322	3	1	1	2	3	4	2	4	6.0
322	3	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	7.0
322	3	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	5.0
322	3	1	1	2	4	3	3	3	2.0
322	3	1	1	2	4	4	2	2	5.0
324	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	6.0
324	3	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	5.0
324	3	1	2	1	1	3	4	2	6.0
324	3	1	2	1	1	4	1	1	7.0
324	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	3	3.0
324	3	1	2	1	2	2	4	2	3.0
324	3	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	6.0
324	3	1	2	1	2	4	1	2	6.0
324	3	1	2	1	3	1	2	1	4.0
324	3	1	2	1	3	2	1	2	5.0
324	3	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	6.0
324	3	1	2	1	3	4	2	2	4.0
324	3	1	2	1	4	1	1	2	4.0
324	3	1	2	1	4	2	1	1	6.0
324	3	1	2	1	4	3	3	3	6.0
324	3	1	2	1	4	4	2	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	1	3	4	2	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	1	4	1	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	3	3	1	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	3	4	2	1	6.0

325	3	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	4	2	1	2	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	4	3	3	3	6.0
325	3	1	2	3	4	4	2	1	6.0
326	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	2	6.0
326	3	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	5.0
326	3	2	2	3	1	3	4	2	6.0
326	3	2	2	3	1	4	1	1	7.0
326	3	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	5.0
326	3	2	2	3	2	2	4	1	4.0
326	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	6.0
326	3	2	2	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
326	3	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	5.0
326	3	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	7.0
326	3	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	7.0
326	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	2	6.0
326	3	2	2	3	4	1	1	2	6.0
326	3	2	2	3	4	2	1	1	7.0
326	3	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	5.0
326	3	2	2	3	4	4	2	1	6.0
327	3	1	1	4	1	1	2	2	6.0
327	3	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	5.0
327	3	1	1	4	1	3	4	2	7.0
327	3	1	1	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
327	3	1	1	4	2	1	1	1	3.0
327	3	1	1	4	2	2	4	2	5.0
327	3	1	1	4	2	3	2	3	6.0
327	3	1	1	4	2	4	1	1	7.0
327	3	1	1	4	3	1	2	2	5.0
327	3	1	1	4	3	2	1	1	7.0
327	3	1	1	4	3	3	1	1	7.0
327	3	1	1	4	3	4	2	4	6.0
327	3	1	1	4	4	1	1	1	7.0
327	3	1	1	4	4	2	1	1	7.0
327	3	1	1	4	4	3	3	3	5.0
327	3	1	1	4	4	4	2	2	4.0
401	4	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	4.0
401	4	2	2	3	1	2	1	3	5.0
401	4	2	2	3	1	3	4	4	6.0
401	4	2	2	3	1	4	1	2	5.0
401	4	2	2	3	2	1	1	4	7.0
401	4	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	4.0
401	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	5.0
401	4	2	2	3	2	4	1	2	6.0
401	4	2	2	3	3	1	2	3	4.0
401	4	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	5.0
401	4	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	6.0
401	4	2	2	3	3	4	2	3	4.0
401	4	2	2	3	4	1	1	2	7.0
401	4	2	2	3	4	2	1	1	7.0
401	4	2	2	3	4	3	3	4	6.0
401	4	2	2	3	4	4	2	2	5.0

402	4	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	4.0
402	4	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	6.0
402	4	2	2	3	1	3	4	4	6.0
402	4	2	2	3	1	4	1	3	5.0
402	4	2	2	3	2	1	1	2	4.0
402	4	2	2	3	2	2	4	4	2.0
402	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	4	5.0
402	4	2	2	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
402	4	2	2	3	3	1	2	4	5.0
402	4	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	4.0
402	4	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	6.0
402	4	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	7.0
402	4	2	2	3	4	1	1	2	5.0
402	4	2	2	3	4	2	1	3	3.0
402	4	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	6.0
402	4	2	2	3	4	4	2	4	7.0
403	4	2	2	3	1	1	2	2	6.0
403	4	2	2	3	1	2	1	4	6.0
403	4	2	2	3	1	3	4	4	5.0
403	4	2	2	3	1	4	1	2	5.0
403	4	2	2	3	2	1	1	2	6.0
403	4	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	5.0
403	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	6.0
403	4	2	2	3	2	4	1	2	6.0
403	4	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	5.0
403	4	2	2	3	3	2	1	3	4.0
403	4	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	6.0
403	4	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	6.0
403	4	2	2	3	4	1	1	1	7.0
403	4	2	2	3	4	2	1	1	7.0
403	4	2	2	3	4	3	3	4	6.0
403	4	2	2	3	4	4	2	2	6.0
404	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	4.0
404	4	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3.0
404	4	1	2	3	1	3	4	4	2.0
404	4	1	2	3	1	4	1	3	3.0
404	4	1	2	3	2	1	1	3	2.0
404	4	1	2	3	2	2	4	4	2.0
404	4	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	2.0
404	4	1	2	3	2	4	1	1	3.0
404	4	1	2	3	3	1	2	1	5.0
404	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	2	4.0
404	4	1	2	3	3	3	1	4	4.0
404	4	1	2	3	3	4	2	3	4.0
404	4	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	7.0
404	4	1	2	3	4	2	1	2	6.0
404	4	1	2	3	4	3	3	3	7.0
404	4	1	2	3	4	4	2	4	6.0
405	4	1	2	2	1	1	2	4	4.0
405	4	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	1	4	1	1	5.0

405	4	1	2	2	2	1	1	3	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	2	2	4	2	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	2	4	1	1	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	3	1	2	1	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	3	2	1	3	6.0
405	4	1	2	2	3	3	1	2	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	3	4	2	4	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	4	1	1	4	6.0
405	4	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	5.0
405	4	1	2	2	4	3	3	3	7.0
405	4	1	2	2	4	4	2	1	4.0
406	4	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	5.0
406	4	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	5.0
406	4	1	2	4	1	3	4	3	5.0
406	4	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	7.0
406	4	1	2	4	2	1	1	1	4.0
406	4	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	5.0
406	4	1	2	4	2	3	2	4	6.0
406	4	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	7.0
406	4	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	6.0
406	4	1	2	4	3	2	1	2	6.0
406	4	1	2	4	3	3	1	3	4.0
406	4	1	2	4	3	4	2	4	7.0
406	4	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
406	4	1	2	4	4	2	1	2	5.0
406	4	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	5.0
406	4	1	2	4	4	4	2	1	7.0
407	4	2	2	3	1	1	2	2	6.0
407	4	2	2	3	1	2	1	3	5.0
407	4	2	2	3	1	3	4	2	5.0
407	4	2	2	3	1	4	1	2	4.0
407	4	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	6.0
407	4	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	6.0
407	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	5.0
407	4	2	2	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
407	4	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	6.0
407	4	2	2	3	3	2	1	2	5.0
407	4	2	2	3	3	3	1	3	5.0
407	4	2	2	3	3	4	2	2	6.0
407	4	2	2	3	4	1	1	1	6.0
407	4	2	2	3	4	2	1	2	5.0
407	4	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	7.0
407	4	2	2	3	4	4	2	1	6.0
408	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	1	7.0
408	4	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	4.0
408	4	1	2	3	1	3	4	2	5.0
408	4	1	2	3	1	4	1	2	6.0
408	4	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	5.0
408	4	1	2	3	2	2	4	1	5.0
408	4	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	6.0
408	4	1	2	3	2	4	1	1	3.0

408	4	1	2	3	3	1	2	4	4.0
408	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	2	7.0
408	4	1	2	3	3	3	1	3	1.0
408	4	1	2	3	3	4	2	2	5.0
408	4	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	3.0
408	4	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	7.0
408	4	1	2	3	4	3	3	4	4.0
408	4	1	2	3	4	4	2	1	7.0
409	4	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	6.0
409	4	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	7.0
409	4	1	2	1	1	3	4	2	5.0
409	4	1	2	1	1	4	1	2	1.0
409	4	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	5.0
409	4	1	2	1	2	2	4	1	1.0
409	4	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	7.0
409	4	1	2	1	2	4	1	1	6.0
409	4	1	2	1	3	1	2	2	5.0
409	4	1	2	1	3	2	1	4	7.0
409	4	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	7.0
409	4	1	2	1	3	4	2	4	4.0
409	4	1	2	1	4	1	1	1	7.0
409	4	1	2	1	4	2	1	2	7.0
409	4	1	2	1	4	3	3	3	7.0
409	4	1	2	1	4	4	2	1	7.0
410	4	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	3.0
410	4	1	2	4	1	2	1	2	5.0
410	4	1	2	4	1	3	4	2	.
410	4	1	2	4	1	4	1	2	.
410	4	1	2	4	2	1	1	1	7.0
410	4	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	6.5
410	4	1	2	4	2	3	2	4	6.5
410	4	1	2	4	2	4	1	2	.
410	4	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	5.0
410	4	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	4.0
410	4	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	7.0
410	4	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	5.0
410	4	1	2	4	4	1	1	1	7.0
410	4	1	2	4	4	2	1	1	6.0
410	4	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	6.0
410	4	1	2	4	4	4	2	2	7.0
411	4	1	2	4	1	1	2	3	4.0
411	4	1	2	4	1	2	1	2	5.0
411	4	1	2	4	1	3	4	2	3.0
411	4	1	2	4	1	4	1	1	5.0
411	4	1	2	4	2	1	1	1	6.0
411	4	1	2	4	2	2	4	2	4.0
411	4	1	2	4	2	3	2	4	6.0
411	4	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	6.0
411	4	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	5.0
411	4	1	2	4	3	2	1	1	4.0
411	4	1	2	4	3	3	1	1	6.0
411	4	1	2	4	3	4	2	2	5.0

411	4	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	7.0
411	4	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	6.0
411	4	1	2	3	4	3	3	3	3.0
411	4	1	2	3	4	4	2	2	6.0
412	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	4.0
412	4	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	5.0
412	4	1	2	3	1	3	4	2	4.0
412	4	1	2	3	1	4	1	2	3.0
412	4	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	7.0
412	4	1	2	3	2	2	4	1	4.0
412	4	1	2	3	2	3	2	4	6.0
412	4	1	2	3	2	4	1	2	3.0
412	4	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	5.0
412	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	4.0
412	4	1	2	3	3	3	1	2	3.0
412	4	1	2	3	3	4	2	2	4.0
412	4	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	6.0
412	4	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	4.0
412	4	1	2	3	4	3	3	3	5.0
412	4	1	2	3	4	4	2	2	5.0
413	4	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	6.0
413	4	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	4.0
413	4	1	1	2	1	3	4	2	7.0
413	4	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	6.0
413	4	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	4.0
413	4	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	6.0
413	4	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	5.0
413	4	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	3.0
413	4	1	1	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
413	4	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	7.0
413	4	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
413	4	1	1	2	3	4	2	3	4.0
413	4	1	1	2	4	1	1	1	5.0
413	4	1	1	2	4	2	1	2	6.0
413	4	1	1	2	4	3	3	3	6.0
413	4	1	1	2	4	4	2	2	7.0
414	4	1	1	4	1	1	2	2	5.0
414	4	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	5.0
414	4	1	1	4	1	3	4	2	7.0
414	4	1	1	4	1	4	1	2	5.0
414	4	1	1	4	2	1	1	1	6.0
414	4	1	1	4	2	2	4	2	3.0
414	4	1	1	4	2	3	2	3	5.0
414	4	1	1	4	2	4	1	2	6.0
414	4	1	1	4	3	1	2	2	5.0
414	4	1	1	4	3	2	1	1	3.0
414	4	1	1	4	3	3	1	1	6.0
414	4	1	1	4	3	4	2	2	6.0
414	4	1	1	4	4	1	1	1	6.0
414	4	1	1	4	4	2	1	3	4.0
414	4	1	1	4	4	3	3	3	7.0
414	4	1	1	4	4	4	2	2	5.0

415	4	2	1	3	1	1	2	2	5.0
415	4	2	1	3	1	2	1	3	7.0
415	4	2	1	3	1	3	4	4	6.0
415	4	2	1	3	1	4	1	2	7.0
415	4	2	1	3	2	1	1	2	1.0
415	4	2	1	3	2	2	4	1	4.0
415	4	2	1	3	2	3	2	3	6.0
415	4	2	1	3	2	4	1	1	6.0
415	4	2	1	3	3	1	2	2	4.0
415	4	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	3.0
415	4	2	1	3	3	3	1	4	2.0
415	4	2	1	3	3	4	2	3	7.0
415	4	2	1	3	4	1	1	1	7.0
415	4	2	1	3	4	2	1	4	6.0
415	4	2	1	3	4	3	3	3	7.0
415	4	2	1	3	4	4	2	4	7.0
416	4	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	7.0
416	4	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	7.0
416	4	1	1	3	1	3	4	4	4.0
416	4	1	1	2	1	4	1	2	7.0
416	4	1	1	2	2	1	1	4	1.0
416	4	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	7.0
416	4	1	1	2	2	3	2	4	6.5
416	4	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	7.0
416	4	1	1	2	3	1	2	3	6.0
416	4	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	5.0
416	4	1	1	2	3	3	1	4	1.0
416	4	1	1	2	3	4	2	3	7.0
416	4	1	1	2	4	1	1	1	7.0
416	4	1	1	2	4	2	1	3	6.0
416	4	1	1	2	4	3	3	2	7.0
416	4	1	1	2	4	4	2	1	7.0
417	4	2	1	3	1	1	2	2	6.0
417	4	2	1	3	1	2	1	2	7.0
417	4	2	1	3	1	3	4	3	5.0
417	4	2	1	3	1	4	1	2	5.0
417	4	2	1	3	2	1	1	4	2.0
417	4	2	1	3	2	2	4	2	6.0
417	4	2	1	3	2	3	2	4	6.0
417	4	2	1	3	2	4	1	1	7.0
417	4	2	1	3	3	1	2	2	3.0
417	4	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	4.0
417	4	2	1	3	3	3	1	2	5.0
417	4	2	1	3	3	4	2	3	3.0
417	4	2	1	3	4	1	1	1	7.0
417	4	2	1	3	4	2	1	3	5.0
417	4	2	1	3	4	3	3	1	7.0
417	4	2	1	3	4	4	2	1	4.0
418	4	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	5.0
418	4	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	6.0
418	4	2	2	3	1	3	4	1	5.0
418	4	2	2	3	1	4	1	2	4.0

418	4	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	5.0
418	4	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	6.0
418	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	4.0
418	4	2	2	3	2	4	1	1	7.0
418	4	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	3.0
418	4	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	5.0
418	4	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	4.0
418	4	2	2	3	3	4	2	2	5.0
418	4	2	2	3	4	1	1	1	7.0
418	4	2	2	3	4	2	1	1	6.0
418	4	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	7.0
418	4	2	2	3	4	4	2	2	5.0
419	4	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	4.0
419	4	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3.0
419	4	2	1	2	1	3	4	1	3.0
419	4	2	1	2	1	4	1	1	5.0
419	4	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	6.0
419	4	2	1	2	2	2	4	2	6.0
419	4	2	1	2	2	3	2	4	4.0
419	4	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	5.0
419	4	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	5.0
419	4	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	6.0
419	4	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	7.0
419	4	2	1	2	3	4	2	2	5.0
419	4	2	1	2	4	1	1	1	7.0
419	4	2	1	2	4	2	1	1	4.0
419	4	2	1	2	4	3	3	3	4.0
419	4	2	1	2	4	4	2	2	5.0
420	4	1	2	3	1	1	2	2	6.0
420	4	1	2	3	1	2	1	4	5.0
420	4	1	2	3	1	3	4	4	5.0
420	4	1	2	3	1	4	1	2	4.0
420	4	1	2	3	2	1	1	2	6.0
420	4	1	2	3	2	2	4	2	3.0
420	4	1	2	3	2	3	2	3	6.0
420	4	1	2	3	2	4	1	2	6.0
420	4	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	5.0
420	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	4.0
420	4	1	2	3	3	3	1	1	6.0
420	4	1	2	3	3	4	2	4	3.0
420	4	1	2	3	4	1	1	2	5.0
420	4	1	2	3	4	2	1	1	6.0
420	4	1	2	3	4	3	3	4	6.0
420	4	1	2	3	4	4	2	2	5.0

Table D1

Relation Between Familiarity With Teacher 1 and
Interpretations of Praise as Deserved or Instructional

CLIP 1

CHOIR		instruc-	deserved	Row Total
		tional 0	1	
CHOIR	Choir 1	13	5	18 22.5
	Choir 2	13	4	17 21.3
	Choir 3	18	7	25 31.3
	Choir 4	15	5	20 25.0
Column Total		59 73.8	21 26.3	80 100.0

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
 .14239 3 .9863 4.463 2 OF 8 (25.0%)

CLIP 2

CHOIR		instruc-	deserved	Row Total
		tional 0	1	
CHOIR	Choir 1	8 -1.2	10 1.7	18 22.5
	Choir 2	13 .5	4 -.6	17 21.3
	Choir 3	15 -.5	10 .7	25 31.3
	Choir 4	18 1.2	2 -1.8	20 25.0
Column Total		54 67.5	26 32.5	80 100.0

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
 10.24151 3 .0166 5.525 None

Table continues

CLIP 3

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
CHOIR	Choir 1	12	6	18 22.5			
	Choir 2	12	5	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	21	4	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	18	2	20 25.0			
Column		63	17	80			
Total		78.8	21.3	100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.< 5		
4.17158	3	.2435		3.612	3 OF 8 (37.5%)		

CLIP 4

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
CHOIR	Choir 1	4 -1.4	14 1.3	18 22.5			
	Choir 2	8 .1	9 -.1	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	9 -.7	16 .6	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	15 2.0	5 -1.8	20 25.0			
Column		36	44	80			
Total		45.0	55.0	100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.< 5		
11.89331	3	.0078		7.650	None		

Table D2

Relation Between Familiarity With Teacher 2 and
Interpretations of Praise as Deserved or Instructional

CLIP 1

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
Choir	Choir 1	14	4	18 22.5			
	Choir 2	9	8	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	12	13	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	12	8	20 25.0			
Column Total		47 58.8	33 41.3	80 100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5		
4.13089	3	.2477		7.012	None		

CLIP 2

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
CHOIR	Choir 1	14	4	18 22.5			
	Choir 2	12	5	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	15	10	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	16	4	20 25.0			
Column Total		57 71.3	23 28.8	80 100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5		
2.67022	3	.4453		4.887	1 OF 8 (12.5%)		

Table continues

CLIP 3

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total		
CHOIR	Choir 1	17	1	18 22.5		
	Choir 2	16	1	17 21.3		
	Choir 3	22	3	25 31.3		
	Choir 4	19	1	20 25.0		
Column Total		74 92.5	6 7.5	80 100.0		
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.< 5	
1.07213	3	.7838		1.275	4 OF 8 (50.0%)	

CLIP 4

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total		
Choir	Choir 1	2	16	18 22.5		
	Choir 2	4	13	17 21.3		
	Choir 3	5	20	25 31.3		
	Choir 4	6	14	20 25.0		
Column Total		17 21.3	63 78.8	80 100.0		
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F.< 5	
2.09687	3	.5525		3.612	3 OF 8 (37.5%)	

Table D3

Relation Between Familiarity With Teacher 3 and
Interpretations of Praise as Deserved or Instructional

CLIP 1

STINTERP→		Count	instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total
CHOIR					
Choir	1	17	1	18	22.5
Choir	2	15	2	17	21.3
Choir	3	18	7	25	31.3
Choir	4	18	2	20	25.0
Column Total		68	12	80	100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
5.10470	3	.1643		2.550	4 OF 8 (50.0%)

Clip 2

CHOIR			instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total
Choir	1	6	12	18	22.5
Choir	2	5	12	17	21.3
Choir	3	5	20	25	31.3
Choir	4	8	12	20	25.0
Column Total		24	56	80	100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
2.24090	3	.5239		5.100	None

Table continues

CLIP 3

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
CHOIR	Choir 1	5 -.8	13 -.7	18 22.5			
	Choir 2	12 2.0	5 -1.6	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	5 -1.6	20 1.3	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	10 .7	10 -.6	20 25.0			
Column Total		32 40.0	48 60.0	80 100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5		
12.74782	3	.0052		6.800	None		

Clip 4

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
CHOIR	Choir 1	18		18 22.5			
	Choir 2	15	2	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	24	1	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	20		20 25.0			
Column Total		77 96.3	3 3.8	80 100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5		
4.51031	3	.2114		.637	4 OF 8 (50.0%)		

Table D4

Relation Between Familiarity With Teacher 4 and
Interpretations of Praise as Deserved or Instructional

CLIP 1

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
CHOIR	Choir 1	3 -1.8	15 1.6	18 22.5			
	Choir 2	15 2.7	2 -2.4	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	14 .8	11 -.7	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	4 -1.7	16 1.5	20 25.0			
Column Total		36 45.0	44 55.0	80 100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5		
24.95068	3	.0000		7.650	None		

CLIP 2

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
CHOIR	Choir 1	7 -.2	11 .1	18 22.5			
	Choir 2	11 1.5	6 -1.3	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	5 -1.7	20 1.4	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	10 .6	10 -.5	20 25.0			
Column Total		33 41.3	47 58.8	80 100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5		
9.19095	3	.0269		7.012	None		

Table continues

CLIP 3

		Instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total			
CHOIR	Choir 1	16	2	18 22.5			
	Choir 2	15	2	17 21.3			
	Choir 3	20	5	25 31.3			
	Choir 4	19	1	20 25.0			
Column Total		70 87.5	10 12.5	80 100.0			
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5		
2.35444	3	.5022		2.125	4 OF 8 (50.0%)		

CLIP 4

		instruc- tional 0	deserved 1	Row Total		
CHOIR	Choir 1	10	8	18 22.5		
	Choir 2	9	8	17 21.3		
	Choir 3	10	15	25 31.3		
	Choir 4	13	7	20 25.0		
	Column Total	42 52.5	38 47.5	80 100.0		
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5	
2.88827	3	.4092		8.075	None	

Table D5

Relation Between Familiarity and Labeling of Instructional Praise of Teacher 1.

CLIP 1

CHOIR	Count	encourag	send a m	cooperat	Row Total
	Exp Val Std Res	ement 2	essage 3	e/partic 4	
Choir 1		13 11.0 .6	0 .7 -.8	0 1.3 -1.1	13 22.0%
Choir 2		8 11.0 -.9	0 .7 -.8	5 1.3 3.2	13 22.0%
Choir 3		17 15.3 .4	1 .9 .1	0 1.8 -1.4	18 30.5%
Choir 4		12 12.7 -.2	2 .8 1.4	1 1.5 -.4	15 25.4%
Column Total		50 84.7%	3 5.1%	6 10.2%	59 100.0%

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min E.P. Cells with E.P. < 5
 18.32564 6 .0055 .661 8 OF 12 (66.7%)

Table continues

CLIP 3

CHOIR	Count	encourag	send a m	cooperat	Row Total
	Exp Val Std Res	ement 2	essage 3	e/partic 4	
Choir 1		9 7.8 .4	1 .8 .3	2 3.4 -.8	12 19.0%
Choir 2		7 7.8 -.3	1 .8 .3	4 3.4 .3	12 19.0%
Choir 3		17 13.7 .9	0 1.3 -1.2	4 6.0 -.8	21 33.3%
Choir 4		8 11.7 -1.1	2 1.1 .8	8 5.1 1.3	18 28.6%
Column Total		41 65.1%	4 6.3%	18 28.6%	63 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
7.32554	6	.2918	.762	6 OF 12 (50.0%)

Table D6

Relation Between Familiarity and Labeling of Instructional
Praise of Teacher 2

CLIP 2

CHOIR	Count	encourag	send a m	cooperat	Row Total
	Exp Val Std Res	ement 2	essage 3	e/partic 4	
Choir 1	12 12.5 -.1	1 .2 1.5	1 1.2 -.2	14 24.6%	
Choir 2	12 10.7 .4	0 .2 -.5	0 1.1 -1.0	12 21.1%	
Choir 3	13 13.4 -.1	0 .3 -.5	2 1.3 .6	15 26.3%	
Choir 4	14 14.3 -.1	0 .3 -.5	2 1.4 .5	16 28.1%	
Column Total	51 89.5%	1 1.8%	5 8.8%	57 100.0%	

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
 4.96661 6 .5481 .211 8 OF 12 (66.7%)

Table continues

CLIP 3

CHOIR	Count	encourag	send a m	cooperat	Row Total
	Exp Val Std Res	ement 2	essage 3	e/partic 4	
Choir 1	0	16	1	17	
	1.8	12.9	2.3	23.0%	
	-1.4	.9	-.9		
Choir 2	5	11	0	16	
	1.7	12.1	2.2	21.6%	
	2.5	-.3	-1.5		
Choir 3	2	19	1	22	
	2.4	16.6	3.0	29.7%	
	-.2	.6	-1.1		
Choir 4	1	10	8	19	
	2.1	14.4	2.6	25.7%	
	-.7	-1.2	3.4		
Column Total	8	56	10	74	
	10.8%	75.7%	13.5%	100.0%	

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
26.85055	6	.0002	1.730	8 OF 12 (66.7%)

Table D7

Relation Between Familiarity and Labeling of Instructional
Praise of Teacher 3

CLIP 1

CHOIR	Count	encourag	send a m	cooperat	Row
	Exp Val	ement	essage	e/partic	
	Std Res	2	3	4	
Choir 1	13 13.0 .0	1 .8 .3	3 3.3 -.1	17 25.0%	
Choir 2	12 11.5 .2	0 .7 -.8	3 2.9 .1	15 22.1%	
Choir 3	13 13.8 -.2	0 .8 -.9	5 3.4 .8	18 26.5%	
Choir 4	14 13.8 .1	2 .8 1.4	2 3.4 -.8	18 26.5%	
Column Total	52 76.5%	3 4.4%	13 19.1%	68 100.0%	

Chi-Square 4.77635 D.F. 6 Significance .5728 Min E.F. .662 Cells with E.F. < 5 8 OF 12 (66.7%)

Table continues

CLIP 4

STINTERP-> CHOIR	Count	encourag	send a m	cooperat	Row Total
	Exp Val Std Res	ement 2	essage 3	e/partic 4	
Choir 1		14 11.0 .9	1 2.3 -.9	3 4.7 -.8	18 23.4%
Choir 2		7 9.2 -.7	2 1.9 .0	6 3.9 1.1	15 19.5%
Choir 3		18 14.6 .9	1 3.1 -1.2	5 6.2 -.5	24 31.2%
Choir 4		8 12.2 -1.2	6 2.6 2.1	6 5.2 .4	20 26.0%
Column Total		47 61.0%	10 13.0%	20 26.0%	77 100.0%

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
12.31795	6	.0552	1.948	6 OF 12 (50.0%)

Table D8

Relation Between Familiarity and Labeling of InstructionalPraise of Teacher 4CLIP 3

CHOIR	Count	encourag	send a m	cooperat	Row Total
	Exp Val Std Res	ement 2	essage 3	e/partic 4	
Choir 1	0 .5 -.7	12 12.6 -.2	4 3.0 .6	16 22.9%	
Choir 2	1 .4 .9	12 11.8 .1	2 2.8 -.5	15 21.4%	
Choir 3	0 .6 -.8	17 15.7 .3	3 3.7 -.4	20 28.6%	
Choir 4	1 .5 .6	14 14.9 -.2	4 3.5 .3	19 27.1%	
Column Total	2 2.9%	55 78.6%	13 18.6%	70 100.0%	
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5	
3.14626	6	.7903	.429	8 OF	12 (66.7%)

Table continues

CLIP 4

CHOIR	Count	encourag	send a m	cooperat	Row Total
	Exp Val Std Res	ement 2	essage 3	e/partic 4	
Choir 1	10 8.3 .6	0 1.0 -1.0	0 .7 -.8	10 23.8%	
Choir 2	6 7.5 -.5	3 .9 2.3	0 .6 -.8	9 21.4%	
Choir 3	9 8.3 .2	1 1.0 .0	0 .7 -.8	10 23.8%	
Choir 4	10 10.8 -.3	0 1.2 -1.1	3 .9 2.1	13 31.0%	
Column Total	35 83.3%	4 9.5%	3 7.1%	42 100.0%	

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
14.99308	6	.0203	.643	8 OF 12 (66.7%)

Table D9

Interpretations by High and Low Achievers Familiar and
Unfamiliar With Teacher 1

Teacher 1 Intent	Clip	1		2		3		4	
		E		D		C		D	
		H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L
Familiar Choir(1)(HA=13)(LA=5)									
<u>Deserved</u>		2	3	10	0	4	2	10	4
<u>Instructional</u>									
Encourage		11	2	3	3	7	2	3	1
Send a message		0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
Cooperate		0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Choir 2 (HA =9) (LA=8)									
<u>Deserved</u>		2	2	3	1	1	4	6	3
<u>Instructional</u>									
Encourage		4	4	2	3	5	2	0	4
Send a message		3	2	4	4	1	0	2	0
Cooperate		0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1
Choir 3 (HA=16)(LA=9)									
<u>Deserved</u>		4	3	6	4	3	1	11	5
<u>Instructional</u>									
Encourage		12	5	7	4	9	8	4	3
Send a message		0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
Cooperate		0	0	2	0	4	0	0	1
Choir 4 (HA=12)(LA=8)									
<u>Deserved</u>		2	3	2	0	0	2	4	1
<u>Instructional</u>									
Encourage		7	5	7	4	7	1	7	6
Send a message		2	0	2	3	1	1	1	1
Cooperate		1	0	1	1	4	4	0	0

Note: D = deserved; E = encourage; M = send a message, and C = cooperate.

Table D10

Interpretations by High and Low Achievers Familiar and
Unfamiliar With Teacher 2

	Clip		1		2		3		4		
Teacher 2 Intent	D		C		E		D				
	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L			
Familiar Choir(2)(HA=9)(LA=8)											
Deserved	3	5	2	3	0	1	8	5			
Instructional											
Encourage	0	2	7	5	2	3	1	1			
Send a message	5	1	0	0	7	4	0	0			
Cooperate	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2			
Choir 1 (HA=13)(LA=5)											
Deserved	3	1	1	3	0	1	12	4			
Instructional											
Encourage	6	4	10	2	0	0	1	1			
Send a message	3	0	1	0	12	4	0	0			
Cooperate	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0			
Choir 3 (HA=16)(LA=9)											
Deserved	8	5	5	5	3	0	11	9			
Instructional											
Encourage	4	4	9	4	2	0	4	0			
Send a message	4	0	0	0	10	9	1	0			
Cooperate	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0			
Choir 4 (HA=12)(LA=8)											
Deserved	5	3	3	1	0	1	8	6			
Instructional											
Encourage	4	3	8	6	1	0	4	2			
Send a message	2	0	0	0	6	4	0	0			
Cooperate	1	2	1	1	5	3	0	0			

Note: D = deserved; E = encourage; M = send a message, and C
 = cooperate.

Table D11

Interpretations By High and Low Achievers Familiar and
Unfamiliar With Teacher 3

Teacher 3 Intent	Clip		1		2		3		4	
			E		D		D		E	
	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L
Familiar Choir (3)(HA=16)(LA=9)										
<u>Deserved</u>	6	1	11	9	15	5	1	0		
<u>Instructional</u>										
Encourage	6	7	5	0	0	4	11	7		
Send a message	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1		
Cooperate	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	1		
Choir 2 (HA=9)(LA=8)										
<u>Deserved</u>	0	2	7	5	3	2	0	2		
<u>Instructional</u>										
Encourage	8	4	2	3	3	5	4	3		
Send a message	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0		
Cooperate	1	2	0	0	2	0	3	3		
Choir 1 (HA=13)(LA=5)										
<u>Deserved</u>	1	0	9	3	9	4	0	0		
<u>Instructional</u>										
Encourage	8	5	4	1	4	0	10	4		
Send a message	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0		
Cooperate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1		
Choir 4 (HA=12)(LA=8)										
<u>Deserved</u>	2	0	7	5	6	4	0	0		
<u>Instructional</u>										
Encourage	8	6	3	2	2	2	5	3		
Send a message	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	3		
Cooperate	1	1	1	0	2	1	4	2		

Note: D = deserved; E = encourage; M = send a message, and C = cooperate.

Table D12

Interpretations of Praise By High and Low Achievers Familiar
and Unfamiliar With Teacher 4

Teacher 4 Intent	Clip		1		2		3		4	
			D		D		M		E	
	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	H	L
Familiar Choir(4)(HA=12)(LA=8)										
<u>Deserved</u>	10	6	6	4	0	1	5	2		
<u>Instructional</u>										
Encourage	1	2	4	1	1	0	6	4		
Send a message	0	0	2	2	9	5	0	0		
Cooperate	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	2		
Choir 2 (HA=9)(LA=8)										
<u>Deserved</u>	0	2	2	4	2	0	5	3		
<u>Instructional</u>										
Encourage	5	5	5	3	0	1	3	3		
Send a message	3	0	2	1	6	6	1	2		
Cooperate	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0		
Choir 3 (HA=16)(LA=9)										
<u>Deserved</u>	7	4	12	8	3	2	8	7		
<u>Instructional</u>										
Encourage	8	5	4	1	0	0	7	2		
Send a message	1	0	0	0	10	7	1	0		
Cooperate	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0		
Choir 1 (HA=13)(LA=5)										
<u>Deserved</u>	11	4	9	2	1	1	7	1		
<u>Instructional</u>										
Encourage	2	1	3	3	0	0	6	4		
Send a message	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0		
Cooperate	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0		

Note: D = deserved; E = encourage; M = send a message, and C = cooperate.

Table D13

Relation Between Ability and Interpretation of Praise as
Deserved or Instructional, Students Familiar With Teacher 1

CLIP 1

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High	Low	
		1	2	
Instructional	0	11	2	13 72.2
Deserved	1	2	3	5 27.8
Column Total		13 72.2	5 27.8	18 100.0

STATISTIC
Fisher's Exact Test

One Tail
.09874

Two Tail
.09874

CLIP 2

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High	Low	
		1	2	
Instructional	0	3	5	8 44.4
Deserved	1	10		10 55.6
Column Total		13 72.2	5 27.8	18 100.0

STATISTIC
Fisher's Exact Test

One Tail
.00654

Two Tail
.00654

Table continues

CLIP 3

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High 1	Low 2	
Instructional	0	9	3	12 66.7
Deserved	1	4	2	6 33.3
Column Total		13 72.2	5 27.8	18 100.0

STATISTIC
Fisher's Exact Test

One Tail
.56092

Two Tail
1.00000

CLIP 4

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High 1	Low 2	
Instructional	0	3	1	4 22.2
Deserved	1	10	4	14 77.8
Column Total		13 72.2	5 27.8	18 100.0

STATISTIC
Fisher's Exact Test

One Tail
.70098

Two Tail
1.00000

Table D14

Relation Between Ability and Interpretation of Praise as
Deserved or Instructional, Students Familiar With Teacher 2

CLIP 1

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High 1	Low 2	
Instructional	0	6	3	9 52.9
Deserved	1	3	5	8 47.1
Column Total		9 52.9	8 47.1	17 100.0

STATISTIC
Fisher's Exact Test

One Tail
.23797

Two Tail
.34694

CLIP 2

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High 1	Low 2	
Instructional	0	7	5	12 70.6
Deserved	1	2	3	5 29.4
Column Total		9 52.9	8 47.1	17 100.0

STATISTIC
Fisher's Exact Test

One Tail
.43665

Two Tail
.61991

Table continues

CLIP 3

		<u>Ability</u>		
Count		High	Low	Row
		1	2	Total
Instructional	0	9	7	16
				94.1
Deserved	1		1	1
				5.9
Column		9	8	17
Total		52.9	47.1	100.0

STATISTIC
Fisher's Exact Test

One Tail
.47059

Two Tail
.47059

CLIP 4

		<u>Ability</u>		
Count		High	Low	Row
		1	2	Total
Instructional	0	1	3	4
				23.5
Deserved	1	8	5	13
				76.5
Column		9	8	17
Total		52.9	47.1	100.0

STATISTIC
Fisher's Exact Test

One Tail
.24118

Two Tail
.29412

Table D15

Relation Between Ability and Interpretation of Praise as
Deserved or Instructional, Students Familiar With Teacher 3

CLIP 1

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High 1	Low 2	
Instructional	0	10	8	18 72.0
Deserved	1	6	1	7 28.0
Column Total		16 64.0	9 36.0	25 100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
.89596	1	.3439	2.520	2 of 4 (50.0%)
1.98964	1	.1584	(Before Yates Correction)	

CLIP 2

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High 1	Low 2	
Instructional	0	5		5 20.0
Deserved	1	11	9	20 80.0
Column Total		16 64.0	9 36.0	25 100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
1.83377	1	.1757	1.800	2 of 4 (50.0%)
3.51563	1	.0608	(Before Yates Correction)	

Table continues

CLIP 3

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High 1	Low 2	
Instructional	0	1	4	5 20.0
	1	15	5	20 80.0
Column Total		16 64.0	9 36.0	25 100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
3.13585	1	.0766	1.800	2 of 4 (50.0%)
5.25174	1	.0219	(Before Yates Correction)	

CLIP 4

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
Count		High 1	Low 2	
Instructional	0	15	9	24 96.0
	1	1		1 4.0
Column Total		16 64.0	9 36.0	25 100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
.00000	1	1.0000	.360	2 of 4 (50.0%)
.58594	1	.4440	(Before Yates Correction)	

Table D16

Relation Between Ability and Interpretation of Praise as
Deserved or Instructional, Students Familiar With Teacher 4.

CLIP 1

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
		High	Low	
Instructional	0	2	2	4 20.0
	1	10	6	16 80.0
Column Total		12 60.0	8 40.0	20 100.0

STATISTIC	One Tail	Two Tail
Fisher's Exact Test	.53457	1.00000

CLIP 2

		<u>Ability</u>		Row Total
		High	Low	
Instructional	0	6	4	10 50.0
	1	6	4	10 50.0
Column Total		12 60.0	8 40.0	20 100.0

STATISTIC	One Tail	Two Tail
Fisher's Exact Test	.67504	1.00000

Table continues

CLIP 3

		<u>Ability</u>		
		Count	High	Low
				Row Total
Instructional	0		12	7
				19
				95.0
Deserved	1			1
				5.0
		Column	12	8
		Total	60.0	40.0
				100.0

STATISTIC	One Tail	Two Tail
Fisher's Exact Test	.40000	.40000

CLIP 4

		<u>Ability</u>		
		Count	High	Low
				Row Total
Instructional	0		7	6
				13
				65.0
Deserved	1		5	2
				7
				35.0
		Column	12	8
		Total	60.0	40.0
				100.0

STATISTIC	One Tail	Two Tail
Fisher's Exact Test	.39164	.64241

Table D17

Relation Between Ability and Teacher Intent, High and Low
Achievers Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher 1

CLIP 1 (Encouragement Praise)

CHOIR	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
Choir 1	1	11	2	13 26.0
Choir 2	2	4	4	8 16.0
Choir 3	3	12	5	17 34.0
Choir 4	4	7	5	12 24.0
Column Total		34 68.0	16 32.0	50 100.0

Chi-square = 3.40815 df = 3, $p = .3329$ Min E.F. 2.560 Cells with E.F. < 5
 3 OF 8 (37.5%)

CLIP 2 (Deserved Praise)

CHOIR	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
Choir 1	1	10		10 38.5
Choir 2	2	3	1	4 15.4
Choir 3	3	6	4	10 38.5
Choir 4	4	2		2 7.7
Column Total		21 80.8	5 19.2	26 100.0

Chi-square = 5.7200 df = 3, $p = .1261$ Min E.F. .385 Cells with E.F. < 5
 6 OF 8 (75.0%)

Table continues

Table D18
Relation Between Ability and Teacher Intent, High and Low
Achievers Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher 2

CLIP 1 (Deserved Praise)

	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
CHOIR				
Choir 1	1	3	1	4 12.1
Choir 2	2	3	5	8 24.2
Choir 3	3	8	5	13 39.4
Choir 4	4	5	3	8 24.2
Column Total		19 57.6	14 42.4	33 100.0

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
 1.98019 3 .5765 1.697 6 OF 8 (75.0%)

CLIP 2 (Cooperation Praise)

	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
CHOIR				
Choir 1	1	1		1 20.0
Choir 3	3	2		2 40.0
Choir 4	4	1	1	2 40.0
Column Total		4 80.0	1 20.0	5 100.0

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
 1.87500 2 .3916 .200 6 OF 6 (100.0%)

Table continues

CLIP 3 (Encouragement Praise)

	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
CHOIR	Choir 2	2	3	5 62.5
	Choir 3	2		2 25.0
	Choir 4	1		1 12.5
Column		5	3	8
Total		62.5	37.5	100.0

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
2.88000	2	.2369	.375	6 OF 6 (100.0%)

CLIP 4 (Deserved Praise)

	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
CHOIR	Choir 1	12	4	16 25.4
	Choir 2	8	5	13 20.6
	Choir 3	11	9	20 31.7
	Choir 4	8	6	14 22.2
Column		39	24	63
Total		61.9	38.1	100.0

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
1.70314	3	.6362	4.952	1 OF 8 (12.5%)

Table D19

Relation Between Ability and Teacher Intent, High and Low
Achievers Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher 3

CLIP 1 (Encouragement Praise)

		Ability		
Count		High	Low	Row Total
CHOIR	Choir 1	8	5	13 25.0
	Choir 2	8	4	12 23.1
	Choir 3	6	7	13 25.0
	Choir 4	8	6	14 26.9
Column Total		30 57.7	22 42.3	52 100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.
1.18557	3	.7565		5.077
Cells with E.F. < 5 None				

CLIP 2 (Deserved Praise)

		Ability		
Count		High	Low	Row Total
		1	2	
CHOIR	Choir 1	9	3	12 21.4
	Choir 2	7	5	12 21.4
	Choir 3	11	9	20 35.7
	Choir 4	7	5	12 21.4
Column Total		34 60.7	22 39.3	56 100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.
1.35758	3	.7155		4.714
Cells with E.F. < 5 3 OF 8 (37.5%)				

Table continues

CLIP 3 (Deserved Praise)

	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
		1	2	
CHOIR	Choir 1	9	4	13 27.1
	Choir 2	3	2	5 10.4
	Choir 3	15	5	20 41.7
	Choir 4	6	4	10 20.8
Column Total		33 68.8	15 31.3	48 100.0

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
.89958	3	.8255	1.563	4 OF 8 (50.0%)

CLIP 4 (Encouragement Praise)

	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
CHOIR	Choir 1	10	4	14 29.8
	Choir 2	4	3	7 14.9
	Choir 3	11	7	18 38.3
	Choir 4	5	3	8 17.0
Column Total		30 63.8	17 36.2	47 100.0

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
.54947	3	.9079	2.532	3 OF 8 (37.5%)

Table D20
Relation Between Ability and Teacher Intent, High and Low
Achievers Familiar and Unfamiliar With Teacher 4

CLIP 1 (Deserved Praise)

		Ability		
Count		High	Low	Row Total
CHOIR	Choir 1	11	4	15 34.1
	Choir 2		2	2 4.5
	Choir 3	7	4	11 25.0
	Choir 4	10	6	16 36.4
Column Total		28 53.6	16 36.4	44 100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.
4.11845	3	.2490		.727
Cells with E.F. < 5 3 OF 8 (37.5%)				

CLIP 2 (Deserved Praise)

CHOIR	Count	Ability		Row Total
		High	Low	
Choir 1	1	9	2	11 23.4
Choir 2	2	2	4	6 12.8
Choir 3	3	12	8	20 42.6
Choir 4	4	6	4	10 21.3
Column		29	18	47
Total		61.7	38.3	100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.
3.96387	3	.2654		2.298
Cells with E.F.< 5				
4 OF 8 (50.0%)				
Table continues				

CLIP 3 (Send a message praise)

		Ability		
Count		High	Low	Row Total
CHOIR				
	Choir 1	8	4	12 21.8
	Choir 2	6	6	12 21.8
	Choir 3	10	7	17 30.9
	Choir 4	9	5	14 25.5
Column		33	22	55
Total		60.0	40.0	100.0
Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance		Min E.F.
.83917	3	.8401		4.800
Cells with E.F. < 5 2 OF 8 (25.0%)				

CLIP 4 (Encouragement Praise)

<u>Ability</u>				
Count		High	Low	Row Total
CHOIR	Choir 1	6	4	10 28.6
	Choir 2	3	3	6 17.1
	Choir 3	7	2	9 25.7
	Choir 4	6	4	10 28.6
Column Total		22 62.9	13 37.1	35 100.0

Chi-Square	D.F.	Significance	Min E.F.	Cells with E.F. < 5
1.35295	3	.7166	2.229	5 OF 8 (62.5%)

TRANSCRIPTION OF VIDEOTAPED CLIPS

Legend:

S = Student or section of choir

C = Choir

T = Teacher

XXXX = Student name is omitted

TEACHER 1CLIP 1

S. Students are gathered around the piano with the teacher as they sing together to prepare for an audition.

T. You did better. You didn't all stop and go -awk! - that time, so that's progress.

CLIP 2

S. Alto section sings in solfege.

T. Okay. Our mi was really flat that time. Okay, everybody this time at the beginning. Everyone solfege one more time, alright? 1, ready, begin.

C. Choir sings.

T. Turning toward altos, teacher lifts her arm as in a signal of triumph and says, "Yes altos!"

CLIP 3

T & C. Singing in neutral syllables. Choir's performance breaks down.

T. Okay, stop. Okay, let's pat ourselves on the back for a good first page, and a good half the second page.

CLIP 4

S. A student is asking a long, complicated question as she gets up from her chair and approaches teacher pointing to the place in the music about which she is asking.

S. A different student laughs and says, "What?"

T. Laughs as she says, "Huh? What? You and I are not on the same question! Are you singing soprano?"

S. The student who has asked the question answers, "No."

T. No? That's an alto note. It is a dotted half so it goes all the way across the measure. Does that make sense, XXXX?

S. As she returns to her chair, student says, "Yes, yes."

T. Looks at choir as she says, "Way - to- go!" You got all the way through that page. Give yourselves a big pat on the back!"

TEACHER 2

CLIP 1

S. A student sings a s-singing exercise.

T. Excellent. Two for XXXX! (Other students in choir applaud).

CLIP 2

C. Sings a s-singing exercise.

T. Excellent! Amazing what you can do when you've got a little confidence behind you.

CLIP 3

C. & T. Teacher chants Italian text in rhythm with choir.

T. Alright, excellent Tenors! I heard some brave soul, XXXX
could it be you?

CLIP 4

C. & T. Choir is gathered around piano while teacher plays
and sings with them.

T. Teacher claps her hands together and gives a thumbs-up
sign at the conclusion of piece and says, "Way - to - go!"

TEACHER 3CLIP 1

C. Choir sings as teacher accompanies at piano.

T. That was a lot better. Be careful - there's two ways to
sing alto. One of them is right and one of them is wrong.

CLIP 2

T. The tone needs to come out on top, or in front, rather
than...See what I am saying? Sit up nice and tall so that
the air is here, okay? Try it. Let's do that first part to
the repeat sign - m.15. (Gives pitch). And I like very much
how you did that. (Teacher sings here to identify a portion
of the performance of a phrase she had liked) You did that
beautifully. I don't remember saying but one time, the very
first day we looked at this, to do that, and you have got
it. That's great. It gives me Goose bumps.

CLIP 3

T. Ready? 1 -2 -1 ready, sing.

S. One section of the choir sings.

T. Ah!! What an improvement! Teacher claps and a few students join in. Teacher motions for others to applaud and says, "Give it to them!" "Now, you sounded like a high school group. My goodness, do it again. I want to hear that again, it was gorgeous. Cahn- tah, make sure you get that down."

CLIP 4

T. Teacher is looking down at her music as she says, "Put in a little effort. Come on, you are not lazy. I know you aren't because I've seen you out on the basketball court.

C & T. Sing together.

T. Choir stops singing as teacher says, "Sahnc - toh - ruhm. Hear the vowel? Sopranos, ready?"

S. Section sings one word.

T. Now, the next one -- shhh. Teacher pauses and waits for students to get quiet.

T. In ecclesia...that's a hard jump, but you are getting it well. Just listen to yourselves and get that sound.

TEACHER 4

CLIP 1

C. Choir sings.

T. Do this, go ah---.

C. Echoes what teacher has just sung.

T. Put all that 'ah' in that sound. Teacher demonstrates by singing, "There's a bah" "Ready, go."

C. Sings, There's a bah...

T. It's so gorgeous guys. Hear the difference? Maybe you don't, but I do. I do. That's incredible. Put that 'ah' in there again. Cool. Ready, again.

CLIP 2

T. Demonstrates how a section of the choir has sung a word. "You are getting a little ballistic on me there. Ready, sing 'die' sensitively now. Ready?"

S. Sings

T. The last word is softer than the first. Ready, again, and go.

S. Sings 'die'

T. Can you see my 'ah' vowel? Keep it until my mouth changes. Go.

S. Sings.

T. That was incredible. Do that again.

CLIP 3

S. ...the breathing....it was like choppy. Like when we take a breath and everybody goes (Student demonstrates incorrect breathing technique).

T. Okay. XXXX, what did XXXX just say?

S. The second student says, "He said our breathing was choppy and ...

T. Very good, and thank you for giving him the respect to listen. That means a lot, guys. (Teacher turns slightly and gestures toward first student) "XXXX, I mean, XXXX might as

well come down...I mean, XXXX, that's all I've been thinking about since yesterday."

CLIP 4

T. XXXX, how low can you go?

S. I can go...

T. What? You can what?

S. Student holds up hand as if it is a staff and points.

T. So, on the staff, you are okay on second space, but nothing below that?

S. Right.

T. You are not singing any of that?

S. Student nods his head to indicate agreement.

T. (Addresses a different student). "XXXX, where is your cut-off?"

S. Third line.

T. We know your cut-off...third line. Alright, basses, here we go. You held your pitches very well, guys.

REFERENCES

Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1992). Thin slices of expressive behavior as predictors of interpersonal consequences: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 111, 256-274.

American Heritage Dictionary (2nd ed.). (1982). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Babad, E., Bernieri, F., & Rosenthal, R. (1991). Students as judges of teachers' verbal and nonverbal behavior. American Educational Research Journal, 28, 211-234.

Babad, E., Bernieri, F., & Rosenthal, R. (1989). When less information is more informative: Diagnosing teacher expectations from brief samples of behavior. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 59, 281-295.

Babad, E., Bernieri, F., & Rosenthal, R. (1987). Nonverbal and verbal behavior of preschool, remedial, and elementary school teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 24, 405-415.

Babad, E. (1990a). Calling on students: How a teacher's behavior can acquire disparate meanings in students' minds. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 25, 1-4.

Babad, E. (1990). Measuring and changing teachers' differential behavior as perceived by students and teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 683-690.

Barker, G. P., & Graham, S. (1987). Developmental study of praise and blame as attributional cues. Journal of Educational Psychology, 79, 62-66.

Becker, W., Madsen, C., Arnold, C., & Thomas, D. (1967). The contingent use of teacher attention and praise in reducing classroom behavior problems. Journal of Special Education, 1, 287-307.

Blumberg, H. (1972). Communication of interpersonal evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 157-162.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Pintrich, P., Meece, J., & Wessels, K. (1982). The formation and role of self perceptions of ability in elementary classrooms. The Elementary School Journal, 82, 401-419.

Boyle, D., & Radocy, R. (1987). Measurement and evaluation of musical experiences. New York: Schirmer.

Brattesani, K. A., Weinstein, R. S., & Marshall, H. H. (1984). Student perceptions of differential teacher treatment as moderators of teacher expectation effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 236-247.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976). The experimental ecology of education. Teacher College Record, 78, 159-204.

Brophy, J. (1988). Research on teacher effects: Uses and abuses. The Elementary School Journal, 89, 3-21.

Brophy, J. (1985). Teacher-student interaction. In J. B. Dusek (Ed.), Teacher Expectancies (pp. 303-328). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brophy, J. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 631-661.

Brophy, J. (1982). Schooling as students experience it. The Elementary School Journal, 82, 519-529.

Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. Review of Educational Research, 51, 5-32.

Brophy, J. (1979). Teacher behavior and its effects. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 733-750.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (Eds.). (1974). Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1969). Teacher-child dyadic interaction: A manual for coding classroom behavior. (Report Series No 27). Austin: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Clark, B. M., & Creswell, J. L. (1979). Participants' versus nonparticipants' perception of teacher nonverbal behavior. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 14, 28-36.

Collins, E. C., & Green, J. (1990). Metaphors: The construction of a perspective. Theory into Practice, 29, 71-77.

Cooper, H. (1977). Controlling personal rewards: Professional teachers' differential use of feedback and the effects of feedback on the students' motivation to perform. Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, no.4, 419-427.

Cooper, H. M., & Baron, R. M. (1977). Academic expectations and attributed responsibility as predictors of professional teachers' reinforcement behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 409-418.

Cooper, H. M., & Good, T. L. (Eds.). (1983). Pygmalion grows up: Studies in the expectation communication process. New York: Longman.

Cooper, M. (1989). Analyzing public discourse. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc.

Cronbach, L. T. (1955). Processes affecting scores on understanding of others and assumed similarity. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 177-193.

Dixon, C., Cruz, E., Green, J., Lin, L., & Brandts, L. (1992). Do you see what we see? The referential and intertextual nature of classroom life. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27, 29-36.

Dowdy, S. & Wearden, S. (1983). Statistics For Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dusek, J. B. (Ed.). (1985). Teacher Expectancies. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). Common knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom. New York: Falmer Press.

Emmer, E. T. (1988). Praise and the instructional process. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 23, 32-39.

Fiocca, P. D. (1986). A descriptive analysis of the rehearsal behaviors of selected exemplary junior high and middle school choir directors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Funder, D. (1987). Errors and mistakes: Evaluating the accuracy of social judgment. Psychological Bulletin, 101, 75-90.

Good, T., Cooper, H., & Blakey, S. (1980). Classroom interaction as a function of teacher expectations, student sex, and time of year. Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 378-385.

Harris, M. J., & Rosenthal, R. (1985). Mediation of interpersonal expectancy effects: Thirty-one meta-analyses. Psychological Bulletin, 97, 363-386.

Heller, M., & White, M. (1975). Rates of teacher verbal approval and disapproval to higher and lower ability classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 67, 796-800.

Horn, T. S. (1985). Coaches' feedback and changes in children's perceptions of their physical competence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77, 174- 186.

Kane, M. (1982). A sampling model for validity. Applied Psychological Measurement, 6, 125-160.

Kenny, D., & Albright, L. (1987). Accuracy in interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 102, 390-402.

Kruglanski, A. W. (1989). The psychology of being "right": The problem of accuracy in social perceptions and cognition. Psychological Bulletin, 106, 395-409.

Lamb, M. E., Suomi, S. J., & Stephenson, G. R. (Eds.). (1979). Social interaction analysis. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Lord, C. G., Umezaki, K., & Darley, J. M. (1990). Developmental differences in decoding the meanings of appraisal actions of teachers. Child Development, 61, 191-200.

Madsen, C. K., & Alley, J. (1979). The effect of reinforcement on attentiveness: A comparison of behaviorally trained music therapists and other professionals with implications for competency-based academic preparation. Journal of Music Therapy, 16, 70-82.

Madsen, C. K., & Duke, R. (1993). Selection and development of prospective music teachers. Journal of Music Teacher Education, 3, 5-11.

Madsen, C. K., & Duke, R. (1985). Observation of approval/disapproval in music: Perception versus actual classroom events. Journal of Research in Music Education, 33, 205-214.

Madsen, C., & Madsen, C. K. (1974). Teaching/Discipline: A positive approach for educational development (2nd ed.). Raleigh, NC: Contemporary Publishing Co.

Madsen, C. K., & Yarbrough, C. (1985). Competency-based music education (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Marshall, H. H., & Weinstein, R. S. (1986). Classroom context of student-perceived differential teacher treatment. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 441-453.

Marshall, H. H., & Weinstein, R. S. (1984). Classroom factors affecting students' self-evaluations: An interactional model. Review of Educational Research, 54, 301-325.

Medley, D. M. (1982). Systematic observation. In H. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational Research (5th ed., Vol. 4). New York: Free Press.

Meyer, W. U. (1982). Indirect communications about perceived ability estimates. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 888-897.

Meyer, Wulf-U. (1979). Academic expectations, attributed responsibility, and teachers' reinforcement behavior: A comment on Cooper and Baron, with some additional data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, no.2, 269-273.

Meyer, Wulf-U., Bachmann, M., Biermann, U., Hempelmann, M., Ploger, F., & Spiller, H. (1979). The informational value of evaluative behavior: Influences of praise and blame on perceptions of ability. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 258-268.

Mishler, E. G. (1979). Meaning in context: Is there any other kind? Harvard Educational Review, 49, 1-19.

Morine-Dersheimer, G. (1982). Pupil perceptions of teacher praise. The Elementary School Journal, 82, 421-434.

Murray, K. C. (1973). The effect of teacher approval/disapproval on the performance level, attentiveness, and attitude of high school choruses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Price, H. E. (1992). Sequential patterns of music instruction and learning to use them. Journal of Research in Music Education, 40, 14-29.

Price, H. E. (1989). An effective way to teach and rehearse: Research supports using sequential patterns. UPDATE: Applications of Research in Music Education, 8, 42-46.

Price, H. (1981). The effect of conductor academic task presentation, conductor reinforcement, and ensemble practice on performers' musical achievement, attentiveness, and attitude. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse.

Rogosa, D., & Ghandour, G. (1991). Statistical models for behavioral observations. Journal of Educational Statistics, 16, 157-252.

Roscoe, John T. (1975). Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Roscoe, John T., & Byars, Jackson A. (1971). An investigation of the restraints with respect to sample size commonly imposed on the use of the chi-square statistic. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 66, 755-759.

Rosenholtz, S., & Wilson, B. (1980). The effect of classroom structure on shared perceptions of ability. American Educational Research Journal, 17, 75-82.

Rosenthal, R. (1984). Meta-analytic procedures for social research (1st ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. (1986). Meta-analytic procedures for combining studies with multiple effect sizes. Psychological Bulletin, 97, 527-529.

Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, Dixon, C., de la Cruz, E., Green, J., Lin, L., & Brandts, L. (1992). Do you see what I see? The referential and interactional nature of classroom life. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27, 29-36.

Thomas, J. D., Presland, I. E., Grant, M. D., & Glynn, T. L. (1978). Natural rates of teacher approval and disapproval in grade-7 classrooms. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 11, 91-94.

- Walker, R., & Adelman, C. (1976). Strawberries. In M. Stubbs & S. Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in classroom observations (pp. 138-150). London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Weinstein, R. S. (1983). Student perceptions of schooling. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 287-312.
- Weinstein, R. S., & Middlestadt, S. E. (1979). Student perceptions of teacher interactions with male high and low achievers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 421-431.
- White, M. A. (1975). Natural rates of teacher approval and disapproval in the classroom. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 8, 367-372.
- Yarbrough, C. (1973). The effect of magnitude of conductor behavior on performance, attentiveness, and attitude of students in selected mixed choruses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Yarbrough, C., & Price, H. E. (1989). Sequential patterns of instruction in music. Journal of Research in Music Education, 37, 179-187.
- Yarbrough, C., & Price, H. E. (1981). Prediction of performer attentiveness based on rehearsal activity and teacher behavior. Journal of Research in Music Education, 29, 209-217.