

2009

Focus on Scaffolding Language and Sequential Units During Choral Instruction

Patrick K. Freer

Georgia State University, pfreer@gsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/music_facpub



Part of the [Music Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Freer, Patrick K., "Focus on Scaffolding Language and Sequential Units During Choral Instruction" (2009). *Music Faculty Publications*. 39.

https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/music_facpub/39

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Music at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Music Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

FOCUS ON SCAFFOLDING LANGUAGE AND
SEQUENTIAL UNITS DURING CHORAL INSTRUCTION

Update – MS # 8-17-08R

Personal Details

Title: Focus on Scaffolding Language and Sequential Units During Choral Instruction

- *Update* – MS # 8-17-08R

Date: September 30, 2008

Author: Patrick K. Freer

Position: School of Music
Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia (USA)

Address: Dr. Patrick K. Freer
Georgia State University – School of Music
PO Box 4097
Atlanta, GA 30302 (USA)

Phone: 404-413-5949 (office)
404-354-1726 (cell)

Fax: 404-414-5910

Email: pfreer@gsu.edu

Note: Patrick K. Freer is assistant professor of music education in the School of Music at Georgia State University. He is an active conductor of middle school all-state & honor choirs and is the author of the DVD series “Success for Adolescent Singers: Unlocking the Potential in Middle School Choirs.”

ABSTRACT

FOCUS ON SCAFFOLDING LANGUAGE AND SEQUENTIAL UNITS DURING CHORAL INSTRUCTION

The purpose of the study reported in this paper was to investigate the instructional discourse of two middle school choral music teachers videotaped during a total of 24 classroom visits. The findings indicate that teacher attention to complete sequential units of instruction (teacher presentation, student interaction, teacher feedback) may encourage the employment of scaffolding language (language that supports student learning). Focus on scaffolding language corresponded to a decrease in the completion of sequential units of instruction. Choral teachers seeking to foster a constructivist-oriented rehearsal environment may find it advantageous to focus attention on the completion of sequential units of instruction. Similarly, teachers of collegiate methods classes may wish to draw students' attention to complete sequential units as a precursor to exploring the application of constructivist theory to ensemble rehearsal technique.

Word Count: 130

FOCUS ON SCAFFOLDING LANGUAGE AND SEQUENTIAL UNITS DURING CHORAL INSTRUCTION

The purpose of the study reported in this article was to investigate the instructional discourse of middle school choral music teachers, with specific attention to the relationship between scaffolding language and complete sequential units of instruction. The primary research question was whether a focus on either scaffolding language or complete sequential units of instruction affects a middle school choral music teacher's employment of the other category of discourse. For this study, scaffolding language was defined as language that assists students in the creation of their own knowledge and skills. Non-scaffolding language was defined as language indicating that the authority for learning rests with the teacher. A complete sequential unit of instruction included the three-step sequence of teacher presentation of a task, student interaction with the task, and teacher feedback specific to the task.

Background and Perspectives

One instructional strategy of effective teachers is the provision for “assisting instruction” (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990) that supports students as they simultaneously take control of their own learning. This assistance is often termed “scaffolding” when it is characterized by the teacher presentation of challenges that are just slightly greater than the present skill levels of their students. Teacher support is gradually withdrawn as students achieve the skill level necessary to meet the challenge. The “scaffold” is then raised to another level when a new, greater challenge is subsequently presented to the students. The concept of scaffolding is associated with the work of Vygotsky (1978) who emphasized the social construction of meaning and knowledge. Social constructivism focuses on the learning partnerships that exist

between individual students, groups of students, and their teachers (Windschitl, 2002). Early conceptions of scaffolded learning pointed to the necessity of a reciprocal relationship between teacher and student (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976); both the teacher and student must be willing to invest the energy necessary for sustained, individualized attention – even that which occurs during whole group instruction.

Meyer (1993) used this description of scaffolding as the basis for an examination of how scaffolded instruction is evidenced in classrooms. Meyer's work evolved into a later study of teacher language use during scaffolding (Turner, Meyer, Cox, Logan, DiCintio, & Thomas, 1998). The subsequent study found that student reports of affect, interest and motivation were positively correlated with teacher use of scaffolding language. This finding was echoed in a study of choral music instruction (Freer, 2008). In each of these studies, three characteristics of instructional language were identified with scaffolding: the negotiation of learning and content in ways meaningful for the student, the gradual transfer of the responsibility for learning from the teacher to the student, and the provision for intrinsic motivational support during learning tasks. Those three characteristics correspond with the three types of scaffolding language analyzed for the present study.

Research about the instructional language of music teachers potentially complements the research about scaffolding language. A study in the early 1980s looked at conductor teaching behaviors as a reflection of a direct instruction model and later developed into a three-step process known as complete sequential patterns of instruction (Yarbrough & Price, 1981). A complete sequential pattern begins with the presentation of an academic musical task, follows with interaction by a student with the task and teacher, and concludes with subsequent teacher

feedback that is specific and related to the task presentation (Price, 1992; Price & Yarbrough, 1993; Yarbrough, Price, & Hendel, 1994).

Studies have shown that teachers who are given opportunities to learn how to teach with complete sequential units of instruction include more of them in their rehearsals and are able to limit the overall time spent in verbal instruction (Arnold, 1995; Maclin, 1993; Yarbrough, Price, & Bowers, 1991). Student and researcher evaluations of choral instruction containing complete sequential units of instruction are consistently higher than those of instruction containing incomplete units or a lack of sequential patterns altogether (Price & Yarbrough, 1993; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999; Yarbrough & Madsen, 1998; Yarbrough et al., 1994).

A challenge for choral teachers is to match their instructional practices with research findings in the fields of music education, general education, and choral music. As reviewed in the preceding paragraphs, research emanating from general education suggests that the employment of scaffolding language positively affects student motivation and interest, while research within music education has long demonstrated that the use of complete sequential units increases teacher efficiency and students' perception of instructional effectiveness.

One defining component of both scaffolding language and complete instructional units is the feedback provided by a teacher to students. But, all verbal feedback is not equal, and many studies have attempted to discern the qualities of feedback that promote interest and learning (see Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Choral music teachers have a multitude of opportunities during rehearsals to provide verbal feedback that is beneficial to both individual students and the larger group. This study explores the relationship between scaffolding language and complete sequential units in an attempt to further clarify how teacher verbal feedback can provide specific information to students while maintaining a constructivist learning environment.

Conceptual Framework

A focal point of this study was a replication of the quantitative discourse analysis portion of a study of mathematics instruction (Turner, et al., 1998). The present study included the categories of scaffolding and non-scaffolding instructional language employed in the mathematics study, although the category names were slightly altered to reflect instruction in music. Subcategories of scaffolding included negotiation, transfer of responsibility, and task-focused support. Subcategories of non-scaffolding language included I-R-E, or initiation-response-evaluation, procedures and criticism/coercion. The subcategory of procedures was further delineated by instructional procedures and logistical procedures. Tables 1 and 2 contain definitions and excerpts from transcripts collected for this study. This categorization was coupled with an analysis of the same instructional language to identify complete sequential units of instruction (see Table 3).

The present study was also a partial replication of previous research in music education (Freer, 2008). The earlier study noted that as levels of scaffolding language increased during middle school choral music instruction, there was a corresponding increase in complete sequential units. Analysis of the instructional language revealed the types of scaffolding language that were used within complete sequential units, but it was unclear whether teachers were intentionally using the language associated with scaffolding to “complete” their sequential units, or whether the act of completing sequential units resulted in the greater employment of scaffolding language.

The present study was therefore designed to address the remaining question: does an increased focus on scaffolding language result in greater numbers of complete sequential units of instruction, or does a teacher’s focus on completing instructional units result in greater use of

scaffolding language? Since research indicates that the two language types occur in tandem, constructivist-oriented ensemble teachers may find it simpler to focus attention on just one type. Collegiate instructors may similarly find it beneficial to emphasize the use of just one of these instructional language types within their pre-service methods classes.

Data Sources and Procedures

This exploratory study involved a limited number of teachers observed within a limited span of time. The participants were the two teachers of general choral ensembles in two middle schools in a suburban location in the southeastern United States. The teachers are referred to here as “Julie” and “Linda.” The teachers were of similar age, ethnic background, and socioeconomic status. Both teachers were enrolled in masters-level music education courses at the time of this study, although at different universities. Both had been teaching middle school choral music for their entire careers: Julie for 15 years and Linda for 12.

Julie’s classroom was small, dark and crowded with chairs, a piano, and sound equipment. The walls were filled with posters and chalkboards that looked as though they had not been changed in quite some time. The focus in Julie’s room was on instruction; the room was a place to meet and sing. Students came from different parts of the campus to the music room, so they arrived at different times, nearly always announced with loud chatter and greetings from other students. Chorus was a social affair for these students, and Julie was challenged to focus the students’ energies on the musical tasks at hand. The openings of Julie’s rehearsals were characterized by announcements, disciplinary warnings, and non-musical discussions. There were 30 students in Julie’s seventh grade chorus (7 boys, 23 girls) and 26 students in her eighth grade chorus (7 boys, 19 girls).

By contrast, Linda's classes always began with music. The bell rang, students promptly sat in their assigned seats, the downbeat was given on the piano, and warm-ups ensued. Linda's room was long and narrow, spacious, and brightly lit. The walls were minimally adorned. This room conveyed a sense of precision and attention to detail; the room was a place for serious study of music with little room for extra-curricular conversation. Students in Linda's class were enthusiastically focused on music nearly all of the time. There were 22 students in Linda's seventh grade chorus (5 boys, 17 girls) and 32 in her eighth grade chorus (9 boys, 23 girls).

Six consecutive rehearsals of each choir were videotaped in their entirety for a total of 24 classroom visits. During the first three observations of each choir (Phase I), the teachers were informed that the study concerned "the relationship between teaching and learning." At the midpoint of the study, the two teachers engaged with the researcher in discussions about instructional language. Julie received information about complete sequential units of instruction, and Linda received information about scaffolding language. Each teacher was then asked to focus her attention on employment of the language characteristics that had been discussed. Phase II of the study consisted of the final three observations of each choir.

Overview of Methods of Analysis

Discourse recorded during the observed rehearsals was transcribed and analyzed to determine what types of scaffolding or non-scaffolding language were used during instruction (Meyer, 1993; Turner et al., 1998) and whether complete sequential units of instruction were evident in the transcripts (Price, 1992; Yarbrough, 2002). Each rehearsal was recorded for its full duration of approximately 40 minutes, but only language that was instructional in nature was

included in the analysis. The rehearsals tended to be organized into distinct segments, and those considered instructional included warm-ups, sight-reading, and rehearsal of specific repertoire.

Transcripts were coded according to categories of scaffolding and non-scaffolding language (Tables 1 & 2) and components of instructional units (Table 3). Multiple coders (the researcher, a professional transcriber/coder, and a graduate student) were employed to insure reliability of the discourse analysis, and these coders reached an agreement level of 91.87%. Coded discourse units were verbal utterances that ranged from single words to entire speaking turns, such as when a teacher spoke at length without interruption by a student. New codes were assigned at the beginning of each new idea or speaking turn whenever practical.

Results and Analysis

Scaffolding and Non-Scaffolding Language

The overall use of scaffolding and non-scaffolding language for Julie and Linda is detailed in Table 4. The preponderance of language use was procedural, with logistical directives such as, “Turn to page 12. One, two, ready, sing...” utilized far more frequently than procedures that were instructional in nature. Scaffolding language only occupied a small percentage of these teachers’ language use. During Phase I, 4.87% of Julie’s total instructional language could be categorized as scaffolding, while Linda employed scaffolding in 11.20% of her instructional language. During Phase II, Julie’s total percentage of scaffolding language rose to 12.70% while Linda’s increased only slightly to 12.19%.

In Phase I, the scaffolding language sub-category of “transfer” accounted for most of these teachers’ use of scaffolding whereas all types of scaffolding language were more evenly distributed in Phase II.

Sequential Units of Instruction

The next stage of discourse analysis included the identification of complete sequential units of instruction and how scaffolding language was employed within them. Complete sequential units of instruction occasionally consisted of a simple interaction between students and teacher. More often, these complete units spanned multi-step interactions that were related to the original task (Hendel, 1995). For example, teachers may have presented an initial task, students may have sung in reply to the task request, and the teacher subsequently responded with another task presentation related to the initial goal. Such sequential units were not considered complete until finalized by teacher reinforcement directly related to the original task. Incomplete units were those that omitted the reinforcement component altogether or included feedback not related to the original task.

Julie and Linda taught in very different ways, as evidenced by their use of sequential units of instruction (Table 5). Where Julie rarely completed instructional units by providing specific feedback, Linda included complete sequential units as a matter of course, especially in the Phase I rehearsals. During the course of the study, seventh graders experienced 100 more complete sequential units than eighth graders. In Phase I, both of Julie's classes experienced a similar number of complete sequential units, while Linda's seventh graders received more than twice the number of complete sequential units than her eighth graders. In Phase II, these proportions changed dramatically for both teachers as described below.

The complete sequential units of instruction were analyzed to identify if they contained scaffolding language. For this level of analysis, either the teacher presentation or the teacher reinforcement component of the sequential unit could contain scaffolding language. Many of these teachers' complete sequential units contained scaffolding during both the presentation and

the reinforcement components; some components of complete sequential units contained more than one occurrence of scaffolding language (Table 6).

In Phase I, Julie employed scaffolding language within eight complete sequential units, seven of these during the presentation component, and once during reinforcement. In Phase II, her use of scaffolding language increased to occur within 36 complete sequential units: 9 during the presentation component only, 22 in the reinforcement component only, and five during both.

Linda's use of scaffolding language occurred more frequently during presentation. Of the 55 complete sequential units where she used scaffolding language during Phase I, 29 included scaffolding during the presentation component only, 19 in the reinforcement component only, and seven during both. In Phase II's 45 complete units with scaffolding language, she included scaffolding during 25 presentation components only, ten in the reinforcement component only, and ten during both.

Influence of Teacher Focus on Language Use

Phase I of this study established a baseline of Julie and Linda's instructional language characteristics. At the conclusion of Phase I, Julie received information about complete sequential units of instruction and was asked to focus attention on the incorporation of these within the Phase II rehearsals. Meanwhile, Linda received information about scaffolding language at the close of Phase I and was asked to focus attention on the employment of scaffolding language during Phase II. The effects of this focus are detailed in Table 7.

Following instruction about complete sequential units of instruction, Julie doubled her use of complete units from a total of 28 in Phase I to 59 in Phase II. Julie's employment of scaffolding language increased from 27 occurrences in Phase I to 83 in Phase II, even though

scaffolding language had not been discussed with her. Conversely, Linda's use of both complete sequential units and scaffolding language declined between Phases I and II. She completed 184 sequential instructional units in Phase I and 79 during Phase II, a 57% decrease. Despite receiving information about scaffolding language, her use of scaffolding language decreased from 102 instances in Phase I to 83 instances in Phase II, a decrease of 19%.

Discussion

A review of the findings reveals some interesting details. Seventh and eighth graders did not always receive the same type of instructional language. Both teachers employed approximately the same amount of scaffolding language in their seventh and eighth grade classes during Phase I. But, while Julie did not use many complete sequential units within her instruction for either grade, Linda's use of complete sequential units was markedly higher for her seventh graders than for her eighth graders.

During informal conversation on the observation days, Julie and Linda spoke about their sense of responsibility for preparing eighth graders for high school choral music, and this may have resulted in their less frequent use of scaffolding language with these students. When working with eighth graders, these teachers often pressed forward with lengthy series of task presentations but omitted reinforcements related to those tasks. It is possible that the teachers felt that task reinforcement would encourage student dependence on the teacher. Previous research (Freer, 2008) indicated that choral teachers purposely decreased feedback to eighth graders because they perceived this as "preparing" students for the types of instruction they would encounter in high school. Comparable discrepancies between the developmental needs of young adolescents and teacher expectations have been documented in research about students

transitioning to and from middle school grades (e.g. Eccles, Midgley, Wigfield, Miller-Buchanan, Reuman, Flanagan, & Mac Iver, 1993).

As scaffolding language increased or decreased, the number of completed sequential units correspondingly increased or decreased. When examining individual rehearsals, this finding was more robust for Julie's instructional language than for Linda's, but it was generally true across the study when Phases I and II were viewed collectively. Language transferring the responsibility for learning from teacher to student was most prominent during the presentation component of complete sequential units of instruction. Language providing task-focused support to students was most prominent during the reinforcement component of complete sequential units of instruction. Each of these findings supports previous research (Freer, 2008).

The Phase II decrease in Linda's use of both scaffolding language and complete sequential units of instruction is intriguing, particularly when contrasted with the increases in Julie's use of the same language characteristics (Table 7). Discourse analysis indicates that drawing Linda's attention to scaffolding language increased her use of scaffolding language during the presentation component of sequential units, with a corresponding decrease in the number of reinforcement statements of any kind – hence, the fewer number of complete sequential units of instruction. It appears as though Linda's focus on scaffolding language interrupted her customary use of verbal feedback in rehearsals, one of the components of a complete sequential unit. Conversely, Julie, the teacher who received instruction about complete sequential units of instruction, increased her employment of all types of reinforcement statements, including those with scaffolding language. The result was an increased completion of sequential units.

These findings also indicate that these choral music teachers quickly returned to their habitual patterns of instructional language use. The first rehearsals of Phase II were marked by a substantial increase in the type of language use under consideration. The “new” language pattern, while continuing, was minimized during subsequent rehearsals. While the discussion of language use between the researcher and teachers at the midpoint of this study might be viewed as a form of professional development, the initial encounter was brief (20 minutes) with minimal additional reminders to employ the targeted instructional language types at the start of each Phase II rehearsal. The results of this study might have been quite different were it constructed as an action research project where teachers could immediately gauge the impact of changes in their instructional language. For the moment, there is indication that a one-time exposure to these language types was not enough to prompt sustained change in the instructional discourse of these teachers. Even so, the basic relationship between the two language types explored here was clear, while persistent employment of the language types is a topic for another study.

Although student behaviors were not formally analyzed for this study (the video camera was focused on the teacher), researcher field notes recorded fewer off-task student behaviors in the first of Julie’s Phase II rehearsals, directly after she began focusing on her use of complete sequential units. In these rehearsals, Julie used her highest amounts of scaffolding language and complete sequential units of instruction. Earlier research noted an increase in positive affect when middle school choral students were exposed to higher levels of scaffolding language and complete sequential units of instruction (Freer, 2008). Topics for future research include the relationship of these categories of teacher language use to student on- and off-task behaviors, knowledge acquisition, and skill development.

The primary research question for this study asked whether a focus on either scaffolding language or complete sequential units of instruction affects a middle school choral music teacher's employment of the other category of instructional language. In this study, drawing teacher awareness to complete sequential units of instruction initiated an increase in both scaffolding language and completed sequential units. Drawing teacher awareness to scaffolding language resulted in a decrease of both scaffolding language use and completed sequential units.

The indication here is that attention to complete sequential units of instruction encourages the employment of scaffolding language in middle school choral rehearsals. Choral teachers seeking to increase student affect and motivation while fostering a constructivist-oriented rehearsal environment may find it advantageous to focus attention on the completion of sequential units of instruction. While the simple employment of specific feedback can accomplish this task, teachers may find it beneficial to use language that transfers the responsibility for learning to students and encourages specific progress toward task achievement. Similarly, teachers of collegiate methods classes may wish to draw students' attention to complete sequential units as a precursor to exploring the application of constructivist theory to ensemble rehearsal technique.

References

- Arnold, J. A. (1995). Effects of competency-based methods of instruction and self-observation on ensemble directors' use of sequential patterns. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 43*, 127-138.
- Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Miller-Buchanan, C., Reuman, D., Flanagan, C., & Mac Iver, D. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stage-environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and families. *American Psychologist, 48*, 90-101.
- Freer, P. K. (2008). Teacher instructional language and student experience in middle school choral rehearsals. *Music Education Research, 10*(1), 107-124.
- Gallimore, R., & Tharp, R. (1990). Teaching mind in society: Teaching, schooling, and literate discourse. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 175-205). Cambridge University Press.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81-112.
- Hendel, C. E. (1995). Behavioral characteristics and instructional patterns of selected music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 41*, 182-203.
- Maclin, J. P. (1993). The effect of task analysis on sequential patterns of music instruction. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 41*, 48-56.
- Meyer, D. K. (1993). What is scaffolded instruction? Definitions, distinguishing features, and misnomers. In D. J. Leu & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Examining central issues in literacy research, theory, and practice: Forty-second yearbook of the National Reading Conference*. (pp. 41-53). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference, Inc.
- Price, H. E. (1992). Sequential patterns of music instruction and learning to use them. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 40*, 14-29.
- Price, H. E., & Yarbrough, C. (1993). Effect of scripted sequential patterns of instruction in music rehearsals on teaching evaluations by college nonmusic students. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 119*, 170-178.
- Turner, J. C., Meyer, D. K., Cox, K. E., Logan, C., DiCintio, M., & Thomas, C. T. (1998). Creating contexts for involvement in mathematics. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 730-745.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (Ed.). (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 72*, 131-175.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology, 17*, 89-100.
- Yarbrough, C. (2002). Sequencing musical tasks: The teaching artistry of Robert Shaw. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 21*(1).
- Yarbrough, C., & Henley, P. (1999). The effect of observation focus on evaluations of choral rehearsal excerpts. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*, 308-318.
- Yarbrough, C., & Madsen, K. (1998). The evaluation of teaching in choral rehearsals. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 46*, 469-481.
- Yarbrough, C., & Price, H. E. (1981). Prediction of performer attentiveness based on rehearsal activity and teacher behavior. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 29*, 209-217.
- Yarbrough, C., Price, H. E., & Bowers, J. (1991). The effect of knowledge of research on rehearsal skills and teaching values of experienced teachers. *Update, 9*(2), 17-20.
- Yarbrough, C., Price, H. E., & Hendel, C. (1994). The effect of sequential patterns and modes of presentation on the evaluation of music teaching. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 120*, 33-45.

Table 1

Distinguishing Characteristics of Scaffolding Discourse Categories

Code	Sub-Category Of Scaffolding Language	Definition	Examples
N	Negotiation	Adjusting instruction in response to students and guiding them to deeper understanding	I need you to think carefully. Just think about your section and what you just sang. What was most comfortable for you to sing? Least comfortable? OK. Measure 13? The whole measure? OK. Just the rhythm? The rhythm of the notes or the rhythm of the rests? OK. So, let's work on the rhythm of the rests and see if that makes it more comfortable for you to sing. (Linda)
TR	Transfer of Responsibility	Supporting the development of strategic thinking; autonomy; holding students accountable for learning	Why do you think I stopped the singing right there? What should have been happening? (Julie) Is there something you – personally -- could do that would make that vowel sound taller and more roomy? What could you do? (Linda)
TFS	Task-Focused Support	Responding to students with feedback directly tied to a musical concept; viewing challenge as desirable; responding positively to errors; commenting on progress; evoking interest and curiosity	Oh . . . I liked that! You focused on what we talked about before, that the problem was our diction, not our dynamics. That time you emphasized the first syllable of "lion" and that made the whole phrase sound better. You used diction to help both dynamics and phrasing. Good job! (Julie)

Note. Scaffolding language is defined as language that assists students in the creation of their own knowledge and skills.

TABLE 2

Distinguishing Characteristics of Non-Scaffolding Discourse Categories

Code	Sub-Category of Non-Scaffolding Language	Definition	Examples
I-R-E	Initiation-Response-Evaluation	Asking known-answer questions; evaluating a student response as right or wrong; minimizing student talk through “turn-taking” (could also be just one utterance, either I or E)	Is this in major or minor? (Linda) Good job. Let’s move on. (Julie)
PI	Procedures (Instructional)	Giving directions related to the subject matter without allowing for student response; providing instructions or suggestions about <i>how</i> to do something; modeling behaviors	When we have words with [i] vowels on high notes, be sure to shape your mouth for an [I] instead. (Julie) It should sound like this . . . (Linda)
PL	Procedures (Logistical)	Giving directions about <i>where</i> , <i>what</i> or <i>when</i> to do something; telling students how to think or act	All right. Let’s try it again. Everybody, heads down. (Julie) Turn to page 6 and sing louder this time. (Linda)
CC	Criticism/Coercion	Superficial, positive or negative comments focusing on aspects other than learning, such as the ease of completion; using threats or negative expectations to gain student compliance	Hmmm . . . some of you still need me to tell you exactly what to do, just like babies. (Linda) He can do that because he’s really talented. (Julie)

Note. Non-scaffolding language is defined as language indicating that authority for learning rests with the teacher.

TABLE 3

Distinguishing Characteristics of Complete Sequential Units of Instruction

Complete Sequential Units of Instruction		
Component	Activity	Specifications
Presentation	Teacher presentation of academic information and/or a musical task	<p>Must contain academic musical information/task</p> <p>Must contain a single task (not a series of directions)</p> <p>May include questions or prompts that relate to the academic or musical task</p> <p>May end with directions necessary to initiate student interaction with the task (“1-2-ready- sing”)</p>
Response	Student interaction with the information and/or task	<p>Must immediately follow the presentation without interruption</p> <p>Can be expressed verbally (answering questions), non-verbally (adjusting posture) or through musical production (singing or playing)</p>
Reinforcement	Teacher feedback that is related to the task	<p>May occur immediately following the student interaction</p> <p>May be delayed by further presentation-interaction activities <i>only if the intervening presentation-interaction activities are directly related to the initial task</i></p> <p>May be approving or disapproving</p> <p>Simple feedback (“good”) may only be considered if clearly related to the task</p>

TABLE 4

*Total Percentage of Categories of
Language Use By Teachers*

Language Category	<u>Julie*</u>		<u>Linda**</u>	
	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I	Phase II
% Scaffolding Total	4.87	12.70	11.20	12.19
% Negotiation	0.18	2.86	0.66	5.14
% Transfer	3.61	5.08	8.12	4.60
% Task-Focused Support	1.08	4.76	2.41	2.79
% Non-Scaffolding Total	95.13	87.30	88.80	87.81
% I-R-E	18.77	13.81	24.48	33.81
% Procedures (Instructional)	8.48	15.40	9.44	17.18
% Procedures (Logistical)	61.55	46.51	53.13	34.80
% Criticism/Coercion	6.32	11.59	1.76	2.06
# Language Elements Coded	554	630	911	681

Note. * Received instruction about complete sequential units between phases I and II.

** Received instruction about scaffolding language between phases I and II.

TABLE 5

Instructional Units by Teacher and Class

Instructional Units	Julie*				Linda**			
	Phase I		Phase II		Phase I		Phase II	
	7 th	8 th	7 th	8 th	7 th	8 th	7 th	8 th
Mean # of Complete Sequential Units (<i>SD</i>)	4.33 (3.21)	5.00 (2.65)	14.00 (3.60)	5.67 (3.06)	41.64 (5.51)	19.67 (5.51)	15.67 (2.52)	10.67 (2.08)
Mean # containing Scaffolding Language (<i>SD</i>)	1.33 (1.15)	1.33 (1.15)	9.00 (2.65)	3.00 (2.00)	14.33 (4.93)	4.00 (1.00)	8.33 (2.52)	6.67 (5.69)

Note. Many sequential units contained more than one occurrence of scaffolding language.

* Received instruction about complete sequential units between phases I and II.

** Received instruction about scaffolding language between phases I and II.

TABLE 6

*Scaffolding Occurrences within
Complete Sequential Units*

Language Category	Mean (SD)			
	Julie*		Linda**	
	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I	Phase II
Presentation				
Negotiation	–	0.33 (0.82)	0.50 (0.84)	2.67 (1.63)
Transfer	0.83 (0.75)	1.66 (1.37)	4.67 (4.13)	2.67 (2.88)
Task-Focused Support	0.33 (0.52)	0.33 (0.82)	1.50 (2.26)	0.50 (0.84)
Reinforcement				
Negotiation	–	0.67 (1.21)	–	1.33 (1.75)
Transfer	–	0.33 (0.52)	1.83 (1.47)	0.50 (0.55)
Task-Focused Support	0.33 (0.52)	3.50 (2.26)	2.50 (1.87)	1.33 (1.21)

Note. Many sequential units contained more than one occurrence of scaffolding language; some components of complete sequential units contained more than one occurrence of scaffolding language.

* Received instruction about complete sequential units between phases I and II.

** Received instruction about scaffolding language between phases I and II.

TABLE 7

Frequency of Scaffolding Language and Complete Sequential Units by Rehearsal

<i>Rehearsal #</i>	Phase I			Phase II		
	1	2	3	4	5	6
<u>Julie* - Grade 7</u>						
Occurrences of Scaffolding Language	6	3	3	23	11	17
Complete Sequential Units	8	2	3	18	11	13
<u>Julie* – Grade 8</u>						
Occurrences of Scaffolding Language	8	3	4	18	3	11
Complete Sequential Units	7	2	6	9	3	5
<u>Linda** – Grade 7</u>						
Occurrences of Scaffolding Language	32	16	24	22	14	16
Complete Sequential Units	47	36	42	18	13	16
<u>Linda** – Grade 8</u>						
Occurrences of Scaffolding Language	9	11	10	22	3	6
Complete Sequential Units	25	14	20	13	9	10

Note. * Received instruction about complete sequential units between phases I and II.

** Received instruction about scaffolding language between phases I and II.