A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES USED BY SUZUKI AND NON-SUZUKI STUDIO VIOLIN TEACHERS

by

KELSEY NICOLE HOLLENBAUGH

A THESIS

Presented to the School of Music and Dance
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Music

September 2018

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Kelsey Nicole Hollenbaugh

Title: A Descriptive Analysis of Instructional Strategies Used by Suzuki and Non-Suzuki Studio Violin Teachers

This thesis has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Music degree in the School of Music and Dance by:

Dr. Jason M. Silveira	Chairperson
Dr. Andrew Strietelmeier	Member
Dr. Beth Wheeler	Member

and

Janet Woodruff-Borden	Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded September 2018

THESIS ABSTRACT

Kelsey Nicole Hollenbaugh

Master of Music

School of Music and Dance

September 2018

Title: A Descriptive Analysis of Instructional Strategies Used by Suzuki and Non-Suzuki Studio Violin Teachers

This study was an investigation of the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons. This study was conducted in two phases. In phase one, participants ($N = 85$) completed an online questionnaire detailing percentage of lesson time spent in a variety of teaching behaviors. In phase two, participants ($N = 3$) were observed teaching a studio violin lesson, after which the data were analyzed to determine the teaching behaviors used in the lesson. The data gleaned from both phases were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Results indicated that Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers exhibited similar amounts of many teaching behaviors, but some differences in the areas of parental involvement, assigned listening to recordings at home, and use of reading music, rote teaching, and playing from memory. Implications and future directions for research are discussed.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Kelsey Nicole Hollenbaugh

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
Western State Colorado University, Gunnison, CO

DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Music in Music Education, 2018, University of Oregon
Bachelor of Arts in Music Education, 2015, Western State Colorado University

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

String Music Education

PRESENTATIONS:

Hollenbaugh, K. N. (2018, January). *A descriptive analysis of instructional strategies used by Suzuki and non-Suzuki studio violin* teachers. Poster session presented at the Oregon Music Education Association Conference, Eugene, OR.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my music education professors at the University of Oregon. Thank you to my advisor Dr. Jason Silveira for being incredibly giving of your time and teaching me so much about writing, research, and teaching. Thank you to my committee members Dr. Andrew Strietelmeier and Dr. Beth Wheeler for all of your assistance; I have learned so much from the classes I had with you during my time here, and you have prepared me well for the teaching world. Thank you to Professor Lillie Manis for teaching me about the Suzuki method; I have learned valuable information that I will apply to my future teaching career. Thank you to my friends who let me observe their violin lessons, and Amanda, Trevor, and Lauren for being my thesis-writing support. Thank you to Professor Ken Todd for giving me so many opportunities at my undergraduate institution. Special thank you to the late Dr. John Wacker; because of you I majored in music education and went to graduate school. You were an amazing teacher and inspiration to all of us.

DEDICATION

To my parents Laura and Brad for instilling in me a love of adventure, learning, and curiosity. Thank you for the great example you set and all the help you give me. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Master-Apprenticeship Model

Apprenticeship is the oldest and most common form of education and teaching in human cultures across the world, and was almost the exclusive mode of instruction in hunter-gatherer societies (Egan & Gajdamaschko, 2003). However, modes of learning akin to the master-apprenticeship model, such as imitative learning, extend as far back as the animal kingdom. Wild chimpanzees in Guinea demonstrate "education by master-apprenticeship" in which infant chimpanzees are not motivated by food, but to produce a copy of the mother's actions (Matsuzawa et al., 2001). While chimpanzees do not engage in direct teaching, they appear to provide a setting for learning to occur, aided by observation and imitation. Although the master-apprenticeship model may seem outdated, many fields still employ its basic principles when teaching certain kinds of skills. Clinical medical education is one such field that follows a master-apprenticeship structure. Central to the system of knowledge acquisition within the medical field is the idea of a teacher modeling techniques and behaviors for younger colleagues and students in clinical practice, as well as the students' ability to use the information in accordance with what clinical teachers believe is correct, and what tradition allows (Nilsson, Pennbrant, Pilhammar, & Wenestam, 2010).

Traditionally, the master-apprenticeship model has been used widely throughout the arts. Leonardo da Vinci spent 10 years from the age of 14 as an apprentice before starting his own studio (Burwell, 2012). Along with visual arts, Jørgensen (2000) reported that the master-apprentice relationship has also been predominantly used in

instrumental instruction, where the master is seen as a role model, and the dominating mode of student learning is imitation. Historically, apprenticeship has been associated with fostering musical performance skills, even before the development of the conservatoire model (the term reflecting the one-to-one music lessons given in music conservatories), and the master-apprentice dyad remains characteristic of instrumental teaching and learning today (Burwell, 2012). This relationship is especially seen within higher music education in Western classical music, in which "the master-apprentice tradition, with its dominant one-to-one mode of tuition [instruction] focuses predominantly on knowledge transmission from teacher to student" (Hanken, 2016, p. 364). In this model, university music students study within a particular professor's studio, learning the trade of instrumental music-making in the style of that teacher. While the master-apprenticeship model is seen in conservatories and universities, it is also relevant to one-on-one musical instruction with children, adolescents, and adults in "private" music instruction. The novice who is engaged in an apprenticeship relationship with an expert learns by "doing" or imitating, with the expert on hand to guide and correct the learner (Egan & Gajdamaschko, 2003).

Some common characteristics found in the music education master-apprenticeship model include the acquisition of experiential knowledge or skill, the use of modeling and imitation, and a particular nature of the master-apprentice relationship (Burwell, 2012). Historically, "craft" professions such as carpentry or plumbing were reliant on the master-apprenticeship model, in order to pass down knowledge. However, Gamble (2001) described a potential flaw in the master-apprenticeship model, stating, "while conventional wisdom has long held that skill is transmitted through modeling and

practical example, the traditional 'master'-apprentice relationship represents a mode of pedagogy that is no longer deemed viable in modern workplaces where continuous change is the norm" (p. 185). Gamble's concern lies in modern interpretation of apprenticeships, where acquisition of knowledge is favored over tacit transmission. Nevertheless, Gamble believed that transmission of knowledge from a "master" has a stronger impact than has been acknowledged in recent years, and master-apprenticeship pedagogy should not be easily discounted as "pedagogically empty practice" (p. 191).

Upon examination of music-specific research, two pedagogical approaches were used by educators in the one-to-one setting: transfer and transformative pedagogy (Carey, Bridgstock, Taylor, McWilliam, & Grant, 2013). The former focuses more on imitation of student and teacher and performative outcomes in students, giving less attention to scaffolding and increasing ability through new knowledge or skill acquisition. Teachers utilizing the second approach, transformative pedagogy, place an emphasis on depth of student understanding by increasing student ability through learning new knowledge or skills, and putting them into practice by performing (Carey et al., 2013). Transformative teaching includes aligning authentic learning activities, assessment, and learning outcomes. Educators who utilize transformative teaching believe that students are more likely to be actively engaged in their learning if taught in a transformative way that emphasizes process over content. The findings suggest performance outcomes are not the sole measure of teaching effectiveness, but rather the interactions between master and apprentice are as important as the product created (Carey et al., 2013). In a later study, Carey and Grant (2015) found that music students viewed the one-to-one teaching

approach as irreplaceable, due to the ability of the teacher to respond to the individual in a customizable, effective way.

Music Pedagogy

Many debates in music education stem from pedagogical differences and beliefs about the way music should be taught. In the past, music teaching has been an unsystematic discipline in which different experiences occurred for each teacher and student (Lee, 1987). Developments in music pedagogy might stem from attempts to organize the tradition of music teaching (Lee, 1987). It is important for music education pedagogy to be thoroughly researched in order to use effective methods and benefit the greatest number of students. While deficits still exist, there have been improvements in music teacher education throughout the past few decades (e.g., McPherson & Welsch, 2012).

There are many pedagogical approaches found in the broad field of music education. One pedagogical approach found in music education includes the Positive Instruction in Music Studios (PIMS) model (Patson & Waters, 2015). In the PIMS model, teachers utilize four processes found in positive psychology including: (1) positive priming (e.g., stating what is going well); (2) strengths spotting (e.g., connecting students with their signature strengths); (3) positive pause (e.g., stopping when the student does something well); and (4) process praise (e.g., praising effort and technique, not just outcomes). Patson and Waters state that PIMS can be intertwined with other models of music instruction, and the four stages do not have to follow any particular order. Constructivist pedagogy is another approach teachers can utilize. Constructivism was intended to provide students with a wide range of learning experiences and choices, to

help them develop self-regulation and give autonomy in studio-music instruction (McPhail, 2013). According to McPhail, allowing students to make choices in their learning experiences increases the likelihood of students developing intrinsic motivation. Another approach, critical pedagogy, aims to connect the music that students enjoy listening to with the music that teachers want them to learn (Abrahams, 2005). This approach was originally developed to teach illiterate adults in Brazil to read by posing questions and problem to encourage students to use knowledge they already possessed as a bridge to new learning. Teachers apply critical pedagogy to music education when they relate school music to the music in students' personal lives and prior music experience (Abrahams, 2005).

Along with the different pedagogies found in a variety of musical settings, there are also various pedagogies specific to violin instruction. Gholson (1998) examined a renowned violin pedagogue and found that one of the main strategies she used was an application of the theory of proximal positioning. This strategy accounts for the adjustments that a pedagogue makes in order to assist students through zones of proximal development (e.g., Vygotsky, 1978). She used preparatory strategies to establish a comforting instructional atmosphere through patterns of praise, affirmation, and comfort language that create buffer zones and encourage student risk taking (Gholson, 1998). Similarly, Shaw (1964) stated that emphasis on proper positioning, establishing core techniques and basics, repetition of basic repertoire, clear presentation of new material, and sight-reading were important aspects in violin lessons. At the college level, Mio (2017) examined postsecondary applied violin instructors to determine what pedagogical techniques they used with incoming first-year students and found that the teachers

addressed corrections with students through effective communication, based on the individual physiological and psychological wellbeing of every student, their level of self-efficacy, motivation, resistance to change, and postsecondary expectations. A great variety of pedagogical strategies exist within the string music education setting; however, many of these strategies contribute to the two main pedagogical approaches found in string instruction – the Suzuki method and the non-Suzuki, or "traditional" method, which includes the various approaches of pedagogues such as Paul Rolland, Ivan Galamian, and Carl Flesch, to name a few.

Suzuki Method

The Suzuki method was developed by Dr. Shinichi Suzuki in Japan and is based on patterns that he observed in language learning (Bugeja, 2009). Suzuki noticed babies learned their native language, or their "mother tongue," with ease when they were young, and hypothesized that the environment was the main contributor to language acquisition (Kendall, 1966). For his method, sometimes called the "mother tongue" method, Suzuki applied language-learning principles to violin instruction. Suzuki's early teaching practice in the 1930s and 1940s established a few central ideas: (1) the importance of repetition in learning; (2) the recording as teacher; (3) a place for mothers in assisting learning; and (4) the teachability of talent (Thibeault, 2018). American interest in Suzuki's method started with his 1958 visit to a regional meeting of the American String Teachers Association (ASTA) at Oberlin College in Ohio (Kendall, 1966). During the 1960s, John Kendall published the first translation of the method in the United States (Thibeault, 2018). The Suzuki method is highly standardized, with much uniformity between teachers all over the world (Brathwaite, 1988). This standardization is due to the

emphasis on a high level of teacher training, as specific sequencing throughout the repertoire is a crucial aspect of the method (Perkins, 1995).

Suzuki developed the core tenets of his method to help create the right environment for a young child to learn an instrument. Suzuki believed that all human beings have the potential to develop musicianship at a very high level, given the right environment (Kendall, 1966). Since the sensitive period for language acquisition occurs in the preschool years, Suzuki believed music education should start at this time as well. Under Suzuki's method, students as young as age three are taught to play the violin, and are strongly encouraged to listen to the repertoire from birth (Thibeault, 2018). When learning a language, the child has many supportive adults who serve as models and encouragement for them. Parental support and participation are vital in Suzuki's method, with the parent attending each lesson, learning along with the student, taking notes, and developing an understanding of the correct posture and hand position (Kendall, 1966). Parents serve as the home teacher with their role being to guide student's daily practice by providing feedback and help students sense the importance of what they are doing in a positive environment (Kendall, 1966). Teachers of the Suzuki method utilize a rote approach to teaching music that is similar to the way a young child develops language ability – using recorded models for the student to listen to daily, as well as plentiful imitation, repetition, and review (Kendall, 1966). All compositions studied are memorized using rote teaching and aural recall, and no music or note reading is used until the student's technique is established, which may take two or more years (Kendall, 1966). According to Suzuki, by not introducing music reading until technique has been developed, students can focus more on correct posture, left- and right-hand techniques,

and tone. Suzuki believed that the development of a beautiful tone was the foundation for learning to play musical instruments (Thompson, 2016).

Daily practice is reinforced in the Suzuki method, as is actively listening to recordings of repertoire. Students are expected to listen to the current piece they are learning, three to four pieces ahead in the book, as well as all of the previous pieces they have learned (Thibeault, 2018). Review of previously-learned pieces is another tenet of the Suzuki method, as he deemed that repetition was important for learning. Kendall (1966) stated that the child should continue practicing their first piece as they add new pieces to their repertory. The repertoire students learn is standardized, with all students following the same sequence of materials.

Non-Suzuki Method

The non-Suzuki or "traditional" method encompasses many different approaches designed by various string pedagogues including Paul Rolland, Ivan Galamian, and Carl Flesch. There is not one monolithic "traditional" method, but rather the term is a catchall for the combination of various approaches utilized in group string instruction (particularly in school systems), as well as private lessons. Aspects of the many non-Suzuki pedagogues are often used in conjunction with one another to create comprehensive string instruction. While there are string educators who subscribe to the ideas of a specific method, many teachers use ideas from multiple pedagogies to form an eclectic method of string instruction (Shehan, 1986). Students learning in the "traditional" Western paradigm of instrumental instruction are taught note reading from the beginning, and the parent's role is not defined or stipulated by any specific organization, as it is in the Suzuki method, but rather depends greatly on individual

teachers and parents (Bugeja, 2009). Overall, traditional violin teachers place less emphasis on ear training as well (Braithwaite, 1988).

Many aspects of the non-Suzuki method come from string pedagogues of the twentieth century. One extremely influential violinist and educator was Paul Rolland. Born in Hungary in 1911, Rolland came to the United States after studying to be a solo violinist. In the United States, Rolland developed quality public school string teaching programs in the late 1950s through the 1970s (Perkins, 1995). The Music Educators National Conference commissioned Rolland to write a method book, called *Basic Principles of Violin Playing.* The text included strategies to teach violin fundamentals to beginners, as well as techniques at the intermediate and advanced level (Rolland, 1960). Berman (1960) stated that *Basic Principles of Violin Playing* was intended to be, "a practical manual on violin teaching, with emphasis placed on fundamental principles generally agreed upon by the teaching profession" (p. 240). Rolland also wrote a pedagogical text titled *The Teaching of Action in String Playing*, a guide for teaching basic violin and viola skills that served as the detailed manual for the film series of the same name produced by the University of Illinois String Research Project (Rolland & Mutschler, 1974). The films and the manual were based on the hypothesis that movement training, designed to free the student from excess tensions, can be introduced within an organized plan of string instruction. Perkins (1995) stated that since many of Rolland's ideas have become woven into current string pedagogy, teachers may be unaware how often they use his techniques in their teaching. Rolland's approach is highly accessible and can be successfully implemented into any string program, especially in a public-school setting, provided the teacher has proper training in the method (Perkins, 1995).

Another influential string pedagogue was Ivan Galamian. Galamian wrote two violin method books detailing his pedagogical approach to violin teaching. In *Principles of Violin Playing and Teaching*, Galamian (1962) emphasized the importance of natural movement, or the techniques that feel comfortable and efficient for each individual student. This text includes general principles of technique and interpretation, left- and right-hand skills, and techniques for practicing the violin. Galamian did not suggest a specific plan of repertoire or materials to be used. Rather, Galamian suggested that scales and etudes are important to build technique. This book might be applicable to a variety of students, since it includes very basic principles of violin playing, as well as more advanced techniques such as vibrato and special bowing considerations. Galamian also wrote *Contemporary Violin Technique* in 1966, which covers essential elements of violin technique (Galamian & Meumann, 1966). This text expands upon the basic technique outlined in the previous text by providing scales and arpeggio exercises that can help to refine technique.

A third non-Suzuki pedagogue who was known as one of the greatest violin pedagogues of the 20th century was Carl Flesch (Perkins, 1995). Flesch was born in Hungary in 1873 and his most famous works are *The Art of Violin Playing* and his scale and technical studies (Perkins, 1995). The majority of Flesch's work is comprised of written text, as opposed to notated music. There are musical examples to support the text, but no exercises or pieces for students to directly play (Knapik, 2015). By including copious amounts of text, it appears as though Flesch wanted to give violinists and teachers the tools to think logically for themselves and analyze technical problems in depth. Overall, Flesch did not align himself with any one particular school of technique,

but rather his writings were a synthesis of various schools, which formed the mainstream of violin teaching during the 19th and 20th centuries (Knapik, 2015).

Background and Importance of Project

Research has been conducted that examines activities and teaching strategies found within both the non-Suzuki music studio (Barry & McArthur, 1994; Duke & Simmons, 2006), as well as in private lessons taught using the Suzuki method (Colprit, 2000; Duke, 1999; O'Neill, 2003). The non-Suzuki and Suzuki methodologies are kept relatively separate when discussed and examined, giving the impression that they are quite different in their approaches. In the professional practice community (as opposed to the research community), there have been many anecdotal accounts of controversy within the Suzuki method in particular. Thibeault (2018) states, "Suzuki's new approach inspired anxiety in the United States that would lead to profound efforts to reform string teaching" (p. 2). While the Suzuki and non-Suzuki methods share certain historical roots and common threads in their pedagogical approaches for teaching violin technique, teachers within the Suzuki method explicitly dictate more aspects of pedagogy than typical non-Suzuki teachers. For example, an early start to music instruction is emphasized in the Suzuki method, with most children beginning when they are of preschool or elementary age. Since students who study the Suzuki method are often very young, questions arise regarding the quality of instruction provided, the adequacy of musical opportunities, and the degree to which each child's musical potential is nurtured during these formative years (Kendall, 1966). Another controversial aspect of the Suzuki method lies in delayed music reading, instead learning by rote from the onset of instruction.

The controversies discussed above appear to be less of an issue today, as the Suzuki method is becoming more commonly accepted in America: "Suzuki's contributions to instrumental teaching and early childhood education are widely known, and the Japanese philosophical views were skillfully adapted to American elementary school music practices" (Shehan, 1986, p. 29). Brathwaite (1988) also made a compelling argument for uniting string pedagogies, stating that there need not be a rigid distinction between Suzuki violinists and those taught traditionally, as both approaches share the same goal: to produce performers who play in tune, with a rich and varied tone, and stylistic and sensitive interpretations of music.

Even with the existing research that examines string pedagogies, a lack of evidence exists detailing the specific instructional strategies and activities used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki violin teachers. There appear to be more studies regarding the Suzuki method, as they have been funded by the International Research Symposium on Talent Education (e.g., Duke, 1999), than the non-Suzuki method, as "non-Suzuki" is a very broad and diverse category. Since scant research exists on each method individually, it is extremely difficult to compare the two string education approaches. Examining commonly used methodologies may help researchers shed light on the specific techniques of each method, to determine where similarities and differences occur. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine and analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons. This study specifically sought to address the following questions: (1) What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities occur in the lessons of Suzuki violin students? (2) What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson

activities occur in the lessons of non-Suzuki violin students? and (3) In what ways, if any, do the teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities used differ between the groups?

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter describes literature relevant to research conducted in the field of teacher effectiveness and time use within group and studio music instruction. It is organized in six sections: (1) theoretical perspectives; (2) general teacher effectiveness; (3) music teacher effectiveness; (4) time use in ensemble rehearsals; (5) private studio instruction; and (6) string instruction.

Theoretical Perspectives

Research within a music context has examined teacher effectiveness in a variety of settings, including string (Duke, 1999) and choral (Nàpoles, 2006; Yarbrough, 1975; Yarbrough & Price, 1981) time use in both group and private lesson settings (Brendell, 1996; Goolsby, 1996; Moore, 1981; Moore & Bonney, 1987), and time use specifically in a string education environment (Cheng & Durrant, 2007; Colprit, 2000; Duke, 1999; Fredrickson, Geringer, & Pope, 2013; Scott, 1992). The majority of research on time use within the string environment has been conducted utilizing two major methodologies of string instruction, the Suzuki method (Colprit, 2000; Duke, 1999, Scott, 1992), and the non-Suzuki method (Cheng & Durrant, 2007, Fredrickson, Geringer, & Pope, 2013). However relatively few studies have been conducted comparing time use between the Suzuki and the non-Suzuki methods, particularly in private studio violin lessons (Bugeja, 2009; Perkins, 1995).

The present study examines teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities used in studio violin lessons. These aspects have been called teaching behaviors in other studies (Ihas, 2011) and include strategies in the lesson that teachers

use to improve student competencies and promote learning. Meissner (2017) examined instructional strategies used by instrumental teachers to facilitate student learning of expressive music performance, finding that teachers used strategies such as singing, imagery, modeling, inquiry, discussion, explanation of expressive devices, gestures and movements, and listening to recordings of oneself. The teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities in the present study were based on those previously found to occur in the lessons of Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers.

Within the Suzuki setting, various teacher behaviors and instructional strategies were found to occur. Colprit (2000) observed lessons and determined that teachers spent the majority of their time in teacher verbalizations (45%), followed by student performance (41%), and then teacher modeling (20%). Totals add up to greater than 100% due to multiple behaviors occurring simultaneously. Duke (1999) also analyzed violin lessons taught by expert Suzuki teachers and observed teacher behaviors occurring within lesson segments. Such behaviors included teacher performance, physical positioning with the student, teacher verbalizations, and a high proportion of positive teacher feedback. In the non-Suzuki setting, Cheng and Durrant (2007) observed string teachers with a variety of students and described the instructional strategies and lesson activities utilized by the teachers. Such strategies included music reading, positive feedback, one point teaching, memorization, improvisation, student performance, and teacher demonstration and modeling. Bugeja (2009) compared parental involvement between the Suzuki and non-Suzuki methods of violin instruction. While this comparison is useful, she only examined one variable – parental involvement. The methodology for the present study was based on previous research conducted with Suzuki and non-Suzuki

string educators. Much of the research conducted on time use in the string education setting is descriptive, with researchers using questionnaires, direct observations, or interviews to determine the instructional strategies used by various string educators (Cheng & Durrant, 2007; Colprit, 2000; Duke, 1999).

General Teacher Effectiveness

Measuring teacher effectiveness is crucial for both teacher accountability and providing evidence of the value of certain instructional strategies. In recent decades, there have been two main developments that have influenced teaching effectiveness research: a shift in focus to the global aspects of teaching and analyzing teaching patterns, as opposed to single teaching acts, and the shift in focus to processes of learning in specific knowledge domains (Seidel & Shavelson, 2007). According to Seidel and Shavelson (2007), the execution of domain-specific learning activities represented the most important influence of teaching on student learning (i.e., music activities). Researchers have since attempted to investigate teachers' effectiveness in a variety of domain-specific contexts. Rink (2013) examined previous research on teacher effectiveness within physical education settings and found that the variable most related to student performance was the amount of time students spent in class engaged in motor activities related to the content. Recently, researchers in the physical education field have sought to understand the teaching process as a whole, and the role the student has in that process.

Researchers have studied the degree to which assessment tools accurately measure teacher effectiveness. One tool that was developed to measure teaching effectiveness in physical education is the Measure of Effective Teaching and the Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument (Rink, 2013). Another evaluation tool

developed by Marshall, Smart, and Alston (2016) includes the Teacher Intentionality of Practice Scale (TIPS), an observational protocol designed to measure intentional teaching and provide support for teacher growth over time. The findings suggested that TIPS not only measured pedagogical knowledge for teaching such as lesson planning, classroom management, and instructional delivery, but also measured the pedagogical content knowledge of teachers necessary to engage students in "meaningful, transformative learning" (Marshall et al., 2016). The data supported a correlation between TIPS ratings and student achievement levels.

Teacher effectiveness has also been measured using pretest/posttest scores on student work (Stronge, Ward, and Grant, 2011). The data suggested that teachers in the top quartile of student achievement gain had fewer disruptions, better classroom management skills, and better relationships with their students than bottom quartile teachers. Pretest-posttest scores are one way of measuring teacher effectiveness, however there are many variables that contribute to student scores and the classroom environment. Such variables might include home learning environment and family socioeconomic status (Connor, Son, Hindman, & Morrison, 2005).

Teacher attributes have also been shown to contribute to student success; in one study, fifth grade students demonstrated stronger vocabulary and decoding skills when their teachers were warm, responsive, and spent more time in academic activities (Connor, Son, Hindman, & Morrison, 2005). The factors that influence student success in the classroom are extensive, making accurately measuring teacher effects on student outcomes challenging.

Music Teacher Effectiveness

Researchers have also examined teacher effectiveness in music-specific settings. According to Grant and Drafall (1991) studies of effective teaching fall into three broad categories: (1) identification of personal and professional characteristics of teachers; (2) identification of specific music teacher competencies; and (3) instructional behaviors used by music teachers.

Characteristics of Teachers

Characteristics of music teachers have been found to contribute to effectiveness in the classroom. Baker (1981) developed a checklist for evaluating music teachers that measured teachers' characteristics. He found that the most crucial characteristics included enthusiasm for teaching, caring for students, maintaining strong yet fair discipline, and interest in student enjoyment. Mills and Smith (2003) surveyed music teachers to determine which characteristics were believed to be attributes of effective instrumental teachers. They found that the ideal teacher is one who is enthusiastic, accomplished, and positive, communicates effectively with students, organizes lessons to encompass all levels and learning styles, and ensures pupils have fun and spend much of their lessons playing their instruments. These important characteristics are similar to those found in Baker's (1981) study, suggesting that certain teachers appear more effective than others due to their personal qualities. Brand (1990) observed characteristics of master music teachers and determined the commonalities that existed among them. Master music teachers appeared to place high value on music and music education, were highly devoted to teaching, and were able to challenge and inspire their students.

While researchers have measured personal qualities of experienced music teachers, other studies involve preservice teachers. Schmidt (1998) surveyed student teachers to determine their beliefs on the personal qualities that were essential for good teaching. The consensus was that good teachers exhibited humor and enthusiasm, were respected, and developed a sense of community in the ensemble. Social skills also seem to play a role in preservice teacher effectiveness. Hamann, Lineburgh, and Paul (1998) found three social factors that contributed to teaching effectiveness among preservice teachers. Those skills included the teacher's skill in expressing nonverbal communication, in receiving and interpreting nonverbal communication of others, and their ability to engage others in social discourse. Nonverbal communication ability has been found to enhance teacher effectiveness in music classrooms (Grant & Drafall, 1991; Hamann et al., 1998; Juchniewicz, 2010). In another study of preservice music teachers, Hamann, Baker, McAllister, and Bauer (2000) measured the effect of instruction and lesson content on students' perceptions of teacher effectiveness. Students found lessons with good delivery but poor content to be more interesting than lessons with poor delivery and good content. This supports previous findings that interpersonal skills may be as or more important than musical skills in determining the effectiveness of or attitude towards music teachers (Juchniewicz, 2010; Yarbrough, 1975). While this research is valuable, student perception does not inherently correlate with effectiveness.

Music Teacher Competencies

The second category of music teacher evaluation, identification of specific music teacher competencies, is widely represented in the research literature. McAllister (2008) posited that in music education research, specific categories are often used to evaluate

teaching: preparation, content knowledge, interactive skills such as delivery, teacher affect and intensity, pacing, sequencing, use of feedback, and modeling. C. Madsen (1990) measured the relationship between teacher intensity and student attentiveness and determined that low intensity teacher delivery would not often maintain enough student attentiveness for the subject matter to be learned. In this study, students were on-task while playing music, and quickly became off-task once the music stopped, during periods of "getting ready." K. Madsen (2003) supported this research through findings that middle and high school participants rated teachers relatively high despite inaccurate academic instruction, as long as the teacher delivery was high and the students were on-task. These results indicate that the intensity level of the teacher may have a greater influence on music students' perceptions of effective teaching than the accuracy of the teacher's instruction. Cassidy (1990) also measured the effect of intensity training on preservice teachers' accuracy of instruction and effectiveness of delivery. Results suggested that teacher behaviors scored as "low intensity" were also categorized as poor information and/or ineffective delivery, further supporting the hypothesis that teacher intensity is related to perceptions of teacher effectiveness. Siebenaler (1997) measured several teacher behaviors that contributed to the perception of teacher effectiveness. Relatively active teachers were ranked higher than inactive teachers, possibly because they provided more modeling and gave more feedback. Effective lessons contained very brief directives and the instructional pace included more frequent teacher-student interaction. Nielsen (2014) utilized the Danielson Framework for Teaching model for measuring teacher competencies. This model was used for measuring teacher effectiveness in four domains: (1) planning and preparation; (2) the class environment;

(3) instruction; and (4) professional responsibilities. This model is a rubric-based assessment, in which the participants are categorized as distinguished, proficient, basic, or unsatisfactory (Nielsen, 2014). While the teacher behaviors and competencies observed in the aforementioned research studies include important qualities for teachers to develop, the specific effects of teacher behaviors on student achievement may not necessarily lead to increased student learning outcomes.

Instructional Behaviors

The third category of music teacher evaluation, as recognized by Grant and Drafall (1991), includes process-product studies, which measures the effect of teacher behavior on student attentiveness, attitude, and achievement. Student attentiveness is related to the nature of the activities in which students engage, with higher ratings of attentiveness during classroom activities that involve active participation, such as music making, and significantly higher rates of off-task behavior during nonperformance activities (Duke, 1999; Witt, 1986; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Teacher experience plays a role in student attentiveness as well, with more experienced teachers typically attaining higher rates of student attentiveness (Duke, 1999; Moore & Bonney, 1987). These findings suggest that teachers with more experience use shorter intervals of teacher activity, such as talking, and spend more time devoted to instructional activities involving students (Duke, 1999).

Student attitudes have also been measured in relation to teacher effectiveness. Nàpoles (2017) measured the effect of teacher talk on student perceptions and found that students preferred rehearsals with fewer verbal instructions because they were able to perform more. These findings suggest that pacing is related to student attitudes of teacher

effectiveness as well. Silveira (2014) discovered that teachers who had speech pacing lapses during instruction were met with negative ratings from observers, indicating a negative reaction to the discontinuity.

The relationship between teacher behavior and student achievement has also been examined to determine teacher effectiveness. Siebenaler (1997) measured durations of teacher behaviors such as playing, talking, and rate of approvals and determined that a more rapid rate of teacher talk was related to higher student performance scores. Results also indicated that students with more active teachers tended to perform more successfully. These findings corroborate the above studies regarding pacing (Nàpoles, 2017; Silveira, 2014), and directly relate teacher pacing to student performance.

Gerrity (2013) stated that a recent trend in evaluating educators was to examine value-added data such as student test scores. For example, in the state of Indiana, a significant portion of a music teachers' effectiveness rating is determined by the performance of their students on both teacher-generated and standardized assessment tasks. While having concrete data such as student test scores may be useful in determining teacher effectiveness, many states do not have standardized music tests, and a music teacher's effectiveness is often determined through observation by administration (Gerrity, 2013). Nielsen (2014) found that school administrators usually conduct two types of classroom observations: drop ins (which create a snapshot of instruction) and formal observation in which the observer is present for a whole class period and use a pre- and post-observation conference. The observers are likely not measuring student achievement and performance, but rather rating a music teacher's characteristics and competencies, as well as student on- and off-task behavior, in order to determine

effectiveness. When studying music teacher effectiveness, researchers have often examined time use in a variety of settings from ensemble rehearsals to one-on-one lessons, to determine the effect certain activities and instructional strategies have on student learning.

Time Use in Ensemble Rehearsals

Many of the researchers that measured teacher effectiveness have examined teacher behaviors, musical activities, and instructional strategies being used in the classroom, to determine their effect on student performance. As previously stated, student attending behavior is a function of the nature of the activity in which students participate, with more on-task behavior occurring during activities that involve active music making (Brendell, 1996; Duke, 1999; Forsythe, 1977; Witt, 1986; Yarbrough & Price, 1981). Therefore, it is important to examine the activities that teachers use in their classrooms to determine how time is being spent.

Teaching time use in music rehearsals has also been found to differ between experience levels of teachers. Wagner and Strul (1979) determined that experienced teachers spent significantly less time giving directions than novice teachers. Moore and Bonney (1987) also measured time use between student teachers and experienced teachers in a general music education setting. Between both groups of teachers, singing was the most common music activity and teacher instruction encompassed the highest percentage of non-music making activities. Student teachers spent more time in each instance of an activity than experienced teachers, and experienced teachers gave a higher percentage of approvals and had a higher rate of student attentiveness than student teachers. Further, Goolsby (1996) examined instrumental music rehearsals taught by

novice, experienced, and student music teachers and found that experienced teachers spent significantly more time in performance and used more nonverbal modeling than the other groups of teachers. Experienced teachers also divided rehearsal time more equally between a warm-up and two musical selections, and got the ensembles on-task the quickest. These findings suggest that experienced teachers have learned which strategies and classroom activities keep students on task to utilize rehearsal time in the most efficient way.

Various research has also been conducted measuring rehearsal activities of both choral and band conductors. Results indicated that choral conductors have specific lesson activities they use regularly in rehearsal which include a warm-up period, sight-reading, and literature instruction (Brendell, 1996; Fiocca, 1989). Rehearsal activities have also been shown to change depending on the amount of time before a concert with a decline in non-performance activities (such as sectionals) in the final rehearsals prior to the performance (Cox, 1986). When observing band rehearsals, Sherrill (1986) discovered that each conductor used a warm-up of a different length and content; however, all but one director utilized scales during the warm-up period.

In addition to examining specific activities used in music rehearsals, researchers have also examined the type and amount of teacher feedback used in various settings. Duke and Madsen (1991) observed music teachers modeling for students 26–30% of the time, giving non-specific (e.g., “do it again”) instructions 20% of the time, and giving specific descriptions of instructional tasks 70–73% of the time. Varying amounts of approval/disapproval feedback also occurred between studies (Blocher, Greenwood, & Shellahamer, 1997; Duke & Madsen, 1991; Moore, 1981).

Rehearsal time use has also been studied with regard to teacher effectiveness in the string orchestra setting. Cheng and Durrant (2007) investigated factors that contributed to effective instrumental teaching, finding that instructional strategies and activities such as music reading, positive feedback, one point teaching, memorization, improvisation, student performance, and teacher demonstration and modeling were important for string education effectiveness. While time use has been amply measured in the large ensemble setting, several studies have also examined time use in the private studio setting.

Private Studio Instruction

Master-Apprenticeship Model

As previously discussed, the master-apprentice dyad that has existed for hundreds of years is the dominant model used in studio music instruction. The one-to-one conservatoire model seen in higher education provides a rich mentoring environment and can be used as a powerful tool for developing musical talent, as well as providing effective communication and knowledge transfer (Gaunt, 2011; Gaunt, Creech, Long, & Hallam, 2012). Teachers shape the musicianship of their students, demonstrating the standards for tone quality and technique through modeling (Kennell, 2002). Since studio music instruction contains the classic dyad of teacher and student, instruction must include teacher knowledge and expertise, student characteristics and development, and the interactive strategies that ensure replication of the desired skills (Kennell, 2002).

While the master-apprentice dyad is used extensively and is a complex system of transferring musical knowledge, the instructional processes used in group music instruction have been more widely researched than those used in the applied studio

(Brand, 1992). While many of the commonly-used approaches of applied studio instruction often yield desired results, new techniques and materials produced through experimental research needs to be evaluated as well, in order to gain a deeper understanding of pedagogical effectiveness (Madsen, 1965; Parkes, 2012). Research on the applied studio setting is becoming more common in recent years. Parkes (2012) stated that recent research in applied studio instruction can be grouped into three categories: (1) characteristics of the applied studio; (2) the use of practice in the applied studio; and (3) the use of evaluation in the applied studio.

Characteristics of the Applied Studio

The majority of research investigating characteristics of the applied studio focuses on what occurs at the instructional, behavioral, and pedagogical levels (Parkes, 2012). Regarding instruction, Kennel and Marks (1992) reported that direct instruction usually lasts for 30 to 60 minutes each week and contains both the structure of a routine from week to week as well as flexibility, as lesson content depends upon students' home practice time. Kostka (1984) investigated instructional time use in piano lessons and discovered that the lessons were divided between student performance (56.57%) and teacher talk (42.24%), with approvals and disapprovals nearly equal. Zhukov (2004) examined student behaviors in the music conservatory environment and found that lessons mostly consisted of student performance of technical repertoire and teacher suggestions for improvement. Teacher behaviors included demonstration, giving general directions, reinforcement, positive and negative evaluation, questioning, explanation, and discussion of practicing strategies. Other pedagogical strategies that have been researched include parental involvement (Creech & Hallam, 2003), use of physical touch (Zorzal &

Lorenzo, 2017), and strategies for teaching musicality aspects such as expression (McPhee, 2011).

Duke and Simmons (2006) examined a few examples of the Western applied studio and identified common characteristics between effective teachers and found that teachers used the pedagogical tool of setting performance goals for students. The teachers studied assigned repertoire well within students' technical capabilities and selected lesson targets that were slightly more difficult than students' current skill level, so that targets were achievable in the short term. The teachers were tenacious in working to accomplish the lesson targets and had students repeat target passages until accurate. Duke and Simmons (2006) also identified variables within the applied studio setting including allocation of time, teacher verbalizations, and gestures and activities. Parkes and Wexler (2012) replicated Duke and Simmons' (2006) study and observed some of the same behaviors occurring. However, Parkes and Wexler found the most frequent behaviors to be teaching targets and positive feedback. They also found that teachers demonstrated many aspects of performance at once, including modeling the melodic and rhythmic structure, the right and wrong way to play a passage, ways to break down a passage into manageable parts, and demonstration of sample practice techniques. This study addressed behaviors that occurred at the same time, which were not addressed in the Duke and Simmons study. Colprit (2000) examined characteristics in the Suzuki applied studio identifying variables such as time use and teacher verbalizations. Some characteristics of effective teachers identified by both Duke and Simmons (2006) and Colprit (2000) overlapped, including the setting of musical targets or performance goals for students as well as consistent patterns of observable student/teacher interactions (Parkes, 2012).

Aside from instructional strategies, another important characteristic found in the one-to-one studio music environment involves the dyad between teacher personalities and student learning styles. In one study, teacher personality variables were significantly related to four teaching behaviors: (1) approvals; (2) rate of reinforcement; (3) teacher model/performance; and (4) pace of the lesson (Schmidt, 1989). Teachers who were rated as extraverted on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) had significantly higher rates of approval and reinforcement than did introverted teachers. In another study, Beheshti (2009) advocated for the use of learning style models as a teaching framework. He believed that tailoring instruction to students' dominant learning style (visual, aural, or kinesthetic) could help a teacher more effectively design an individualized pedagogical approach for each student. Zhukov (2007) also examined student learning styles and identified six prominent styles, with the first three enumerated styles being considered positive learning styles and the latter three considered negative learning styles: (1) compliant (in which student behavior is submissive to the teacher); (2) extrovert (students who exhibited sociable, positive behavior); (3) serious (students who appear thoughtful and not very extroverted); (4) apologetic (students made excuses and blamed various factors for their poor performance); (5) disappointed (these students scored highest in the category of disappointment); and (6) frustrated (students who appear discontent). Students found to be in the "frustrated" learning style tended to play less, ask fewer questions, and spend less time in agreement with the teacher. In contrast, the most frequent student behavior found in the "compliant" category was agreement with the teacher's directions. Having an awareness of both teacher and student behavioral

tendencies in studio music lessons can lead to a greater understanding of student/teacher strengths and weaknesses, resulting in a higher degree of personalized instruction.

Another characteristic of studio music instruction includes the attitudes and perceptions held by teachers, students, and parents. Upon surveying college-level music performance majors teaching applied lessons, Fredrickson (2007) found that the student teachers' expectations of the quality of their music lessons were consistently lower than the lesson evaluations provided by outside expert observers. The student teachers were also inaccurate in connecting the best/worst aspects of their teaching with the best/worst aspects of student learning, indicating that pre-service music teachers struggle with accurately evaluating and reflecting upon their own teaching performance. In a follow-up study, Villarreal (2010) more closely examined attitudes of pre-service teachers. Participants reported a lack of continuing education resources for active private lesson teachers, as well as a strong enjoyment and commitment to teaching private lessons. Findings also showed a lack of agreement on private lesson teaching "best practices," including teaching styles and curriculum. More research on the teaching styles, teaching strategies, and curriculum used within the private studio might lead to increased uniformity and standardization for empirically-based practices.

Researchers have also measured attitudes and motivation of students who take lessons from studio teachers. Students who study with "excellent" teachers expressed highly positive attitudes about lessons, performances, and practicing (Duke, Flowers, & Wolfe, 1997). When studying attrition in the applied music studio, Williams (2002) found that most students ceased music instruction both during adolescence and when the excitement of starting a new instrument faded. Teachers can use strategies such as

working in the "zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky, 1978) to motivate students to persist with music lessons (Parkes & Wexler, 2012). This ideal learning situation occurs when the teacher assigns a task to students that is just beyond their current capabilities, and the teacher's experience supports students in completing the task. Through examining student attitudes and motivation in the one-to-one music setting, educators can use effective strategies that may help facilitate student learning.

Use of Practice in the Applied Studio

The use of independent student practice is a key component to the studio-teaching model. Typically students see their teachers for an hour each week and student progress on the instrument is facilitated by individual practice between lessons (Kennell, 2002; Kennell & Marks, 1992). Teachers reported that they always or almost always discussed the importance of practice and specific practice techniques with students, however teachers' approaches were not always consistent with the literature and practice strategies endorsed by college studio teachers (Barry & McArthur, 1994). Barry (2007) found a clear relationship between teaching styles and individual student practice techniques. Students in this study only used practice strategies their teacher had emphasized repeatedly through verbalizations and modeling/demonstration in the lesson. More active teachers (those who provided more feedback and a faster pace) produced students who utilized singing/vocalizations and repetition more than other teachers studied (Barry, 2007). More reserved teachers (those who were not as active or outwardly enthusiastic) produced students who practice more mechanically and utilized slow practice techniques. In examining practice expectations and attitudes of college-level students and their teachers, Kostka (2002) found a disconnect between the two groups. Teachers expected

more weekly practice time to be taking place than was reported by students. Teachers expected students to follow a specific practice routine and 55% of students indicated they did not do so. While nearly all teachers stated that they discussed practice strategies with students, 67% of students reported that practice strategies were not discussed in their lessons. The results of the aforementioned study call into question the effectiveness of studio teacher instruction and its influence on student practice.

Evaluation in the Applied Studio

In an attempt to measure teacher effectiveness, researchers have studied evaluation instruments used in the applied studio setting. Abeles (1975) developed a 30-point scale for evaluating applied music instruction that consisted of statements concerning teacher behaviors in five areas: (1) rapport; (2) instructional systemizations; (3) instructional skill; (4) musical knowledge; and (5) general musical competence. This evaluation scale was deemed reliable in evaluating applied faculty. Kurkul (2007) had evaluators rate teachers' effectiveness by examining the rapport they exhibited with students, finding that a teacher's ability to accurately judge and interpret the meaning of nonverbal cues from students was related to their effectiveness ratings. Siebenaler (1997) found that students of more active studio teachers (teachers that provided more modeling and gave more feedback) performed more successfully than those of inactive teachers, with a higher rate of teacher music talk relating to higher performance scores. The percentage and average duration of teacher modeling episodes were also positively related to student performance scores. Teachers that were rated as more effective also provided descriptive disapproval feedback, and students were told specifically what needed to be corrected and given strategies for improvement. Effective lessons contained

brief directives, teacher modeling, and successful student performances. Paige (2007) found that instrumental training and performance backgrounds of string teachers did not ensure a consistent level of teacher competence. Formal pedagogical training was found to be an advantage to teachers in that it provided a starting point for a range of content and strategies, but results also indicated that the effectiveness of the pedagogy courses varied widely. The field of applied music instruction, specifically string instruction, would benefit from more research examining the effectiveness of various teaching strategies, as well as the effectiveness of pedagogical training offered.

String Instruction

Beginning string instruction is found in both the private studio setting, as well as the public school setting in many areas of the United States. Many beginning string programs in the school system start students in fifth and sixth grade (Tellejon, 1989). Teachers of these programs are often masters of pedagogy on all of the string instruments, as well as classroom management, as they have to teach large, heterogeneous string classes. Brenner (2010) listed many advantages of string study in schools, including developing the ability to break down tasks, applying flexible and creative solutions to problems, and working effectively in group settings. The active participation found in orchestra classes can also benefit students who struggle in the typical classroom environment by allowing them to participate actively, exhibit physical movements, and express themselves emotionally. The studies that have been conducted within the public school string setting mainly focus on students' technical skill development including tuning ability (Hopkins, 2015), vibrato and intonation (Cowden, 1972; Papich & Rainbow, 1974), and bow strokes (Lowe, 1973). Other researchers have

examined the effectiveness of various types of feedback with public school string students, finding that positive verbal feedback was equally as effective as negative feedback in correcting the left hand position errors of elementary school string students (Salzberg & Salzberg, 1981), and that verbal feedback produced more accurate intonation than recorded or model performance feedback (Salzberg, 1980). Research has also been conducted that examines teaching behaviors of middle and high school orchestra directors, specifically measuring time and frequency spent in specific teaching behaviors (Ihas, 2011). Findings suggested that the highest percentage of instructional time was spent in nonverbal (28.15%) and verbal instruction (27.76%), with the least amount of time spent on nonverbal feedback (2.42%). Understanding the techniques being taught to students in school orchestra ensembles, as well as the behaviors used to teach these techniques can help give music educators a framework of pedagogical practices to use with students.

While research studies have been conducted with public school string instruction, studies examining similar aspects have been done within the private studio setting. Creech (2012) found that students of private string teachers played in the lesson an average of 38% of the time, while teachers talked for 29% of the lesson, either in a directive way, diagnosing pupil performance, or providing feedback. Teachers used scaffolding methods for 28% of the time, which included modeling on the violin or singing, playing along with the pupil on the violin, accompanying on the piano, or providing hands-on practical help (e.g., guiding the bow, assisting with posture). Teachers utilized questioning for nine percent of the time, including open questions intended to check student understanding. Examining specific instructional strategies and

activities used in private violin lessons can help give insight into the differences between public school and studio music instruction, as well as differences among various teachers' studios.

Research on instructional strategies can also assist with developing a pedagogy designed for the school string class or the studio setting, and string educators can develop effective teaching techniques from which students can benefit (Nelson, 1983). In regards to studio instruction Nelson stated, "string teaching in the studio is often centered on schools of playing that can be linked to the pedagogy of an artist teacher" (p. 39). These artist teachers often use an eclectic mix of string pedagogies to form their own method of teaching. Typically, this eclectic approach to music instruction is summed up and defined as "traditional" string instruction. In this study, "traditional" string instruction will be referred to as non-Suzuki, as the method encompasses a variety of pedagogies that were in use before or developed separately from the Suzuki method.

Non-Suzuki String Instruction

Traditional, or non-Suzuki string instruction, is often seen in public school orchestra settings and is comprised of many different pedagogical methods. Nelson (1983) stated that, "public school string classes continue to develop along tradition bound lines" (p. 45). The heterogeneous nature of non-Suzuki instruction allows the method to be easily adaptable to public schools, however the non-Suzuki method is also widely used in the private studio setting. Paul Rolland was an influential string pedagogue who influenced subsequent string pedagogues including Mimi Zweig. Zweig stated that she combined her different teachers' pedagogies and influences to create her own teaching tools, and that she utilized instructional strategies such as singing, modeling, and asking

questions during lessons with her students (Sabo-Skelton, 1998). Zweig has shaped many students who display professional technique and performance ability, including solo violinist Joshua Bell.

Researchers have also measured time use within non-Suzuki lessons. McPhail (2010) examined time use in string lessons and determined that two types of teaching modes existed – practice and performance mode. In performance mode, students played larger sections of a piece and focused more on musical goals. Practice mode involved detailed work on technical aspects of performance, with teachers breaking down a skill into manageable parts, utilizing scaffolding, coaching, demonstrating, and setting up home practice strategies. Barry and McArthur (1994) also examined use of practice strategies in string studio instruction, finding that many of the teachers reported they discussed specific practice techniques with students. Duke and Simmons (2006) also surveyed time use in non-Suzuki string lessons and determined that the expert teachers that were studied used similar strategies between them when teaching lessons to students. Teachers assigned repertoire within students' technical capabilities, selected lesson targets that were technically or musically important, and allowed the course of the music to direct the lesson, with errors in student performance eliciting stops and corrections.

Research is scant in the non-Suzuki areas of teaching effectiveness, rehearsal time use, and private lesson analysis/descriptions. Generalization of non-Suzuki aspects is challenging due to the wide variety of non-Suzuki settings and pedagogies. Nelson (1983) accurately stated that string teaching has traditionally been resistant to change, as many contemporary approaches can be traced to methodologies used in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with little research being conducted to develop or test

alternative methods. One such alternative method that has been developed more recently and somewhat researched in the past decade is the Suzuki method of string instruction.

Suzuki String Instruction

More research has been conducted on the effectiveness of Suzuki private violin lessons than non-Suzuki. Wensel (1970) started *Project Super*, a pilot Suzuki program for over 300 children, in order to evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of Suzuki instruction administered by North American teachers. Findings from *Project Super* suggested that the Suzuki approach could be adapted to the social and educational system of the United States (as the method began in Japan), and string teachers could manage the Suzuki approach with minimal training under Dr. Suzuki. Results also indicated that the Suzuki approach could be used in a variety of school systems and communities of differing socio-economic levels. Brunson (1969) also investigated the feasibility of using the Suzuki method in the school setting, particularly in heterogeneous string instrument classes. Although the approach was primarily designed for private instruction, Brunson judged the program a success based on student performance, lack of dropouts, and positive student feedback. More recently, research has been conducted regarding the effectiveness of the Suzuki method with young children. Preschool-aged children enrolled in Suzuki violin lessons scored higher on attention tasks, spent more time on perseverance tasks, and received more teacher approval than preschool-aged children not enrolled in Suzuki lessons (Scott, 1992).

Similar to the studies conducted with school music ensembles, researchers have also examined teaching behaviors and activities used by Suzuki studio teachers.

Results indicated that the majority of the lesson time was devoted to teacher verbalizations, followed by student performance, and then teacher performance and performance approximations (Colprit, 2000; Duke, 1999). Lessons were also characterized by high rates of approval, achievement of one goal at a time (a tenet of the Suzuki method), and prominent use of physical positioning. Küpers, van Dijk, and van Geert (2014) examined the use of scaffolding in Suzuki string lessons and found that students and teachers worked on many different kinds of goals in the lessons, constantly shifted between different types of instruction to achieve lesson goals and did not exclusively use verbal instructions. Garson (1973) found that teachers of the Suzuki method break down motor activities such as bowing and fingering into simple components. Infants complete preliminary exercises before they start learning the violin, and children play games to learn "bow gymnastics," correct posture, balance, and develop quick reflexes.

Since the parent serves as the home teacher for young Suzuki students, it seems warranted to examine time use within the home environment as it relates to instruction. O'Neill (2003) analyzed the home practice sessions of Suzuki students and their parents and found that 36% of practice time was spent learning new skills, 31% was spent reviewing previously learned skills, 54% was spent with students actively playing their instruments, and 2% was spent in off-task behavior. The parents exhibited high rates of positive verbal reinforcement, as well as directive cues or instructions, and used physical touch and singing regularly to assist students with goals. Parents reported using time in a similar way to Suzuki studio teachers, providing some consistency between the child's lesson instruction and home instruction.

One teaching behavior that has been observed frequently in Suzuki studio lessons is the use of targets, or aspects of student performance that need improvement. Colprit (2000, 2003) recorded instances in which Suzuki teachers identified targets for their students during the lesson and evaluated student performance trials of the target as successful or unsuccessful. Teachers worked on intonation, note accuracy, and bow distribution more frequently than other types of targets, and students were more successful when teachers expressed goals in terms of specific physical action (e.g., move the bow faster) than when they described changes in terms of musical effort (e.g., make a crescendo here). This finding is interesting considering student participants' experience was rather varied (10 students working on repertoire in Suzuki books 1–3, and 14 students in Suzuki books 4 and above). Across all rehearsal frames, 48% of all student performance trials were successful in terms of what teachers asked students to do (Colprit, 2003).

Another teaching behavior that is frequently observed in Suzuki string lessons is listening and learning by rote, before learning to read notation. The basis of Suzuki's method is called the Mother Tongue Approach and is based on the belief that children who experience music as a natural part of their culture become natural musicians in the same way children become natural speakers by hearing their language spoken (Liperote, 2006). Young children build their musical literacy by first engaging in music learning without notation: singing, chanting, moving, improvising, and creating. Children who study violin under Suzuki instructors often begin at the preschool and elementary age, when good pedagogy is crucial to development. Nelson (1983) stated, "With the Suzuki method in wide use today, it is vitally important to investigate its effectiveness and the

ramifications it has for the musical development of the preschool and elementary age child" (p. 45).

Summary

Studio violin teachers use either the Suzuki or non-Suzuki method when teaching lessons to students, and some use a combination of the two approaches. There are some pedagogical aspects specific to the Suzuki method and some attributed to non-Suzuki pedagogues; however similarities also exist between the methods. Bugeja (2009) compared two case studies involving a student and a parent from both a Suzuki and non-Suzuki approach. The data suggested that despite the lack of defined parental involvement in non-Suzuki approaches, the parents undertook a similar role regardless of the approach being used. Across all approaches, students and their parents may benefit from proactive parental involvement in music learning. Perkins (1995) offered a comprehensive comparison of the Rolland and Suzuki methods that clearly outlined both technical and nontechnical aspects of each method. Suzuki and Rolland share similarities in the structure of their programs, including both group and individual lessons, listening, learning by rote, sequential learning, and standardized repertoire. However, the extent to which these nontechnical aspects are utilized differ between the methods. Differences also exist in the technical aspects of each method, including instrument posture and positioning, and left/right hand aspects. While Perkins adds to the body of literature comparing string pedagogies, researchers have yet to compare other non-Suzuki methods of string instruction with the Suzuki method.

Gaps and contributions of proposed study to knowledge base

There are some studies focusing on the lesson activities and strategies used by teachers of each method; however, a lack of research exists comparing activities and techniques of Suzuki and non-Suzuki studio violin lessons. This study aims to address the gaps in research in order to accurately assess the instructional value of both methodologies and to determine their similarities and differences. Data gathered from participants' collective responses may help string educators better understand which instructional strategies are used in various methodologies of string instruction, and how these strategies are similar or different to those found by previous research to be effective. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to analyze instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons. Specifically, the following research questions were addressed: (1) What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities occur in the lesson of Suzuki violin students? (2) What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities occur in the lessons of non-Suzuki violin students? and (3) In what ways, if any, do the teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities used differ between the groups?

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to determine and analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons. This study specifically sought to address the following questions: (1) What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities occur in the lesson of Suzuki violin students? (2) What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities occur in the lessons of non-Suzuki violin students? and (3) In what ways, if any, do the teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities used differ between the groups?

This study contained two phases. Phase one utilized an online questionnaire (see Appendix A), which measured self-reported teacher behaviors occurring in private studio violin lessons. Phase two consisted of in-person observations and the use of an observation form based on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). Two pilot studies were conducted with the phase one questionnaire before phase one began. A pilot study was not explicitly conducted with the phase two observation form, as corrections from the phase one pilot were incorporated into the observation form as needed. The phase two observations were intended to provide a reliable snapshot of the teacher behaviors occurring in studio violin lessons, as the data were not self-reported but rather corroborated by the researcher.

Pilot Study One

In order to determine the feasibility of this study, the researcher conducted a pilot study with the research questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of four sections: (1)

Teacher Verbalizations; (2) Instructional Strategies; (3) Lesson Activities, and (4) Demographics. The researcher sent the questionnaire to seven string music educators teaching at the collegiate level and received four responses with feedback. The following suggestions/recommendations were made: (1) Flow of the survey. Multiple participants believed it would take longer than 10 minutes as indicated in the instructions, especially if participants had taught at multiple levels, and participants believed the questionnaire could benefit from a "back" button as opposed to just a "next" button; (2) Participants were confused by some of the wording in the questionnaire, including the interchangeable use of the terms method, methodology, and approach. Participants suggested the term "playing by ear" should be replaced with "playing by rote;" (3) Pilot participants believed the five-point Likert scale was an inaccurate measurement tool for the questions being asked and felt their responses to the questions did not fit into the categories "always, most of the time, about half of the time, sometimes, and never." The researcher received suggestions to either add a "rarely" category or change the scale to a seven-point Likert scale. Other suggestions included incorporating sliding scales to measure percentage of lesson time spent using particular instructional strategies. Subjects also expressed a desire to have all of the age groups that they have taught listed under each question, in order to compare time use between age groups easily without going back and forth between questions; (4) Participants were confused by some of the question wording as well. For example, it was unclear how to differentiate between the strategy of "instructional feedback" and the "approvals/disapprovals" strategy, as they could be construed as interchangeable. Participants were also unsure what the researcher meant by the "other" questions at the end of each section. Pilot participants wanted more

clarification on terms such as “listening to recorded music,” “one point teaching,” and “new repertoire,” as these aspects can be interpreted differently by each participant. The question of tuning was presented as being either a teacher- or a student-centered activity; however, participants felt it could involve a mixture of the two and that the response options should allow for this possibility.

Many of the recommendations from the first pilot study were incorporated into the next draft of the research questionnaire. The researcher changed the approximate time of the survey to 20 minutes and added a “back” button. The Likert scales were changed to sliding scales, so the participant could measure percentage of lesson time spent utilizing certain instructional strategies, and each of the teaching levels could be seen under each question for easier comparison by participants. The instructional feedback question was deleted, and an open-ended response was added to the end of the “Teacher Verbalizations” section, to account for other types of feedback not specified. Approvals and disapprovals were changed to positive and corrective feedback, respectively, and examples were added to ensure clarity. The question “listening to recorded music” was split into two questions: one specified “assigned listening at home” and the other included “listening in the lesson.” The question of “one-point teaching” was removed and the questions regarding teacher and student modeling were divided into categories to allow for greater response accuracy. These categories included teacher/student modeling on instrument, voice, and using clapping. More specific open-ended responses were added in place of “other” categories, prompting participants to include aspects of the lesson that were not previously addressed, and more examples and definitions were added to questions to ensure continuity and clarity.

Pilot Study Two

The second pilot study was conducted approximately two weeks after the first. The updated questionnaire was sent to three university string education faculty and feedback was received from one. The participant felt that the researcher should add more than one "other, please specify" box for age groups at the beginning, and to have the typed-in "other" age group carry forward for each question. Suggestions were also made to add two pages to the beginning of the questionnaire, one detailing the upcoming sections to give the participants an idea of the layout and how to use the sliding scales, and the other page to state that all methods are valid and have merit, and even though this questionnaire may seem Suzuki-centered, the researcher welcomes information about all methods. Feedback was also given regarding the questions asked. The pilot participant suggested the researcher add more non-Suzuki activities to the questionnaire, including "playing along to tracks at home," "time spent playing with piano accompaniment," and "time spent playing with recorded accompaniment in the lesson." The participant also gave feedback for the demographics section, expressing interest in more questions related to hybrid methods, particularly Suzuki hybrid methods. The participant suggested asking how often the teachers use Suzuki method materials, as well as listing other method books they use, in order to compare the materials they use to their answer for the method that they teach (Suzuki, non-Suzuki, or other). The participant also thought the questionnaire might benefit from asking opinion questions, such as "I agree/disagree (sliding scale) with most principles of the Suzuki method," or "I employ most principles of the Suzuki method."

Most of the recommendations from the second pilot study were incorporated into the final draft of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The researcher added multiple "other, please specify" boxes for the age groups section. Two pages were added at the beginning as well, the first outlining the upcoming sections of Teacher Verbalizations, Instructional Strategies, and Lesson Activities, as well as explaining that the grand total for the sliding scales does not need to add up to 100%, in case participants were unsure of this. The second page added at the beginning of the questionnaire contained a statement intended to reduce the perception of bias in the items, stating that there are many methods of teaching strings, the questions may appear Suzuki-centered and may not allow for comprehension of other methods (particularly "hybrid" methods), however participants should use the open-ended space at the end of each section to provide explanations of these methods if desired. The researcher also incorporated the suggested questions regarding lesson activities as well as the demographics questions about method book use. The researcher did not include opinion questions, as they might create more bias with the Suzuki-focused wording.

The observation form for phase two was based on the questionnaire and was piloted with the first version of the questionnaire. The researcher observed and videotaped a graduate music education major teaching a studio violin lesson using the Suzuki method. The observation form was then revised to reflect changes from pilot study one, as the observation form contained the same sections as the questionnaire: (1) Teacher Verbalizations; (2) Instructional Strategies; (3) Lesson Activities, and (4) Demographics which the participants completed (see Appendix A).

Participants

Phase One

Participants in phase one were gathered using a combination of convenience and snowball sampling and included 85 studio violin teachers from the United States and Canada. In order to recruit participants for this study, e-mails were sent to chapter presidents of music education organizations around the United States. These organizations included the Oregon Music Education Association (OMEA), the Suzuki Association of the Americas (SAA), the American String Teachers Association (ASTA), the Suzuki Institute in each state, and String Project programs associated with major universities. E-mails were also sent to applied violin faculty and music education faculty at various universities around the United States, high school orchestra teachers in Oregon, music education graduates, and current students enrolled at the University of Oregon. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) was also posted on a number of Facebook pages (the researcher, researcher's major professor, ASTA, and SAA). Overall, the questionnaire link and recruitment e-mail were sent to 264 people, and the e-mail asked the music educators to take the questionnaire themselves, as well as send it to colleagues who had or are currently teaching studio violin lessons. The researcher received 36 replies from the respondents stating that they took the questionnaire themselves, and that they sent it to members of their state organization, or they sent it to students/colleagues. All participants were given a consent form at the beginning of the questionnaire, which had been approved by the university's institutional review board (see Appendix B). Participants who did not consent were redirected to the end of the questionnaire.

Participants (N = 85) included 74 females and 11 males, represented Suzuki (n = 50) and non-Suzuki (n = 30) teachers, and teachers who identified with teaching a hybrid of the two methods (n = 5). The mean age of the participants was 41.76 years old (SD = 16.14), and participants had a mean self-reported experience level of 7.88 (SD = 2.4, with 1 = Very inexperienced; 10 = Very experienced) regarding teaching private lessons. Participants represented 29 states and 3 Canadian provinces (see Table 3.1). Participants also listed the settings in which they taught private lessons, which included: (1) private studio (n = 73; 52%); (2) public school (n = 26; 19%); (3) private school (n = 12; 8.57%); and (4) other (n = 29; 21%). Totals exceed 100% since participants were instructed to "select all that apply." Participants who cited "other" as their teaching setting listed settings such as college/university, community programs, string project programs, ASTA and All-State Orchestra clinics, students' homes, and youth orchestras. Participants were also asked to list the age groups they have taught private lessons to, which included pre-kindergarten (n = 59; 69%), elementary age (n = 84; 99%), middle school (n = 84; 99%), high school (n = 75; 88%), college (n = 43; 51%), and two "other" options for participants to specify as needed. The "other" age groups specified included mostly adults (n = 47; 55%), with some participants (n = 9; 11%) differentiating between adult beginners, adult amateurs, adult parent of a student, and various ages of adults (i.e., "50 plus"). Participants taught private lessons to a wide variety of age groups including (1) two age groups (n = 8; 9.41%), (2) three age groups (n = 10; 11.76%), (3) four age groups (n = 18; 21.17%), (4) five age groups (n = 10; 23.53%), (5) six age groups (n = 27; 31.76%), and (6) seven age groups (n = 2; 9.41%). All participants taught lessons to at least two age groups.

Table 3.1

Number of Participants by Geographical Region (According to the U.S. Census Bureau) for Phase One

Geographical Region	Number of participants
Northeast	4
Midwest	27
South	21
West	29
Canada	4
Total	85

Participants were also asked about the types of materials they used when teaching private lessons. Most Suzuki teachers reported using Suzuki materials most of the time (*n* = 30; 60%) or always (*n* = 16; 32%), with eight percent (*n* = 4) of Suzuki teachers using Suzuki materials about half the time. Most non-Suzuki teachers reported using Suzuki materials about half the time (*n* = 15; 50%), with 30% (*n* = 9) using Suzuki materials sometimes, and 10% (*n* = 3) using them never or most of the time. When asked to give an open-ended response regarding the method books they used for teaching studio violin lessons, the majority of participants reported using the *Suzuki* books (*n* = 23; 27%), followed by the *Wohlfahrt Etudes* and *Essential Elements* (*n* = 11; 13%), then *I Can Read Music* (*n* = 9; 11%), and the Barbara Barber scale book (*n* = 8; 9.4%). Participants were also asked to describe their level of pedagogical training for various violin pedagogies (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2

Participants' Amount of Pedagogical Training for Phase One

	None	A Little	A moderate amount	A lot	Highly trained
Suzuki	4	14	22	15	30
Rolland	35	35	10	4	1
Zweig	56	22	5	2	0
Flesch	36	25	11	6	3
Galamian	31	25	18	5	6

Phase Two

Phase two participants ($N = 3$) were recruited using convenience sampling by the researcher via e-mail (see Appendix B). Ten recruitment e-mails were sent out to both Suzuki and non-Suzuki violin teachers in the Eugene, Oregon community; however, only four responses were received (see limitations in discussion). The fourth respondent stated that none of their students would feel comfortable having an outside observer in the room for their lessons. Two of the participants taught private violin lessons through a community music program at the University of Oregon and the third participant taught private violin lessons at a local arts institute in Eugene. The three participants consented to being observed and video taped (see Appendix B) teaching a violin lesson to an elementary-aged student who had taken violin lessons for one to two years. The participants were all female, all teach in Oregon, and all identified themselves as Suzuki method teachers, with one participant indicating "modified" Suzuki method (no further explanation was provided regarding this response). Participants' mean age was 24.33 ($SD = 1.53$) and participants had a mean self-reported experience level of 6 ($SD = 1$; 1 = Very inexperienced; 10 = Very experienced) regarding teaching private lessons. Participants

listed the settings in which they taught private lessons, which included a private studio (*n* = 2) and "other" (*n* = 3). Participants who cited "other" specified settings including a university, a community music institute, and a Suzuki music program. Participants were asked to list the age groups they have taught private lessons to, which included pre-kindergarten (*n* = 3), elementary age (*n* = 3), middle school (*n* = 1), high school (*n* = 1), and "other," specified as adult (*n* = 1). One participant had taught four age groups, one had taught three, and one had taught two. Participants also listed their pedagogical training (see Table 3.3). Participant number one taught a studio violin lesson to a seven-year-old student who had been playing the violin for one-and-a-half years. Participant number two taught a studio violin lesson to a nine-year-old student who had been playing the violin for two years. Participant number three taught a studio violin lesson to a six-year-old student who had been playing the violin for one year.

Table 3.3

Participants' Amount of Pedagogical Training for Phase Two

	None	A Little	A Moderate Amount	A Lot	Highly Trained
Suzuki			2	1	
Rolland	2	1			
Galamian		1	2		
Flesch		1	2		
Zweig	3				
Additional training	Participant 1: None reported. Participant 2: Music Mind Games training, BM Music Education with student teaching in middle school orchestra and elementary music. Participant 3: Music Mind Games Unit 1 certification, education classes in university masters program.				

Materials

The measurement instrument used for phase one of this study consisted of an online questionnaire titled "Inventory of Instructional Strategies" (See Appendix A). The first section of the questionnaire consisted of Teacher Verbalizations. Participants were asked to estimate the percentage of lesson time they spent on each verbalization, which included the following: (1) Directives/instructions pertaining to technical performance (i.e., posture, bowing, fingering); (2) Directives/instructions pertaining to musical performance (i.e., dynamics, phrasing); (3) Questioning (asking directed questions), with an open-ended response box to list examples of the types of questions used; (4) Positive feedback, with an open-ended response box to provide examples; and (5) Corrective feedback, with an open-ended response box to provide examples. The second section entitled Instructional Strategies asked participants to estimate the percentage of lesson time spent using the following strategies: (1) Modeling using your instrument; (2) Modeling using your voice; (3) Modeling using clapping; (4) Student performance on instrument; (5) Student performance on voice; (6) Student clapping; (7) Physical touch; (8) Parent in the room for the lesson; (9) Parent video taping/taking notes during the lesson; (10) Listening to recorded music during the lesson; (11) Assigned listening to recordings at home; and (12) Assigned play-along tracks at home. The third section entitled Lesson Activities asked participants to estimate the percentage of lesson time spent engaging in the following lesson activities: (1) Reviewing previously learned repertoire; (2) Learning new repertoire or sections of repertoire; (3) Reading music notation; (4) Teaching by rote; (5) Playing from memory; (6) Sight-reading; (7) Playing student-teacher duets; (8) Playing with piano accompaniment; and (9) Playing with

"play-along" accompaniment. Participants were also asked to give open-ended responses including: (1) Describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities you use frequently in the lesson; and (2) Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson.

The items on the questionnaire were modeled after several studies that examined time use in music ensemble and private lesson settings. Items were drawn from studies examining teacher verbalizations, which included approvals/disapprovals (Duke & Madsen, 1991; Kostka, 1984; Moore, 1981; Schmidt, 1989), teacher feedback (Blocher, Greenwood, and Sellahamer, 1997; Creech, 2012), teacher directives (Colprit, 2003; Creech, 2012; Kostka, 1984; Schmidt, 1989), and teacher questioning (Creech, 2012; Schmidt, 1998). Items addressing instructional strategies included teacher modeling (Creech, 2012; Duke & Madsen, 1991; Schmidt, 1989), student performance on instrument (Creech, 2012; Duke & Madsen, 1991; Kostka, 1984; Witt, 1986), teacher physical contact to assist student with technique (Creech, 2012; Zorzal & Lorenzo, 2017), and parental involvement within the lesson (Creech, 2003). Items for the questionnaire were also drawn from research that measured the various activities taking place in private lessons, including teacher accompanying the student on the piano (Creech, 2012), warm-ups (Brendell, 1996), sight-reading (Brendell, 1996), and music literature instruction (Brendell, 1996). Along with the research articles previously mentioned, articles detailing both the Suzuki and non-Suzuki methods were taken into account when designing the research instrument. The Suzuki method relies heavily on parental support and participation (Kendall, 1966; Thibeault, 2018), and was therefore measured in the questionnaire. Teachers of the Suzuki method also use music recordings at home for students to familiarize themselves with new repertoire (Kendall, 1966; Thibeault, 2018).

Non-Suzuki teachers often use note reading from the beginning of instruction (Bugeja, 2009; Braithwaite, 1988), while Suzuki teachers use rote and repetition until the students' technique is developed (Kendall, 1966; Thibeault, 2018). The final section of the questionnaire was devoted to collecting demographic information.

Procedures

Phase one included incorporating the revisions from the pilot study (listed above) and creating the final version of the questionnaire using an online survey platform. Upon designing the questionnaire, the researcher e-mailed the final questionnaire to the participants (see participants section). Phase two included videotaped observations of violin lessons. Prior to the observations, the participants asked their student and student's parent(s) for permission to video tape the lesson, and told the researcher which lessons would be best to observe to fit the criteria of (a) elementary age and (b) have taken lessons for one to two years. The teacher participants signed a consent form prior to the observation (see Appendix B) and filled out the demographics portion of the observation form after the lessons were over (see Appendix A). Observations were concurrently recorded using a Zoom Q4 Handy Video Recorder. The camera was positioned several feet from the participant, in a way that both the studio teacher and student were in view of the camera. However for the purposes of this study, the focus of the observation was solely on the teacher. The researcher was seated in the corner of the room so that the students' back was to the researcher and the teacher was in full view. The researcher also took field notes using the observation form (see Appendix A), and for the purposes of reliability, she went back and subsequently analyzed the video recordings using Scribe 4 software (Duke & Stammen, 2011) on a MacBook Pro laptop. Scribe 4 software is a data

analysis program that allows users to label events in live or recorded observations, summarize event timings, and play back labeled events. Using Scribe 4, the researcher labeled the specific teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities found on the observation form (see Appendix A). Most behaviors were measured by frequency of occurrence, time of each occurrence, and percentage of occurrence during the lesson. Teacher verbalizations were only measured by frequency, given that the length of each verbalization was minimal. After the videos were analyzed using Scribe 4 software, the data were transferred to the observation form (see Appendix A). The field notes taken by the researcher served as a reminder of the teaching behaviors that were used during the lesson, as well as those that were not, which better prepared the researcher to complete the Scribe analysis with only the behaviors that were used.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine and analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons. This study specifically sought to address the following questions: (1) What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities occur in the lesson of Suzuki violin students? (2) What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities occur in the lessons of non-Suzuki violin students? and (3) In what ways, if any, do the teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities used differ between the groups?

Phase One

Suzuki Teacher Verbalizations

Raw data consisted of survey participants' reported percentage of lesson time engaged in teacher verbalizations. This section will outline the most and least reported Suzuki teacher verbalizations (for full details see Table 4.1). All subsequent means reported are mean percentages of lesson time. Suzuki teachers who teach the pre-kindergarten age group most often reported using directives pertaining to technical performance (M = 67.4, SD = 27.0), followed by positive feedback (M = 60.6, SD = 30.0). Teachers reported using the least amount of directives pertaining to musical performance (M = 18.2, SD = 19.8). Results were similar with the elementary age group, with participants using directives pertaining to technical performance the most (M = 62.2, SD = 23.7) followed by positive feedback (M = 59.2, SD = 29.5). For the middle school age group, teachers also used more technical directives than any other teacher

verbalization (*M* = 57.4, *SD* = 22.5), followed by positive feedback (*M* = 55.3, *SD* = 29.2). For the high school age group, the highest reported teacher verbalization used was directives pertaining to musical performance (*M* = 53.3, *SD* = 24.8), and used questioning the least amount of time (*M* = 50.8, *SD* = 29.7). For the college age group, teachers used the highest number of musical directives (*M* = 55.5, *SD* = 31.0) and the least number of technical directives (*M* = 47.6, *SD* = 24.0). Participants who reported teaching the "other" age group specified "adult," and used corrective feedback the most (*M* = 58, *SD* = 33.2), followed by positive feedback (*M* = 57.8, *SD* = 31.3), and used musical directives (*M* = 35.6, *SD* = 21.1) the least.

Suzuki Instructional Strategies

Raw data consisted of participants' reported percentage of lesson time engaged in the aforementioned strategies. This section will outline the most and least reported Suzuki instructional strategies. Teachers reported using the instructional strategy of having the parent in the room for the lesson the most (*M* = 99.4, *SD* = 3.20), The next most frequently reported strategy was the parent videotaping and/or taking notes (*M* = 87.7, *SD* = 24.3), then assigned listening at home (*M* = 87.7, *SD* = 28.9). Teachers also reported spending a large proportion of lesson time utilizing physical touch with pre-kindergarten students (*M* = 66.7, *SD* = 29.5), and used the least amount of listening to recorded music during the lesson (*M* = 15.9, *SD* = 21.9). When teaching the elementary age group, teachers also most frequently reported the parent being in the room for the lesson (*M* = 90.9, *SD* = 20.8), followed by assigned listening to recordings at home (*M* = 85.5, *SD* = 30.1), then the parent taking notes during the lesson (*M* = 76.9, *SD* = 32.9). Teachers also spent the least amount of time listening to recorded music during the lesson

(*M* = 14.3, *SD* = 20.2). With the middle school age group, teachers used the instructional strategy of assigned listening to recordings at home (*M* = 87, *SD* = 26.5) the most, followed by student performance on instrument (*M* = 69.8, *SD* = 18.8). With the high school age group, teachers also used assigned listening to recordings at home the most (*M* = 86.7, *SD* = 25.2), followed by student performance on instrument (*M* = 74.3, *SD* = 17.1). With the college age group, teachers also most often used assigned listening to recordings at home (*M* = 87.1, *SD* = 23.9), followed by student performance on instrument (*M* = 77.9, *SD* = 12.6). With adults in the "other" category, teachers most often used assigned listening to recordings at home (*M* = 76.1, *SD* = 36.5), followed by student performance on instrument (*M* = 69.2, *SD* = 17.0), then teacher modeling using instrument (*M* = 53.6, *SD* = 27.9).

Suzuki Teacher Lesson Activities

Raw data consisted of participants' reported percentage of lesson time engaged in the aforementioned activities. This section will outline the most and least reported Suzuki lesson activities. The most used activity with pre-kindergarten students was playing by memory (*M* = 92.2, *SD* = 16.7), followed by rote teaching (*M* = 76, *SD* = 32.8). The lesson activity used the least was sight-reading (*M* = 2.6, *SD* = 5.0). With elementary students, the most used lesson activity was playing by memory (*M* = 80.6, *SD* = 21.4) and the least used activity was playing with recorded accompaniment (*M* = 8.3, *SD* = 15.6). With middle school students, teachers most often used playing by memory (*M* = 62.5, *SD* = 23.4) followed by review of previously learned repertoire (*M* = 42.7, *SD* = 20.8). With high school students, the most used lesson activity was reading music (*M* = 56.4, *SD* = 26.8), followed by playing by memory (*M* = 47.8, *SD* = 25.1), then learning new

repertoire or sections of repertoire ($M = 47.5$, $SD = 23.6$). With college students, teachers most frequently used reading music ($M = 53$, $SD = 33.4$), and with the "other" adult category, teachers also most frequently used reading music ($M = 60.6$, $SD = 32.0$) (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

Suzuki Phase One Percentage of Lesson Time

	Pre-K			Elementary			Middle School			High School			College			Other		
Teacher Verbalizations																		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Directives-tech.	46	67.4	27.0	50	62.2	23.7	49	57.4	22.5	46	52.8	22.6	27	47.6	24.0	22	50.8	21.7
Directives-mus.	46	18.2	19.8	50	30.1	18.8	49	44.3	22.1	46	53.3	24.8	26	55.5	31.0	22	35.6	21.1
Questioning	44	37.3	30.8	47	43.4	27.1	47	48	28.1	44	50.8	29.7	24	49.1	31.4	21	43.7	31.8
Positive feedback	46	60.6	30.0	50	59.2	29.5	49	55.3	29.2	46	52.1	29.4	26	49.9	28.6	22	57.8	31.3
Corrective feedback	46	52	30.5	50	52.6	27.4	49	54.5	25.5	46	51.7	26.2	26	49.5	28.3	22	58	33.2
Instructional Strategies																		
Modeling-instrum.	46	46.4	30.0	50	53.8	26.0	49	53	24.6	46	50	23.9	26	48.1	25.5	22	53.6	27.9
Modeling-voice	45	51.9	30.8	49	48.1	29.7	48	42.1	28.7	45	38.4	26.1	25	34	23.9	21	34.1	27.0
Modeling-clap	44	32.3	28.8	48	28.2	26.7	46	23.1	22.2	42	18.1	17.3	25	12.5	13.0	20	14	15.9
Student-isntrum.	46	60.8	25.1	50	67.3	21.8	49	69.8	18.8	46	74.3	17.1	26	77.9	12.6	22	69.2	17.0
Student-voice	46	36.8	29.2	50	30.5	26.2	49	24.4	23.1	46	21.5	20.4	26	21.1	18.8	21	15.8	20.1
Student-clapping	44	34.5	30.0	47	26.8	26.4	45	22.1	24.5	41	19.1	22.8	23	11.5	13.1	19	15.1	24.2
Physical touch	45	66.7	29.5	49	56.2	28.2	47	37.4	28.3	44	26.7	24.6	25	23.2	21.2	19	26	24.6
Parent in room	46	99.4	3.20	50	90.9	20.8	49	63.1	27.8	42	27.3	25.6	19	5.5	22.9	15	0.1	0.30
Parent video taping/notes	45	87.8	24.3	48	76.9	32.9	46	52.7	32.7	41	21.5	27.4	20	5	21.7	16	6.3	25.0
Listening recorded	40	15.9	21.9	43	14.3	20.2	43	13.4	17.9	44	15.5	18.5	25	8.4	10.3	18	12	24.1
Assign. listening	46	87.7	28.9	49	85.5	30.1	48	87	26.5	46	86.7	25.2	26	87.1	23.9	22	76.1	36.5
Assign. Play along	40	23.3	31.8	44	22.6	29.9	41	20.2	26.7	41	16.8	24.3	24	12.4	20.5	19	11.1	24.4

(Table 4.1 Continued)

Lesson Activities																		
Review	46	61.3	26.0	50	51.7	23.4	49	42.7	20.8	46	35.6	21.9	26	30.8	22.9	20	33.3	25.8
Learning new	46	21.8	13.5	50	30.7	15.2	49	38.3	17.6	46	47.5	23.6	26	45.5	26.1	22	38.2	23.3
Reading music	34	5	6.40	49	17.5	12.2	49	41.6	21.1	46	56.4	26.8	24	53	33.4	22	60.6	32.2
Rote teaching	44	76	32.8	48	56.7	31.5	47	18.7	16.3	42	18.7	16.3	23	8.3	8.10	20	22.8	27.8
Playing memory	46	92.2	16.7	50	80.6	21.4	49	62.5	23.4	46	47.8	25.1	25	40.8	26.5	21	29.5	28.0
Sight reading	35	2.6	5.00	45	10	7.60	46	16.7	10.4	44	20.4	13.0	25	19.9	15.1	21	15.6	13.2
S/T duets	44	25.3	28.5	49	26.7	25.3	47	20.4	15.8	45	19.2	17.3	26	15.1	13.7	20	19.8	19.0
Piano accomp.	43	21.5	27.1	46	21.9	25.8	43	14.8	20.1	42	16.1	21.2	25	16.7	19.2	19	11.8	19.9
Recorded accomp.	36	9.2	20.4	41	8.3	15.6	39	6.7	14.4	37	5.4	13.8	23	1.3	2.70	17	4.7	18.4

Non-Suzuki Teacher Verbalizations

Raw data consisted of non-Suzuki participants' reported percentage of lesson time engaged in teacher verbalizations. This section will outline the most and least reported non-Suzuki teacher verbalizations Teachers most frequently used the verbalization of positive feedback (M = 74.5, SD = 22.8), followed by technical directives (M = 71.1, SD = 29.7), and used musical directives (M = 31.4, SD = 26) the least. Teachers most frequently used positive feedback with elementary students (M = 65.7, SD = 25) and with middle school students (M = 58.7, SD = 27.9). With high school students, teachers most frequently used musical directives (M = 59.5, SD = 24.8), as well as with college students (M = 64.8, SD = *26.2).* With the "other" adult category, the most frequently used teacher verbalization was technical directives (M = 53.9, SD = 31.7), with musical directives being used the least (M = 42.2, SD = 22.8).

Non-Suzuki Instructional Strategies

Raw data consisted of participants' reported percentage of lesson time engaged in the aforementioned strategies. This section will outline the most and least reported non-Suzuki instructional strategies. Teachers most frequently used the strategy of the parent being in the room with pre-kindergarten students (M = 94.7, SD = 15), followed by teacher modeling using instrument (M = 81.5, SD = 20.2). Teachers used recorded music listening the least during the lesson (M = 25.1, SD = 28.6). With elementary school students, teachers most frequently used student performance on instrument (M = 64.2, SD = 22.5), followed by modeling using instrument (M = 63.8, SD = 28.1). With middle school students, the most used instructional strategy was student performance on instrument (M = 66.4, SD = 21.2) followed by teacher modeling (M = 56.7, SD = 28.1).

The most frequently used instructional strategy with high school students was also student performance on instrument (M = 75.2, SD = 18.6). With college students, teachers most frequently used student performance on instrument (M = 74, SD = 21.1), followed by assigned listening to recordings at home (M = 57.7, SD = 44.5). In the "other" adult category, teachers most frequently used student performance on instrument (M = 76.4, SD = 15.2) followed by teacher modeling on instrument (M = 54.4, SD = 25.6).

Non-Suzuki Lesson Activities

Raw data consisted of participants' reported percentage of lesson time engaged in the aforementioned activities. This section will outline the most and least reported non-Suzuki lesson activities. Teachers most frequently used rote teaching with pre-kindergarten students (M = 67.6, SD = 26.4), followed by playing from memory (M = 60.8, SD = 28.2) and reviewing previously learned repertoire (M = 60.3, SD = 26.9). Teachers used sight-reading the least with pre-kindergarten students (M = 5.3, SD = 6.6). With elementary students, teachers most frequently used reviewing previously learned repertoire (M = 45, SD = 26.9), followed by reading music (M = 42.8, SD = 25.2), and used playing with recorded accompaniment the least (M = 4.9, SD = 7.1). With middle school students, teachers most frequently used reading music (M = 55.3, SD = 28.6) followed by review (M = 39, SD = 24.8). With high school students, the most frequently used lesson activity was also reading music (M = 61.1, SD = 32) followed by learning new repertoire (M = 43.3, SD = 19.1), as the data also showed for college students in regards to reading music (M = 62.2, SD = 38.3) and learning new repertoire (M = 44.3, SD = 22). With adults in the "other" category, reading music was also the most frequently

used lesson activity (M = 57.4, SD = 29.3), followed by review of previously learned repertoire (M = 48.3, SD = 23.8) (see Table 4.2).

Hybrid Method Data

Five participants selected the "not sure" option on the questionnaire, and indicated in the open-response section that they use a mix of both methods. Given the small number of respondents that selected this option, and the fact that the data were beyond the scope of the research questions, these data were not analyzed.

Open Response Prompts

In the questionnaire for phase one, there were a series of free-response questions: (1) If you use questioning with students, please provide a few examples in the space below; (2) If you use positive feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below; (3) If you use corrective feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below; (4) If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning teacher verbalizations that you use with students; (5) If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning instructional strategies that you use with students; (6) Please describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities you use most frequently in lessons (i.e., scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.); (7) Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc.); and (8) If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning lesson activities that you use with students. Free-response answers from phase one were analyzed heuristically, by examining overarching themes for each prompt (see Appendix D).

Table 4.2

Non-Suzuki Phase One Percentage of Lesson Time

	Pre-K			Elementary			Middle School			High School			College			Other		
Teacher Verbalizations																		
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Directives-tech	11	71.1	29.7	29	61.1	26.9	30	57.8	24.6	24	49.8	28.4	15	49.9	29.5	13	53.9	31.7
Directives-mus.	11	31.4	26.0	29	26.6	18.4	30	43.0	21.9	24	59.5	24.8	15	64.8	26.2	12	42.2	22.8
Questioning	11	34.9	30.4	29	41.1	26.7	30	42.3	24.9	24	49.3	27.8	15	55.3	29.4	13	50.2	28.3
Positive feedback	10	74.5	22.8	28	65.7	25.0	29	58.7	27.9	23	57.2	30.4	14	46	32.0	13	46	28.3
Corrective feedback	11	50.5	25.6	29	50.3	26.5	30	50.3	27.1	24	53.6	27.8	14	46.2	26.9	13	46.5	24.2
Instructional Strategies																		
Modeling-instrum.	11	81.5	20.2	29	63.8	28.1	30	56.7	28.1	24	51	28	15	45.9	28.0	13	54.4	25.6
Modeling-voice	11	61.9	32.0	29	47.6	28.5	29	44.9	27.2	24	42.5	29.5	15	39.6	28.1	13	40.4	26.0
Modeling-clapping	11	49.7	38.5	29	36.1	31.8	29	32.3	29.3	22	28.1	28.8	15	20.9	25.2	13	27.3	24.2
Student-instrument	11	67.7	23.4	29	64.2	22.5	30	66.4	21.2	24	75.2	18.6	15	74	21.1	12	76.5	15.2
Student-voice	11	43.5	29.8	28	32.3	25.0	29	26	23.4	24	19.7	23.6	15	20.4	26.7	12	26.5	28.5
Student-clapping	11	44	35.3	29	28.9	27.8	28	25.6	26.0	22	20.6	24.6	15	16.5	26.3	11	27	27.9
Physical touch	11	53.8	33.4	27	42	31.7	28	35.2	30.3	23	25.6	27.4	14	23.4	31.5	11	28.7	31.4
Parent in room	11	94.7	15.0	24	59.8	36.4	24	30.7	30.6	18	12.5	22.0	11	1	1.50	7	0.7	1.10
Parent video taping/notes	11	77.5	31.3	23	45.1	39.3	22	16.5	26.8	18	4.1	11.8	12	0.5	0.70	6	0.2	0.40
Listening recorded	9	25.1	28.6	23	11.5	16.7	25	12.9	15.7	22	16.1	22.3	14	12.7	18.6	9	19.2	32.1
Assign. listening	10	76.1	36.8	26	37.8	40.9	28	35	40.1	22	43.5	42.7	14	57.7	44.5	11	48.4	43.7
Assign. Play along	10	35.7	43.8	26	23.7	32.4	25	19.4	26.9	19	14.9	22.9	13	12.8	24.6	9	26.1	31.9

(Table 4.2 continued)

Lesson Activities																		
Review	11	60.3	26.9	29	45	26.9	29	39	24.8	23	41.9	24.2	15	32.1	23.9	12	48.3	23.8
Learning new	11	31.5	20.9	29	34.2	18.7	30	37.6	18.1	24	43.3	19.1	15	44.3	22.0	12	37.5	14.8
Reading music	11	19.9	21.8	29	42.8	25.2	30	55.3	28.6	24	61.1	32.0	15	62.2	38.3	12	57.4	29.3
Rote teaching	11	67.6	26.4	29	38.9	24.0	30	21.5	15.4	23	15.7	12.2	15	13.1	14.5	12	22.7	14.6
Playing memory	10	60.8	28.2	27	34.1	25.8	27	23.3	16.2	21	23.4	18.0	14	35.2	29.8	12	18	13.1
Sight reading	9	5.3	6.60	26	8.5	5.60	28	16.6	12.0	23	24.3	21.2	14	17.7	10.3	11	13.5	5.40
S/T duets	10	32.8	30.1	29	31.3	24.2	30	26.6	19.5	24	23.4	22.9	14	8.8	12.8	11	20.2	16.2
Piano accomp.	10	27.5	30.3	25	21.4	26.8	25	20.4	23.1	21	16.2	19.2	14	27.1	24.2	8	17.8	13.1
Recorded accomp.	9	6.4	7.50	23	4.9	7.10	23	4.8	6.00	17	2.1	3.30	11	1.1	2.00	8	5.6	6.80

Regarding prompt one (student questioning), six themes emerged for Suzuki teachers using questioning (listed in order of most reported): (1) Self-analysis questions (e.g., What could you do to improve your performance more?); (2) Technique questions (e.g., What are the three big bow variables that you can use to change your sound?); (3) Musical interpretation questions (e.g., Where is the phrase going?); (4) Practicing questions (e.g., How would you practice this section at home?); (5) Theory questions (e.g., What is the form of this piece?); and (6) General questions (e.g., How was your day/week?) Regarding prompt one, five themes emerged for non-Suzuki teachers using questioning (listed in order of most reported): (1) Technique questions (e.g., High or low two?); (2) Self-analysis questions (e.g., How do you think that run through went?); (3) Musical interpretation questions (e.g., What do you think the composer is trying to say?); (4) Theory questions (e.g., What key are we in?); and (5) Practice questions (e.g., How much did you practice this week?).

Regarding prompt two (positive feedback), 11 themes emerged for Suzuki teachers: (1) Musical aspects (e.g., Beautiful phrasing.); (2) Effort (e.g., That was great improvement.); (3) Technique (e.g., Look at that thumb! It stayed curved the whole time!); (4) Bowing (e.g., Your bow stayed in lane two for the entire piece.); (5) Intonation (e.g., That was correct intonation); (6) Positive followed by suggestion; (7) Tone (e.g., I hear a clear, rich tone); (8) General (e.g., Great job); (9) Specific (e.g., Good job with…); (10) Posture (e.g., Your tall posture makes me feel happy and proud.), and (11) Rhythm (e.g., You played very rhythmically.). Regarding prompt two for non-Suzuki teachers, the same themes emerged as seen with Suzuki teachers.

Regarding prompt three (corrective feedback), the following themes emerged for Suzuki teachers: (1) Analysis (e.g., Do you know why your violin/viola made that odd sound?); (2) Technique (e.g., Curve your pinky finger.); (3) Musical interpretation (e.g., I'd like to hear more contrast in your dynamics.); (4) Posture (e.g., Readjust your feet.); (5) Positive before corrective (e.g., I like how you (specific point), now let's try to work on (specific point)).; (6) Specific (e.g., Try doing this instead.); (7) Bowing (e.g., This piece is all in the upper half.); (8) General (e.g., Oops- that wasn't quite it, I think we better try that again.); (9) Tone (e.g., Let's try to get that bow straight for a more clear tone.); (10) Rhythm (e.g., Read the rhythms carefully and try that passage again.); (11) Practice (e.g., Did you practice this?); (12) Non-verbal (e.g., facial gestures). Regarding prompt three, teachers using the non-Suzuki method reported similar themes of corrective feedback. Non-Suzuki teachers also reported feedback on Theory (e.g., This is actually in the key of C Major.) and reported no examples of General corrective feedback or Non-verbal corrective feedback.

Regarding prompt four (teacher verbalizations), the following themes emerged from Suzuki teachers: (1) Analyzing (e.g., prompting students to analyze their own playing); (2) Paired verbalizations (e.g., pairing corrective feedback with directives or positive with corrective); (3) Modeling (e.g., combining modeling and verbal instruction); (4) Age groups (e.g., verbalizations are the same at all age groups); (5) Specific (e.g., specific feedback and how to make changes); (6) General conversation (e.g., asking about their week to build comfort level); (7) Practice (e.g., asking about practice habits); (8) Student-specific (e.g., the verbalization demand depends on student). Regarding prompt four, non-Suzuki teachers' responses fit into all of the above themes

except for Practice and Age groups. Other themes that emerged among the non-Suzuki teachers included: (1) Analogies (e.g., elephant chewing analogy concerning wrist, fingers, and knuckles at the frog); (2) Questioning (e.g., What fingering would work bets in this passage?); and (3) Catch phrases (e.g., using catch phrases to reinforce an aspect of technique).

Phase Two

Teacher One

Raw data from the phase two *in situ* observations consisted of frequency counts regarding teacher verbalizations used by participants. Teacher one used the highest number of directives pertaining to technical performance (n = 49), which included directives regarding bow hold, fingers, intonation, and tempo. Two directives pertaining to musical performance were used. More instances of positive feedback were used (n = 46) than corrective feedback (n = 39). Raw data consisted of participants' observed instructional strategies by calculating the percentage of lesson time spent in each strategy. The most frequently used strategy was student performance on instrument (41.6% of lesson time). Students also performed using their voice (7.3% of lesson time) and patting the steady beat (4.7% of lesson time). The teacher modeled with her instrument (22% of lesson time), her voice (5.41% of lesson time), and clapping/patting (4.54% of lesson time). One of the techniques that was used the least was physical touch (1% of lesson time), which included aspects of technique such as bow hold and fingers. The student's parent was in the room for this lesson but was not videotaping or taking notes. Teacher one did not have the student listen to recorded music during the lesson; however, she did assign listening to recordings at home, telling the student to listen to the next piece in

Suzuki Book I. Teacher one did not assign play-along tracks for student to do at home. Raw data consisted of participants' observed lesson activities by calculating the percentage of lesson time spent in the aforementioned activities. The researcher found that teacher one spent more time reviewing previously-learned repertoire or sections of repertoire with the student (52.6% of lesson time) than teaching new repertoire (3.1% of lesson time). Teacher one had the student read music notation for 19.2% of lesson time, and music reading by the student occurred during sight-reading and while the teacher was modeling for the student. Teacher one taught by rote 24.4% of the time on activities such as warm-ups, scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, and sections of review pieces. The student played from memory 17.7% of the lesson time. Teacher one did not use the lesson activities of student/teacher duets, playing with piano accompaniment, or playing with "play-along" accompaniment (for further details see Appendix C).

Teacher Two

Upon analyzing the teacher verbalization data, the researcher found that teacher two used the highest frequency of directives pertaining to technical performance (n = 54) and used zero directives pertaining to musical performance. Equal amounts of positive and corrective feedback occurred (24 instances). Upon analyzing the instructional strategies data, the researcher found that student performance on instrument was used for the highest percentage of lesson time (33.1%) followed by teacher modeling on instrument (15.8%). The teacher also modeled using clapping/patting/snapping by snapping the steady beat or rhythm for the student (13.3% of lesson time). The teacher used physical touch to fix aspects of posture and fingerings (0.9% of lesson time). Teacher two did not include the parent in the room for the lesson, did not listen to

recorded music during the lesson, did not assign listening to recordings at home, and did not assign "play-along" tracks at home. Regarding the lesson activities, teacher two had the student read music notation for the highest percentage of lesson time (66.2%), followed by reviewing previously learned repertoire (39.9%). Other lesson activities used included sight-reading (13.3% of lesson time) and teaching by rote (11% of lesson time). The student did not learn any new repertoire or sections of repertoire, and used zero instances of student playing from memory, student/teacher duets, playing with piano accompaniment, or playing with "play-along" accompaniment (for further details see Appendix C).

Teacher Three

Teacher three used the teacher verbalization of directives/instructions pertaining to technical performance the most (27 instances). In contrast, directives/instructions pertaining to musical performance were used for two instances in the lesson. Other teacher verbalizations used included positive feedback ($n = 21$) and corrective feedback ($n = 25$). Teacher three used the instructional strategy of student performance on instrument for the highest percentage of lesson time (33.3%), followed by physical touch (21%). Other instructional strategies used included teacher modeling with voice (14.2% of lesson time) and instrument (2.3% of lesson time). The student's parent was in the room for the lesson and was videotaping parts of it. The teacher did assign listening to recordings at home, specifically the next piece Suzuki Book I. Teacher three did not listen to recorded music during the lesson, and did not assign "play-along" tracks at home. Regarding lesson activities, teacher three used the greatest amount of lesson time to review previously learned repertoire (68.1%), followed by teaching by rote (45.5%).

The teacher spent less time in other lesson activities including learning new repertoire (5.1% of lesson time), reading music notation (3.8% of lesson time), and playing from memory (16.4% of lesson time). The teacher used no instances of sight-reading, student/teacher duets, playing with piano accompaniment, or playing with "play-along" accompaniment.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine and analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons. This study specifically sought to address the following questions:

1. What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities are occurring in the lessons of Suzuki violin students?
2. What teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities are occurring in the lessons of non-Suzuki violin students?
3. In what ways, if any, do the teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities used differ between the groups?

The data revealed several important findings regarding the instructional strategies, teacher verbalizations, and lesson activities used by Suzuki and non-Suzuki violin teachers. To address the research questions, a questionnaire was developed to measure frequency of each teaching behavior, and in-person observations were conducted to examine and verify the teaching behaviors used in violin lessons. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the frequency of each teaching behavior and to construct a snapshot of behaviors occurring in various studio violin lessons. Data suggest that Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers exhibit more similarities than differences, including the age group of a student directing many of the teacher behaviors used in lessons. However, notable differences between the methods include, (1) Parental involvement; (2) assigned listening

to recordings at home; and (3) music reading, rote teaching, and playing from memory.

Results in the Context of Existing Research

Similarities

Results suggest that Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers exhibited more similarities than differences with their use of studio lesson time. Both methods appeared to tailor their teaching behaviors to the age group they were teaching, as themes were consistent across the various age levels. Regarding teacher verbalizations, both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers indicated they spent more time giving directives relating to technical performance than musical performance with younger students. The data from the phase two observations of Suzuki teachers also support this finding, as all three teachers gave more technical than musical directives with the elementary-age students (no phase two data were collected from non-Suzuki violin teachers, therefore the non-Suzuki data from phase one cannot be compared to in-person observations). This finding is somewhat corroborated by Colprit's (2003) study, which found that Suzuki students were more successful when teachers expressed target goals in terms of physical actions as opposed to musical effort. In the self-reported data, the use of technical directives with pre-kindergarten, elementary, and middle school students showed a relative decline as students increased in age, while the percentage of musical directives increased with older students, with the exception of adults. This suggests that technical directives are used more with younger and less experienced students, perhaps since they do not yet possess the musical vocabulary needed to respond to musical directives.

Another similarity regarding teacher verbalizations lies with the type of feedback given by teachers. Suzuki teachers reported using more positive feedback than corrective

feedback with all age groups except adults in the "other" category, suggesting they follow the Suzuki-like tendency to employ high proportions of positive feedback (Duke, 1999). However, this tendency might not be limited to Suzuki teaching, as self-reported phase one data showed that non-Suzuki violin teachers also use more positive than corrective feedback with younger age groups, which is supported by Cheng and Durrant (2007). The observation data from phase two slightly contrasts the self-reported data of Suzuki teachers, as teacher two gave equal amounts of positive and corrective feedback, and teacher three gave more corrective than positive feedback, even though her student was the youngest. Data from the open response prompts also suggests similarities between the methods regarding teacher verbalizations. Both groups reported used similar tactics regarding questioning with students, asking the most questions concerning self-analysis and technique.

Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers also exhibited similarities regarding instructional strategies. High amounts of physical touch were reported with pre-kindergarten students in both methods, and the frequency of this strategy declined throughout each of the older age groups except adult (in which it increased slightly from college level to adults). The data suggest that teachers use more physical touch with young students, possibly due to less refinement of fine motor and self-regulation skills at that age. Another possibility for this finding is shared vocabulary, as it might be necessary to *show* younger students a concept when we expect a more experienced student will understand by *telling* them. Data from the in-person observation revealed that Suzuki teacher three used high amounts of physical touch compared to the other two teachers who used this strategy for 1% or less of the lesson time. Teacher three had the youngest student, which could

explain the need for more physical touch than with the later elementary-age students. Suzuki teachers also used more physical touch with pre-kindergarten and elementary students than non-Suzuki teachers, however throughout the older age groups, the reported mean becomes more equally balanced between the methods. These findings suggest that physical touch may not be as crucial with students in middle school and above, and that Suzuki teachers do utilize physical position with young students in particular (Duke, 1999). Teachers of both methods also exhibited high amounts of student performance on instrument, a finding that is also supported by phase two observation data. This finding makes sense, as the teacher is there to guide and correct the student's performance, and is supported by Colprit (2000) who found that Suzuki lessons consisted of more student performance than teacher modeling, and Cheng and Durrant (2007) found that instructional strategies in non-Suzuki lessons included high amounts of student performance. Other studies on time use have found that student performance is used the most during lessons as well (Kostka, 1984; Creech, 2012; Zhukov, 2004). Another similarity between groups was seen in the instructional strategy of listening to recorded music during the lesson, which was the least used strategy with pre-kindergarten through high-school students.

Similarities were also found in the lesson activities used by both groups. Teachers frequently used review of previously learned repertoire with pre-kindergarten through middle school students, as well as adult students, with high school and college students most often learning new repertoire. Phase two data support phase one findings, as all three teachers used much more review of previously learned repertoire than teaching of new repertoire, due to the young age of their students. These data suggest that students

who have been playing for less time require more review to learn skills, and students who have more experience can learn more new repertoire. Both groups also reported similar amounts of sight-reading across all age groups, which suggests that both Suzuki and non-Suzuki students learn to read music, regardless of when they start learning this skill. Also, all age groups except pre-kindergarten (who used the least sight-reading) used the least amount of playing with "play-along" accompaniment in the lesson.

Common themes were also found between groups regarding the open-response prompts. Teachers reported using verbalizations that fit into similar categories between the two methods. They also reported using similar non-repertoire playing material, including scales and arpeggios, etudes, technical exercises, improvisation and composition, sight-reading, working on outside repertoire, and playing educational games with students. Teachers also reported similarities in the tuning procedures between age groups, and the data suggest that teachers of both methods tune younger students and transition older students to tuning themselves.

Differences

Despite the many similarities, both methods also exhibited differences in the areas of parental involvement, assigned listening to recordings at home, and music reading, rote teaching, and playing from memory. The most reported instructional strategy used by Suzuki teachers with pre-kindergarten and elementary-age students was the parent being in the room for the lesson. This makes sense, as the parent would likely either be in the room for 0% or 100% of each lesson. Suzuki teachers also reported high frequencies of the parent videotaping and/or taking notes with these age groups, though the frequency was lower with elementary-age students. However, the phase two observation data

showed the parents were also only in the room for two students and were only videotaping/taking notes with one of the students. This is possibly because the students being videotaped have younger siblings, and the parent took the younger sibling out of the room so it would not distract from the videotaping process. Non-Suzuki teachers also reported high rates of the parent being in the room for the lesson with pre-kindergarten students, but Suzuki teachers overall reported higher rates of parental involvement, suggesting that parents act more as the home teacher for Suzuki students than for non-Suzuki students. This finding makes sense, as the Suzuki parent is usually expected to take notes or videotape the lesson for use during home practice (Kendall, 1966), and the parents' role is not defined or stipulated as commonly by teachers of the non-Suzuki method (Bugeja, 2009). Open response data from one non-Suzuki participant revealed that they preferred no one else be in the room with the student (including the parent), as it can distract from the learning experience.

Another difference lies in the instructional strategy of assigned listening at home, which was highly used by Suzuki teachers throughout all age groups, suggesting that Suzuki teachers placed an emphasis on listening and ear training (Kendall, 1966; Thibeault, 2018). Other phase two data slightly contradict phase one findings however, as only two of the three teachers assigned listening to recordings at home. This could be due to the fact that one of the teachers was teaching a newly transferred student from another studio, and this student was not as immersed in the Suzuki methodology yet as the other two were. Another possibility is that in this particular lesson, listening could have been assumed to be an ongoing activity or standing assignment that the teacher did not specifically mention during this lesson. In the reported data of non-Suzuki teachers,

assigned listening to recorded music at home was a strategy frequently used with both pre-kindergarten students and college students, but not as widely used with the elementary or middle school ages. Overall, Suzuki teachers reported higher amounts of assigning listening to recordings at home than non-Suzuki teachers, which makes sense as this is a key aspect of the Suzuki method (Kendall, 1966). The open-response data also corroborate findings regarding the importance of listening to recordings at home. Several participants stated they assigned listening to recordings in every lesson, and specified that the recordings could be on websites such as YouTube or via Smart Music, or the videos that the parents recorded in the lesson.

Other differences were found in the area of lesson activities, specifically music reading, rote teaching, and playing from memory. The lesson activity used most frequently by Suzuki teachers with pre-kindergarten through middle school students consisted of playing by memory, though this percentage decreased as the student increased in age. This finding aligns with the Suzuki tenet of learning by ear or by rote before reading music notation, and the frequent use of rote teaching with the younger age groups (Kendall, 1966; Küpers, van Dijk, and van Geert, 2014). The most frequently used lesson activity with high school through adult students was reading music, suggesting that Suzuki students do learn music reading after a certain time frame or age group. In the phase two observation data, teachers one and three also used high amounts of rote teaching with students, possibly because the younger students were not as proficient at reading music yet but had developed aural skills. Teacher two used mostly music reading with her student, possibly since the student was accustomed to reading music from the previous teacher. The non-Suzuki data also show that teachers used mostly rote teaching

and playing from memory with pre-kindergarten students; however, non-Suzuki teachers reported using music reading more frequently with all other age groups, which aligns with the idea of using note reading from the beginning of instruction (Braithwaite, 1988; Bugeja, 2009; Cheng & Durrant, 2007). The data possibly suggest that Suzuki teachers place more emphasis on ear training and technical set up when teaching young beginners, while non-Suzuki teachers focus on a more comprehensive musical education that includes note reading from the start.

Overall, Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers appear to exhibit more similarities than differences regarding pedagogy in individual violin lessons. A larger sample size and a wider variety of phase two participants would allow for the ability to contrast self-reported data with observation data; however, trends are clearly seen in phase one that allow for descriptive analysis of the teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities of Suzuki and non-Suzuki violin teachers. Also, given that the standard deviations are fairly high for many of the teaching behaviors, the data seem to suggest that there is perhaps no one standard way of teaching an individual lesson. This makes intuitive sense, as each student and teacher dyad is individual and various techniques and strategies will not work for all students; however, there may be many other variables contributing to these large standard deviations.

Limitations

The results obtained should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size. Phase one had a sample size of 50 Suzuki and 30 non-Suzuki teachers. A larger and more equal distribution would provide more accurate data for comparing the teaching behaviors of each group. The questionnaire data for phase one is also self-reported data,

with no means of a reliability check. Participants have inherent biases that may have influenced their answers to survey responses. The questionnaire responses were also organized by age group, as opposed to ability level. While age is more quantifiable than ability, ability may be the more important factor for some methods. One participant provided feedback, stating that she has "…12 year old students that are in Suzuki violin book 6 working their way through the Handel Sonatas…and 12 year olds that [she] just started teaching." The data suggest that teachers would use different strategies with each age group depending on the ability level of the student. Perhaps organizing the questionnaire by ability level would produce more reliable data.

Another limitation exists in the phase two, in-person observations. Only three participants agreed to be observed and videotaped for this study, and all were self-reported Suzuki method teachers. Phase two data would have been more useful if there were non-Suzuki teachers that participated in this study as well; however, recruitment was unsuccessful despite several attempts to contact potential participants. The phase two data should be interpreted with caution, given the small sample size of participants and the fact that all of the Suzuki teachers came from the same program at the same school. One of the phase two participants was teaching a transfer student for the observation, and therefore the data may not best represent a true Suzuki teacher lesson. The data may also have been influenced by an outside observer videotaping the lessons and being present in the room. Parents who otherwise might have stayed in the lesson left the room to take care of a younger sibling, so as not to disturb the research process. Teachers may have exhibited different teaching behaviors knowing they were being researched.

Implications

Based on the results obtained in this study, Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers differed in a few key areas of violin instruction. However, overall their lessons appeared to be more similar than different in the teacher verbalizations, instructional strategies, and lesson activities used. A lack of research exists comparing teaching behaviors of various methodologies, and this study provides a starting point for future research to be conducted in this area.

Perhaps the teaching behaviors that were used more often by teachers of both groups are effective with students in the studio setting. Also, certain strategies may be more widely used depending on the age group of the student, but perhaps more so the ability level of the student. Certain teaching behaviors also appear to be more widely used in the Suzuki versus non-Suzuki settings, possibly due to the regulation and uniformity of many Suzuki programs, and the unstipulated nature of non-Suzuki programs.

Due to the large standard deviations found with many of the teaching behaviors, the data suggest that teaching studio violin lessons is a very individual practice. It is important for teachers to realize that strategies used by others may not work within their particular setting or with their students. However, using the data collected in this study, studio violin teachers might examine which teaching behaviors others are using to teach violin lessons, and possibly incorporate more widely used behaviors into their own teaching environment. Perhaps studio violin teachers will more closely examine and analyze the behaviors they use in lessons to determine if students are receiving the best education possible.

Directions for Future Research

Further research should continue to examine the strategies used by Suzuki and non-Suzuki violin teachers, as there is a great need for research in this area. Perhaps incorporating more specific methodologies (i.e., Rolland, Galamian) might help define and narrow down the broad category of "non-Suzuki." Another useful next step would be to repeat this study incorporating solutions to some of the limitations listed above. A follow-up study using a wider variety of Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers for both questionnaire and in-person observation would provide more insight into the teaching behaviors used in a variety of studio violin lessons.

Other researchers could expand upon this study by examining the effectiveness of certain strategies that were found to differ between the two methods, in order to determine which strategies work best for teaching studio violin lessons. Researchers could even examine effectiveness by age group, or ability level, to provide teachers with an effective framework for instruction. It would also be very interesting to study the heterogeneous classroom setting, to determine which teaching behaviors occur in a large, mixed ensemble setting. Since there are many string classrooms that use a hybrid-version of the Suzuki method, a follow-up study could examine that setting along with a more traditional string classroom setting. Researchers could measure the teaching behaviors *in situ*, either for determining teacher effectiveness or simply to describe the teaching behaviors that are occurring.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND OBSERVATION FORM

Phase One Questionnaire – Inventory of Instructional Strategies

Section I

. **Consent Form**

University of Oregon School of Music and Dance
Title of Study: A Comparative Analysis of Instructional Strategies Used by Suzuki and Non-Suzuki Studio Violin Teachers
Investigator: Kelsey Hollenbaugh

Introduction

- You are being asked to be in a research study that seeks to analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons.
- You were selected as a possible participant because of your background teaching studio violin using either the Suzuki or non-Suzuki approaches.

Purpose of Study:

- The purpose of this study is to determine and analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons.

Description of the Study Procedures:

- If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to complete a brief questionnaire regarding your use of instructional strategies in studio violin lessons. This study will take approximately 20 minutes of your time.

Risks/Discomforts of Being in the Study:

- There are no reasonable foreseeable (or expected) risks. This study may include risks that are unknown at this time.

Benefits of Being in the Study:

- While this study is not intended to benefit participants directly, this study is expected to benefit the string education community by providing evidence for instructional strategies that are used in a variety of methodologies, as well as helping educators understanding how these strategies most often used are similar or different from those found by previous research to be effective.

Compensation:

- You will receive no reimbursement for participation in this study.

Confidentiality:

- The records of this study will be kept private and no identifiable information will be made public. In any sort of report we may publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be kept in a locked file.
- All electronic information will be coded and secured using a password-protected file. Records will be destroyed after three years.
- Access to the records will be limited to the researcher; however, please note that regulatory agencies and the Institutional Review Board and internal University of Oregon auditors may review the research records.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:

- Your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your current or future relations with the University.
- You are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason.

- There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not taking part or for stopping your participation.

Contacts and Questions:

- For questions or more information concerning this research you may contact Kelsey Hollenbaugh at khollenb@uoregon.edu
- If you believe you may have suffered a research related injury, contact Kelsey Hollenbaugh at 720-982-9898 who will give you further instructions.
- If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact: Research Compliance Services, University of Oregon at (541) 346-2510 or ResearchCompliance@uoregon.edu

. Please choose from one of the following options

I **consent** and agree to participate in this study

I **do not consent** and do not agree to participate in this study

.

1. Have you ever taught studio violin lessons?

Yes

No

. Which age groups have you taught studio violin lessons to? (Check all that apply)

Pre-Kindergarten

Elementary

Middle School

High School

College

Other 1 (please specify)

Other 2 (please specify)

.

Please note that there are many methods, much overlap, and multiple successful ways of teaching violinists. You are encouraged to provide comments in open-ended questions to illuminate these items. Some of the questions may be Suzuki-centered, and may not fully allow for comprehension of other methods (particularly 'hybrid' methods). However, the researcher is truly interested in learning about these other methods. Open-ended space is provided below each section to elaborate on aspects of other methods.

.

This survey contains three upcoming sections dealing with Teacher Verbalizations, Instructional Strategies, and Lesson Activities. You will be asked to estimate how often you use certain strategies in each of these categories. Please note that if you wish to indicate "0" on the scale, the toggle still needs to be triggered, otherwise that question will show as "not answered." Also, please note that each section contains multiple sliding scales and the grand total does not need to add up to 100.

Section I

.

Section I: Teacher Verbalizations

How often do you use the following teacher verbalizations when giving a studio violin lesson to each level listed below?

Q1. **Directives/instructions pertaining to technical performance (i.e., posture, bowing, fingering)**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	
» High School	
» College	
» Other 1 (please specify)	
» Other 2 (please specify)	

Q2. **Directives/instructions pertaining to musical performance (i.e., dynamics, phrasing)**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q3. **Questioning (asking directed questions)**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q4. **If you use questioning with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:**

Q5. Positive Feedback (i.e., praising students efforts and behaviors, positively-phrased commands)

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q6. If you use positive feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Q7. **Corrective Feedback (i.e., correcting student errors or misconceptions)**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	
» High School	
» College	
» Other 1 (please specify)	
» Other 2 (please specify)	

Q8. **If you use corrective feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:**

Q9. **If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning teacher verbalizations that you use with students:**

Section II

. Section II: Instructional Strategies

On average, how much time do you spend using the following instructional strategies when giving a studio violin lesson to each level listed below?

Q1. Modeling using your instrument

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	
» High School	
» College	

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q2. Modeling using your voice (chanting, speaking, singing, etc.)

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q3. Modeling using clapping

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q4. **Student performance on instrument**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q5. **Student performance on voice (chanting, speaking, singing, etc.)**

Percentage of time per lesson

(approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q6. **Student clapping**

Percentage of time per lesson
(approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q7. **Physical touch (i.e., physically correcting or reinforcing aspects of students' technique)**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	
» High School	
» College	
» Other 1 (please specify)	
» Other 2 (please specify)	

Q8. **Parent in the room for the lesson**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q9. **Parent video taping and/or taking notes during the lesson**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q10. **Listening to recorded music during the lesson**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q11. **Assigned listening to recordings <u>at home</u>**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q12. **Assigned play-along tracks at home (i.e., playing with CD from book)**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	
» High School	
» College	
» Other 1 (please specify)	
» Other 2 (please specify)	

Q13. **If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning instructional strategies that you use with students:**

Section III

. Section III: Lesson Activities

On average, how much time do you spend using the following lesson activities when giving a studio violin lesson to each level listed below?

Q1. **Time spent reviewing and/or polishing previously learned repertoire**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	
» High School	
» College	
» Other 1 (please specify)	
» Other 2 (please specify)	

Q2. **Time spent learning new repertoire or new sections of repertoire**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q3. **Time student spends reading music notation**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q4. **Time spent teaching by rote (learning something using repetition in order to play it from memory)**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q5. **Time student spends playing from memory**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q6. **Time spent sight-reading (reading repertoire without previous preparation)**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q7. **Time spent playing student-teacher duets**

Percentage of time per lesson (approximate)

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q8. **Time spent playing with piano accompaniment**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	
» Middle School	
» High School	
» College	
» Other 1 (please specify)	
» Other 2 (please specify)	

Q9. **Time spent playing with 'play-along' accompaniment in the lesson (i.e., CD tracks, etc.)**

	Percentage of time per lesson (approximate) 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
» Pre-Kindergarten	
» Elementary	

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q10. **Please describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities you use most frequently in lessons (i.e. scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.)**

Q11. **Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc):**

» Pre-Kindergarten

» Elementary

» Middle School

» High School

» College

» Other 1 (please specify)

» Other 2 (please specify)

Q12. **If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning lesson activities that you use with students:**

Section IV

Q1.
What is your age?

Q2. What is your gender?

Q3.
In what state do you teach (or have most recently taught) private violin lessons?

Q4.
In what settings do you teach music? (Check all that apply)

Private Studio
Public School
Private School
Other (please specify)

Q5.
Would you characterize yourself as someone who primarily teaches using the Suzuki method?

Yes
No
Not sure/other (please explain)

Q6.
How often do you use Suzuki Method materials? (i.e., books, repertoire, etc.)

Always
Most of the time
About half the time
Sometimes
Never

Q7. If you use method books for teaching studio violin lessons, please list the books

you use below. If you do not, please put N/A.

Q8. Please rate your experience level of teaching private violin lessons

Very Inexperienced					Very Experienced

Q9.
Please describe your level of formal training in the following methods:

	None at all	A little	A moderate amount	A lot	Highly trained
Suzuki	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Rolland	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Zweig	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Flesch	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Galamian	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Q10. Using the space below please describe any additional pedagogical training you have received

Powered by Qualtrics

Phase Two Observation Form

Observation Form (Participant Form)

Demographic Information

1. What is your age?

2. What is your gender?

3. In what state do you teach private violin lessons?

4. In what settings do you teach music? (Check all that apply)
   - ☐ Private Studio
   - ☐ Public School
   - ☐ Private School
   - ☐ Other (please specify) _____

5. Would you characterize yourself as someone who primarily teaches using the Suzuki method? (Check one)
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Sure (please explain)

6. What age groups do you primarily teach in your private violin lessons? (Check all that apply).
   - ☐ Pre-Kindergarten
   - ☐ Elementary
   - ☐ Middle School
   - ☐ High School
   - ☐ College
   - ☐ Other (please specify) _____

7. On a scale of 1-10 how would you rate your experience level of teaching private violin lessons?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

   Very Inexperienced Very Experienced.

8. Please describe your level of formal training in the following methods (Check one box per method):

	None	A Little	A Moderate Amount	A Lot	Highly Trained
Suzuki					
Rolland					
Galamian					

Flesch					
Zweig					

9. Using the space below please describe any additional pedagogical training you have received.

Observation Form (PI Form)

1. Subject (#)

2. Age of Student

3. Years playing the violin

Teacher Verbalizations	Type of…	Number of instances	
Directives/instructions pertaining to technical performance (i.e., posture, bowing, fingering).			
Directives/instructions pertaining to musical performance (i.e., dynamics, phrasing).			
Questioning (asking directed questions).			
Positive feedback (i.e., praising students efforts and behaviors, positively-phrased commands).			
Examples of positively phrased commands.			
Corrective feedback (i.e., correcting student errors or misconceptions).			
Examples of corrective feedback			
Instructional Strategies	Type of	Time/%	Number of instances
Teacher modeling using instrument			
Teacher modeling with voice (i.e., chanting, singing, speaking, etc.).			
Teacher modeling using clapping/patting			

Student performance on instrument.			
Student performance on voice (i.e., chanting, singing, speaking, etc.).			
Student clapping/patting			
Physical touch (i.e., physically correcting or reinforcing aspects of students' technique).			
Parent in the room for the lesson (yes/no).			
Parent videotaping and/or taking notes during the lesson (yes/no/NA).			
Listening to recorded music during the lesson			
Assigned listening to recordings at home (yes/no).			
Assigned play-along tracks at home (i.e., playing with CD from book) (yes/no).			
Lesson Activities	Type of	Time/%	
Time spent reviewing and/or polishing previously learned repertoire.			
Time spent learning new repertoire or new sections of repertoire.			
Time student spends reading music notation.			
Time spent teaching by rote (learning something using repetition in order to play it from memory).			
Time student spends playing from memory.			
Time spent sight-reading (reading repertoire without previous preparation).			
Time spent playing student/teacher duets.			

Time spent playing with piano accompaniment.	
Time spent playing with 'play-along' accompaniment in the lesson (i.e., CD tracks, etc.).	
Describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities used (scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.).	
Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc.).	

APPENDIX B

IRB APPROVAL, CONSENT FORMS, AND RECRUTIMENT LETTERS

IRB Approval

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

DATE: November 14, 2017 **IRB Protocol Number: 10162017.015**

TO: Kelsey Hollenbaugh, Principal Investigator
School of Music

RE: Protocol entitled, "A Comparative Analysis of Instructional Strategies Used by Suzuki and Non-Suzuki Studio Violin Teachers"

Notice of IRB Review and Exempt Determination as per Title 45 CFR Part 46.101 (b)(1)

The above protocol has been reviewed by the University of Oregon Institutional Review Board and Research Compliance Services. This is a minimal risk research protocol that qualifies for an exemption from IRB review under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(1) for research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as research on regular or special education instructional strategies or research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

Please note that you will not be required to submit continuing reviews for this protocol, however, you must submit any changes to the protocol to Research Compliance Services for assessment to verify that the protocol continues to qualify for exemption. **This exempt determination will expire November 13, 2022.** Should your research continue beyond expiration date, you will need to submit a new protocol application.

Your responsibility as a Principal Investigator also includes:

- Obtaining written documentation of the appropriate permissions from public school districts, institutions, agencies, or other organizations, etc., prior to conducting your research
- Notifying Research Compliance Services of any change in Principal Investigator
- Notifying Research Compliance Services of any changes to or supplemental funding
- Retaining copies of this determination, any signed consent forms, and related research materials for five years after conclusion of your study or the closure of your sponsored research, whichever comes last.

As with all Human Subject Research, exempt research is subject to periodic Post Approval Monitoring review.

If you have any questions regarding your protocol or the review process, please contact Research Compliance Services at ResearchCompliance@uoregon.edu or (541)346-2510.

Sincerely,

Lizzy Utterback
Research Compliance Administrator

CC: Jason Silveira, Faculty Advisor

COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS • RESEARCH COMPLIANCE SERVICES
677 E. 12th Ave., Suite 500, 5237 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97401-5237

Phase One Consent Form

Consent Form

University of Oregon School of Music and Dance
Title of Study: A Descriptive Analysis of Instructional Strategies Used by Suzuki and Non-Suzuki Studio Violin Teachers
Investigator: Kelsey Hollenbaugh

Introduction
You are being asked to be in a research study that seeks to analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons. You were selected as a possible participant because of your background teaching studio violin using either the Suzuki or non-Suzuki methodologies.

Purpose of Study:
The purpose of this study is to determine and analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons.

Description of the Study Procedures:
If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to complete a brief questionnaire regarding your use of instructional strategies in studio violin lessons. This study will take approximately 20 minutes of your time.

Risks/Discomforts of Being in the Study:
There are no reasonable foreseeable (or expected) risks. This study may include risks that are unknown at this time.

Benefits of Being in the Study:
While this study is not intended to benefit participants directly, this study is expected to benefit the string education community by providing evidence for instructional strategies that are used in a variety of methodologies, as well as helping educators understanding how these strategies most often used are similar or different from those found by previous research to be effective.

Compensation:
You will receive no reimbursement for participation in this study.

Costs:
There is no cost to you to participate in this research study.

Confidentiality:
The records of this study will be kept private and no identifiable information will be made public. In any sort of report we may publish, we will not include any information

that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be kept in a locked file. All electronic information will be coded and secured using a password-protected file. Records will be destroyed after three years. Access to the records will be limited to the researcher; however, please note that regulatory agencies and the Institutional Review Board and internal University of Oregon auditors may review the research records.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:
Your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your current or future relations with the University. You are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason. There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not taking part or for stopping your participation.

Contacts and Questions:
The researcher conducting this study is Kelsey Hollenbaugh. For questions or more information concerning this research you may contact her at khollenb@uoregon.edu. If you believe you may have suffered a research related injury, contact Kelsey Hollenbaugh at 720-982-9898 who will give you further instructions. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact: Research Compliance Services, University of Oregon at (541) 346-2510 or ResearchCompliance@uoregon.edu

Please choose from one of the following options

- ○ I consent and agree to participate in this study (1)
- ○ I do not consent and do not agree to participate in this study (2)

Phase Two Consent Form

Observation Consent Form

University of Oregon School of Music and Dance
Informed Consent for Participation as a Subject in: A Comparative Analysis of Instructional Strategies Used by Suzuki and Non-Suzuki Studio Violin Teachers
Investigator: Kelsey Hollenbaugh
Type of consent: Adult Consent Form

Introduction

- You are being asked to be in a research study that seeks to analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons.
- You were selected as a possible participant because of your background teaching studio violin using either the Suzuki or non-Suzuki methodologies.
- We ask that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Purpose of Study:

- The purpose of this study is to determine and analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons.
- Participants in this study are from the United States of America.

Description of the Study Procedures:

- If you agree to be in this study, we would ask you to do the following things: teach a studio lesson to your violin student in the same manner you normally do while being video recorded and observed by the researcher.
- Your participation will be limited to an hour or less (i.e., the duration of one violin lesson).

Risks/Discomforts of Being in the Study:

- There are no reasonable foreseeable (or expected) risks. This study may include risks that are unknown at this time.

Benefits of Being in the Study:

- The purpose of the study is to determine and analyze the instructional strategies used by both Suzuki and non-Suzuki teachers when teaching private studio violin lessons.
- While this study is not intended to benefit participants directly, this study is expected to benefit the string education community by providing evidence for instructional strategies that are used in a variety of methodologies, as well as helping educators understanding how these strategies most often used are similar or different from those found by previous research to be effective.

Compensation:

- You will receive no reimbursement for participation in this study.

Costs:

- There is no cost to you to participate in this research study.

Confidentiality:

- The records of this study will be kept private and other than video data, no identifiable information will be collected of participants. Participants will be kept anonymous in the final research study report.
- Video data will be transferred to the PI's password protected laptop and deleted from the memory of the camera. All data will be aggregated and stored digitally on the PI's laptop and will be deleted after three years. The hard copy of the consent forms will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the PI's home office and will be destroyed after three years.
- Access to the records will be limited to the PI, with the faculty advisor having access to the aggregate de-identified data; however, please note that regulatory agencies and the Institutional Review Board and internal University of Oregon auditors may review the research records.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:

- Your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your current or future relations with the University.
- You are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason.
- There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not taking part or for stopping your participation.

Contacts and Questions:

- The researcher conducting this study is Kelsey Hollenbaugh. For questions or more information concerning this research you may contact her at khollenb@uoregon.edu. The faculty advisor directing this research is Jason Silveira, assistant professor and area head of music education (jsilveir@uoregon.edu).
- If you believe you may have suffered a research related injury, contact Kelsey Hollenbaugh at 720-982-9898 who will give you further instructions.
- If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact: Research Compliance Services, University of Oregon at (541) 346-2510 or ResearchCompliance@uoregon.edu

Copy of Consent Form:

- You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records and future reference.

Statement of Consent:

- I have read (or have had read to me) the contents of this consent form and have been encouraged to ask questions. I have received answers to my questions. I give my consent to participate in this study. I have received (or will receive) a copy of this form.

Signatures/Dates

_____

Study Participant (Print Name)

_____

Participant or Legal Representative Signature **Date**

Phase One Recruitment Letter

Dear String Music Educator,

My name is Kelsey Hollenbaugh and I am a graduate student from the School of Music at the University of Oregon. I am studying Music Education with an emphasis in the string orchestra setting and am conducting a research project for my Masters Thesis. I am writing to invite you to participate in my research study about the instructional strategies and activities used by private studio violin teachers. You are eligible to be in this study because you are or have been a studio violin teacher.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to fill out a questionnaire, estimating the percentage of time you spend using certain activities or instructional strategies while teaching private violin lessons. You will also be asked demographic questions relating to your level of teaching experience. This questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes of your time.

Remember this is completely voluntary. You can choose to be in this study or not. Your participation will help string educators better understand which instructional strategies and activities are used in various methodologies of string music instruction. Your responses will be completely confidential and anonymous. If you have any questions about the study please email or contact me at khollenb@uoregon.edu.

If you'd like to participate, please copy and paste the following link into your web browser and complete the online questionnaire at your earliest convenience: https://oregon.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3ekfNOK5RVXOsmx

Thank you very much. I look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Kelsey Hollenbaugh

Phase Two Recruitment Letter

Dear String Music Educator,

My name is Kelsey Hollenbaugh and I am a graduate student from the School of Music at the University of Oregon. I am studying Music Education with an emphasis in the string orchestra setting and am conducting a research project for my Masters Thesis. I am writing to invite you to participate in my research study about the instructional strategies and activities used by private studio violin teachers in both Suzuki and non-Suzuki settings. You're eligible to be in this study because you are a studio violin teacher who utilizes either a Suzuki or non-Suzuki approach to teaching. I obtained your contact information from fellow string educators in the Eugene, Oregon area.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to allow me to observe a private violin lesson. I will be sitting in on one lesson and taking observational notes of the activities occurring within the lesson. In order to refer back to the activities that occurred in the lesson and collect accurate data of how much time was spent on each activity in the lesson, I would like to video record one of your violin lessons.

Remember, this is completely voluntary. You can choose to be in the study or not. Your participation will help string educators better understand which instructional strategies and activities are used in various methodologies of string music instruction. If you'd like to participate or have any questions about the study, please email or contact me at khollenb@uoregon.edu.

Thank you very much. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kelsey Hollenbaugh

APPENDIX C

OBSERVATION DATA

Phase Two Observation Forms

Observation Form Subject 1

Subject (#): 1

Age of Student: 7

Number of years student has been playing the violin: 1.5

Teacher Verbalizations	Type of…	Number of instances
Directives/instructions pertaining to technical performance (i.e., posture, bowing, fingering).	Bow hold, fingering, intonation, tempo	49
Directives/instructions pertaining to musical performance (i.e., dynamics, phrasing).	Dynamics.	2
Questioning (asking directed questions).	About fingering, intonation, scale names, rhythm, bow hold.	15
Positive feedback (i.e., praising students efforts and behaviors, positively-phrased commands).	Verbal affirmation of technique or behaviors.	46
Examples of positively phrased commands.	"yeah!" "good" "nice" "awesome job" "nice job you had a really nice bow hold throughout that and I can tell your pitch is getting better." "very nice…you got all the way through it"	
Corrective feedback (i.e., correcting student errors or misconceptions).	Verbal corrections of errors and misconceptions	39
Examples of corrective feedback	"Were your F#'s high enough? They were just a little low" "We have to pick a tempo that you can do it all so lets go a little slower" "Try it again."	

	"that was supposed to be the short ending"		
Instructional Strategies	Type of	Time/%	Number of instances
Teacher modeling using instrument	Incorrect rhythm, correct rhythm/intonation, model of new and current piece	6:46.6, 22%	49
Teacher modeling with voice (i.e., chanting, singing, speaking, etc.).	Singing, chanting, speaking	1:37.4, 5.41%	35
Teacher modeling using clapping/patting	Patting steady beat	1:21.8, 4.54%	9
Student performance on instrument.	N/A	12:29.5, 41.59%	60
Student performance on voice (i.e., chanting, singing, speaking, etc.).	Chanting, singing, speaking	2:11.4, 7.29%	39
Student clapping/patting	Patting steady beat	1:24.2, 4.68%	7
Physical touch (i.e., physically correcting or reinforcing aspects of students' technique).	Bow hold, intonation/fingering	00:18.0, 1.00%	2
Parent in the room for the lesson (yes/no).	YES		
Parent videotaping and/or taking notes during the lesson (yes/no/NA).	NO		
Listening to recorded music during the lesson	NO		
Assigned listening to recordings at home (yes/no).	Yes		
Assigned play-along tracks at home (i.e., playing with CD from book) (yes/no).	NO		
Lesson Activities	Type of	Time/%	
Time spent reviewing and/or polishing previously learned repertoire.	Roll dice for review piece: Lightly Row Working piece: Minuet 2	15:48.5, 52.62%	
Time spent learning new repertoire or new sections of repertoire.	1 piece, just listened to teacher play it, Minuet 3	0:55.5, 3.08%	

Time student spends reading music notation.	Read both Suzuki pieces by pointing at each note while Lauren played. Read the sight reading music.	5:46.1, 19.20%
Time spent teaching by rote (learning something using repetition in order to play it from memory).	Warm-up scales, arpeggios, and technical exercises, review piece sections	7:19.5, 24.38%
Time student spends playing from memory.	The two review pieces	5:19.6, 17.73%
Time spent sight-reading (reading repertoire without previous preparation).	I can read music book	1:13.0, 4.05%
Time spent playing student/teacher duets.	None	
Time spent playing with piano accompaniment.	None	
Time spent playing with 'play-along' accompaniment in the lesson (i.e., CD tracks, etc.).	None	
Describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities used (scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.).	Scales- B major Arpeggios- B major, b minor Elevator exercises between open string and first finger, and first and second finger	
Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc.).	Teacher tunes using an electronic tuner producing the pitch "A," then tunes the open 5ths.	

Observation Form Subject 2

Subject (#): 2

Age of Student: 9

Number of years student has been playing the violin: 2 years

Teacher Verbalizations	Type of…	Number of instances	
Directives/instructions pertaining to technical performance (i.e., posture, bowing, fingering).	Posture, bow hold, fingering, note names/fingers	54	
Directives/instructions pertaining to musical performance (i.e., dynamics, phrasing).	0	0	
Questioning (asking directed questions).	Note names	17	
Positive feedback (i.e., praising students efforts and behaviors, positively-phrased commands).	Praising behaviors, positive commands	24	
Examples of positively phrased commands.	"it sounded a lot better the second time, it was much more in tune" "awesome" "good job" "that's great" "this is very good work, you're able to play through the whole thing"		
Corrective feedback (i.e., correcting student errors or misconceptions).	Correcting errors and misconceptions	24	
Examples of corrective feedback	"check that note" "lets just check this rhythm" "G natural" "hold it for two counts"		
Instructional Strategies	Type of	Time/%	Number of instances
Teacher modeling using instrument	Playing with student, modeling notes and tone and rhythms	4:50.3; 15.82%	36
Teacher modeling with voice (i.e., chanting,	As scaffolding-saying rhythms with	1:37.4; 5.31%	29

singing, speaking, etc.).	student, Singing pitches/finger numbers for student		
Teacher modeling using clapping/patting	Snapping the beat most of the time, occasionally the rhythm	4:04.9; 13.34%	24
Student performance on instrument.	Sight reading, scales, review pieces	10:07.1; 33.07%	45
Student performance on voice (i.e., chanting, singing, speaking, etc.).	Singing the note names or rhythm	2:18.5; 7.55%	11
Student clapping/patting	None	0	0
Physical touch (i.e., physically correcting or reinforcing aspects of students' technique).	Posture- raising violin up, finger placement when out of tune	00:15.5; 0.85%	6
Parent in the room for the lesson (yes/no).	NO		
Parent videotaping and/or taking notes during the lesson (yes/no/NA).	N/A		
Listening to recorded music during the lesson	NO		
Assigned listening to recordings at home (yes/no).	NO		
Assigned play-along tracks at home (i.e., playing with CD from book) (yes/no).	NO		
Lesson Activities	Type of	Time/%	
Time spent reviewing and/or polishing previously learned repertoire.	Pieces- On the Ocean and Etude	12:12.2; 39.89%	
Time spent learning new repertoire or new sections of repertoire.	0	0%	
Time student spends reading music notation.	Review pieces- On the Ocean and Etude Sight-reading- I can read music book	20:14.6; 66.17%	
Time spent teaching by	A major scale	3:22.0; 11.01%	

rote (learning something using repetition in order to play it from memory).		
Time student spends playing from memory.	0	0%
Time spent sight-reading (reading repertoire without previous preparation).	I Can Read Music book, pitches and rhythms	4:04.4; 13.32%
Time spent playing student/teacher duets.	None	
Time spent playing with piano accompaniment.	None	
Time spent playing with 'play-along' accompaniment in the lesson (i.e., CD tracks, etc.).	None	
Describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities used (scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.).	Note reading- say and play A major scale	
Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc.).	Teacher tunes student to her A string on her violin, then tunes in fifths	

Observation Form Subject 3

Subject (#): 3

Age of Student: 6

Number of years student has been playing the violin: 1 year

Teacher Verbalizations	Type of…	Number of instances
Directives/instructions pertaining to technical performance (i.e., posture, bowing, fingering).	Bow hold, fingerings, note names, posture	27
Directives/instructions pertaining to musical performance (i.e., dynamics, phrasing).	Dynamics in Long Long Ago (crescendo and decrescendo)	2
Questioning (asking directed questions).	Bow direction, note names	20
Positive feedback (i.e., praising students efforts and behaviors, positively-phrased commands).	Praising student effort, technique, specific and general comments.	21
Examples of positively phrased commands.	"that was perfect, those were all the right notes" "you've done some great work" "that's a nice looking bow hold" "there we go" "I like your violin hold though, that was beautiful" "great focus, I loved your rhythm"	
Corrective feedback (i.e., correcting student errors or misconceptions).	Mostly in the form of questions, asking the student to evaluate their behaviors.	25
Examples of corrective feedback	"what's the last note" "lets stand right here, rest position please" "if the words are 'up down goes my bow', what direction is your first note?" "close, can we do it again?" "that's where we're doing a double up and I don't think we have a slur in there" "bows are for playing our violin, not for putting them in our mouths"	

Instructional Strategies	Type of	Time/%	Number of

			instances
Teacher modeling using instrument	Student and her own instrument to demonstrate concepts like notes, bow direction, dynamics. Does not play at the same time as student*	00:29.7; 2.27%	4
Teacher modeling with voice (i.e., chanting, singing, speaking, etc.).	Singing notes of scale, singing the words for the review pieces, singing dynamics	3:05.0; 14.16%	39
Teacher modeling using clapping/patting	None- however did model using imaginary violin (air-bowing) quite often	0	0
Student performance on instrument.	Say and play scales, review pieces	7:14.5; 33.25%	31
Student performance on voice (i.e., chanting, singing, speaking, etc.).	Say and play scales, imaginary violin singing bow directions	3:13.0; 14.77%	12
Student clapping/patting	None	0	0
Physical touch (i.e., physically correcting or reinforcing aspects of students' technique).	Posture- pushing scroll up, tapping fingers for scale, riding along on bow hand to help with bow direction, moving student's hands when playing with imaginary violin	4:34.3; 20.99%	34
Parent in the room for the lesson (yes/no).	Yes		
Parent videotaping and/or taking notes during the lesson (yes/no/NA).	Yes- videotaping and asking questions and clarification from teacher		
Listening to recorded music during the lesson	No		
Assigned listening to recordings at home	Yes- Next piece in book (Long Long Ago)		

(yes/no).		
Assigned play-along tracks at home (i.e., playing with CD from book) (yes/no).	No	
Lesson Activities	Type of	Time/%
Time spent reviewing and/or polishing previously learned repertoire.	O Come Little Children May Song Long Long Ago	14.50.2; 68.10%
Time spent learning new repertoire or new sections of repertoire.	Dynamics in Long Long Ago- crescendo	1:06.8; 5.11%
Time student spends reading music notation.	Long Long Ago May Song	00:49.0; 3.75%
Time spent teaching by rote (learning something using repetition in order to play it from memory).	Bowing to O come little children	9:54.5; 45.48%
Time student spends playing from memory.	O Come little children, may song, long long ago first half	3:33.9; 16.36
Time spent sight-reading (reading repertoire without previous preparation).	0	0%
Time spent playing student/teacher duets.	None	
Time spent playing with piano accompaniment.	None	
Time spent playing with 'play-along' accompaniment in the lesson (i.e., CD tracks, etc.).	None	
Describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities used (scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.).	A major scale- say and play D major scale- say and play	
Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc.).	Teacher tunes student using pizzicato and no reference pitch, A first, then in fifths	

Phase 2 Data Summary

Teacher Verbalizations

Verbalization	Selected Examples			Number of Instances		
	T1[a]	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3
Directives/instructions pertaining to technical performance	Bow hold, fingers, intonation, tempo	Bow hold, fingers, note names, posture	Bow hold, fingers, note names, posture	49	54	27
Directives/instructions pertaining to musical performance	Dynamics	N/A	Dynamics (crescendo and decrescendo)	2	0	2
Questioning	Fingerings, intonation, scale names, rhythm, bow hold	Note names	Bow direction, note names	15	17	20
Positive feedback	Verbal praise General (i.e., good, nice) Specific (i.e., you had a nice bow hold)	Verbal praise General (i.e., awesome, good job) Specific (i.e., this is good work, you're able to play the whole thing)	Verbal praise General (i.e., there we go) Specific (i.e., you got all the right notes)	46	24	21
Corrective feedback	Verbal corrections General (i.e., try it again) Specific (i.e., were your F-sharps high enough?)	Verbal corrections General (i.e., let's check that rhythm) Specific (i.e., hold it for two counts)	In the form of questions mostly General (i.e., close, can we do it again?) Specific (i.e., what's the last note?)	39	24	25

[a] T = Teacher

Instructional Strategies

Instructional Strategy	Selected Examples			Total Time (m:ss.ms)			Percent %		
	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3
Teacher modeling - instrument	Rhythm, intonation	With student, notes, rhythms	Hers and students' instrument- notes, bow direction, dynamics. Not at same time as student	6:46.6	4:50.3	00:29.7	22	15.82	2.27
Teacher modeling - voice	Singing, chanting, speaking	Saying with student, singing pitches and finger numbers	Singing pitches, lyrics, dynamics	1:37.4	1:37.4	3:05.0	5.41	5.31	14.16
Teacher modeling – clapping/ patting	Patting steady beat	Snapping the beat or rhythm	N/A	1:21.8	4:04.9	0	4.54	13.34	0
Student performance - instrument	Repertoire	Sight reading, scales, review pieces	Say and play scales, review pieces	12:29.5	10:07.1	7:14.5	41.59	33.07	33.25
Student performance - voice	Chanting, singing, speaking	Singing note names or rhythm	Say and play scales, singing bow directions	2:11.4	2:18.5	3:13.0	7.29	7.55	14.77
Student performance - clapping/	Patting steady beat	N/A	N/A	1:24.2	0	0	4.68	0	0

patting									
Physical touch	Bow hold, fingering	Posture, fingering	Posture, bow ride-along	00:18.0	00:15.5	4:34.3	1.00	0.85	20.99
Parent in room for lesson	Yes	No	Yes			N/A			
Parent videotaping or note-taking	No	N/A	Yes- video taping			N/A			
Listening to recorded music during the lesson	No	No	No			N/A			
Assigned listening to recordings at home	Yes- next piece in book	No	Yes- next piece in book			N/A			
Assigned play-along tracks at home	No	No	No			N/A			

Lesson Activities

Lesson Activities	Selected Examples			Time (mm:ss:ms)			Percent %		
	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3	T1	T2	T3
Review repertoire	Roll dice for review: two piece	Two pieces	Three pieces	15:48.5	12:12.2	14.50.2	52.62	39.89	68.10
New repertoire	One piece, listened to teacher play it	N/A	New dynamics in working piece	0:55.5	0	1:06.8	3.08	0	5.11
Reading music notation	Read separate from playing while teacher played	Review pieces, Sight reading	Working piece Review piece	5:46.1	20:14.6	00:49.0	19.20	66.17	3.75
Teaching by rote	Warm-up scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, review piece sections	A major scale	Bowing section in review piece	7:19.5	3:22.0	9:54.5	24.38	11.01	45.48
Playing from memory	Two review pieces	N/A	Review pieces	5:19.6	0	3:33.9	17.73	0	16.36
Sight-reading	I Can Read Music book	I Can Read Music book	N/A	1:13.0	4:04.4	0	4.05	13.32	0
Student/ teacher duets	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

Piano accompaniment	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
'Play-along' accompaniment	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-repertoire playing activities	Scales/ arpeggios –B major/ minor Elevator exercises	Note reading say and play A major scale	A major and D major say and play				N/A		
Tuning Procedure	Teacher tunes using electronic tuner producing pitch "A"	Teacher tunes student to her A string, then in fifths	Teacher tunes student with no reference pitch, A first				N/A		

APPENDIX D

OPEN RESPONSE DATA

Open Response Prompts Suzuki

1. If you use questioning with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Self-Analysis
What's the biggest thing that needs to change about how you play this piece?
I ask if they hear intonation differences. I ask them to observe other players and what they notice.
What was different between your sound and my sound? Which was better, the first time you played that or the second time? Why? Hmm... why do you think you are getting that scratchy tone?
Wow that was great. Was that just luck, or can you do it again?
What do you think you could improve upon in this piece/passage?
What went well? What could you fix? How can we fix this? Which example sounds better? Why?
Was your performance in tune?
Did you like your sound?
What could you do to improve your performance more?
How were your dynamic levels?
How did it sound to you? Is your finger in the right position? Does your bow hold look right to you?
What did you like about how you played? What didn't you like? What would make it better?
What can you do to improve...? How did you like that? What did you like/dislike?
What do you hear in your playing that needs work?
How would you work on that problem?
On a scale of 1 to 10 -- where 1 is the very first time you ever tried this piece/passage, and 10 is totally performance-ready, where are you right now? (In response to student's score, I then ask, "What will it take to get it half a point higher?")
Middle school and above: "What is your goal for this play-through?" followed by: "Did you achieve your goal?"
Elementary and younger: "Which fingers landed on the tapes?" "Did your bow stay in the highway the whole time?"
What do you hear happening differently from the first section and the last?
How did that sound to YOU?
How could you improve your sound here?
What did you notice about your dynamics?
Did you like the way that sounded?
What would you like to improve?
How did that feel?

Now that you are playing the correct notes and bowings, what can you do to make the music sparkle?
What finger was out of tune when you played just now?
What did you think of how you played that?
Would you change anything if you played it again?
What were you thinking about while you played?
What is your focus going to be while playing this piece? (Posture, intonation, rhythm, bowings, dynamics...)
What did you think of that? Do you like example A or B? Why? What did you hear? Did yours sound like mine? What could you do differently?
Did you notice a difference?
Can you describe that difference?
Which one of these (2-3 played examples) is most pleasing/closest to what we are aiming for?
Would you count that take?
Asking students to self assess. Asking questions that might be related to a point I'm trying to make or an aspect of the material that I want to call the student's attention too. What did you like about how you played?" "What did you want to change?" "Did you notice anything about your tone?" "Did you hear any scratches?" "What were your eyes watching while you played?"
Was that repetition correct or incorrect?
How did this time when you played compare with last time?
Can you tell me one thing you liked/didn't like about the way you played that?

Technique
What are the three big bow variables that you can use to change your sound? (Weight, speed, contact point)
To a pre-K or elementary student: "If 2nd finger is used to being placed next to 3rd finger in all the songs we have done so far, what do you think it is going to want to do if we now need to place it next to 1st finger?" To an advanced student: "As we play in a higher position on the string, does the bow play closer to the bridge or farther away?" "If we want to play louder, do we put the bow closer to the bridge or farther from the bridge?"
How can you use your bow to make that note sound more beautiful?
What is your left hand doing that would make playing this note more difficult?
How can you divide your bow to make that phrase continue to grow?
Can you play that spot again with tall fingers?
What part of the bow did I play this in?
Why did I start from the string?
Where is your thumb supposed to be in fifth position?
What are the different ways to make an accent?
Why do you think we use a 4th finger in this passage instead of an open string?
Why do you think there is an up bow in that spot?
Should you use an open or a 4?
I'm having trouble with my bow hold....can you help me fix it? What could I do to fix it?
What's happening with my pinky here?
Can you feel your 2nd and 3rd fingers touching on the fingerboard?

Is your scroll as tall as the target on the music stand?
Can you keep your feet in playing position while I count to 10?
Did your pinky stay curved the whole way through?
What does ""staccato"" mean and how do we do it?
Try both of these fingering options [one in first position -- one with shifts], and tell me which you prefer and why.
How do you play piano on your violin?
How would you do bow distribution in the beginning of this piece?
Is that your best bow hold?
What can you do with your bow to create more dynamic contrast?
Where is your bow driving?
Do you still have a round pinky?
Who's bow hold looks better, mine or yours?
Pre-kindergarten ""How is your bow hold?
High School ""How did you decide to choose this fingering?"""
What's the high point of the phrase? Which notes were out of tune?
How does that feel? (Posture), what's the difference between the two examples (technical or musical), what is your tendency (intonation)
How can you change your posture to improve your tone?
Kindergarten/elementary: How do you make a bowhold? What color is your performance space?
Elementary/middle: How do you play forte? How do you play legato?
Where in the bow should we play this excerpt?
What part of the bow is this section going to be played in and why?
How did that feel for your left hand? What did you hear with your bow? What part of your bow makes this stroke easiest?
When you shift, are you thinking about where your first finger and thumb are going? (How much space is between the original position, and the new position?)
What is the handframe (series of half and whole steps in the fingers like Barbara Barber color strings)?
What is a good fingering for this passage? (Especially for older students who are playing things outside of traditional literature ie: school music etc.)
Think about your thumb - where is it going, where it being placed, is it squeezing too much?
Younger students- What is your bow hold thumb supposed to look like?
Can you help fix my posture?
Older students- do you like that fingering choice? Or do you have better option?

<u>Musical Interpretation</u>
How does this piece make you feel?
What kind of music is this? Happy/sad? Etc.
Which of these sounds better (tone, musical interpretation, etc.) to you?
What sound were you looking for? How do we get that sound? What techniques get us that sound?
What do you see or imagine when you hear this piece of music (pictures in head or storyline)?

What kind of trill would this composer want you to use?
Which sound did you like the best? How do you think you could make that more exciting? Where do you feel like the peak of this phrase is? What do you think the most surprising note is in this phrase?
Where is this phrase going? What's the destination?
This is marked ""dolce."" What does that mean? How will you create that?
What story does this music tell? How would you describe your tone?
Can you play this section a little darker?
Which note is the peak of the phrase?
What note do you think is the most important? Can you tell me the end of this musical sentence?
Middle School "What is your musical intention in this section?"

Practice
What is the major practicing goal for this week?
Do they understand what they are to practice
How was you practice this week?
What would be your practice strategy for this passage? What's your goal? Try it out now . . . did you reach your goal?
What would be a good way to practice this section?"
Asking about how practice went.
High school: how would you practice this section at home?

Theory
What symbol in the sheet music tells us to play a note staccatto?
How do you know if these notes are slurred or hooked?
Ask them to identify the sharps or flats in a key sig and to extrapolate the key. Ask students why certain bowings/fingerings might be used instead of others etc.
What does ""dolce"" mean?
Elementary "What is the form of this piece?”

General
How was your day/week?

2. If you use positive feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Musical Aspects
You are doing the dynamics in this section really well.
That was so much more exciting now that you [did whatever it was]
There was a bigger difference between your fortes and pianos that time, good.
Very musical playing!
The crescendo really was clear
Beautiful phrasing in the middle section.
Great job on your phrasing. I can tell you spent a lot of time working on it this week. because of it. Sounds great.

Beautiful phrasing.
You obviously put a lot of work into your phrasing this week!
I love the way you dropped from forte to piano in measure 39!
I love the way you did your dynamic change
Your expression in the first passage where you used increasing bow speeds was fantastic!
I heard the ring
I loved the way you phrased that!
That was such a beautiful sound, I'd love to hear it again!!
Ahh, that's a much richer sound!
I can hear your ringing third finger on the D string.
I loved the way you tapered your phrases.
I loved the echo you made in the 2nd part of the song!
I could really hear the different dynamics
I really felt something while you played, I heard your dynamic contrast
High school: I liked how you played with a good tone, vibrato, and phrasing
Elem/middle: Wow! Good progress and preparation of this piece
I loved how clear your phrasing was here

<u>Effort</u>
That is much improved! I can tell that you really worked on (blank) skill! That is great! I can see you are really understanding (blank).
Good, you did exactly what I asked you to do.
That was way better. Wow, that was your best time. Now that's really good listening.
You played that section perfectly!
That was great improvement.
You can see that you worked really hard.
I like how you (specific point). You are really improving on your (specific point).
Well done! I can see that you have worked on that1
Good job getting through the passage!
You fixed a lot of the issues!
Don't get frustrated! You didn't even know third position in September. Now you know Third, Fifth, and Second and it is April.
Did you hear the difference? That's exactly the sound you wanted.
You worked so hard!
Great work! I can tell you worked on this piece a lot this week.
Your goal was to make that a ringing tone 5 times in a row, and you did it!
Great job listening!
Thank you for being ready to go.
That was tough but you didn't give up.
I can tell you worked hard on this section.
Compliment on the amount of work done/memory in the past week, or for a successful performance
I hear a lot of improvements since last week
You seem very focused

Great work this week, I really liked you preparation. (or if the week's prep wasn't so great... I loved your preparation last week, can we try to get back to that for next week's lesson?)

Technique
Nice bow hand, left hand, posture point or musical idea like intonation, articulation, etc.
You made great progress on the fingering in that spot.
Nice job keeping your feet still while you played!
Look at that thumb! It stayed curved the whole time!
I love how your fingertips are coming down on the string on the left side of the finger.
Specific comments on good bow hold, good sound, fingers in correct spot - posture - constant and ongoing
I loved how you kept your vibrato going all the way to the end of the note.
Hey - you made your pinkie round all by yourself!
You just did all the third fingers we talked about beautifully!
Your scroll stayed as high as the target on the music stand for your entire scale.
Your bow hold (posture, thumb, left hand, etc.) looks better today
You remembered to play over the fingerboard for the pp
What a great shift - you really were soft in the thumb and your finger knew where it was going. Now can you replicate that?

Bowing
You kept your bow on the straight path most of the time!
You really watched the bow like we talked about
You kept a beautifully curved pinky on your bowhold for the entire piece.
Great progress keeping your thumb bent on your bow hold!
Now that you've figured out how to sustain your bow at the tip, your bow changes will be a lot smoother
Your bow stayed on Lane 2 for the entire piece.
Wow! Look at that bow hold! You must have practiced a lot this week!
You kept your bow parallel to the bridge.
You played all correct bowings.
Forming a good bow hold is difficult and you are making it look easy
your bow-hold is looking great
Nicely done, you kept your bowhold the entire time
You remembered the bowing in the tricky place.
Kinder/elem: I like how you played with a good bow hold the entire time

Intonation
I can tell you are listening closely because I saw you moving your fingers.
The intonation in this section has improved so much since last week!
Your intonation was great on that D#!
I love the way you checked that note
Nice work finding that shift note
Okay, much better in tune!
I can tell you are really thinking about the second finger intonation!

That was correct intonation.
You have really grown in your intonation since I first met you
That passage was perfectly in tune
You played all of the notes correctly.
You remembered the C#.

Positive followed by suggestion
Direct, specific comments after a student plays a piece about what I liked. Aim to give at least 2 positive comments before any corrective comment
When ever a student plays for me, I try to always pick at least one thing, whether posture or dynamics or rhythm or intonation, etc. that they did well before talking about what we can improve upon.
Everything I ask a student to do is in a positive way. Even the corrective feedback.
Johnny, I really liked how you stood there with your violin in rest position while I asked you about the piece we just played (for a younger student who is a little rambunctious)

Tone
Great tone!
That was clear tone
You are pulling such a nice straight bow today and your tone is so big and confident
I hear a clear, rich tone!
You had beautiful tone when you pulled your bow across the string like that. Did you hear how it made the pitch ring?
Your tone was beautiful in this section

General
Great job! Wow, you did it. You've really improved this week. yes!
You sound like a professional.
That was amazing!
Much better
That was beautiful
College: it is getting better

Specific
What impresses my about what I just heard is . . . [comments on phrasing, intonation, steady rhythm, etc.]
I really liked how you...
Good job with...
(I like to give specific positive feedback, rather than just saying ""Good job."")
"Wow--what a nice tone!

Posture
Your tall posture makes me feel happy and proud.
You look so professional when you sit up straight like you did today
I love the way you took time to get your posture and bow hold ready

Rhythm
While you were playing, I noticed that your mom was tapping her foot. That mean you played very rhythmically. Even better . . . it means that you moved someone with your music. You literally made your mom move

3. If you use corrective feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Analyzing
You know, my sound is still a little different that yours because I'm _____.
Oops, did you forget to listen? I hear you do this just a second ago and I'm going to hold you to that- go ahead and try it again.
Does that sound good to you?
Let's listen and make more of your notes in-tune with the others.
Let's see if we can listen to all of our 3rd finger notes and make sure they ring like crazy!
older ones: ""What did you hear from your sound? Any discrepancies? Keep your eyes on your bow this time and see if it makes a difference
Do you know why your violin/viola made that odd sound?
Are there any dynamics on the page? Did you play them? What could you do to make them more effective?
In a previous piece, you learned how to [name of technique]. Do you see a place to use that here?
Test that passage again using your elbow to change strings.
What's the best part of the bow to use for that technique?
Ooooh . . . did you hear that crunch when you landed the bow circle? How can you get rid of that sound
I try to only tell students out-right if they can't figure it out on their own (with the help of guided questioning , playing shower, or examples when needed).
Most of the time I try to get the students to vicalize what needs to be corrected by asking questions.

Technique
curve your pinky finger
I want you to imagine that you are holding a baseball in your right hand. Right now your hand looks like a duck.
Your fingers need to stay on the tapes
The shift was more accurate the last time because you used an 'up and over' motion. Let's see if the next shift is better if you do that
I think you should play that measure again, focusing on keeping your fingers down.
The shifting in that measure needs some attention. Play it again and focus on feeling your thumb move from the old position to the new one.
Keep your wrist straight so you can reach your 4
Your pinky looks like a French fry instead of like a rainbow.

Musical Interpretation
Let's start your vibrato right at the beginning of the note.

Can you use your vibrato to reinforce the tension in this spot?
I'd like to hear more contrast in your dynamics.
That was a nice mezzo-piano, but I'm pretty sure it's supposed to be forte....do you want to try again?"
Try this passage again and see if you can exaggerate the dynamics as marked in the part.

Posture
Readjust your feet. Check in the mirror and watch your bow.
Don't squish your birds nest. Don't feed the mosquitos. Or any other quick posture reminder that I have set up previously through a story.
Breath for balanced posture
Following Ed Krietman's ""Teaching Priorities"" I typically comment on a posture element first.

Positive before corrective
Good job, but one thing that I noticed in your playing (reference), you should work on (gives feedback/fix their mistake)
All criticism or comments for improvement start with addressing what WAS good as that's the basis for motivation towards focusing on improvements
I like how you (specific point), now let's try to work on (specific point).
That was great, remember that in 5th position your arm should be around the violin.

Intonation
Your half steps still aren't as tight as they need to be
Remember that all the 2nd fingers in this piece are high!
How was that C#--in tune or not? Let's move it up higher to get it in tune
A low 2 should touch 1, they are best friends.

Specific
Try doing this instead
It might be more comfortable for you if you did this
Let's do that again and try doing ____
I attempt to be very specific in corrective feedback to students.

Bowing
This piece is all in the upper half.
All of the songs you have learned start down bow.
Does this piece start with an up or a down bow? Did you start with that type of bow?

General
Oops- that wasn't quite it. Hmm, I think we better try that again.
No. Let's fix that. Please fix that

Tone
Let's try to get that bow straight for more clear tone
Kinder/elem: Let's practice playing in lane three so we have a good tone

Rhythm
Can we clean-up this passage by going slower or using rhythms?
"Read the rhythms careful and try that passage again.

Practice
(Specific note or bow corrections) did you practice this? Show me how you practiced this.

Non-Verbal
Often they are facial gestures
Pre-Kindergarten - mostly non verbal

4. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning teacher verbalizations that you use with students:

Analyzing
I try to keep the student's mind actively involved with solving things that need correction, by asking questions or using analogies to create a picture so they remember how to correct. I have always tried to be positive in the lessons. I try to be aware of how much I am talking, because a parent at a workshop I taught at once said I talked too much!!
I make self-assessment and self-reflection a priority. If the student names something they like, I address that and can agree with them. If the student names something they didn't like, I can help them make it become something they like. It instills intrinsic motivation.
I do my best to be solution-focused -- i.e., not to outline problems, but to discover, with the student, what is working and to build from that.
It is important to make things relatable, and when possible, fun. Most students want to succeed (though there are those that don't care) but are also afraid of failure. I try to praise all the positive things that are working right that I observe, and notice where their greatest struggle is and give them a small and attainable adjustment to make that will lead to success. When they feel good about themselves, both for what was working right and for overcoming a struggle or mastering a new skill, they are happier and therefore more inspired to keep working harder!
For example just today I had a young student playing French Folk Song ALL WRONG! But rather than telling him what was wrong I had him check back with the written instructions to see how many times each note was played, (he was empowered to use the skills he already possesses to help himself) we broke things down into short sections and drew cards for the number of repetitions of the section, and rather than telling him he was playing way too fast and sloppily we talked about what animals move slowly and played it like "Flash" from Zootopia, and like a tortoise, etc. In 15 minutes of playing games like this, he was playing French Folk Song almost perfectly, and had had fun in the process and not been made to feel bad about the first (disaster!) run through he'd worked so hard all week to prepare for

Paired verbalizations

Often my "corrective feedback" is either paired with or phrased as a directive for the next attempt. "There was more dynamic contrast that time, good, but it's still only a quarter of what it needs to be."
I tend to focus on things that can be improved upon instead of what went well because that is the environment I was brought up in. However, I have realized the importance of praise in a teaching environment and have started incorporating that more into my studio.
Positive item, then discuss strategies to fix errors or enhance piece.
I always try to state something positive about the students playing before a correction (or even multiple things). Even if it's something simple like "thank you for standing up so straight and tall while you play for me", I think it helps them feel like I'm watching everything and acknowledging their effort to do a good job.
Always lead with what was done correctly (preferably several things) before moving on to the one thing to focus on correcting.
Always use positive feedback first before demonstrating corrective feedback
Constructive praise always comes before correction
I try to frame things in a positive manner and break things down into the smallest element that will make the biggest difference and be quickly attainable.
I believe as teachers, it is our job to encourage and to help train our students. Praise is a great motivator in helping students change, and also helping them to make a note when they've done something well
It's a bit challenging to parse how much of each lesson is spent on each category outlined above as they are often all mixed together!

Modeling
I like to combine modelling and verbalizing instructions during lesson times.
balance between verbal and modeling - so never over talk during lessons!
I basically try to say one positive thing before I say any corrections for the younger child. For mid to high, they seem to appreciate straightforward reflections on something that I see or hear that they can try to fix.
In general, I am trying to talk lesson during lessons and demonstrate more and have the students play more.

Age Groups
I don't think about teaching pre-schoolers as being any different than teaching college students in terms of the directives, feedback, or questions I give/ask. To me, the pacing might be a little different for learners at different ages, but what makes our brain learn is the same: receiving feedback that helps us identify moments of "lovely playing" and distinguish it from moments of playing that could be a little better.

Verbalizations as pacing tool
I also pace lessons with talking. If they need a break, I tell them a story or explain something. If they need to play, I use more modeling and more nonverbal expression.

Specific and how
Be specific and then immediately follow it with how to fix it and repetitions to check for understanding

General conversation
I like to ask at the beginning of each lesson 1. How was their week? (to gauge their mood) 2. How much practice they've done? (to gauge my mood...just kidding. To know how prepared I should expect them to be) 3. What they learned in school this week. (So that I can show them that education is important)
I verbally acknowledge the beginning and end of the lesson along with the student during starting and ending bows.

Practice
How much did you practice this week?
How are you practicing?

Student specific
And I think it is also our responsibility to phrase constructive feedback in a way that the student will receive it. Some students need a more directive response, some need a more gentle reminder, and some need to be asked questions so that they can help realize mistakes on their own. In this way, it's important to know your students.

5. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning instructional strategies that you use with students:

Parental involvement
we are doing a modified Suzuki program at our school for grade 2 students - it limits the parent involvement

Recordings
The last two questions were unclear. I always assign listening, but it does not take too much time.
Listening to classical recordings on iTunes or Youtube.
Not sure about q11, but my answers indicate that I give listening assignments to all my students all the time.
Using Smart Music or Music Minus 1 recordings at home and in the lesson
I often make slow practicing CDs for my students to practice with at home until they build up the necessary tools to play it at tempo with the purchased CD.
Regarding the listening/playing along - recently I have been assigning students to play along (silently with the bow on the shoulder) with youtube videos. This has helped the more beginning students keep up with the rest of the group in recital playdowns so that at least their bows know how to follow even if their fingers can't yet keep up!
I do have my students watch videos the parents take and then play at home, but not play with , normally.

Student Performance
I try to allow a lot of time for each student to play their practiced assignments. Especially their newest piece-I often will let them just play and not say anything until they are

finished. I like to give them at least one opportunity to do that in each lesson so they can really show me what they did that week.

Rhythm
I use clapping very little, but I use marching a lot! I.e., student plays and marches on the main beats. I call it "being your own metronome." I expect every student to become skillful at this.
Instead of clapping, I have students use words to talk about rhythms. I love the "Music Mind Games" words, and it allows the kids to have a really excellent sense of rhythm. Once they can really get to that point, then we can switch over into the more adult language of quarter, eighth, etc., or "one-e-and-a" etc.

Theory
Theory books for all levels.

Live music
Encouragement of concert attendance.

Practice
Every student has a binder with a piece of paper for each part of practice (listening, bow exercises, scales, vibrato, review, 3 current pieces, etc.) put in practice order in the binder. Older students write their own notes in the binder."

6. Please describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities you use most frequently in lessons (i.e., scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.):

Scales and Arpeggios
Scales- 39 instances
Arpeggios- 24 instances

Technical exercises
Lots of fingerboard geography exercises, many introduced by rote.
technical exercises.
Bowing exercises
Finger patterns
Whistler shifting
Shifting exercises
Tonalization
finger pattern exercises
pitch memory exercises
vibrato exercises
shifting exercises
bow flexibility exercises
Bow circles and bow games to get the bow and arm/wrist doing its job better.
Elevators/Escalators from the Mastery for Strings book.

open string tonalization, finger dexterity exercises, vibrato, bow exercises, technical exercises using review pieces (relaxed thumb or straight bow for example)
tonalization, open string exercises, finger exercises
tone exercises, Now arm exercises
Trill exercises
Bow hand and tone exercises
String crossing exercises
Rhythm exercises
Double stops
open strings, shifting, vibrato, Suzuki exercises
Tonalization exercises
Giving a ""sniff"" -- giving a cue to an accompanist or ensemble
bow exercises, vibrato exercises, tone exercises, trill exercises, shifting
shifting
shifting, double stops, studies, technique
double stops, shifting exercises, tonalization
homemade exercises, tonalizations
tonalization
double stops, tonalization, shifting exercises
technique books (I Can Read Music, Doflein, Wolfhart)
shifting exercises, finger pattern exercises, bow technique exercises on and off the string
shifting, vibrato, bowing exercises
styles, bowing variations, rhythms and articulations.
short tech exercise

Etudes
etudes
etudes like Wohlfahrt, Kreutzer
etudes
More advanced students play from various etude books
Some etudes by middle school.
Etudes
etudes
Elementary through adult students at least in Suzuki book 1 have some sort of etude work - ""First Etude Album"" for the younger ones and Wohlfahrt for the older, and as they advance we add Whistler ""Introducing the Positions.
etudes
etudes
For more advanced students, basic etudes
Etudes
Kreutzer etudes, Schradieck etudes
they switch to standard etudes-usually right around Book Four.

Repertoire exercises
Segments of the repertoire that we subsequently take out of context and play from memory/rote.

small sections of repertoire piece made into an exercise
preparatory exercises for upcoming repertoire.

Improvisation and composition
Improvisation
Improvisation
improvisational call-and-response games

Method books
Kievmann- middle school
Mazas-middle school
Sassmanshaus method for reading in third position. Mazas etude book, Rode etude book.
My Suzuki book 4 and above students work in the Carl Flesh book. The book 5 and above students add the Trott double stops book
Wolfahrt, Mazas etudes
Trott double stops
Barbara Barber Finger Geography exercises
For my older kids: I use Schradieck, Wolfhart, Kreutzer, and Galamian/Flesch, Also Harvey Whistler
I pretty much follow the Delay/Fried list

Sight-reading
I can read music 1 and 2
Reading books (adventures in music reading),
reading
Reading exercises
We also include music reading practice (Essential Elements, All for Strings, etc.)
Every group (except pre-twinkle) plays at least one group pierce that they have never seen or heard. I start students in the I Can Read Music book at the pre-twinkle stage. They go through the whole book, using only the rhythm side, clapping and counting out loud the rhythms. I am not in a hurry to get to the end, but when they can do the whole book clapping and counting out loud, we go back to the beginning and do the whole book again with their bow on the string. I eventually add the pitch side of the book. The students are rarely on the same page for pitch and rhythm.
sight-reading
reading
For my beginners I use: I can read music, Fiddle Magic, and all Cassia Harvey Duos, Fiddle Books, and beginning reading books
I Can Read Music books by Joann Martin
note reading
Once they reach the end of Book One, they are doing note reading in every lesson.

Outside repertoire
Work on their orchestra/ensemble music
I am also frequently spending lesson time on Group class music, orchestra music and chamber music, especially with middle and high schoolers.

Other
Flash cards
For Pre-K and beginning elementary students, we spend time doing posture games such as those found in ""The New Pre-Twinkle Book"".
Instrument care
echo games - familiar tunes - Mary had a little lamb

7. Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc.):

Pre-K
Teacher
teacher tunes
Have pitch being played and tune instrument
teacher tunes
teacher, child assists
teacher tunes
Teacher
teacher
Teacher
teacher tunes
Teacher
I tune them
teacher tunes
teacher tunes
Parent Tunes
teacher
teacher
Teacher
Teacher
teacher
Parent
teacher tunes
Teacher tunes, student watches
teacher tunes
assisted tuning
box violin, no tuning
Teacher tunes
teacher tunes
teacher tunes, student sings pitches
Teacher
Teacher tunes
Teacher tunes
Teacher tunes
teacher

Teacher
teacher tunes
teacher tunes
teacher tunes
teacher
teacher tunes
I tune the instrument
teacher

Elementary
Transitioning
teacher tunes
teacher tunes most of the time, maybe student helps towards end of elementary
Pitch being played and tu e instrument. Ask student to identify if the pitch is high or low
Teacher Tunes
teacher tunes
assisted tuning
teacher, sometimes child on A, assists mostly
teacher tunes
Teacher/ training student
teacher
Teacher
assisted tuning
Assisted tuning
They tune themselves to a drone
teacher tunes
student matches teacher (assisted tuning)
assisted tuning
teacher/assisted
teacher/assisted
Assisted
Teacher
teacher/assisted
Parent or student
assisted
Begin teaching how to tune, using a tuner--put student in change as soon as possible--help student learn to play double-stop to check tuning
assisted tuning
assisted tuning
teacher tunes, but student plays
Teacher tunes
teacher tunes
student tunes to tuner, teacher helps, especially if they do not have fine tuners
Teacher
Teacher tunes
Teacher works with student to teach student to tune

Teacher tunes or assists student in tuning
teacher
Student with tuner
teacher tunes
teacher tunes
teacher tunes
teacher
student plays open fifths, some the kids tunes, some the teacher moves fine tuners
I tune the instrument
teacher

Middle School
Student
assisted tuning
student tunes with teacher assistance (or with teacher looking on to double check)
Pitch being played have student try and tune. Fix if needed
Student Tunes
student tunes
assisted tuning
student tunes, teacher assists
assisted tuning
student
Assisted
assisted turning
Student
Tune themselves to a drone
teacher tunes
assisted tuning/student tunes
Student Tunes
teacher/assisted/student
student
Student
Student first
student/assisted
Student
student tunes
Student tunes, possibly using a tuner, mostly using double-stops from a violin or piano A
student tunes
student tunes
assisted tuning
Depends on student level
teacher tunes
student tunes to tuner, teacher helps, especially if they do not have fine tuners
Student
Assisted
Student tunes

Student tunes
student with assistance
Student tunes a to tuner then by ear then checks with tuner
assisted tuning
teacher assists tuning
teacher tunes
assisted tuning
student plays open fifths - some can tune these on their own, some teacher tunes
I will start teaching them how to tune, either using a tuner for listening for the sound of the strings
student

High School
Student
student tunes
student tunes
Give student pitch
student tunes
student tunes, teacher may assists
student tunes
student
Student
student tunes
Student
Tune themselves to a drone
teacher tunes
student tunes
Student tunes
student/assisted
student
Student
Student
student
Student
student tunes
Student tunes
student tunes
student tunes
assisted tuning if pegs are difficult, otherwise student tunes
Student tunes
student tunes/assisted tuning
student tunes A to tuner and then tunes the rest of strings by ear. Checks with tuner if not quite sure
Student
Assisted
Student tunes

Student tunes
student
Student tunes a to tuner then tunes by ear
student tunes
student tunes
student
student tunes with open fifths
I will start teaching them how to tune, either using a tuner for listening for the sound of the string was being played together
student

College
Student
student tunes
student tunes
Give student pitch
student tunes
student tunes
student
Tune themselves to a drone
student/assisted
student
Student
student
Student
Student tunes
student tunes
student tunes
Student tunes
student tunes
Tunes A to tuner and then tunes rest of strings.
Assisted
Student tunes
teacher assists
student tunes
They tune themselves

Other
Depends on level
assisted tuning
Adult tunes, teacher assists
teacher training student
Student
assisted medical
Tune Themselves to a drone

Depends on ability
assisted
Student
Same as elementary/middle school
student tunes
assisted tuning, if needed
Assisted
Assisted tuning
Depends on level
teacher tunes
student
student plays open fifths, most tune themselves, some need some help still

8. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning lesson activities that you use with students:

Memory
I'd love to report a higher percentage of time from memory, but I have done a lot of work with students that I didn't begin, and with many of these it's like pulling teeth to get them to play from memory.

Non-repertoire playing activities
It's hard to do technical work and have time for the repertoire in a 30-minute lesson, for sure!

Tuning
Always tune kids until they are in middle school or show interest. Middle school and older always tune themselves unless they are adult learners. Tuning is an essential tool that students and parents must learn as soon as possible"
games to work on technique, rhythms, posture, etc.
"Just to address the tuning: I don't allow my students to use visual based tuners in their lessons. It doesn't teach them to listen to intonation.
I teach the students to tune their own instruments, but I always tune their instruments for them at lesson as it allows me to check over their instrument for any issues (repairs, lack of rosin, etc.)
Even with youngest students, I tune while they bow, and I ask them to stop bowing when my fine-tuning has brought their string to match the reference pitch.
I try to get students independent and competent at tuning as soon as possible. This means teaching how to play double-stops to complete beginners, so that they hear a perfect 5th played many, many times before they are ready to tune on their own.
I listen a lot

Listening to recorded music in the lesson:
In terms of CDs in the lesson: I do use for my younger students the Alice Kanack Improvisation CD"

For Elementary and Middle School (Suzuki Bk 1-4) 1/3 time technique and note reading, 1/3 time review, 1/3 time new pieces

Ability
A lot of these questions so far have been age-based. Private teachers usually base their lesson around ability, not age. For example, there's a large difference between a 12 year old that just started lessons with me and a 12 year old that I started when he/she was 3 years old. The lesson activities would NOT be the same.

Other Repertoire
As needed I help them with repertoire for church or other special events.

Games
With younger students, I may pull out some of my ""Music Mind Games"" materials and do a few games."
Ear training games and activities for beginning elementary and preschool students

Open Response Prompts Non-Suzuki

1. If you use questioning with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Technique
High or low two?
Is your thumb bent? "
Are you squeezing your left hand?
What part of the bow do you think would work best for this style?
What is your pinky doing?
Are you comfortable with that bowing/fingering? Does it help your musical goals?
How do you get more volume out of the instrument?
Is the (bow hold or left hand position correct)?
Do you need a high or low 2nd finger for that note? Why?
Are you using pressure, weight or gravity to produce your sound?
How does the arm position itself for playing X string?
What moves when we shift positions?
How could you improve this articulation?
What do you do with your right hand to make those measures piano. What part of your bow should you use to play this passage. What finger pattern do you use in this (these) measures
What lane should your bow be placed for that dynamic level?
Since the speed increased in your bow, how much weight should be used, more or less?
Since we are in C Major, what finger pattern will be used on the G-string.
Was that finger high enough? Was that note in tune? Was your bow in the correct lane?
What position are you shifting to, really, when aiming for that 4th finger D on the E-string?"
Beginner: Which finger is across from the thumb?
Would it be better to start an up bow or a down bow in this passage? Why?
When we play tremolo, what part of the bow should we be in?

Self-analysis
How do you think that run through went?
How can we improve this?
What do you think went well in that run through?
Do you like that sound?
If you had to score yourself, what would you give yourself on a scale of 1-10?
What was wrong with that scale (you just played)?
What did your sound sound like? Use describing words.
What accidental did you miss in that whole passage?
What are 3 things you thought you did well and 3 things to work on?
Was your bow straight? How could you tell?
How can you demonstrate (fill in the blank)
If you were helping someone else learn this piece, what would you say and do?
What did you notice about that?

What was good about that time you played the passage?
What could you do better next time?
What would you like to focus on the next time we play that?"
What do you think should…
What do you hear during that bow change?
How does your tongue sound?
Do you know which Note is out of tune?
What did you think you did well? What was tricky?
What did you like about what you played? What can you do better?
Intermediate: What should we warm up before we start this section?
Were you happy with that sound?
What did you do well when you played that time?
Name one thing you could fix the next time you play that.

Musical Interpretation
What do you think the composer is trying to say?
Where is the end of the phrase?"
Where do you think the phrase beginning/ending is?
Should there be a crescendo or diminuendo in this phrase?
What do you think the dynamic should be here?"
What is the character of the music here? "
Do you know this piece?
When I play it two or three different ways, what do you hear? Is there anything you like and want to incorporate in your playing? Is there anything you don't like? Why?
Did you make a contrast between the dynamics indicated?
Where does this phrase end? What caused the bad sound that you heard?"
What did you notice about your dynamics when you played?
What does the contour of the music suggest to you in terms of performance?
Do we want a pulsed sound here, or should we carry the tone throughout this passage?
Intermediate/advanced: How can we make this phrase more musically engaging?

Theory
What key signature is this in?
What key are we in?
What is this note? How do you know that it is a (sharp, flat, natural)? What is the time signature? What is the key signature?
What is the key signature?
What is the key signature/time signature/title/tempo?
I will usually start with vocabulary and the next lesson I will ask them to recall the vocab.
I usually ask questions about theory that engages their brain in critical analyses, for example, I will explain a concept like rhythm and why and how many beats are in 4/4 time and then change the time to 2/4 and ask how many beats are in this measure.
If f sharp is the leading tone, what key are you in?
If you are in the key of G major, which strings have a low 2nd finger?
What does this series of notes look like? (A. ie, a scale or a triad, etc)
Can you tell me what is in the key signature for D Major?

Practice
How much did you practice this week?
How are you practicing?
How are you going to practice this, what steps do you think you should take?

2. If you use positive feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

General
Yes!
Great...now let's add...
That's it!
Beautiful!
Good work.
There's a lot of good things going on here let's work on the places that aren't as strong.
You are improving very quickly!
I use a subjective rating scale, taking into account the level the student is presently at (mostly in their bowing): Good, Very good, excellent!
Good job!
That was very nice, that sounds terrific!
Good work!
Yes! Exactly!
After working a section-better. That's the idea.

Efforts
Thank you for your hard work.
You must have really practiced this!
That last time I heard the change we've been working on! Let's do it again!
Way to go! That's exactly what we've been talking about. Let's play it again.
I will only give positive feedback if they are doing something excellent.
You worked hard to clean up that spot.
Good, again with more!
This sounds like you have worked on it a lot since the last lesson; is that so?
That was the best one yet!
I always make sure to praise focus to young and distracted students. I also praise parents for their dedication or hard work with the student through the week or help with behavior.
After a lesson performance I make sure to praise what I like and appreciate from their playing and notice what they have improved on throughout the week or month.
Wow! You've made so much progress this week!

Technique
Good job- your thumb is looking nice and bent!
Pre-Kindergarten/Elementary: "Great job using helicopter hover fingers!" "No pancake wrist, excellent!"
JH: "You used 4th finger instead of open string, very elegant choice!"

I love how your violin was ringing when you played 3rd finger on the A - the D string couldn't help but sing along!
Look at your violin position (i take a photo). What an improvement
Excellent job bringing the left elbow forward to set the left hand frame for C# on the G-string!
Fantastic right hand finger flexibility in the direction change!
After first playing- good job I liked your elbow level, I could hear the ringing tones we talked about last week.
I loved your articulation.

Intonation
Your intonation has improved a lot since last week.
Good job for observing the (sharp, flat, natural)!
I like the way to changed the pitch to correct the note.
Intonation is much improved
Your intonation was really good that time.
The shift to 3rd position was in tune!
The intonation was very good.
Wow, your intonation is spot on today. You must be using your ears today.
That shift was much more in tune.
Your second finger played the f-natural better.

Musical Aspects
I liked the dynamic range you performed in that section.
That was a very musical performance."
HS: The phrasing had peaks/valleys and kept me wanting to hear more!
That phrase sounded so much better by following the dynamics.
I like the way you slowly built the sound in this crescendo passage.
The contrast between these two phrases was excellent.

Specific
I like the way you...
Bravo on...
_____ was very nicely done."
I usually tell them what they're doing well and why they're doing it so well. Or work with what they're doing well to help progress in other areas that they're struggling with.
I heard several good things, such as ...

Bowing
Your bow went much straighter that time.
I like the way you used long bows.
That was really good! I liked how you played at the tip of your bow like I asked you to.

Tone
Wow- your tone is amazing!
That section had good tone.

Your tone was much better today.

Rhythm
Thank you for counting your rhythms.
Your timing was much better that time.
Your rhythm was much steadier this time than the last.

Positive followed by suggestion
That was very good-let's try it with (suggestions for improvement)
That was 90% how can you make it 100% next time?
You used more bow weight to make that crescendo. Now add some vibrato.

Posture
Your posture looks wonderful!

3. If you use corrective feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Analyzing
Let's try it both ways and see which sounds best to our ears.
What do you think needs to happen to correct this?
How do you...
It depends on what we are working on and if we had gone over the techniques needing corrective feedback. I will usually ask them questions that will help them remember what we talked about before. For example, what shape or animal should your bow hand be in? Or... something that is helpful to remember your bow hand may look like an elephant's mouth and trunk ((:
I heard some wrong notes here; do you know where the half steps are on the E string?
You have got the sound in your head this way, but you need to listen again to what you are doing and change this.
Here's how your shift sounded. Can you make it sound like this?
You're almost playing F#, like this. Can you make it sound like this, with your fingers touching?

Technique
That is a low two because we have a c natural
Your intonation is great so now we can work on your spiccato
This time, let your elbow guide your string crossing.
Is your wrist straight enough? I may gently help the student adjust the left hand position.
Is your right thumb curved? Is your pinky on top of the bow?
Play the passage again with the correct arm position and see if it fixes the problem.
Check your wrist - remember we want a long, straight line from the back of your hand to your elbow.
Remember you need to have a mouse hole. We don't want our mouse friends homeless.
Beginner: let's try that phrase again and add focusing on maintaining a curved thumb

Intonation
Let’s look at the G# in the second measure
Let's see if we can play that passage again while listening carefully to get the C in tune.
Can you play that line again with a higher G#?
For that scale you need to move your third finger up a little bit since you were a bit flat
Let's try that again, and this time make sure you play the low 2's on the e string.

Bowing
One more time with a good bow hold.
Let’s start with the other upbow.
You are using your bow very nicely in the upper half. Lets use some more flexibility in order to utilize the lower half of the bow
Ah! Check the mirror - see where your bow is? Bring it in closer to the bridge!"
Intermediate: make sure you start this note at the frog

Musical Interpretation
See if you can play the forte louder, so the piano can have a bigger contrast
What was wrong with that phrase?"
I like how you are using more vibrato. Can you use it more often on the longer notes in the phrase?
Advanced: use a wider vibrato for this style

Rhythm
Make sure you're counting that measure
Play the rhythm on open A and repeat after me.
This rhythm really goes like this...
I could tell when you stopped counting- you want to always feel a strong pulse in the music.
Which hand is controlling the rhythm? Focus on that hand now.

Positive before corrective
(Start with a positive comment), now let’s look at (whatever needs to be fixed). Talk to me about why you played it that way. Let’s analyze it together.
Your bow hold looks great. Let’s see if we can just get our wrist to move a little more freely.
I liked how you fixed your intonation by making sure your fingers were on your tapes. Can we do it one more time, and this time can you also make sure that your bowing is nice and smooth?

Specific
Usually it will be intonation, rhythm, phrasing
Something to think about...
I'm still hearing X and it's annoying, can you play it again without X?

Posture

I take a photo to show position and posture issues. And we discuss together how to make corrections to meet my expectations.

Tone
Your bow is producing a nice sound. Perhaps if we concentrate on the sounding point, we can get an even bigger sound.

Theory
Actually, this is in the key of C Major.
"Oops" I think you want to look more closely at where that note sits on the staff.

Practice
We need to practice this a lot more because the concert is coming up quickly.
Slower practice will help you more than fast run-throughs

4. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning teacher verbalizations that you use with students:

Analyzing
Think about what sound you want, what needs to happen with your bow to achieve that sound?
I spend time with all of my students asking them to correct my playing when I have purposely played incorrectly either with notes and rhythms or posture and instrument setup. This is one of the ways I can assess how much they really understand what we're working on.
I never teach passively, I always engage the student and ask them questions and give them as many hints and extra tools to help them learn. Especially when I've been working with a student for a while and I've learned how they learn best I will tailor my teaching style to the way they learn.
Giving students a chance to verbalize and analyze what physical or mental blocks are stopping their progress on a skill can be very helpful and lead students to practice using the same analysis skills in their home practice.
Self assessment is an important tool.

General conversation
One of the ways that I get students to open up more and participate verbally more in lessons is when I first start teaching them, I allow them to tell me a little bit about their day so they feel like they can be friendly with me. Eventually, I am able to walk in and get right to work and then I ask about their day/week as they are packing up afterwards. This encourages them to talk to me and for some kids, that is hard to do because they are so shy. It's just breaking the ice a little bit at a time.

Paired Verbalizations
Praise can never be given enough, as long as it is honest.
I always try to pair correcting student errors with something positive.

"I usually try to pair positive and corrective feedback together in a single statement, so that their confidence is not over inflated or shattered by too much of either one. Example: I liked the stable tone you have in this measure and how you carried the sound through the bow stroke instead of jabbing it. One thing I might add is trying to create some more interest by adding a continuous vibrato to warm up these notes."

Analogies
Living in a state with mountains I relate the curve of the right thumb to a mountain peak. With elementary students I tell them there is a cave under the mt. with a baby bear in it. If the mt. caves in the poor baby bear will be swished.
"I try to use humor and analogy as well as direct information.
Concerning wrist and finger flexibility in the bow hand, I talk about pulling and collapsing the wrist, fingers and knuckles at the frog. Elephant chewing analogy, rope pulling etc

Modeling
Better than talking is playing along on piano, or violin duets!
I think it's important for the student to work with me to make improvements. I hope that by my demonstrations, using a lot of praise and taking video and still photos of what they're doing that they will improve

Specific and how to make the technique
Specific ideas are important, with information about how to produce the sound. Not just "play this more forte," but "Here's what you need to do with your bow and arm weight to make this sound more forte."

Student specific
It depends on the student and sometimes even the day they are having. Some weeks I can drill out spots and the next week that same student might cry!

Questioning
What fingering would work best in this passage?
How could you finger this to stay on one string?
What position would work best for this passage?

Catch Phrases
I have a few catch phrases about shifting, bow changes, phrasing that we (eventually) repeat together in a sing-song voice, particularly when I've said something repeatedly in a lesson.

5. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning instructional strategies that you use with students:

Individual
Again, it's very individual.

Bowing
Straight bow: upper arm against wall
Bow hold (beginner: wooden dowel, large pencil
Often times, left hand issues can be resolved by addressing bow had issues that may not be so obvious. In other words, issues of left hand technique may often be resolved by addressing technical issues of the bow hand.

Note reading
Note reading: Beginner - big staff, Middle: flashcards
Playing mini games for note recognition and sight reading.

Vibrato
"Vibrato: egg-shaker and knocking on wall

Recordings
With Middle School through College, I recommend finding as many different recordings they can find and listen, then decide which they like best and why.
I think it is important for students to hear and watch correct examples of how to play the music, but it is important for them to come up with their own interpretation. Music is meant to been an expression and if it is void of that, I don't really see the point.
I haven't used recordings much, but it's been 15 years since I taught many private lessons. Now there are lots of books that come with CDs or DVDs that I would likely assign for home practice.

One-point teaching
Correcting one thing at a time (e.g., either bow position or fingering position but not both).

Games
Scale challenges for all levels of playing.

Modeling
I usually prefer not to pick up my violin except to demonstrate a new technique. I primarily use singing to highlight musical aspects of the piece with them while they play, encouraging them to exaggerate these musical ideas.

Parental involvement
It is very much my preference that nobody else ever be in the room (including parents), although I will make exceptions for elementary students because of their age. But in my experience, nearly all children are more uncomfortable with their parents watching, and it detracts from their learning experience.

6. Please describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities you use most frequently in lessons (i.e., scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.):

Scales/Arpeggios

Scales, Arpeggios
scales/arpeggios related to solos or festival requirements
Age appropriate technical studies, scales, and arpeggios at ALL levels.
Scales
Most lessons begin with at least one scale, many times more
Scales (especially in the key of the sight-reading piece before playing the piece)
Arpeggios (of the same scale)
Scales (Barbara Barber, Flesch, 2 oct. sheet)
Scales

Etudes
etudes except for younger students
Etudes
Etude
etudes from late elementary onward
Etudes

Technical exercises
Bowing exercises- detache, martele, staccato
Technical exercises for bow arm, left hand shape exercises
Shifting exercises
Straight bowing
Bowing exercises
Technique books
Finger patterns
"I start my beginners using all 4 fingers on the string beginning as follows:
Squeeze relax - all fingers down - to strengthen the fingers
Press-lift - All fingers down - start by lifting 4-3-2-1
Press-pluck-lift- all fingers down - start with 4-3-2-1-0
Final excercise - 4-3-2-1-0-1-2-3-4 - This is done as a daily warm-up - Always pizzicato - I usually start on the A string then do on all strings - A-D-G-E"
Shifting and vibrato
String crossings (Ysaye)
rote strategies for specific skills
Left hand warm ups
Right hand warm ups

Method books
A Tune a Day Bk, Essential Elements - for beginners or remedial
Schradieck, Sevcik, Trott

Composition and improvisation
composition, improvisation

Aural skills
echo exercises

aural exercise

Theory and history
theory/history
For younger students, sometimes written music theory assignments to learn note names and rhythms

Open strings
"Open String exercises

7. Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc.):

Pre-kindergarten:
teacher tunes
Teach
Teacher tunes
teacher
Teacher tunes
teacher
teacher tunes
Teacher
Teacher tunes until student bow is slow and steady
student plays, teacher tunes, parent observes, all can see tuner

Elementary
Assisted Tuning
Teacher assisted
Teacher assisted tuning for each string
assisted tuning
assisted tuning
assisted tuning
Assisted tuning
student plays, some students tune, teacher helps or tunes, parents observe; often parents tune instrument before lesson begins (self-initiated, not at my request)
Teacher, with student listening
teacher/student
Teacher tunes
teacher tunes
Teacher tunes
teacher
Teacher tunes
Teacher
teacher tunes
teacher tunes
Teacher

Depending on the student and the quality of instrument and ease of tuning I make them physically do it. Usually to match a pitch.
teacher manipulates pegs or tuners while student bows; teacher tunes until student can hear tuning with tuners only
Student
student
Student tunes
teacher tunes

Middle School
Student Tunes
Student tunes
student
student tunes
student tunes
student tunes
Student tunes
Student
Student
student
Student tunes to teachers A (fine tuners ok)
Student tunes using Snark
assisted tuning
student tunes with teacher help
assisted tuning
Assisted tuning
teacher manipulates pegs or tuners while student bows;teacher tunes until student can hear tuning
student tunes with help
assisted tuning
Assisted
assisted
teacher helps tune
teacher tunes/student tunes, teacher assists
Teacher depending on level
Usually to pitch, occasionally to electric tuner.

High School
student
student tunes
student tunes
student tunes
Student
student
Student tunes to teaches A using pegs
student tunes as soon as ready

student
Student tunes
Student gets a from me, they tune themselves
student tunes
student tunes
Student
Student tunes with double stops
student tunes
student tunes
Student tunes
assisted tuning
student tunes with teacher help only when needed
Student tunes, maybe teacher assists

Tuning procedure College
student tunes with help
student tunes
Student
student tunes
student
Student entirely self tunes.
student tunes as soon as ready
student
student tunes as needed
student tunes wth teacher help only when needed
student tunes
Student
Student comes tuned beforehand
Student tunes

Tuning procedure Other
Student after about 2 lessons
depends on level
We tune to a 440 A. And with guidance for the younger students tune in fifths
student tunes
assisted tuning
student tunes as soon as ready
Depends on the level of the adult
assisted
Student tunes
Teacher depending on level
depends on level - all used
student tunes with teacher help / guidance
assisted tuning

8. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning lesson activities that you use with students:

Tuning
Students tune themselves unless they are beginner level. Some need assistance.
Teacher tunes for first 4 months, then student learns to tune using a chromatic tuner.

Ability
Most of my college students are beginners.

Other lesson activities
Historical information, discussions of form, listening for harmonic centers.
Some of the previous questions are not independent. Interval training (for both ear training and sight-reading training, e.g., 4 up 3 down going up the scale followed by 4 down 3 up coming down the scale for the key of interest)
"staff chart and magnets for note reading
flashcards for note reading, alphabet order
I try to keep the lesson activities different from week to week so that the lessons stay fresh and don't get too predictable. Some weeks I'll surprise students with a white board and markers and give them the assignment to draw what they hear while listening to a piece of music they may or may not be playing. I also like to have students write short stories about their music. Periodically the studio as a whole will focus on one issue together. (Like bow holds: we all are working on them at the same time and I encourage the students to help each other) other activities in lessons can include reviewing really old rep from years ago as well as super hard sight reading of pieces they want to play someday to keep them wanting to move forward.
Also written theory on chalk board, worksheets.
We spend a good chunk of time discussing WHY practice strategies work the way they do, discussing brain and body systems and awareness and how to work smarter instead of harder during practice time.
Sometimes we record and listen back. Video is helpful for posture check/awareness.

Open Response Prompts Hybrid

1. If you use questioning with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Technique
I saw one bowing you did differently than what's written, can you find it when I play?
Why use second position here instead of first or third?
Can you see the cross string relationship and why you need to tunnel your hand position?
What do we need to do with the bow to get this sound or character you want?
Is my bowing crooked or straight?
Am I playing the correct pitch?
Did you hear the sound get louder?
Did you hear the sound get softer?

Self-Analysis
Did you notice which notes weren't out of tune? Explain to me how we broke that down.
(after playing a passage) What went well with your playing? What could be improved for next time?
Can you hear the difference in your pitch and mine or the piano?
Okay, what are your observations on what you just played, both things you thought went well and things you want to continue improving?

Musical Interpretation
Where is the high point in this line dynamically?
What is the character of this section?

2. If you use positive feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Technique
Now you are leaving your fingers in a tunnel without my asking, great!
I noticed you shifted to third position where it is not marked to do so. Tell me why, by the way I like it and I'm going to use it from now on."

Musical Aspects
I really heard the dynamics differences between loud and soft
I really heard how sad Aunt Rhody feels about the goose

Specific
I liked your (tone/tuning/dynamics/etc...)"
___ went really well.
Good use of ____

General

That was great!

Posture
I like how tall you are standing

Intonation
That was really in tune, good job.

Tone
Wonderful! That was very clear. Your tone was much stronger that time

Efforts
I like how you played the whole Twinkle sandwich.

3. If you use corrective feedback with students, please provide a few examples in the space below:

Analyzing
Your ears are the most important part of your instrument! Please listen to each other at all times. This is necessary in order to play in tune, together, with good dynamics, bow technique and musical styles just to name a few. Your eyes are overrated please listen to your pitch, do not look at your fingers, and use the second most important part of your instrument, your sense of touch!
I play back to the student exactly the mistake they made

Tone
This time try it with more bow, that will help your tone quality.

Rhythm
You played the quarter notes as 8ths in that line, try it again with the right rhythm.

Specific
I see what you're doing, but this is actually what's written

4. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning teacher verbalizations that you use with students:

Hierarchy
I generally begin the semester focusing on technique, and will spend more time on that in earlier lessons. Then I will move to dynamics and phrasing, though this isn't a hard and fast rule.

Paired Verbalizations
I always try to balance positive and corrective feedback, and never tell my student something that isn't true.

Analogies
I do rhythm matched to words to supplement the basic divisions that theory books and conducting classes teach us. For instance for 5/8 I use hip po potamus or potamus hip po. 7/8 hip po hip po potamus etc.

5. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning instructional strategies that you use with students:

Recordings
Sometimes I record a student myself and play it for them the following week or two later and ask them why it is better then than it is now when they claim a huge amount of practice. I do this with the parents permission and ask them to help find a solution to the practice problem.

6. Please describe the types of non-repertoire playing activities you use most frequently in lessons (i.e., scales, arpeggios, technical exercises, etc.):

Scales/Arpeggios
scales & arpeggios in 1-3 octaves depending on age, single position scales
Scales and arpeggios-- most students
"Scales
Arpeggios

Technical exercises
Straight bow on single string or double stops,
handframe intonation and efficiency exercises
bow strokes on 2 octave scale (detache, martele, spiccato)

Repertoire
Keeping that in mind all scales, arpeggios, technical exercises etc. appear in the repertoire therefore any and all presented will aid in performance. I admit that some of this is not very exciting so I do try to find literature that teaches these techniques and and scale patterns so my students can see the parallels.

Etudes
Etudes-- middle school and high school"
Etudes

Sight Reading
Sight reading

7. Describe the tuning procedure in the lesson (i.e., student tunes, teacher tunes, assisted tuning, etc.):

Pre-K

Teacher tunes
Teacher

Elementary
Teacher tunes, sometimes sit on floor together and tune with pizz
I tune
tune each string to piano, assisted
teacher then assisted
Teacher assisted

Middle School
Teacher tunes, sometime sit on floor and tune with pizz, sometimes tune with bow
assisted then student tunes
Student tunes to a tuner
student tunes, learns tuning by fifths
Student

High School
Student tunes
student tunes
student tunes
Student tunes to a tuner
Student

College
student tunes

Other
student tunes

8. If desired, please use the space below to elaborate on anything else concerning lesson activities that you use with students:

Method books
I use an iteration of Dorothy Delay's basics passed down from my teacher.
Again the ear is the most important and critical part of our instrument.

REFERENCES CITED

Abeles, H. F. (1975). Student perceptions of characteristics of effective applied music instructors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 23*, 147–154. doi: 10.2307/3345287

Abrahams, F. (2005). Transforming classroom music instruction with ideas from critical pedagogy. *Music Educators Journal, 92*(1), 62–67. doi: 10.2307/3400229

Baker, P. J. (1981). *The development of music teacher checklists for use by administrators, music supervisors, and teachers in evaluating music teacher effectiveness.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Barry, N. H. (2007). A qualitative study of applied music lessons and subsequent student practice sessions. *Contributions to Music Education, 34*, 51–65.

Barry, N. H., & McArthur, V. (1994). Teaching practice strategies in the music studio: A survey of applied music teachers. *Psychology of Music, 22*, 44–55. doi: 10.1177/0305735694221004

Beheshti, S. (2009). Improving studio music teaching through understanding learning styles. *International Journal of Music Education, 27,* 107–115.

Berman, J. H. (1960). Reviewed work(s): Basic principles of violin playing; a report prepared for the MENC committee on string instruction in the schools by Paul Rolland. *Notes, 17*(2), 240–241.

Blocher, L., Greenwood, R., & Shellahamer, B. (1997). Teaching behaviors of middle school and high school band directors in the rehearsal setting. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*, 457–469. doi: 10.2307/3345539

Brand, M. (1990). Master music teachers: What makes them great? *Music Educators Journal, 77*(2), 22–25. doi: 10.2307/3397811

Brand, M. (1992). Voodoo and the applied music studio. *Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 3*(2), 3–4.

Brathwaite, A. (1988). Suzuki training: Musical growth or hindrance? *Music Educators Journal, 75*(2), 42–45. doi: 10.2307/3398060

Brendell, J. K. (1996). Time use, rehearsal activity, and student off–task behavior during the initial minutes of high school choral rehearsals. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 44*, 6–14. doi: 10.2307/3345409

Brenner, B. (2010). Reflecting on the rationales for string study in schools. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 18*, 45–64.

Brunson, T. R. (1969). *An adaptation of the Suzuki-Kendall violin method for heterogeneous stringed instrument classes*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

Bugeja, C. (2009). Parental involvement in the musical education of violin students: Suzuki and 'traditional' approaches compared. *Australian Journal of Music Education, 1*, 19–28.

Burwell, K. (2012). Apprenticeship in music: A contextual study for instrumental teaching and learning. *International Journal of Music Education, 31*, 276–291. doi: 10.1177/0255761411434501.

Carey, G. M., Bridgstock, R., Taylor, P., McWilliam, E., & Grant, C. (2013). Characterising one-to-one conservatoire teaching: Some implications of a quantitative analysis. *Music Education Research, 15*, 357–368. doi: 10.1080/14613808.2013.824954.

Carey, G., & Grant, C. (2015). Teacher and student perspectives on one-to-one pedagogy: Practices and possibilities. *British Journal of Music Education, 32*, 55–22. doi: 10.1017/S0265051714000084.

Cassidy, J. W. (1990). Effect of intensity training on preservice teachers' instruction accuracy and delivery effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 38*, 164–174. doi: 10.2307/3345180

Cheng, E. K. & Durrant, C. (2007). An investigation into effective string teaching in a variety of learning contexts: A single case study. *British Journal of Music Education, 24*, 191–205. doi: 10.1017/S0265051707007413

Colprit, E. J. (2000). Observation and analysis of Suzuki string teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 48*, 206–221. doi: 10.2307/3345394

Colprit, E. J. (2003). Teacher verbalization of targets in Suzuki string lessons. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 157*, 49–61. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.uoregon.edu/stable/40319186

Connor, C. M., Son, S. H., Hindman, A. H., & Morrison, F. J. (2005). Teacher qualifications, classroom practices, family characteristics, and preschool experience: Complex effects on first graders' vocabulary and early reading outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology, 43*, 343–375. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2005.06.001

Cowden, R. L. (1972). A comparison of the effectiveness of first and third position approaches to violin instruction. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 20*, 505–509. doi: 10.2307/3343811

Cox, J. (1986). Choral rehearsal time usage in a high school and a university: A comparative analysis. *Contributions to Music Education, 13*(1), 7–22.

Creech, A., & Hallam, S. (2003). Parent-teacher-pupil interactions in instrumental music tuition: A literature review. *British Journal of Music Education, 20*, 29–44. doi: 10.1017/S0265051702005272

Creech, A. (2012). Interpersonal behavior in one-to-one instrumental lessons: An observational analysis. *British Journal of Music Education, 29*, 387–407. doi: 10.1017/S026505171200006X

Duke, R. A. (1999). Teacher and student behavior in Suzuki string lessons: Results from the International Research Symposium on Talent Education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*, 293–307. doi: 10.2307/3345485

Duke, R. A., Flowers, P. J., and Wolfe, D. E. (1997). Children who study piano with excellent teachers in the United States. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 132*, 51–84.

Duke, R. A., & Madsen, C. K. (1991). Proactive versus reactive teaching: Focusing observation on specific aspects of instruction. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 108*, 1–14. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.uoregon.edu/stable/40318434

Duke, R. A., & Simmons, A. L. (2006). The nature of expertise: Narrative descriptions of 19 common elements observed in the lessons of three renowned artist-teachers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 170*, 7–20. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.uoregon.edu/stable/40319345

Duke, R. A., & Stammen, D. (2011). *Scribe 4* (for observation and assessment). Austin, TX: Learning & Behavior Resources.

Egan, K., & Gajdamaschko, N. (2003). Some cognitive tools of literacy. *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context.* Cambridge University Press Cambridge, UK.

Fiocca, P.D. (1989). A descriptive analysis of the rehearsal behaviors of exemplary junior high and middle school choir directors. *Contributions to Music Education, 16*(1), 19–33.

Forsythe, J. L. (1977). Elementary student attending behavior as a function of classroom activities. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 25*, 228–239. doi: 10.2307/3345307

Fredrickson, W. E. (2007). Perceptions of college-level music performance majors teaching applied music lessons to young students. *International Journal of Music Education, 25*, 72–81. doi: 11.77/0255761407074893

Fredrickson, W. E., Geringer, J. M., & Pope, D. A. (2013). Attitudes of string teachersand performers towards preparation for and teaching of private lessons. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 61*, 217–232. doi: 10.1177/0022429413485245

Galamian, I. (1962). *Principles of violin playing and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Galamian, I., & Meumann, F. (1966). *Contemporary violin technique*. New York, NY: Galaxy Music Corp.

Gamble, J. (2001). Modelling the invisible: The pedagogy of craft apprenticeship. *Studies in Continuing Education, 23*(2), 185–200.

Garson, A. (1973). Suzuki and physical movement: Is movement the basis of all learning? *Music Educators Journal, 60*(4), 34–37. doi: 10.2307/3394476

Gaunt, H. (2011). Understanding the one-to-one relationship in instrumental/vocal tuition in Higher Education: Comparing student and teacher perceptions. *British Journal of Music Education, 28*, 159–179. doi: 10.1017/S0265051711000052

Gaunt, H., Creech, A., Long, M., & Hallam, S. (2012). Supporting conservatoire students towards professional integration: One-to-one tuition and the potential of mentoring. *Music Education Research, 14*(1), 25–43.

Gerrity, K. W. (2013). Measuring music education: Teacher evaluation in Indiana. *Music Educator's Journal, 99*(4), 17–19. doi: 10.1177/002743211348614

Gholson, S. A. (1998). Proximal positioning: A strategy of practice in violin pedagogy. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*, 535–545. doi: 10.2307/3345349

Goolsby, T. W. (1996). Time use in instrumental rehearsals: A comparison of experienced, novice, and student teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 44*, 286–303. doi: 10.2307/3345442

Grant, J. W., & Drafall, L. E. (1991). Teacher effectiveness research: A review and comparison. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 108*, 31–48.

Hamann, D., Lineburgh, N., & Paul, S. (1998). Teaching effectiveness and social skill development. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*, 87–101. doi: 10.2307/3345762

Hamann, D. L., Baker, D. S., McAllister, P. A., & Bauer, W. I. (2000). Factors affecting university music students' perceptions of lesson quality and teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 48*, 102–113. doi: 10.2307/3345569

Hanken, I. M. (2016). Peer learning in specialist higher music education. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 15*(3–4), 364–375.

Hopkins, M. T. (2015). Eighth-grade violinists' instrument tuning ability: A comparison of pitch perception and tuning accuracy. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 63*, 349–368. doi: 10.1177/0022429415597884

Ihas, D. A. (2011). *Teaching behaviors of middle and high school orchestra directors in the rehearsal setting* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*,* University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Jørgensen, H. (2000). Student learning in higher instrumental education: Who is responsible? *British Journal of Music Education, 17*, 67–77.

Juchniewicz, J. (2010). The influence of social intelligence on effective music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 58*, 276–293. doi: 10.1177/0022429410378368.

Kendall, J. D. (1966). *Talent education and Suzuki*. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference.

Kennell, R. (2002). Systematic research in studio instruction in music. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 243–256). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kennell, R., & Marks, V. (1992). Student motivation in the applied studio. *American Music Teacher, 41*(6), 26–29.

Knapik, S. (2015). The master(ed) violinist: Carl Flesch's pedagogical treatise and memoirs. *Music and Letters, 96*(4), 564–601.

Kostka, M. J. (1984). An investigation of reinforcements, time use, and student attentiveness in piano lessons. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 32*, 113–122. doi: 10.2307/3344978

Kostka, M. J. (2002). Practice expectations and attitudes: A survey of college-level music teachers and students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50*, 145–154. doi: 10.2307/3345818

Küpers, E., van Dijk, M., & van Geert, P. (2014). 'Look closely at what I'm doing!' Scaffolding in individual string lessons: Two case studies. *International Journal of Music Education, 32*, 375–391. doi: 10.1177/0255761413516064

Kurkul, W. W. (2007). Nonverbal communication in one-to-one music performance instruction. *Psychology of Music, 35*, 327–362. doi: 10.1177/0305735607070385.

Lee, S. (1987). Music pedagogy. *American Music Teacher, 36*(5), 37–41.

Liperote, K. A. (2006). Audiation for beginning instrumentalists: Listen, speak, read, write. *Music Educators Journal, 93*(1), 46–52.

Lowe, H. I. (1973). *A study of the tone quality of beginning violin students using the long bow-stroke approach as compared to the short bow-stroke approach.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas, Austin, TX.

Madsen, C. K. (1965). Experimental research in applied music. *Music Educators Journal, 51*(6), 63–64. doi: 10.2307/3390459

Madsen, C. K. (1990). Teacher intensity in relationship to music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 104,* 38–46.

Madsen, K. (2003). The effect of accuracy of instruction, teacher delivery, and student attentiveness on musicians' evaluation of teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*, 38–50. doi: 10.2307/3345647

Marshall, J. C., Smart, J., & Alston, D. M. (2016). Development and validation of Teacher Intentionality of Practice Scale (TIPS): A measure to evaluate and scaffold teacher effectiveness. *Teaching and Teacher Evaluation, 59*, 159–168.

Matsuzawa T., Biro D., Humle T., Inoue-Nakamura N., Tonooka R., & Yamakoshi G. (2001). Emergence of culture in wild chimpanzees: Education by master-apprenticeship. In Matsuzawa, T. (Ed.) *Primate origins of human cognition and behavior* (pp 557–574). Springer, Tokyo.

McAllister, L. S. (2008). Evaluating teaching effectiveness in music. *American Music Teacher, 58*(3), 14–17.

McPhail, G. J. (2010). Crossing boundaries: Sharing concepts of music teaching from classroom to studio. *Music Education Research, 12*, 33–45. doi: 10.1080/14613800903568296

McPhail, G. J. (2013). Developing student autonomy in the one-to-one music lesson. *International Journal of Music Education, 31*, 160–172. doi: 10.1177/0255761413486407.

McPhee, E. A. (2011). Finding the muse: Teaching musical expression to adolescents in the one-to-one studio environment. *International Journal of Music Education, 29*, 333–346. doi: 10.1177/0255761411421084.

McPherson, G. E., & Welch, G. F. (Eds.). (2012). *The Oxford handbook of music education, volume 1*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Meissner, H. (2017). Instrumental teachers' instructional strategies for facilitating children's learning of expressive music performance: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Music Education, 35*, 118–135. doi: 10.1177/0255761416643850.

Mio, V. A. (2017). An investigation of postsecondary violin instructors' remedial pedagogy: A case study. *International Journal of Music Education*, 1–12.doi: 10.1177/0255761417731439.

Mills, J., & Smith, J. (2003). Teachers' beliefs about effective instrumental teaching in schools and higher education. *British Journal of Music Education, 20*, 5–27. doi: 10.1017/S0265051702005260.

Moore, R. S. (1981). Comparative use of teaching time by American and British elementary music specialists. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 66/67*, 62–68.

Moore, R. S. & Bonney, J.T. (1987). Comparative analysis of teaching time between student teachers and experienced teachers in general music. *Contributions to Music Education, 14*, 52–58.

Nàpoles, J. (2006). The effect of duration of teacher talk on the attitude, attentiveness, and performance achievement of high school choral students. *Research Perspectives in Music Education, 11*, 22–29.

Nàpoles, J. (2017). Teacher talk and perceived teacher effectiveness: An exploratory study. *UPDATE: Applications of Research in Music Education, 35*(3), 5–10. doi: 10.1177/8755123315626228.

Nelson, D. J. (1983). String teaching and performance: A review of research findings. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 74*, 39–46.

Nielsen, L. D. (2014). Teacher evaluations: Archiving teaching effectiveness. *Music Educators Journal, 101*(1), 63–69. doi: 10.1177/0027432114536736

Nilsson, M. S., Pennbrant, S., Pilhammar, E., & Wenestam, C. (2010). Pedagogical strategies used in clinical medical education: An observational study. *BMC Medical Education, 10*(9).

O'Neill, A. M. (2003). *Parent as home teacher of Suzuki cello, violin, and piano students: Observation and analysis of Suzuki method practice sessions*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Parkes, K. A. (2012). Recent research in applied studio instruction: Characteristics of the applied setting. *The Journal of Research in Music Performance, 1*(1), 14–20.

Parkes, K. A. & Wexler, M. (2012). The nature of applied music teaching expertise: Common elements observed in the lessons of three applied teachers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 193*, 45–62.

Patson, T. & Waters, L. (2015). Positive instruction in music studios: Introducing a new model for teaching studio music in schools based upon positive psychology. *Psych Well-Being, 5*(1), 10. doi: 10.1186/s13612-015-0036-9

Paige, P. (2007). *The relationship between instrumental and pedagogical training of string teachers and their self-perceptions of teaching effectiveness*. (Unpublished masters thesis). University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

Papich, G., & Rainbow, E. (1974). A pilot study of performance practices of twentieth-century musicians. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 22*, 24–34. doi: 10.2307/3344615

Perkins, M. M. (1995). *A comparison of violin playing techniques: Kato Havas, Paul Rolland, and Shinichi Suzuki*. Bloomington, IN: American String Teachers Association.

Rolland, P. (1960). *Basic principles of violin playing*. Reston, VA: American String Teachers Association with National School Orchestra Association.

Rolland, P., & Mutschler, M. (1972). *The teaching of action in string playing developmental and remedial techniques: violin and viola*. Urbana, Ill: Illinois String Research Associates.

Rink, J. E. (2013). Measuring teacher effectiveness in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 84*, 407–418.

Sabo-Skelton, L. (1998). Intuition and absorption. *Strad, 109*(1303), 1226–1228.

Salzberg, R. S. (1980). The effects of visual stimulus and instruction on intonation accuracy of string instrumentalists. *Psychology of Music, 8*, 42–49. doi: 10.1177/030573568082005

Salzberg, R. S. & Salzberg, C. L. (1981). Praise and corrective feedback in the remediation of incorrect left-hand positions of elementary string players. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 29*, 125–133. doi: 10.2307/3345021

Schmidt, C. P. (1989). Applied music teaching behavior as a function of selected personality variables. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 37*, 258–271. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.uoregon.edu/stable/40318937

Schmidt, M. (1998). Defining "good" music teaching: Four student teachers' beliefs and practices. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 138,* 19–46.

Scott, L. (1992). Attention and perseverance behaviors of preschool children enrolled in Suzuki violin lessons and other activities. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 40*, 225–235. doi: 10.2307/3345684

Seidel, T., & Shavelson, R. J. (2007). Teaching effectiveness research in the past decade: The role of theory and research design in disentangling meta-analysis results. *Review of Educational Research, 77*, 454–499. doi: 10.3102/0034654307310317.

Shaw, G. J. (1964). An experiment in violin pedagogy. *Music Educators Journal, 50*(6), 69–71. doi: 10.2307/3390179

Shehan, P. K. (1986). Major approaches to music education: An account of method. *Music Educators Journal, 72*(6), 26–31. doi: 10.2307/3401273

Sherrill, M. H. (1986). *An analytical study of videotaped rehearsal and conducting techniques of selected junior and senior high school band conductors*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Rochester, Rochester, New York.

Siebenaler, D. J. (1997). Analysis of teacher-student interactions in the piano lessons of adults and children. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 45*, 6–20. doi: 10.2307/3345462

Silveira, J. M. (2014). The perception of pacing in a music appreciation class and its relationship to teacher effectiveness and teacher intensity. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 62*, 302–318. doi: 10.1177/0022429414542978

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*, 339–355.

Tellejon, P. (1989). Ensuring your string program's success. *Music Educators Journal, 76*(3), 30–32. doi: 10.2307/3400922

Thibeault, M. D. (2018). Learning with sound recordings: A history of Suzuki's mediated pedagogy. *Journal of Research in Music Education,* 1–25. doi: 10.1177/0022429418756879.

Thompson, M. (2016). Authenticity, Shinichi Suzuki, and "beautiful tone with living soul, please." *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 24*, 170–190. doi: 10.2979/philmusieducrevi.24.2.04

Villarreal, E. K. (2010). *Private lesson teachers' attitudes towards private teaching and pre-service education: A replication and extension*. (Unpublished masters thesis). Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. and Trans.; original works published 1930–1935).

Wagner, M. J. & Strul, E. P. (1979). Comparisons of beginning versus experienced elementary music educators in the use of teaching time. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 27*, 113–125. doi: 10.2307/3344897

Wensel, V. F. (1970). *Project Super 1966-1968.* Eastman School of Music, Rochester, NY.

Williams, K. (2002). Attrition in applied music study: Three retrospective case studies. *UPDATE: Applications of Research in Music Education, 21*(1), 1–9. doi: 10.1177/87551233020210010101

Witt, A. C. (1986). Use of class time and student attentiveness in secondary instrumental music rehearsals. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 34*, 34–42. doi: 10.2307/3344796

Yarbrough, C. (1975). Effect of magnitude of conductor behavior on students in selected mixed choruses. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 23*, 134–146. doi: 10.2307/3345286

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. doi: 10.2307/3344994

Zhukov, K. (2004). *Teaching styles and student behavior in instrumental music lessons in Australian conservatoriums* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of New South Wales, Sydney.

Zhukov, K. (2007). Student learning styles in advanced instrumental music lessons. *Music Education Research, 9*, 111–127. doi: 10.1080/14613800601127585

Zorzal, R., & Lorenzo, O. (2017). Teacher-student physical contact as an approach for teaching guitar in the master class context. *Psychology of Music,* 1–14. doi: 10.1177/0305735617737154.