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ABSTRACT

The visual and performing arts have been included in landmark studies of talent development but, within the field of gifted education, less is known of the arts as an area of talent development compared to other intellectual and academic talent areas. The lack of research related to the teachers of talented students in the arts endangers these students by potentially overlooking needs specific to their talent domain.

This descriptive study examined the teacher characteristics and behaviors that contribute to working successfully with artistically talented students at the secondary level as indicated by arts teachers in selected specialized secondary schools for the performing arts. This study also examined the instructional strategies and differentiated teaching behaviors implemented by these teachers and compared these to the literature and research on teacher effectiveness and differentiated instruction in the academic fields of gifted education.

The study used multiple data sources including questionnaire data from teachers at specialized secondary schools for the performing arts, follow-up interviews with selected teacher participants, administrator interviews, and document review. Overall, the study supported the research on teacher characteristics and behaviors from general and gifted education as applicable to arts teachers who work with talented students in the performing arts in specialized secondary schools. Teacher behaviors received lower ratings overall than teacher characteristics. Participants rated themselves highly on a
measure of differentiated classroom practices, but the term differentiation was not recognizable to a majority of the teacher and administrator interview participants.

While the findings from this study support the assumption that the best teachers for talented students in the arts are highly-trained and experienced performing artists, responses indicate that most of the participants lack an understanding of effective pedagogy and educational practices reflected in the educational literature. Implications for practice, policy, and research focus on connections between general education and arts education regarding teacher effectiveness, connections between gifted education and arts education regarding talent development, and articulating differentiated practices within specialized programs for the performing arts.
Chapter One

Introduction to the Study

Talent development has become a primary focus in the field of gifted education over the past three decades, expanding conceptions of “giftedness” and the services provided to gifted and talented students (Feldhusen, 2001; Reis, 2004; Subotnik, 2003a). While the visual and performing arts have been included in landmark studies of talent development (e.g., Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, & Whalen, 1993) and cited as representing exemplary practices in the development of talent (Renzulli, 2000; Subotnik, 2003b), less is known of the arts as an area of talent development in a field that has emphasized identifying and developing general intellectual or traditional academic abilities for the majority of its history (Clark & Zimmerman, 1998, 2004; Haroutounian, 2000b, 2002; Oreck, Baum, & McCartney, 2000; Piirto, 1994; Winner & Martino, 1993, 2000). Specifically, the research on the talent development process within the performing arts is limited.

The field of gifted education has long recognized the existence of artistic ability, incorporating the arts in the federal definition of gifted education (Marland, 1972; U. S. Department of Education, 1993) and in many state definitions of giftedness (Stephens & Karnes, 2000; Swanson, 2000). The same standards that apply to identifying and providing for students in the other areas of giftedness are assumed to apply to the arts (Clark & Zimmerman, 2004). However, as demonstrated by a recent publication of “the most frequently cited articles” of the premier journal in the field of gifted education, Gifted Child Quarterly (Reis, 2004, p. x), there remains a need for research to discover the “the impact of educational opportunities, educational settings, and the role of art
teachers on the development of artistically talented students” as well as “the impact of global and popular culture on the education of artistically talented students” (Zimmerman, 2004, p. xxxii).

While the visual and performing arts are often combined in studies of giftedness and talent development in the arts (i.e., Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Freeman, 2000; Gagné, 1993; Guskin, Peng, & Majd-Jabbari, 1988; Karnes, Chauvin, & Trant, 1985; Patrick, Ryan, Alfeld-Liro, Fredricks, Hruda, & Eccles, 1999), this study will address only the performing arts. This focus was selected based on the assumption that performance in front of an audience requires a different approach, an assumption reflected in the literature on giftedness and talent development in the arts (Haroutounian, 2002; Hermelin & O’Connor, 1986; Piirto, 1994; Zimmerman, 2004).

Statement of the Problem

Research on the Artistic Talent Development Process

The lack of in-depth study into arts talent development might produce misconceptions about the nature of artistic talent and the artistically talented (Zimmerman, 2004), especially in an era of accountability highly focused on achievement in the core academic areas (Frahm, 2005; Rand Corporation, 2005). The lack of research related to the teachers of talented students in the arts also endangers the needs of these students by potentially overlooking needs specific to their talent domain. Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the field of K-12 public education has witnessed a shift in focus from educational experiences to educational outcomes (Marzano & Kendall, 1996). A system of standards-based accountability has become part of an overall movement toward
systemic reform that seeks to increase student learning and achievement (Fuhrman, 1993), but has focused primarily on academic areas as the means to that end. During this same time, the arts have become the focus of a movement to improve student achievement in academic areas by using the arts to inspire or improve cognitive functioning (Kassell, 1998; Kay, 2000; Oddleifson, 1994; Seidel, 2002), despite a limited research base to support these claims (Seidel, 2002).

Within the various art forms, the field of music education outlines a research agenda (e.g., Music Educators National Conference, 1998; Seidel, 2002), but the research objectives and research questions focus on competent musical performance, musical understanding, lifelong involvement in music, and transfer of musical skills from school-based to non-school-based settings in all students, not on developing high levels of musical talent. The field of dance education supports research within the field, and a national dance education organization has recently received a grant to examine the research within the field of dance education with a focus on what research exists and how dance education addresses other educational issues such as student achievement, brain research, and interdisciplinary education (National Dance Education Organization, n.d.). The field of theater education also supports research within the field but the major organization for theater education does not describe a specific research agenda (American Alliance of Theater and Education). The National Standards for Arts Education (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994) include standards for “proficient” and “advanced” abilities in music and theater; however, an ongoing push to have all students participate in arts education has diverted attention from identifying and nurturing high levels of artistic talent (Atterbury, 1990; Kay, 2000).
Effective Teachers and Developing Talent in the Arts

Recent reviews of the research literature in education describe and develop characteristics and skills of effective teachers to improve student achievement (Harris, 1998; Stronge, 2002). The field of gifted education also has a literature and research base that addresses what makes an effective teacher of gifted and talented learners (Buttermore, 1979; Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002; Feldhusen, 1985; Heath, 1997; Joffe, 2001; Maker, 1975; Rejskind, 2000; Rogers, 1989; Seeley, 1979; Sisk, 1975; Story, 1985; Westberg & Archambault, 1997). Characteristics of effective teachers in gifted education and studies of general student achievement include enthusiasm, knowledgeable, having a good sense of humor, and the ability to incorporate differentiated instruction (Buttermore, 1979; Heath, 1997; Minor et al., 2002; Story, 1985; Stronge, 2002; Walls et al., 2002; Westberg & Archambault, 1997). The field of gifted education has identified additional characteristics such as a secure self-concept and creative abilities (Buttermore, 1979; Heath, 1997; Rejskind, 2000; Story, 1985). However, this collection of research and literature does not explicitly address the domain of the performing arts or the particular needs of artistically talented students (Zimmerman, 2004).

Several studies related to talent development in the visual and performing arts suggest characteristics that may be important to develop high levels of ability, such as teacher knowledge within the talent area (Bloom, 1985; Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; Sosniak, 1985; Sloane & Sosniak, 1985; Zimmerman, 1988, 1997) and teacher knowledge of the talent development process (Bloom, 1985; Yeatts, 1980; Zimmerman, 1992), but more research in this domain of talent is needed.
Specialized Schools and Programs to Develop Talent

Before and since A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), specialized secondary schools for performing arts have been established by school districts and state legislatures to serve the needs of artistically talented students (Dodson, 1994; Kolloff, 2002; Lewis, 1993). While many of these schools and programs are described in the literature (Alabama School for Fine Arts, 1979; Carpenter, 1987; Churchwell, 1981; Cox & Daniel, 1983; Daniel, 2000; Haroutounian, 2000a; Kaufmann, 1985; Kolloff, 2002; Lewis, 2002), the research related to these schools is limited (Dodson, 1994; James, 1988; Haroutounian, 2002; Saronson, 1991). Research examining the intersection of these specialized secondary schools, the field of gifted education, and the talent development process within the performing arts is limited to a few studies of interpersonal characteristics (Karnes, Chauvin, & Trant, 1985), individualistic experiences (Freeman, 1999), and post-secondary educational programs (Kingsbury, 1988; Persson, 2000). Research studying effective teachers for talented students in the performing arts or in specialized secondary schools for the performing arts was not uncovered.

Within the field of gifted education, certain programs and services are accepted as essential to developing intellectual and academic talent (Daniel & Cox, 1985; VanTassel-Baska, 2005). Accelerated study, content acceleration, and grade-level acceleration are often promoted in the core subject areas for gifted learners (Colangelo et al., 2004; VanTassel-Baska, 2005). Differentiated curriculum is another recommendation for talented students when served through gifted education programs. While several models of differentiation are described in the literature, one that is applicable within a content-
based or accelerative model examines the strategies of acceleration, complexity, depth, challenge, and creative thinking within an instructional setting (VanTassel-Baska & Stambaugh, 2006). Questions remain as to how these models of programs and instruction appropriate for gifted learners in academic domains correlate to existing options in non-academic domains such as the performing arts.

**Differentiated Instruction to Develop Talent**

Differentiation is a concept that forms the foundation for the field of gifted education, a field that recognizes individual differences in learners and, therefore, different learning needs (Lubinski & Benbow, 1994). The definition of differentiation most often cited is that of Maker (1982) where it is defined as a qualitatively different curriculum modified in the areas of content, process, product, and learning environment. Arguments supporting differentiation often cite the different learning needs of students with advanced abilities (Ward, 1980) or the relationship between their abilities and their potential for contributing to a domain of knowledge (Jellen and Verduin, 1986).

In the Marland Report (1972), differentiated programs are described as: a) promoting higher cognitive processes, b) providing instructional strategies that accommodate both curriculum content and the learning styles of gifted and talented children, and c) using special grouping practices appropriate to particular children. Most models of differentiation have developed in general education to address general intellectual or academic ability. A relationship between differentiation and the content areas of the arts has not been explicitly established, although the traditions of training in the arts reflect several elements of differentiation as it is used in the field of gifted education.
Subsequent descriptions of differentiation include elements that could be translated into the artistic domains (Kaplan, 1979), such as interdisciplinary study; independent study (Reis & Schack, 1993), including complex or higher-level thinking skills, developing research skills, and developing new and creative products (Kaplan, 1979). Another definition of differentiation emphasizes the teacher’s role as being responsive to a learner’s needs (Tomlinson & Allan, 2001). This definition does not focus specifically on the needs of gifted learners but on the needs of learners of all ability levels, demonstrating an expansion of the concept of differentiation. According to Tomlinson (2001), principles of differentiation include a flexible classroom, ongoing assessment of learner needs, and flexible grouping. The elements of curriculum that can be differentiated are still content, process, and product. However, Tomlinson (1999, 2001) articulates that teachers can also differentiate for student characteristics in terms of their readiness (i.e., prerequisite skill to complete a task or learning objective) and interest. This definition also reflects a shift in curriculum paradigms toward a more constructivist perspective which is centered on the student (Brooks & Brooks, 1999).

The research on differentiation clearly indicates the existence of various models of differentiation (Coleman & Gallagher, 1995; Dinoccenti, 1998; Friedman & Lee, 1996; Maker, 1982; Renzulli & Reis, 1998; Tomlinson, 1999; VanTassel-Baska, 2002; VanTassel-Baska & Stambaugh, 2006), the limited implementation of differentiation in general education classrooms (Archambault, Westberg, Brown, Hallmark, Zhang, & Emmons, 1993; Tomlinson, Moon, & Callahan, 1998), and the need for training and support for teachers to successfully implement principles and models of differentiation (Johnsen, Haensly, Ryser, & Ford, 2002; Reis & Westberg, 1994; Tomlinson, 1995).
While some examples of differentiated practices in arts classes have been provided (Tomlinson, 1999; Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005), the research examining the differentiated practices of arts teachers is nonexistent. The use of differentiation in the development of artistic talent by effective art teachers has also not been addressed in the research.

**Conceptual Framework**

The field of gifted education has focused mainly on intellectual and academic abilities (Colangelo & Davis, 1997; Gallagher, 1997; VanTassel-Baska, 1998). The shift in focus from giftedness to talent development is due to a broadening conception of giftedness beyond intelligence (Gardner, 1983; Renzulli & Reis, 1986; Sternberg, 1985; Tannenbaum, 1997), the use of talented to describe students with advanced abilities (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Stanley, 1986, 1991), and the use of developing talent (Bloom, 1985) and talent development (United States Department of Education, 1993; VanTassel-Baska, 1998) to describe school-based programs for above-average students. As the field of gifted education moved towards developing talent, theoretical models were developed to describe the interaction of different factors in the talent development process. These models were to serve as both a conceptualization of the talent development process and to provide a framework for coordinating educational programs and services to facilitate the development of talent (Feldhusen, 2001).

Gagné’s Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (DMGT; 1991, 1993, 1995, 2000) is one talent development model that has received a wide base of support in the field of gifted education (Feldhusen, 2001; Feldhusen & Jarwan, 2000). The DMGT moves beyond an academic or intellectual conception of giftedness (Feldhusen, 2001;
Feldhusen & Jarwan, 2000) or talent, using a systems approach to explain the development of gifts into talents (See Figure 1). Giftedness is defined as natural abilities, the inputs to the talent development system, and talent is mastery of “systematically developed abilities (or skills) and knowledge” (Gagné, 2000), or the outputs of the system. The DMGT describes the translation of natural gifts into developed talent as a systematic process facilitated by interpersonal (physical, motivation, volition, self-management, and personality) and environmental catalysts (milieu, persons, provisions, and events; Gagné, 2000). This study will focus on environmental catalysts in the talent development process through the study of persons, specifically, teachers, and educational provisions, specifically defined as teachers’ instructional behaviors and instructional strategies.

Figure 1: Gagné’s Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (2000)
Statement of the Purpose

Educational opportunities within specialized schools and programs are one example of environmental provisions identified within the talent development process by Gagné (2000). Teachers, as both persons within the environment and participants in the educational opportunities that students encounter, are another catalyst with which students interact in the talent development process within specialized schools. What characteristics of teachers make them effective in working with talented students in the performing arts? What knowledge and skills are prerequisites to working effectively with talented performing arts students? What are the responsibilities of arts teachers within the talent development process for the performing arts? To what extent are program components and instructional strategies from the field of gifted education translated into the artistic domains by arts teachers within specialized secondary schools for the performing arts?

This study examined the teacher characteristics and behaviors that contribute to working successfully with artistically talented students at the secondary level as indicated by arts teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts. This study also examined the instructional strategies and differentiated teaching behaviors implemented by these teachers and compared these to the literature and research on teacher effectiveness and differentiated instruction in the academic fields of gifted education.
Research Questions

1. What are the perceptions of arts teachers in specialized secondary schools for the performing arts regarding the characteristics and teaching behaviors that make teachers effective in working with talented students in the performing arts?

2. How do the descriptions of characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers working with talented students in the performing arts differ by arts area?

3. What instructional strategies do teachers of talented students in the performing arts use to develop the talent of their students? How is the success of these strategies assessed?

4. How do arts teachers in selected specialized schools for the performing arts rate themselves on an instrument reflecting differentiated instructional behaviors?

Definitions of Terms

1. *gifted*: This term is often used in the research and literature interchangeably with or alongside of the term *talented*. The *National Excellence* report (U.S. Department of Education, 1993) claims that the term *gifted* summons connotations of a mature ability but there is still considerable disagreement in the field as to the meaning and appropriateness of the term. For the purpose of this study, the term *gifted* reflects Gagné’s use of the term in his Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent [DMGT] (2000). *Gifted* describes the “possession and use of untrained and spontaneously expressed superior natural abilities (called aptitudes or gifts), in at least one ability domain, to a degree that places the
individual at least among the top 10% of his or her age peers” (Gagné, 2000, p. 2).

In the review of the literature, this term was reported according to how it is used in the original study or publication.

2. talented: In the context of the National Excellence report, talent is defined as “the potential for performing at remarkably high levels of accomplishment when compared with others of their age, experience, or environment” (Part III, electronic version), and is therefore often used interchangeably in the research and literature with the term gifted. For this study, the term talent or talented reflects the Gagné’s DMGT and be defined as “systematically developed abilities (or skills) and knowledge” (Gagné, 1995, p. 107), placing an individual in the top 10% of their age-peers who are also active in that field (Gagné, 2000). In the review of the literature, this term was reported according to how it is used in the original study or publication.

3. field of gifted education: This is the field of study within education that addresses the characteristics and needs of gifted and talented learners. While the shift within the field has been to adopting a language of talent development, the term field of gifted education is still used to describe this field of study and specialized educational programs.

4. performing arts: This term refers to the traditional grouping of three arts areas that has been adopted by the national public school system (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). The domain of the performing arts includes music, theater arts, and dance.
5. *artistically talented or artistic talent:* Though these terms are often used to refer to students who are gifted or talented in the visual arts, they are used strictly to describe talent in any of the visual or performing arts. Talent in a specific arts area will be clarified with phrases such as “talented students in the performing arts”, “musically talented”, or “talented students in the visual arts”.

6. *differentiation:* This is the practice of modifying instruction to meet the needs of individual learners. This term most often refers to the use of instructional strategies to meet the needs of learners who have mastered certain content or skills and/or who have the ability to move at an accelerated pace through the planned instruction.

7. *specialized schools:* These are generally schools that have specific admissions criteria, such as a test or an audition, and a corresponding program that provides advanced instruction and sustained focus in a specific program area such as mathematics, science, technology, humanities, or the arts.

8. *effective teachers and effectiveness:* Teacher effectiveness is often associated with outcome measures such as student achievement and measured through test scores, grades, and success in certain programs, although other educational outcomes are also used to evaluate a teacher’s effectiveness (Stronge, 2002). This concept has yet to be clearly defined for the context of the performing arts and in the context of the field of gifted education. For the purpose of this study, *effectiveness* and *effective teachers* in the performing arts are those who have worked and continue to work in specialized schools and programs for the performing arts. Assumptions were made that teachers selected for such programs demonstrate a higher level of
professional expertise, training, experience, and knowledge of their performing arts area.

Significance of the Study

This primary contribution of this study will be to the literature of effective teachers of the arts in the field of gifted education. Currently, the majority of the existing literature addresses the instructional needs of students who are identified as intellectually or academically gifted and talented. This study will provide a list of characteristics and skills of effective teachers for talented students in the performing arts in selective schools and programs to be used in future research studies or in the selection or training of teachers for performing arts programs.

A secondary contribution of this study will be to provide insight into the instructional strategies and program components of specialized secondary schools for the performing arts. This information can then be compared to the literature on instruction and programming in the field of gifted education in academic areas. This information might also be useful to educators seeking to design appropriate programs for artistically talented students or improve existing programs.

An indirect contribution of this study will be to the literature on talent development and the responsibilities of the artist-teacher in the talent development process for the performing arts. The findings may elicit directions for future research and study of the talent development process in the performing arts.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study is limited by the non-random and non-representational nature of the sample and the explanatory design of the research questions and methods. Logical
generalizations may only be made to the staff of the selected schools and programs.

This study is delimited by the scope of inquiry and its focus on teacher effectiveness with talented students in the performing arts, the talent development process in performing arts, and the role of the arts teacher in the talent development process. Due to a lack of objective outcome measures currently available for the arts and for specialized schools for the arts, there is the assumption that such schools with an established program of at least ten years are able to prepare their students for professional work and training in their fields. There is also the assumption that schools with established programs and reputations with the performing arts community attract artist-teachers with extensive performance experience and knowledge of their arts area.

The researcher chose to begin this strand of research with the perceptions and expertise of professional artist teachers rather than observations of these schools due to the limited feasibility of an observation-based study. The current reasoning in the field assumes that the demands of the artistic domains require similar characteristics and skills of the traditional academic domains; the aim of this study is to support or expand upon these assumptions. Due to the limited published data on the outcomes or success of the targeted school population, certain assumptions are also made about the correlation between the ability of a program to produce talented students and the longevity or established history of the program. This study is also confined to the perceptions of arts teachers at specialized secondary schools because of the assumption that the selection criteria for these programs attracts both a higher level of talent from students and a higher level of talent and interest in teaching from the artist-teachers.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

This review of the literature focuses on the following main ideas found within the conceptual framework for this study which is talent development: a) talent development research, b) talent development in the visual and performing arts; c) characteristics and skills of effective teachers; d) differentiated instruction; and e) specialized secondary schools for the gifted and talented.

Talent Development

The field of gifted education has shifted from defining giftedness to studying how the potential of natural gifts is developed to high levels of productivity and problem-solving within a domain (Assouline & Lupkowski-Shoplik, 1997; Renzulli, 1977; Sternberg, 1985). Three models of intelligence or giftedness illustrate this transition in focus (Gardner, 1983; Renzulli, 1977; Sternberg, 1985). Gardner (1983) describes intelligence as the ability to solve problems or create products of value within a specific context. Sternberg’s (1985) Triarchic View of Giftedness identifies three types of giftedness: a) analytic, the ability to take apart and understand problems; b) synthetic, characterized by insight and creative ability in novel situations; and c) practical, the ability to apply analytic or synthetic ability in daily situations. The Enrichment Triad Model (Renzulli, 1977) and Revolving Door Identification Model (Renzulli, Reis, & Smith, 1981) focus on creative productivity and application of knowledge and skills for students in a talent pool of above-average students. Another model of giftedness proposed by Tannenbaum (1997) defines gifted behavior as the interaction of general ability, environmental supports, chance, special aptitude, and non-intellectual
characteristics, specifying that these areas interact differently in the various talent areas. Three of these four theories articulate a bridge between an initial ability (e.g., specific intelligence, analytic or synthetic giftedness, and knowledge and skills, respectively) and then an outcome of the ability within a context (e.g., problem solving, application to real new situations, creative production). Each of these also describes the interaction of several forces to produce a behavior or product that is then declared "gifted" or "productive". Whereas the first three focus on context as playing a role in determining whether the creation or application of ability is valued, the fourth (Tannenbaum) introduces environmental supports and chance as main ingredient in the development of innate ability.

Another model of talent development (Piirto, 1994, 2000) also addresses the origins of and influences upon the development of giftedness and talent. Grounded in genetics and inherited abilities and predispositions, the Piirto Pyramid of Talent Development describes a cognitive or intellectual dimension along with affective or personality attributes involved in the development of ability. Talent is described as an ingredient in this framework, not an outcome. Other factors in the framework include vocational passion and the five "suns" of the environment: home and family, community and culture, school, gender and chance.

Gagné’s Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (DMGT; 1991, 1993, 1995, 2000) provides a systemic view of talent development and a clear delineation between the terms gifted and talented. The DMGT defines giftedness as "possession and use of untrained and spontaneously expressed superior natural abilities (called aptitudes or gifts), in at least one ability domain, to a degree that places the individual at least
among the top 10% of his or her age peers” (Gagné, 2000, p. 2). The four domains of
giftedness or aptitude are intellectual, creative, socioaffective, and sensorimotor (2000).
These aptitudes are described as influenced in part by genetic inheritance can be observed
during the individual’s school experience (2000). Aptitude is observable at any time
during the lifespan and the magnitude of the natural ability is inferred from the ease or
pace with which an individual learns (2000). Talent is then defined as the “superior
mastery of systematically developed abilities (or skills) and knowledge in at least one
field of human activity to a degree that places an individual within at least the upper 10%
of age-peers who are or have been active in that field or fields” (2000, p. 2). Gagné
(1991, 1993, 1995, 2000) articulates that the DMGT justifies the assumption that an
individual cannot be talented without first being gifted but that not all gifts will be
translated into talents.

This translation or development of gifts into a talent is facilitated by interpersonal
and environmental catalysts. Interpersonal catalysts include motivation, temperament (a
hereditary trait), and personality characteristics and attitudes. Environmental catalysts are
macroscopic (i.e., geographic and sociological environment), microscopic (i.e., family,
parenting style, socioeconomic status), and include the people, events, and systematic
educational experiences of one’s environment. Gagné’s (2000) model for understanding
and studying the process of talent development reflects the shift in the field of education
in the late 20th century to a systemic view of education and the context of learning and
development (Fullan, 1993; Wheatley, 1994). The DMGT (Gagné, 2000) provides a
framework for examining the individual elements within the process of developing
natural gifts into talents as well as the interaction of the elements in this system within the
lives of individuals and groups. The DMGT will be the system through which research on
talent development in general and talent development in the arts is examined in the
remaining sections of this review of the literature.

Talent development research.

Early researchers in gifted sought mainly to describe and explain gifted
individuals. The work of Lewis Terman demonstrated that gifted children are generally
more emotionally stable than was previously believed (Colangelo & Davis, 1997) and that
personality and motivation factors are related to achievement (Subotnik & Arnold, 1994).
Leta Stetter Hollingworth examined the development of eminence with a focus on the
environmental components that affected the achievement of eminence. Her research
suggested that early identification of and programming for children with intelligence
scores (IQs) greater than 180 was instrumental in developing their abilities. She also
found that these children were often dissatisfied with schools designed for children of
average intelligence; had difficulties in establishing relationships with age peers and had
few intellectual peers; and that they exhibited asynchrony between their intellectual and
emotional abilities (Morelock & Feldman, 1997). E. Paul Torrance studied the nature of
creative ability (Cramond, 1994) and how it needs to be nurtured. Specifically, in a
review of the research, Torrance (as cited by Feldhusen & Goh, 1995) concluded that
creativity can be taught through programs that are structured appropriately to allow “for
active student involvement in the creative thinking process” (p. 243).

In 1972, Julian Stanley developed the Talent Search model in an effort to
discover, develop, and describe the process of talent development, and then disseminate
this information in the field (Stanley, as cited by Assouline & Lupkowski-Shoplik, 1997).
The Talent Search model was the foundation of the Search for Mathematically Precocious Youth (SMPY), a study that uses above-level tests to identify students that need “additional challenge in a particular subject area” (Assouline & Lupkowski-Shoplik, 1997, p. 171). The ultimate goal of SMPY is to create a better understanding of how precocious intellectual talent develops into “noteworthy products of adult achievement and creativity” (Lubinski & Benbow, 1994, p. 256).

The work of each of these individuals towards describing and understanding abilities and how they are developed led to two landmark cross-disciplinary studies of the process of developing high levels of talent and continued work within a domain (Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, & Whalen, 1993). Bloom’s (1985) landmark study of talent development focused on environmental factors that supported talented individuals, specifically the influence of family and teachers. For this study, talent was defined as “unusually high level of demonstrated ability, achievement, or skill in some special field of study or interest” (p. 5). The research team studied individuals who had achieved world-class recognition before the age of 35 based on the achievement of recognition in their field through competitions and on the recommendation of experts in the various fields of athletics, arts, and research math and science.

Findings from this landmark study indicate that, across the disciplines selected, an individual’s family and teachers were important in helping them develop their talent (1985). Participants also indicted a need to see clear evidence of their own achievement over time to maintain their level of commitment to developing their talent. This study outlined three stages in the talent development process, providing insights into the some environmental catalysts of the talent development process, especially early performance
and achievement opportunities. However, this study only addresses individualistic pursuits in the arts through concert pianists as examples of highly developed talent in music performance and sculptors as examples of high levels of talent in the visual arts. Questions remain as to whether there are additional considerations for developing talents that require collaboration between artists or between artistic disciplines, such as ensemble performance in music, theater, or dance, or in other genres in these performance areas.

Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, and Whalen (1993) studied teenage students with recognized talents in the fields of math, science, and music in order to learn why some teenagers “continue cultivating their talent while other equally gifted teens give up and never develop their abilities” (p. 1). The study was based on a previous longitudinal study of 300 young artists over 20 years that suggested that successful visual artists demonstrated persistence and the ability to examine their art-form with a creative problem-solution approach (Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1976). The participants for Csikszentmihalyi et al. were recommended by teachers and coaches as the experts in the relevant fields as well as standardized measures of student ability. All participants were in the 9th and 10th grades in two diverse suburban school districts with a reputation as a “‘normal’ American adolescent” setting (p. 42). The two-part study focused on each individual’s daily experience of talent development and then a description of the same individual’s accomplishments and interest in the talent area two years later. Like Bloom and his colleagues (1985), this study only focused on the domains of music and visual arts, and narrowed the focus of music to students participating in the school’s auditioned vocal or instrumental ensembles. The participants from all domains were high-achieving in their domain, scored above-average on standardized scores (i.e., PSAT, ACT), and had
family backgrounds and personality traits “conducive to success in their respective fields” (Csikszentmihalyi et al., p. 81).

The study’s summary of factors that support talent development first emphasizes that in order to recognize someone as talented, they “must have skills that are considered useful in their culture” (Csikszentmihalyi et al., p. 243), highlighting the role of context in the recognition and development of talent. The study’s findings supported the researchers’ theory that young people must perceive the requirements of the domain as a reward in order to maintain their commitment to the domain. The participants indicated that they liked teachers who were “supportive and modeled enjoyable involvement in a field” (p. 249). The exposure to others displaying intense commitment and enjoyment of work may be especially important for students whose home environment does not provide such a model. The students involved in the also study had personality traits that support sustained concentration, habits that support talent development, such as choosing to spend less time on unproductive activities, or were in environments that allowed them to focus more time on their talent area (i.e., did not have to work for family financial security, had fewer family chores).

Finally, this study suggests that talent development is a process that requires both expressive (i.e., emotional responses) and instrumental (i.e., useful to future goals) rewards (Csikszentmihalyi et al.). While such goals are stereotypically differentiated between the arts and athletics as providing an expressive reward and the sciences as providing and instrumental reward, the researchers report that “talent development in either area required the synergistic combination of these rewards” (p. 250). Specifically,
"successful young artists showed some of the qualities that typified young scientists, and committed young scientists felt the way artists usually feel about their work" (p. 250).

Models of giftedness and talent development provide educators and researchers with a framework to study and understand the development of innate abilities into high levels of talent (Gagné, 2000; Piirto, 2000; Tannenbaum, 1997). Gagné’s Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (2000) provides a framework with a systemic view of the talent development process and a lens through which to study parts of the talent development process, specifically focusing on environmental and interpersonal catalysts. The work and research of Hollingworth (Morelock & Feldman, 1997) highlighted the role of environment in the development of abilities of gifted learners. Torrance’s study of creativity (Cramond, 1994) and Stanley’s Talent Search model (Lubinski & Benbow, 1994) continued to focus on identifying and providing services for innate abilities. Bloom’s (1985) work looked at environmental factors that support talent development across several fields and highlighted the role of teachers at various stages of the talent development process. The study by Csikszentmihalyi et al. (1993), while focused on interpersonal catalysts within the talent development process, noted that talent requires supportive teachers who nurture students’ abilities while modeling enthusiasm for and engagement in their domain of study.

The research on natural abilities brought to the talent development process suggests that the intellectually gifted are, as a group, emotionally stable (Terman, as cited by Colangelo & Davis, 1997) but that they do exhibit asynchrony in their emotional and intellectual development (Hollingworth, as cited by Morelock & Feldman, 1997). Individuals identified as highly intelligent also do not seem to relate well to their age
peers (Hollingworth, as cited by Morelock & Feldman, 1997). Interpersonal catalysts such as personality traits and motivation contribute to sustained, high levels of achievement (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Terman, as cited by Subotnik & Arnold, 1994).

Individuals must be engaged in their area of talent or perceive the rewards of the talent area to sustain the development of their abilities (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993). To this end, early identification and programming is important (Hollingworth, as cited by Morelock & Feldman, 1997). Classes and programs designed for children of average intelligence are often insufficient (Hollingworth, as cited by Morelock & Feldman, 1997). Above-level standardized achievement tests can be used to identify students who demonstrate precocious ability in a specific academic area (Assouline & Lupkowski-Shoplik, 1997) and who then benefit from accelerated programs in their area of talent (Lubinski & Benbow, 1994). Specifically, creativity, as defined by Torrance, can be taught and enhanced through structured programs (Feldhusen & Goh, 1995).

An individual’s talent area needs to be recognized by their context or culture (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993) and early performance and achievement opportunities are important in further development of abilities (Bloom, 1985). Teachers and family are important to developing talent (Bloom, 1985) and adolescents identified as talented like teachers who are supportive and model engagement in the field (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993). Other environmental supports or constraints can encourage or interfere with the development of talent (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993). Overall, research of and within the talent development process remains a fertile field, with questions remaining in various
domains and within each component of the process. Table 1 provides a synopsis of the research related to talent development across content areas or fields.
Table 1

Synopsis of the Research on Talent Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talent Development Strand</th>
<th>Literature or Research Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Abilities or Gifts</td>
<td>Terman (as cited by Colangelo &amp; Davis, 1997)</td>
<td>Lewis Terman’s longitudinal study demonstrated that gifted children, defined as children identified with high intelligence scores on a standardized test, are emotionally stable as a group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Catalysts</td>
<td>Csikszentmihalyi et al. (1993)</td>
<td>Individuals must be engaged in their area of talent or perceive the rewards of the talent area to sustain the development of their abilities. Personality traits that support sustained concentration and focus of time in talent area lead to productivity and achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

Synopsis of the Research on Talent Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Catalysts</th>
<th>Terman (as cited by Subotnik &amp; Arnold, 1994)</th>
<th>Lewis Terman’s study suggests that personality and motivation are related to achievement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Catalysts</td>
<td>Bloom (1985)</td>
<td>Teachers and family support are important in the talent development process. Early performance and achievement opportunities are important in further development of abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Csikszentmihalyi et al. (1993)</td>
<td>An individual’s talent area needs to be recognized by their context or culture to enable access and commitment to the talent area. Adolescents in environments that do not burden them with requirements such as family chores or a part time job were able to spend more time developing abilities in talent area. Adolescents identified as talented like teachers who are supportive and model engagement in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Synopsis of the Research on Talent Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Catalysts</th>
<th>Hollingworth (as cited by Morelock &amp; Feldman, 1997)</th>
<th>Early identification of natural abilities and early programming to develop talent is important. Classes and programs designed for children of average intelligence are insufficient.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley (as cited by Assouline &amp; Lupkowski-Shoplik, 1997)</td>
<td>Above-level standardized achievement tests can be used to identify students who demonstrate precocious ability in a specific academic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lubinski &amp; Benbow (1994)</td>
<td>Students who are identified as talented in a domain using off-level standardized tests benefit from accelerated programs in their area of talent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feldhusen &amp; Goh (1995)</td>
<td>Creativity, as defined by Torrance, can be taught and enhanced through structured programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Talent development in the arts.

Factors that support the development of talent in the artistic domains vary according to talent area (i.e., visual or performing arts), with more research focusing on talent in visual arts and music than on the domains of dance/movement and theater. Studies of talented individuals and their peers and families suggest that both parents and peers play an important and positive role in talent development in the arts (Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Davidson & Scripp, 1994; Freeman, 2000; Patrick, Ryan, Alfeld-Liro, Fredricks, Hruda, & Eccles, 1999). The amount of time spent working within the area of talent to improve musical performance is also well-supported (Davidson, Howe, Moore, and Sloboda, 1996; Ericcson & Charness, 1994; Ericsson, Krampe, Tesch-Romer, 1993). However, the inclination to spend large amounts of time seems to be dependent upon several interpersonal and contextual factors (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Evans, Bickel, & Pendarvis, 2000; Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1976; Zimmerman, 1995).

School-based activities, individual instruction, and special programs for talent development in the arts tend to be successful in providing students with training in their talent area (Adams, 1992; Clark & Zimmerman, 1988; Freeman, 2000; Kay & Subotnik, 1994; Oreck, Baum, & McCartney, 2000; Renfrow, 1983; Scripp & Davidson, 1994; Wilson & Clark, 2000). Exposure to effective teachers for artistically talented students (Bloom, 1985; Oreck, Baum, & McCartney, 2000; Yeatts, 1980) and support from peers with similar interests (Clark & Zimmerman, 1988; Patrick et al., 1999) tend to be important for developing high levels of talent. Specifically, certain types of teachers may be more effective at certain stages of the talent development process for the arts (Bloom,
1985; Clark & Zimmerman, 1988). However, rules and norms inherent to a specific artistic system might interfere with the development of artistic potential (Kingsbury, 1988; Lakes, 2005; Persson, 2000; Van Rossum, 2004).

A recent longitudinal study that included identification of and services for students suggests that school-based programs may be most important for talented students who lack the financial and emotional support structures (Oreck, Baum, & McCartney, 2000). The sample for this study consisted of artistically talented young people in New York, NY. They were selected from students who currently or had previously participated in an elementary music or dance program, the Young Talent Program (YTP) provided by ArtsConnection. Students in the program were provided with 25 weekly arts classes throughout grades 4-6 and a curriculum that was "challenging and broad in scope" and designed "to give students opportunities to learn a variety of styles and techniques, and to develop their skills in the art form" (Oreck et al., p. 6). The grades 7-9 cohort received instruction on Saturdays and the high school/adult cohort had to support themselves in their artistic studies. The research team used several data collection methods: interviews with students, families, arts instructors, and school teachers; field observations of auditions, lessons, and performances; standardized achievement test scores and grades, when available; progress evaluations in the arts; awards, scholarships, and recognition in students' talent area; and the outcome of auditions and ratings in students' talent area (Oreck et al.).

Findings indicate four obstacles to developing artistic talent: family circumstances, lack of affordable or appropriate instruction, peer resentment and social stigma, and conflict between personal dreams and practical realities (Oreck et al., 2000).
Similar factors were identified to enable overcoming obstacles: family support, instructional opportunities, community and school support, and innate personal characteristics and psychological variables. This study suggests that school-based instruction in the arts for students identified for their artistic potential can play a key role in the lives of such students when they lack family resources to provide access to private arts instruction, as was the case for the grades 7-9 cohort (Oreck et al.). Another related study to identify and serve potentially talented elementary students in dance and percussion resulted in a process to identify potential talent in these areas as well as in a program that addressed areas often not addressed by gifted education (Kay & Subotnik, 1994).

Two longitudinal studies of musical giftedness explored differences between extraordinary and ordinary musical performance in young children (Davidson & Scripp, 1994) and the impact of music reading skills on the musical development of conservatory students (Scripp & Davidson, 1994). The study of young children used a developmental perspective that described the development of abilities within an individual, the conditions of support that enable the development of the ability, and the context of the culture (Davidson & Scripp, 1994). Focusing on the precocious ability of one young child to accurately sing tonal melodies, the researchers identify the rich musical environment surrounding the child, the engagement of the child in perceiving and reflecting on musical skills at an early age, and the opportunity to compare herself to peers contributed to this child’s recognition and understanding of her musical ability, as well as to the development of this ability (Davidson & Scripp, 1994).
The second longitudinal study of conservatory students investigated the relationship between *sightplaying*, defined as “unaccompanied sightreading with an instrument”, and *sightsinging*, defined as “unaccompanied sightreading without an instrument” (Scripp & Davidson, 1994, p. 192). Specifically, the researchers sought to understand how musicians’ ability to anticipate sound when reading musical notation develops. Data were collected for the 87 participants at four instances over a two-year period using four comparable versions of a sightreading test modified for vocal range and using familiar notational clefs. Findings suggest that rhythmic accuracy during sightreading is not dependent upon the use of an instrument or not but on internal cognitive representation of the notation (Scripp & Davidson, 1994). Using a case study of one student, the researchers illustrate that the early and natural abilities that are demonstrated through musical performance and understanding are not sufficient for developing the skills and strategies of professional musicians such as sightreading new music. Young gifted musicians need support to connect innate understanding of musical sounds to the musical notation system through opportunities to reflect, question, and analyze notation and their attempts to reproduce indicated sounds (Scripp & Davidson, 1994). Such an approach would help these young musicians progress from “imitation toward independent artistic thinking in their subsequent professional careers” (p. 210).

Adams (1992) attempted to determine whether first year middle school drama students in a talented magnet program were able to demonstrate a more believable characterization in a scene study project with an introduction to some basic directing methods as an approach to the studying a scene. The researcher employed a within school experimental design wherein the control group did not receive the intervention in the first
scene study, only during the second scene study, and the experimental group received the intervention during both scene studies. All students completed a pre/post attitude scale regarding acting, self-esteem, and career plans; a criterion assessment on elements of scene performance; a descriptive of student’s approach to scene study; and demographic information (Adams, 1992). The intervention consisted of a theater memory game related to adding motion to aid memory; explicit instruction on breaking scenes up into smaller portions called “beats”; and explicit instructions on blocking or physically planning a scene. All scenes were evaluated by the experimental and control teachers as well as an outside reviewer with experience in the field of theater arts education.

Findings of this small study suggest that the teaching of directing methods improved student understanding of the process of acting and their self-confidence (Adams, 1992). The experimental group with scored higher on their first and second scenes according to both teacher evaluations and the external evaluation. The researcher cautions that at the time of the study there was little research available regarding the method of teaching drama and that scene study is only one piece of developing dramatic abilities (Adams). Further study of acting techniques is needed in addition to replications of Adams’ study with different age levels and in different contexts. Additional research related to the characteristics and skills of effective acting teachers is also needed.

Clark and Zimmerman (1988) interviewed students participating in a summer program in the visual arts about their instructional experiences in school and non-school-based programs. More than half of the students reported receiving instruction outside of school, citing that some of their regular art teachers were not challenging them or that pressure to focus on academic courses interfered with their artistic pursuits. These
students reported that their experiences in the summer program challenged them, provided them with instruction in new techniques, encouraged them to try new perspectives in their approach to looking at and creating art products, and provided them with the opportunity to work with students of similar interests and ability levels.

Two studies in the visual arts have addressed the effect of instruction upon students’ ability to draw or interpret artistic products. Renfrow (1983) used a quasi-experimental design with random assignment of 36 students to one of two programs, the control group receiving the regular instruction and the experimental group receiving instruction in perception and drawing. Findings indicate a significant difference between the two groups with a significant interaction between age and the treatment incorporating instruction in perception. These findings suggest that younger students may be more open to specific instruction in drawing and the researcher proposes earlier programs to improve the drawing ability of students (Renfrow, 1983).

Wilson and Clark (2000) studied middle school arts students in art classes with limited prior experience in art appreciation. The purpose of the study was to observe Clark’s Looking and Talking About Art (LATA) method to establish a formal analysis of LATA as an instructional method. Such a method provides opportunities for developing perceptual skills of potentially talented art students and increasing their understanding of art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. These knowledge and skills form the foundation of developing studio art techniques and artistic products (Wilson & Clark).

Data collection included video- and audio-tapes during each of six class sessions, interviews with students and the teacher, and interviews with Clark as the instructor for the LATA method (Wilson & Clark, 2000). Results indicate that a problem-solving
approach using self-expression such as the LATA helped students improve their individual abilities to respond to works of art (Zimmerman, 2004). Findings indicate that successful pedagogical strategies focused on questioning of students to guide the discussion or to model building off of another student’s answer, as well as modeling acceptance of student responses to encourage continuing participation (Wilson & Clark, 2000). Clark also demonstrated several strategies for using artworks to guide discussion such as focusing on one image, comparing and contrasting two images, focusing discussion on one part of an image, and comparing one image with several others (Wilson & Clark).

Freeman (2000) studied children potentially talented in music and the visual arts in non-magnet or arts-focused elementary schools in England. The purpose of the study was to investigate what factors inhibited or enhanced their talent development, indirectly examining the effect of an exposure to a school-based arts program. Freeman’s definition of artistic talent emphasized “development of natural ability to a very high, recognized standard obtained by a few” (Freeman, 2000, p. 98). The sample consisted of a group of students identified as exceptionally talented by experts in music and the visual arts, with 12 students in each domain, and a control group, all aged 8-11. Each artistically talented student was matched with 2 control students in the same school class on age, gender, socio-economic status, and general intelligence. Each student completed personality tests, intelligence tests, verbal fluency tests, and a personal interest questionnaire. Participants also completed an individually administered measure of aesthetic perception created by the researcher. Parent interviews, teacher questionnaires about student behavior, interviews with school administrators, and an assessment of participants’ homes for
aesthetic content completed the data collection (Freeman, 2000). Findings suggest that having a home with an aesthetically or artistically rich environment is more important than school exposure (Freeman, 2000). The author does admit that the sample selected for this study may be limited by the bias of experts in a field that may recognize conformity to standards within a field (i.e., vocal tone, drawing style) rather than creative approaches to artistic ability (Freeman, 2000). Lingering questions remain as to what school-based interventions might lead to artistic talent despite a non-artistic home environment, as well as the benefits of school-based artistic programs in general.

Interpersonal traits and skills also seem to mediate the development of high levels of talent (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1976; Zimmerman, 1995). The ability to persist within an area of interest (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993) and to understand and work within a domain from a creative perspective (Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1976) contributes to the development within a talent area. And individual experiences within the domain may also contribute to sustained interest and fulfillment (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Freeman, 1999).

As discussed above, Csikszentmihalyi et al. (1993) studied the factors that impact the perseverance of talented teenagers in the fields of math, science, and music. The successful students involved in this study had personality traits that support sustained concentration, habits that support talent development, such as choosing to spend less time on unproductive activities, or were in environments that allowed them to focus more time on their talent area (i.e., did not have to work for family financial security, had fewer family chores). Freeman (1999) looked at the individual experiences of musically talented boys, specifically addressing the crystallizing experience that is common among
the musically precocious. Findings from this study suggest that such an experience has a long-term effect on self-concept by improving self-concept and self-efficacy. However, these students still need the support of parents and teachers, and they need to be connected to the appropriate media or instrument (Freeman, 1999), a component that relies upon some informed person in their experience recognizing the goodness of fit between the student and their instrument.

In a longitudinal study of students in a post-secondary art school (i.e., visual arts), Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi (1976) compared the creative process of students majoring in applied art with students majoring in fine art. Their findings suggest that the students differ in their approach to the creative process with fine art students incorporating an approach to problem-solving that first focused on problem-finding within the creative process. This study also suggested that personality traits of individual artists contributed to their success in the problem-finding process, and thus to their success as a professional artist (Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi).

Zimmerman (1995) examined the factors that influenced artistically talented girls in a qualitative study. The findings suggest that young female artists are influenced by cultural stereotypes, their own awareness of abilities in the visual arts, and the conflict between the practical realities of supporting themselves with a career in the arts and their aspirations to be professional artists. The researcher suggests that female artists should be encouraged to “be independent, have a mission in their lives, develop strong senses of identity and self-esteem, and achieve in contexts free of stereotypes or negative influences” (Zimmerman, 2004, p. xxix), clearly emphasizing the development of interpersonal skills and characteristics as part of the talent development process.
The research on talent development in the arts suggests that several factors contribute to the development of talent (See Table 2). The family or home environment can serve as an early introduction to the arts or a specific arts area (Davidson & Scripp, 1994; Freeman, 2002) and parents can play a role in developing talent by helping students choose or connect with the appropriate instrument or arts area (Freeman, 1999), echoing other studies of talent development across multiple domains (Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi, 1976). Certain interpersonal characteristics such as interest in a particular area and the ability to focus time and attention to a talent area (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1976) contribute to productivity and achievement in a field. These findings reflect the research in general development of talent that personality and motivation contribute to achievement in a field (Terman, as cited by Subotnik & Arnold, 1994). An early crystallizing or inspiring experience in the talent area may contribute to a positive self-concept and continued study of the field (Freeman, 1999) and the skills of identifying problems within production of a work in visual arts also contribute to sustained interest and development of talent.

Several studies indicate that instruction contributes to the development of talent in the arts (Adams, 1992; Clark & Zimmerman, 1988; Freeman, 2000; Kay & Subotnik, 1994; Oreck, Baum, & McCartney, 2000; Renfrow, 1983; Wilson & Clark, 2000; Zimmerman, 2004). Instruction within a domain but related indirectly to specific skills may enhance students’ understanding of their abilities and the domain (Adams, 2002; Clark & Zimmerman, 1988). Instruction of specific skills can improve students’ abilities to think about (Wilson & Clark, 2000) and work within the visual arts (Renfrow, 1983),
with earlier instruction tending to be more beneficial (Renfrow). Instructional strategies that support problem-solving in the visual arts include questioning to guide discussion, modeling of building off others’ ideas, openness to student responses, comparing and contrasting images, focusing discussion on part of an image, and comparing multiple examples of art (Wilson & Clark, 2000). Training in sightreading and sightsinging in music helps students transition from a level of imitation and pure performance to the artistic thinking skills that will be required as professionals (Scripp & Davidson, 1994).

Research on developing talent in various areas specified teachers as playing an important role in the talent development process by providing training in the talent area (Bloom, 1985) or by encouraging talent or modeling engagement in the talent area (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993). Teachers that provide challenging instruction and exposure to new techniques in a domain help students broaden their understanding of their talent (Clark & Zimmerman, 1988). Teachers can also help students apply their innate talents appropriately within a field (Freeman, 1999).

To what extent are interpersonal traits and skills included in the instructional process? To what extent do performing arts teachers believe that they are responsible for developing these traits and skills in addition to ability within an artistic domain? The next section will examine the literature and research related to effective teachers in the field of gifted education and in the development of talent in the performing arts.
Table 2

**Synopsis of the Research on Talent Development in the Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Literature or Research</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors that support the</td>
<td>Oreck, Baum, &amp;</td>
<td>Findings indicate four factors that help individuals overcome obstacles to develop talent: family support, instructional opportunities, community and school support, and innate personal characteristics. School-based instruction can support development of talent, especially when students lack family resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of talent</td>
<td>McCartney (2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that support the</td>
<td>Adams (2002)</td>
<td>This small study suggests that teaching directing methods can improve student self-confidence and their understanding of the process of acting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of talent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Clark &amp; Zimmerman (1988)</td>
<td>Students participating in a summer program in the visual arts indicated that their experiences in the summer program were challenging, provided them instruction in new techniques, and encouraged new perspectives in their approach to looking at and creating art products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 (continued)

*Synopsis of the Research on Talent Development in the Arts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors that support the</td>
<td>Renfrow (1983)</td>
<td>A quasi-experimental study with the experimental group receiving instruction in perception and drawing. Findings were significant with an interaction between student age and the experimental treatment. The researcher concludes that younger students may be more open to specific instruction in drawing than older students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of talent:</td>
<td>Wilson &amp; Clark (2000)</td>
<td>A study of middle school students in visual arts classes with limited prior experience in art appreciation. Findings suggest that a problem-solving approach using a specific instructional method improve students' abilities to respond to works of art. The instructional method included questioning to guide discussion, modeling of building off others' ideas, openness to student responses, comparing and contrasting images, focusing discussion on part of an image, and comparing multiple examples of art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Zimmerman (2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Synopsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that support the development of talent: Instruction</td>
<td>Scripp &amp; Davidson (1994)</td>
<td>Findings suggest that young gifted musicians need support to connect innate understanding of musical sounds to the musical notation system through opportunities to reflect, question, and analyze notation and their attempts to reproduce indicated sounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that support the development of talent: Home, Family</td>
<td>Freeman (20002)</td>
<td>A study of children potentially talented in music and visual arts suggests that a home environment is influential in talent development. Musically talented boys who described a crystallizing experience in their talent area still needed the support of a parent or teacher to connect them to the appropriate media or instrument in their talent area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davidson &amp; Scripp (1994)</td>
<td>Focusing on the precocious ability of one young child to accurately sing tonal melodies, the researchers identify the rich musical environment and the engagement of the child in perceiving and reflecting on musical skills at an early age as contributing to this child’s musical ability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

**Synopsis of the Research on Talent Development in the Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors that support the</td>
<td>Clark &amp; Zimmerman</td>
<td>Talented visual arts students participating in a summer program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of talent:</td>
<td>(1988)</td>
<td>provided them with the opportunity to work with peers of similar interests and ability levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that support the</td>
<td>Freeman (1999)</td>
<td>Musically talented boys who described a crystallizing experience in their talent area still needed the support of a parent or teacher to connect them to the appropriate media or instrument in their talent area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of talent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (continued)

**Synopsis of the Research on Talent Development in the Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Factors:</td>
<td>Csikszentmihalyi et al., (1993)</td>
<td>Personality traits that support sustained concentration and focus of time in talent area lead to productivity and achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Characteristics</td>
<td>Freeman (1999)</td>
<td>Crystallizing experiences in musically talented boys may have long-term effects on self-concept and self-efficacy within the talent area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getzels &amp; Csikszentmihalyi (1976)</td>
<td>This study compared the creative process of students majoring either in applied art or fine art. Findings suggest that students in the two majors differ in their approach to the creative process and in interpersonal characteristics such as persistence. Fine art majors incorporated a problem-finding approach and devoted a lot of time and interest to their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimmerman (1995)</td>
<td>The author emphasizes the development of interpersonal skills and characteristics as part of the talent development process in the context of a study of factors that influence talented girls in the visual arts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (continued)

**Synopsis of the Research on Talent Development in the Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors that may inhibit the development of talent</td>
<td>Oreck, Baum, &amp; McCartney (2000)</td>
<td>Findings indicate four obstacles to developing artistic talent: family circumstances, lack of affordable or appropriate instruction, peer resentment and social stigma, and conflict between personal dreams and reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark &amp; Zimmerman (1988)</td>
<td>Students participating in a summer program in the visual arts indicated that pressure to focus on academics interfered with their artistic pursuits. Students also reported that their school-based visual arts teachers were not challenging them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimmerman (1995)</td>
<td>Talented girls in the visual arts are influenced by cultural stereotypes, their own awareness of their abilities, and the conflict between their aspirations to be a professional artist and the practicality of having to support themselves with a career in the arts. The author emphasizes the development of interpersonal skills and characteristics as part of the talent development process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Effective Teaching

*Characteristics and skills of effective teachers in general education.*

The recent trend in educational research is to describe and develop characteristics and skills of effective teachers to improve student achievement (Harris, 1998; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, & James, 2002; Stronge, 2002; Walls, Nardi, von Minden, & Hoffman, 2002). Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, and James (2002) surveyed preservice teachers regarding their perceptions of effective teachers' characteristics. Respondents believed that many characteristics reflected effective teaching, including a student-centered philosophy, effective classroom and behavior management, competent instructor, ethical, enthusiasm for teaching, knowledgeable about subject, and professionalism. Walls, Nardi, von Minden, and Hoffman (2002) investigated the perceptions of novice student teachers, post-student teaching beginning teachers, and experienced teachers regarding the characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers. Themes emerging from respondents' descriptions were: the ability to create an appropriate emotional environment, skill in creating an effective learning environment, teacher motivation, emphasis on activities that actively involve students, and classroom techniques and grading.

Harris (1998) provided a review of the literature on effective teaching, focusing on pedagogy, management, and organization as aspects of teaching. This review found that effective teaching is dependent upon the nature of educational outcomes and goals; requires certain qualities, skills, and behaviors; includes knowledge and use of a variety of teaching styles; and is linked to reflective practice, inquiry, and ongoing professional development.
In a review of decades of research on effective teachers, Stronge (2002) identified common behaviors and backgrounds of effective teachers when effectiveness is related to student achievement and other important, but hard to measure, educational outcomes. This review identifies several key factors that contribute to a teacher’s effectiveness using the following categories: a) teacher background and professional preparation, b) the teacher as a person, c) management and organizational skills, d) organizing for instruction, e) implementing instruction, and f) monitoring student progress and learning.

In the category of teacher background and professional preparation, formal experiences in content-related pedagogy or a greater number of methods courses appear to relate to student achievement and the type of learning experiences provided to students, such as conceptual and hands-on learning (Stronge, 2002). There also seems to be a positive relationship between a teacher’s score on a verbal ability test and scores on basic skills test and student achievement on academic measures. High levels of content-area knowledge also relates positively to improved student achievement and might influence the types of instructional strategies incorporated in the classroom, such as higher-level questioning, student involvement, and student-directed activities. Additionally, teachers with several years of experience tend to employ a wider range of teaching strategies, are more organized for instruction, and use activities that are more differentiated (Stronge, 2002).

In the category of the teacher as a person, several main areas are positively related to student achievement (Stronge, 2002). Effective teachers care about their students, recognize their students as individuals, and treat students with fairness and respect. Effective teachers also demonstrate a good sense of humor and enthusiasm for teaching.
and learning. These teachers work with students to plan instruction, make decisions, and incorporate reflection upon their work to improve the process of teaching and learning (Stronge, 2002).

Finally, effective teachers demonstrate certain behaviors in the classroom that relate positively to student achievement (Stronge, 2002). These teachers use routines effectively to manage the classroom environment, are proactive in the approach to discipline, and make the most of instructional time through their organization of materials and the environment. Effective teachers are also clearly focused on instruction in their use of time and resources, their use of instructional activities, their focus on student learning, and their communication of high expectations for their students. Specifically, in terms of behaviors related to instruction, effective teachers clearly identify and link learning objectives to instructional activities, use a range of instructional strategies as they appropriately relate to the learning objective and students, incorporate a variety of levels of questions, and aim to maximize student engagement in instruction and the learning process (Stronge, 2002).

The literature and research seems to focus on the characteristics, skills, and behaviors of effective teachers. Characteristics of effective teachers include highly motivated and enthusiastic (Minor et al., 2002; Walls et al., 2002), ethical (Minor et al.), well-prepared for teaching in terms of content-knowledge and pedagogical knowledge (Minor et al.; Stronge, 2002), more experienced, caring, reflective, and recognize students as individuals (Stronge, 2002). Skills of effective teachers include classroom and behavior management (Minor et al.; Stronge), the ability to maximize the use of instructional time with a variety of instructional methods (Harris, 1998; Stronge, 2002),
and the ability to create a supportive emotional environment and effective learning environment (Walls et al.). The behaviors of effective teachers are focused on instruction (Minor et al.; Stronge; Walls et al.), involve reflective practice and inquiry (Harris; Minor et al.), and involve students in the teaching and learning process (Stronge; Walls et al.). Table 3 provides a synopsis of the sources reviewing teacher effectiveness in general education.
### Table 3

**Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Effective Teachers in General Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor, Onwuegbuzie, &amp; Witcher (2002)</td>
<td>A survey of preservice teachers on their perceptions of characteristics of effective teachers resulted in a range of characteristics such as having a student-centered philosophy, classroom and behavior management success, being a competent instructor, ethical, enthusiasm for teaching, knowledgeable about subject area, and professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls, Nardi, &amp; von Minden (2002)</td>
<td>Perceptions of novice teachers, beginning teachers, and experienced teachers identified several characteristics and skills as important to effective teaching, including able to create an appropriate emotional and learning environment, teacher motivation, student-involvement, and classroom techniques and grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (1998)</td>
<td>Review of the literature on effective teaching focused on pedagogy, classroom management, and teacher organization suggests that effective teaching is dependent upon educational outcomes and goals, requires certain skills and behaviors such as the knowledge and use of a variety of teaching styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronge (2002)</td>
<td>A review of research on teacher effectiveness categorizes qualities of effective teachers in terms of teacher background and preparation, the teacher as a person, management and organizational skills of effective teaching, organizing and implementing instruction, and monitoring student progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Effective teachers for gifted and talented learners.

Many in the field of gifted education have written about the characteristics and skills that make certain teachers effective with gifted learners (Buttermore, 1979; Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002; Feldhusen, 1985, 1997; Ford & Trotman, 2001; Heath, 1997; Joffe, 2001; Maker, 1975; Nelson & Prindle, 1992; Rejskind, 2000; Rogers, 1989; Seeley, 1979; Sisk, 1975; Starko & Schack, 1989; Story, 1985; Westberg & Archambault, 1997; Whitlock & Ducette, 1989). Characteristics of teachers effective with high-ability students often include: a) flexibility (Buttermore, 1979; Maker, 1975; Story, 1985) or willingness to embrace change or collaborate to plan instruction (Westberg & Archambault, 1997); b) high expectations (Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002); c) creativity (Buttermore, 1979; Chan, 2001; Maker, 1975; Rejskind, 2000; Starko & Schack, 1989); d) encouraging (Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002); e) a developed self-concept (Buttermore, 1979; Heath, 1997; Story, 1985; Whitlock & Ducette, 1989); f) deep and broad general knowledge (Buttermore, 1979; Story, 1985) or high intelligence (Heath, 1997; maker, 1975); g) a broad sense of humor (Story, 1985; Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002); h) advanced knowledge of their teaching area (Westberg & Archambault, 1997); i) advanced training in their area (Westberg & Archambault, 1997); j) a recognition of individual differences (Buttermore, 1979; Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002); and k) enthusiasm for teaching (Heath, 1997; Whitlock & Ducette, 1989).

Skills of effective teachers of high-ability students include: a) the ability to adapt and differentiate instruction (Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; Nelson & Prindle, 1992;
Westberg & Archambault, 1997; Whitlock & DuCette, 1989) and b) the ability to create a positive and secure classroom environment (Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002; Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994). Other literature suggests that effective teachers excel with supportive administrative leadership and the autonomy to implement new curricular and instructional practices (Westberg & Archambault, 1997).

Buttermore (1979) identified several characteristics of effective teachers of the gifted, including flexibility, knowledgeable, accepting of student ideas and behaviors, and having a well-developed self-concept to face the prospect of students having greater intellectual abilities than the teacher. Maker (1975) reviewed the literature and identified specific traits as significant, including high intelligence, imaginative, respectful of individual talents, and an ability to relate to gifted learners.

Story (1985) studied the behavior of six teachers nominated as successful with gifted learners. Findings from this study suggest that these teachers used a variety of instructional resources, emphasized independent study, incorporated higher-level thinking skills, and were flexible in their use of classroom time and activities (Story). Another study asked regular, gifted, and preservice teachers to evaluate specific teaching strategies and their ability to meet the needs of gifted learners (Starko & Schack, 1989). Gifted education teachers indicated the strongest need for teachers to know and use strategies related to higher-level thinking skills, eliminating previously learned content, grouping for instruction, independent study, and creativity (Starko & Schack). Interviews with teachers defined as excellent and average teachers of the gifted resulted in specific characteristics shared by the teachers identified as "excellent": a) enthusiastic, b) self-confident, c) motivated to achieve, d) committed to working with gifted learners, e)
instructional application of theories of learning, and f) the ability to garner support for
gifted programs.

A survey of teachers and administrators has also been used to identify
competencies of teachers for gifted learners (Nelson & Prindle, 1992). Areas identified as
important include promoting thinking skills, development of creative problem-solving
abilities, selecting appropriate methods and materials, knowledge of affective needs of
gifted learners, and facilitation of independent research.

A review of the literature on the personal characteristics, professional
characteristics, and teaching strategies of effective teachers with gifted students notes the
limited research linking teacher characteristics and skills with student outcomes (Heath,
1997). This review also indicated a lack of studies that included teachers as participants
to rate other teachers of the gifted or to identify the characteristics that create effective
teachers of the gifted (Heath, 1997). Many of the studies and writings by experts in the
field included in the review by Heath (1997) were published prior to the recent shift in
the field from defining giftedness to providing for talent development. Most descriptions
of these effective teachers focus on gifted learners within a definition of giftedness as
general intellectual or academic ability (Chan, 2001; Heath, 1997; Rogers, 1989; Story,
1985; Zimmerman, 2004). A review of British research on effective teaching suggests
that effective teachers are empathetic to the needs of gifted learners, create a secure
classroom environment, have high expectations for learners, and use encouragement,
humor, and fun in their teaching.

Since Heath’s (1997) review of the literature, a study of characteristics and skills
of teachers of the gifted in Hong Kong asking teachers to rate important teacher
characteristics and behaviors uncovered similar perceptions (Chan, 2001). The highest rated items identified characteristics such as flexibility, imagination, enthusiasm, recognition of individual differences, respect for students’ perspectives and individuality, maturity, self-confidence, broad general knowledge, and the ability to facilitate learning and develop a student’s self-concept.

One study compared teachers with graduate training in gifted education to those without graduate experiences (Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994). Eighty-two teachers were compared on teaching skill and classroom climate using a standardized observation form applied by trained observers. Results indicate that trained teachers demonstrated were more energetic, better able to adjust pacing of instruction, provided a variety of learning experiences, and engaged students in high-level critical thinking. Another study asked gifted students from lower socioeconomic rural and suburban areas to rate preferred teacher characteristics (Abel & Karnes, 1994). Students from the rural areas differed only in their preference for teachers with more personal-social behaviors such as friendliness, enthusiasm, and respect for students.

There is also a strand of research and literature that suggests teacher perception of giftedness may relate to the instructional strategies and services provided to high-ability students (Gagné, 1993; Guskin, Peng, & Majd-Jabbari, 1988; Heath, 1997). A survey of preservice and inservice teachers found that both groups sorted 20 different abilities into five major categories of giftedness that reflect the literature in the field: analytic or cognitive ability, personality and social skills, creative arts, motor skills, and verbal ability (Guskin, Peng, & Majd-Jabbari, 1988). A similar study suggests that peers and teachers’ perceptions of ability are related to gender, with boys perceived as more
talented in physical and technical areas and girls as more talented in the arts and socioaffective areas (Gagné, 1993). Further investigations need to explore the extent to which their conceptions relate to daily interactions, judgments, and decisions in the classroom (Gagné, 1993; Guskin et al., 1988).

Building on the understanding of perceptions in instructional planning and delivery, Ford and Trotman (2001) developed a list of characteristics of effective teachers with gifted learners from culturally, ethnically, or linguistically diverse populations. This list, reflecting the gifted education and multicultural education literature, includes: a) knowledge of the nature and needs of students who are gifted and diverse; b) the ability to develop methods and materials to use with students who are gifted and diverse; c) skills in addressing individual and cultural differences; d) skills in teaching higher level thinking skills and questioning techniques using multicultural resources and materials; e) ability to recognize the strengths of students who are gifted and diverse; f) seek to develop students' sense of self as a gifted individual and a diverse individual; g) skills in counseling students who are gifted and diverse; and h) skills in creating an environment in which diverse gifted students feel challenged and safe to explore and express their uniqueness (Ford & Trotman, 2001).

Effective teachers for gifted learners reflect several factors identified as important for all effective teachers (e.g., Harris, 1998; Minor et al., 2002; Stronge, 2002). These characteristics and skills include: a) the ability to create a positive and secure classroom environment (Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002; Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; Stronge, 2002; Walls et al., 2002); b) enthusiastic and motivated (Heath, 1997; Minor et al., 2002; Walls et al., 2002), c) encouraging (Eyre et al., 2002;
Minor et al.; Walls et al.); d) hold high expectations (Eyre et al., 2002; Stronge, 2002); e)
knowledgeable in general and in their content area (Buttermore, 1979; Story, 1985
Stronge, 2002; Westberg & Archambault, 1997); f) are well-prepared in their content area
and use a variety of instructional strategies (Harris, 1998; Stronge, 2002; Walls et al.,
2002; Westberg & Archambault, 1997); g) have a good sense of humor (Eyre et al., 2002;
Story, 1985; Stronge, 2002); h) recognize individual differences and students as
individuals (Buttermore, 1979; Eyre et al., 2002; Minor et al., 2002; Stronge, 2002; Walls
et al., 2002); i) incorporate differentiated instruction (Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994;
Stronge, 2002; Westberg & Archambault, 1997); j) collaborate to plan instruction
(Stronge, 2002; Westberg & Archambault, 1997); and k) flexibility (Buttermore, 1979;
Story, 1985; Stronge, 2002) or willingness to embrace change (Westberg & Archambault,
1997).

Characteristics and skills that are identified for teachers of gifted learners
specifically are a) a developed self-concept (Buttermore, 1979; Heath, 1997; Story,
1985); b) high intelligence (Heath, 1997); and c) creative or imaginative (Buttermore,
1979; Chan, 2001; Maker, 1975; Rejskind, 2000). The first two differences probably
reflect the tendency of gifted learners to be precocious in ability and development in
comparison to same-age peers (e.g., Colangelo et al., 2004), a characteristic that some
teachers may find challenging if they are not secure in their own abilities or if they do not
identify to some extent with gifted learners. The third difference, teachers as creative,
also reflects the precocity or advanced development of gifted learners and their need to
move beyond the mastery level often associated with achievement measures linked to
teacher effectiveness, as well as their ability to handle complexity and challenge in
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curriculum and instruction (e.g., VanTassel-Baska & Stambaugh, 2006). Recent efforts are in progress to develop knowledge and skill standards for gifted and talented teacher education programs (The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], n. d.). The standards address 10 areas of knowledge and skill reflecting the research on effective teachers for gifted learners, including development and characteristics of learners, instructional strategies, instructional planning, and assessment. Table 4 summarizes the literature on effective teachers of the gifted and talented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buttermore (1979)</td>
<td>A teacher of gifted students needs to be flexible, open to new ideas, sensitive to students’ creativity, understanding and accepting of nontraditional behavior, insightful, knowledgeable, willing to grow as a person, accepting of students’ ideas and work, and needs to have a well-developed self-concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story (1985)</td>
<td>A model of the teacher’s role in gifted education is described using an ethnographic study of patterns of behavior in six teachers nominated for their success in teaching gifted students. These teachers used a variety of resources in teaching, emphasized independent study and self-direction, incorporated higher-level thinking skills, modeled advanced behaviors, and were flexible in their use of classroom time and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldhusen (1997)</td>
<td>This review of research and literature on effective teachers for gifted learners describes characteristics, competencies, and successful performance of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker (1975)</td>
<td>A review of the literature on characteristics of successful teachers of the gifted identified several traits as significant: a) ability to relate to the gifted, b) flexible and open to change, c) high intelligence, d) imaginative, e) respectful of individual talents, f) focuses on individual needs, and g) recognizes need to develop students’ self-concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 (continued)

**Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Effective Teachers in Gifted Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Whitlock & DuCette (1989) | Interviews with ten excellent and ten average teachers of the gifted resulted in several characteristics shared by the excellent teachers:  
  a) enthusiastic, b) self-confident, c) motivated to achieve, d) commitment to working with gifted learners, e) instructional application of theory, and f) able to mobilize support for gifted programs. |
| Nelson & Prindle (1992) | A survey of teachers and administrators resulted in six competencies upon which both groups agreed: a) promotion of thinking skills, development of creative problem-solving, selection of appropriate methods and materials, knowledge of affective needs, facilitation of independent research, awareness of the nature of gifted students. |
| Starko & Schack (1989) | A study asked regular education, gifted education, and preservice teachers to evaluate specific teaching strategies on how they meet the needs of gifted and talented learners. The gifted education teachers indicated the strongest need for strategies related to: a) higher level thinking skills, b) elimination of previously learned material, c) grouping for instruction, d) independent study, and e) creativity. |
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**Table 4 (continued)**

**Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Effective Teachers in Gifted Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abel &amp; Karnes (1994)</td>
<td>Students from rural areas preferred teachers who were more friendly, enthusiastic, and respectful of students’ needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath (1997)</td>
<td>This review of the literature on personal characteristics, professional characteristics, and teaching strategies of effective teachers of the gifted learners describes a limited research base linking teacher characteristics and skills with student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan (2001)</td>
<td>This study had teachers in Hong Kong to rate important teacher characteristics and behaviors. The highest rated items related to teacher flexibility, imagination, enthusiasm, recognition of individual differences, respect for students’ perspectives and individuality, maturity, self-confidence, broad general knowledge, and the ability to facilitate learning and develop a student’s self-concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen &amp; Feldhusen (1994)</td>
<td>A comparative study of teachers with and without graduate training in gifted education suggests that trained teachers were more energetic, more able to adjust pacing of instruction, provided a variety of learning experiences, and engaged students in higher-level critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Effective Teachers in Gifted Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westberg &amp; Archambault</td>
<td>A multi-site case study describes 10 elementary schools that implement differentiated practices to meet the needs of high ability students. Themes emerged related to advanced training and knowledge of the classroom, teacher willingness to embrace change, collaboration to plan for instruction, use of a variety of strategies to differentiate instruction, supportive school leadership, and support for and autonomy to implement new practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guskin, Peng, &amp; Majd-Jabbari (1988)</td>
<td>Preservice and inservice teachers asked to group 20 different abilities described five major categories of giftedness: analytic or cognitive ability, personality and social skills, creative arts, motor skills, and verbal ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagné (1993)</td>
<td>The perceptions of ability of teachers and student peers seem to be related to gender with boys perceived as more talented in physical and technical areas and girls as more talented in the arts and Socioaffective areas. Further research is needed to explore the relationship between teacher perception and instructional decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 (continued)

**Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Effective Teachers in Gifted Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eyre, Coates, et al., (2002)</td>
<td>A review of British research on effective teaching of able students found effective teachers shared similar beliefs about learning, had empathy with the needs of able children, created a secure classroom environment, held high expectations, used encouragement and praise, and stressed humor and fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford &amp; Trotman (2001)</td>
<td>The authors describe characteristics of effective teachers of gifted learners from diverse populations related to nature and needs of these learners, use of methods and materials with these learners, skills in addressing individual and cultural differences, use of higher level thinking skills and questioning techniques using multicultural resources and materials, recognition of individual strengths, affective strategies for these learners, and creating a learning environment in which students feel comfortable exploring and expressing their individuality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Effective Teachers in Gifted Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCATE (n. d.)</td>
<td>The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) are developing knowledge and skill standards for gifted and talented teacher education programs. The standards address 10 areas of knowledge and skill: a) foundations of gifted education, b) development and characteristics of learners, c) individual learning differences, d) instructional strategies, e) learning environments and social interactions, f) language and communication, g) instructional planning, h) assessment, i) professional and ethical practice, and j) collaboration. An annotated bibliography is being developed to support each standard with citations from relevant theory, research, and practice-based resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective teachers for artistically gifted and talented learners.

What makes an effective teacher to develop the abilities of students who are gifted and talented in the arts? Several studies in the visual and performing arts suggest that teacher knowledge within the talent area (Bloom, 1985; Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; Sosniak, 1985; Sloane & Sosniak, 1985; Zimmerman, 1988, 1997) and teacher knowledge of the talent development process (Bloom, 1985; Yeatts, 1980; Zimmerman, 1992) are important to the development of high levels of ability. Within the performing arts, the research literature related to music provides the richest insight into the domain and the talent development process (Bloom, 1985; Evans, Bickel, & Pendarvis, 2000). Several studies in dance have been identified as relevant to the study of the teacher’s role in talent development in dance (Chen & Cone, 2003; Lakes, 2005; Oseroff-Varnell, 1988; Van Rossum, 2004). The research base for training in theater is scant.

Bloom’s (1985) study of talent development identified three types of teachers central to the process of developing high levels of talent across the artistic, athletic, and cognitive domains. The first stage of talent development, or early exposure, requires support and encouragement, rather than skill development. In this stage, teachers are generally chosen based on proximity and availability and are recognized for making the initial experiences rewarding. The second stage begins with a search for a new teacher, usually a teacher with more expertise and higher qualifications. These teachers tend to hold higher expectations and demand more attention and commitment from the students in their area of study. For the concert pianists, technical proficiency, musicality, and understanding of composers and composition were emphasized by the teachers included in Bloom’s (1985) study. The third stage of talent development begins with seeking out
and applying to a master teacher in the chosen field. Master teachers are even more
selective about the students they choose to work with them than the teachers in the
second stage. The role of the master teacher for the pianists in this study was to identify
imperfections in the musician's performance and help them through difficulties. A
majority of the time of the musician was spent preparing for the session with the master
teacher, developing an individual style, perfecting performance skills, and developing a
depth of understanding of their domain and repertoire.

Clark and Zimmerman (1988) interviewed students talented in the visual arts
about their perceptions of their early talent and talent development experiences, and then
compared their findings with previous studies (i.e., Bloom, 1985; Getzels &
Csikszentmihalyi, 1976). The students in this study identified having positive school
experiences but identifying three types of school-based arts teachers: a) those that were
supportive but not challenging in their domain, b) those that were challenging but not
emotionally supportive, and c) those that were challenging but who did not offer advice
and instruction on how to succeed and improve as an artist. The teachers that the students
encountered in a summer art program were perceived as more challenging, providing
students with new skills and the ability to examine their work more accurately. The
summer program teachers also helped students examine new perspectives and
emphasized the link between new skills and expression as an artist (Clark & Zimmerman,
1988).

Zimmerman (1992) also compared two teachers of talented students in the visual
arts using several different methods and content analysis of themes. Both teachers in the
study stressed acquiring skills and techniques, thinking reflectively about the context in
which they created their art, art issues, and reasons for creating art. The researcher suggests that successful teachers of talented students in the visual arts should understand each student’s sensibilities, teach proactively, present mediated learning experiences in which students can be engaged in the world or art, reflect critically about their teaching, and have preparatory experiences in learning how to organize classes and teach highly able adolescent art students (Zimmerman, 1992).

While some argue a distinct difference between the visual and performing arts in terms of the demands placed upon the artist (Haroutounian, 2000; Zimmerman, 2004), these studies highlight the differences between the educational opportunities of the regular school-based art program and a special program for students identified as gifted or talented in the visual arts (Clark & Zimmerman, 1988; Zimmerman, 1992). Specifically, the students noted the differences in the instructional and interpersonal behaviors of their teachers in the two settings, qualities of effective teachers that are addressed multiple times in research (e.g., Stronge, 2002; Walls et al., 2002). These studies also highlight important characteristics and skills possessed by effective teachers in the domain of the visual arts: knowledgeable and highly skilled in their area, able to help students make connections between skill and expression, and supportive of individual students.

Teachers’ perceptions of students and the nature of their abilities might influence the instructional strategies they provide for their students. Evans, Bickel, and Pendarvis (2000) compared the perceptions of students, parents, and teachers about the student’s musical talent. The sample was drawn from fine arts summer program of 4,000 students, from which 260 were chosen to participate in a more prestigious and advanced program.
for orchestra, band, choir, and jazz band, and most of the participants were white and from middle to high socio-economic status backgrounds. A secondary analysis of the 21-item instrument used in the study was performed to discern attributions to account for musical development and to look for patterns among the three subsets of respondents. The response rate ranged from 34% for teachers to 47% and 48% for parents and students, respectively, and limits interpretations of the findings. Factor analysis was used to create three “ideal types” based on responses of three samples and using current statistical theory for making appropriate decisions about factor selection and organization in regard to sample size (e.g., Grimm & Yarnold, 1995).

The results indicate that the students in the sample attribute their success to innate ability and hard work, and experience limited or discouraging support from family and friends. Their parents report that their students have ordinary ability but have achieved in music due to encouragement from family and friends. The students’ teachers attribute students’ musical development to innate talent, hard work, and schooling, thereby recognizing the complex interaction of ability, motivation, and environment (Evans et al.). Teachers who perceive student motivation as limited or lacking may respond differently and provide different instruction than for students perceived as highly motivated.

Professional artists are often described as ideal teachers for potentially talented students in the arts because they have the content knowledge and skill level necessary for success in their field (Clarke & Gipe, 1989; Piirto, 1994; Yeatts, 1980). One study of 202 artist/teachers and their psychological characteristics described their sample as “creative, confident about their abilities as teachers, highly intuitive, judgmental, evenly introverted
and extroverted, and somewhat less internally directed than expected” (Clarke & Gipe, Abstract). The study demonstrated that many in the sample hold advanced degrees or had advanced professional training in their field but that few had received training related to pedagogy and instruction within their field. Another study, a small case study of an Artist-Teacher in a special program for academically gifted students, resulted in recommendations for special certification for artist-teachers who have much experience and content area knowledge to share but often lack the formal credentials of professional educators (Yeatts, 1980).

Other professionals and researchers question the use of artist-teachers as instructors for talented students. Lakes (2005) describes the pedagogical traditions within Western concert dance training as authoritarian and damaging to the self-concepts and personal spirits of the dancers involved. This style of pedagogy has been passed down through generations without questions from those involved or from those outside the dance studio (Lakes, 2005). Robson, Book, and Wimerding (2000) conducted a survey of dance teachers exploring the psychological stresses they face and their attempts to improve upon the pedagogical legacy they might have experienced in their training. The results found that over 78% of the respondents perceived that they had experienced unjust criticism during their own training and that over half had then used these experiences to be more supportive of their students. The respondents, as potential role models to their students, also reported the types of behaviors they exercised or avoided in the presence of their students, such as staying hydrated, completing warm-ups and stretches, and smoking. Respondents also indicated the factors which caused them the greatest amount
of stress: unmotivated students, lack of instructional time, and lack of administrative support.

Studies in the training of highly talented students in dance address the role of the dance teacher. Van Rossum (2004) investigated the dimensions of dance teacher behavior using an adapted version of the Leadership Scale for Sports administered to students and teachers within a professional training program. Teachers were also asked to rate daily class behaviors of themselves as teachers and students were asked to rate their current dance teacher. Results indicate many similarities in the characteristics of the ideal teacher as perceived by students and teachers. The ideal dance teacher was described as knowledgeable, especially in regards to how to best teach and train students for a professional career. The ideal dance teacher also provides positive feedback consistently. Large differences were found between students and teachers in their perceptions daily class activities related to structure of the class and motivation or inspiration caused by the dance class experience (Van Rossum). This study also did not support the image of the authoritarian dance teacher with unrealistic expectations.

Two studies of the musical conservatory setting and the development of musical talent within a framework of Western art music also address artist-teachers and perceptions of teachers and students (Kingsbury, 1988; Persson, 2000). Kingsbury’s study focused on the context of the conservatory while Persson looked at the master-apprentice relationship between teacher and student in the conservatory setting. Kingsbury defined talent as “a representation of differentials of potential for certain socially valued behavior, differentials that are believed to be ordained not in social order but rather by the inherent nature of people” (1988, p. 63). The pronouncement of
someone as talented is based on a demonstration of their talent through performance and
the validity of the pronouncement is determined by the status of the adjudicator, the
maestro.

Persson (2000) states that conservatory music teachers do not “differentiate
instruction on an individual basis” but that they base their instruction on “historical
tradition, more or less exclusively from his or her individual learning style, preferences,
and personal experience” (¶3). This is especially true at the postsecondary level where
master teachers are chosen on the basis of their performance skills rather than ability to
teach (Persson, 2000). Persson’s study compared the personality characteristics inventory
completed by a master performer and some of his students about the professor; findings
indicate that students perceived the professor differently from the way in which he saw
himself. With a tradition historical performance or authenticity as the dominant Western
classical music ideology, conservatory settings may not be open to “creative
performances” and may not represent a complete picture of developing musical talent

A study of the socialization process of new students in a residential high school
for the performing arts identified aspects of the hidden curriculum, or the context, that
students experience during their transition (Oseroff-Varnell, 1998). The researcher used
observations, interviews, and school documents to understand how communication in a
residential performing arts school could assist students as they became acclimated to their
new setting. Four aspects of the hidden curriculum are described as “a tension or dialectic
between bipolar dimensions”: control vs. freedom; inclusion vs. exclusion; student voice
vs. teacher voice; and collectivism vs. individualism (Oseroff-Varnell, p. 108). The third
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aspect of the hidden curriculum, student voice vs. teacher voice, indicated that the teacher
voice dominated the performance classes but that there was more of a balance in the
academic classes attended by dance students.

The literature related to the role of the teacher and instruction in theater is limited. Piirto (1994) describes two main styles of acting and acting pedagogy: "Method" and "English". Strasburg (1996) clearly describes what has become known as the Method or the System. Based on the work of the Russian director, Stanislavsky, and further developed in America by The Group Theater in the 1920s, the Method focuses on creating an emotionally realistic performance within and through the actor (Strasburg, 1996). Talent within this style required hard work and discipline and commitment to “absolute psychological identification with the character being portrayed and that this identification is at least as important as mastery of voice projection or body movement” (Microsoft® Encarta® Online Encyclopedia [MEOE], 2005). This style has evolved into a style sometimes referred to as Naturalism (MEOE) and viewed as less extreme than the Method style. Another style of acting is Epic acting, fostered by Bertolt Brecht (MEOE). Brecht viewed theater as a medium for social change and aimed to engage audiences intellectually with the content or focus of a play (MEOE).

Stella Adler developed another strategy derived from the Method approach (Rotté, 2000). Adler developed the concept of studying acting techniques in a studio setting prior to seeking out auditions, an approach that ran counter to her own experiences as a young actor. Specifically, the studio provided “an environment in which students could gain security in a technique, giving them the craft to solve any artistic problem that might confront them in their profession” (Rotté, p. 16). Though based on the
Method, she integrated traditional training related to voice projection, diction, movement with the emotional tuning of the Method (Rotté). A study of any of these approaches is likely to be difficult due to the subjective nature of acting and various perspectives of what successful acting looks like (Rotté, 2000; Strasburg, 1996).

The current literature on effective teachers for high-ability students in the performing arts reflects to some extent the characteristics of teachers effective with high-ability students in the core academic areas. The characteristics described as effective with both groups include: a) high expectations (Bloom, 1985; Eyre et al., 2002; Yeatts, 1980; Zimmerman, 1988, 1992); b) knowledgeable (Buttermore, 1979; Story, 1985), especially in their content area (Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; Clarke & Gipe; Van Rossum; Westberg & Archambault, 1997; Yeatts, 1980; Zimmerman, 1992); c) have advanced training or experience in their area (Westberg & Archambault, 1997; Yeatts, 1980; Zimmerman, 1992, 1997); d) recognize individual differences (Buttermore, 1979; Eyre et al., 2002; Gagné, 1993; Guskin et al., 1988; Heath, 1997; Zimmerman, 1988, 1992); and e) demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching (Heath, 1997; Zimmerman, 1988, 1992). Both academic and artistic domains also require teachers to be able to a) adapt instruction (Bloom, 1985; Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; Westberg & Archambault, 1997) and help students make connections between skill and expression, and b) create a positive and supportive environment for individual students (Clark & Zimmerman, 1988; Eyre et al., 2002; Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; Zimmerman, 1992). Only one study of dance teachers addressed creative abilities of arts teachers (Clark & Gipe, 1989). Studies of teachers in the arts address advanced teacher knowledge or experience in their performance area (Clarke & Gipe; Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; Persson, 1993; Van Rossum, 2004;
Westberg & Archambault, 1997; Yeatts, 1980; Zimmerman, 1992, 1997) but do not specifically address general intellectual ability or intelligence.

As Heath (1997) indicated, there is a lack of research that includes teachers as participants to rate other teachers or to identify the characteristics that create effective teachers of the gifted (Heath, 1997). Given the research within the arts that suggests professional artists have both the knowledge and skills to teach talented students in their arts area (Clarke & Gipe, 1989; Piirto, 1994; Lakes, 2005; Van Rossum, 2004; Yeatts, 1980; Zimmerman, 1988, 1992), a logical next step would be to ask teachers currently working with pre-professional and professional students to articulate the characteristics and skills of effective teachers in the performing arts.

However, the context of the setting (Kingsbury, 1988; Persson, 1993; Osseroff-Varnell, 1988) or the domain (Bloom, 1985; Lakes, 2005; Piirto, 1994) should also be considered when identifying characteristics of effective teachers in the performing arts. Teachers at specialized secondary schools for the performing arts need to represent the three stages of teachers (exploratory, technical, master) described by Bloom and his colleagues (1985) based on the purpose, selection criteria, and talent pool served by their school. These teachers then need to recognize students’ levels of abilities and commitment and respond accordingly with appropriate instructional strategies. However, the research suggests that the domains of the performing arts, dance, music, and theater, have their own inherent traditions and philosophies regarding appropriate pedagogy (Kingsbury, 1988; Lakes, 2005; Oseroff-Varnell; Persson, 1993; Piirto, 1994). Table 5 provides a summary of the literature related to teacher effectiveness in the arts.
Overall, the literature on teachers in the artistic fields focuses more on the teacher as a person and their abilities to train students in the artistic disciplines than on their abilities in a classroom setting. Less focus is given to the instructional strategies and learning activities used with students in fields that rely on historical traditions rather than empirically supported methods (i.e., Kingsbury, 1988; Lakes, 2005; Piirto, 1994). Student outcomes are often limited to students' success as performers and teachers, representing less objective measures than those used in general education. Classroom management, organization for instruction, ethical concerns, creating a supportive learning environment, and monitoring student progress (Harris, 1998; Stronge, 2002; Walls, Nardi, von Minden, & Hoffman, 2002) are barely addressed in the literature on effective teachers in the arts.

Based on existing research and literature, a study of effective teachers in specialized secondary schools for the performing arts would need to be sensitive to the traditions of the performing arts domains (Kingsbury, 1988; Lakes, 2005; Oseroff-Varnell; Persson, 1993; Piirto, 1994) and how these traditions affect teaching and pedagogy in these schools. A study of teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts would also need to consider the concept of talent development that has grown out of the field of gifted education and the role of the teacher in the talent development process. The lack of empirically supported methods in the artistic domains and the context of specialized schools for the performing arts outside of the field of gifted education will also influence the outcomes of a study of teachers in the identified schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bloom (1985)</td>
<td>Three stages of development and corresponding teacher characteristics are described across athletic, cognitive, and artistic domains, specifically focusing on the needs of concert pianists and sculptors. First stage teachers support and encourage interest and natural ability. Second stage teachers provide increased technical training and focus on skill development. Third stage teachers are master teachers who focus on developing an individual student’s professional style, performance skills, and depth of understanding of domain and repertoire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Zimmerman (1988)</td>
<td>Visual arts students identified three types of school-based arts teachers: a) supportive but not challenging, b) challenging but not supportive, and c) challenging but not providers of instruction related to improving artistic ability and achieving success as an artist. Teachers encountered in a special summer program provided challenge, instruction in skills and techniques, and linkage between skills and development as an artist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman (1992)</td>
<td>A comparison of two teachers of talented students in the visual arts suggests that teachers of these students need to understand individual students’ sensibilities, teach proactively, provide learning experiences that engage students as artists, reflect critically about their teaching, and need to be trained in preparing for and working with talented art students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

**Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Effective Teachers for the Artistically Gifted and Talented**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Bickel, &amp;</td>
<td>Perceptions of students, parents, and teachers of musical talent differ with students attributing their success to ability and hard work while receiving limited support from family and friends, parents attributing student success to encouragement from family and friends, and teachers attributing development of talent to innate abilities, hard work, and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendarvis (2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Gipe (1989)</td>
<td>A study of artist-teachers describes the sample as creative, confident about their abilities as teachers, intuitive, evenly introverted and extroverted, and less internally directed than expected. These teachers received limited training related to pedagogy and instruction in their field but do have advanced training or degrees in their field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeatts (1980)</td>
<td>A case study of an artist-teacher in a gifted program resulted in specific recommendations for certification of artist-teachers with experience and knowledge of their field but who lack formal training of professional educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury (1988)</td>
<td>Within the context of the musical conservatory, talent is identified mainly by the maestro based on musical performance and that the validity of being identified as talented is based on the maestro’s own ability or status in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Effective Teachers for the Artistically Gifted and Talented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persson (2000)</td>
<td>This study of conservatory music teachers describes a legacy of instruction based on historical tradition and less on individualized needs. A comparison of teacher and student perceptions of the teacher’s personality characteristics indicates that perceptions differ based on role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robson, Book, &amp; Wimerding</td>
<td>A survey of dance teachers found that a majority of these teachers used their own experiences as dance students to improve upon the pedagogical legacy of their field, including modeling positive behaviors and habits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Rossum (2004)</td>
<td>Comparison of ratings of teachers and students of the teacher’s daily class behaviors indicate that the ideal dance teacher is knowledgeable of dance training and preparing for a career in dance and provides positive feedback consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oseroff-Varnell (1998)</td>
<td>A study of the socialization process of new students in a residential high school for the performing arts indicates that teacher voice dominates the performance classes but that academic classes attended by dance students balance teacher and student voice during instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differentiated Instruction in Gifted Education

Differentiation has been at the heart of the field of gifted education since the early research of Terman and Hollingworth (Silverman, 1996; Ward, 1980). The concept of differentiation has also been criticized and critiqued from many angles (Coleman & Gallagher, 1995; Oakes, 1985; Sapon-Shevin, 1994). The definition of differentiation most often cited is that of Maker (1982) where it is defined as a qualitatively different curriculum modified in the areas of content, process, product, and learning environment. However, the emphasis on differentiation began earlier (Ward, as cited by Ward, 1980). Ward (1980) presented an argument for different services based on the biological "superiority" of the gifted child (p. 80). Ward also stressed that gifted children would seemingly make important contributions to society and would therefore need a different curriculum to prepare them for their future roles. A different education would be needed to meet their individual differences.

In recent years, Ward's definition of differentiation has been criticized in the midst of expanding definitions of giftedness because he focused on a narrow definition of giftedness as "exceptional intellectual ability" (Hertzog, 1998, p. 214). Nevertheless, Ward created the phrase "Differential Education for the Gifted" which is defined as "educational experiences uniquely or predominantly suited to the distinguishing behavioral processes of intellectually superior students and to the adult roles that they typically assume as leaders and/or innovators" (Jellen & White, 1980, p. xliv). This term was based on an earlier definition of differentiation as "a plan for meeting individual differences" where "the content of instruction may differ in degree of difficulty, areas of
student interest, quantity and quality of content, or context” (Good, 1959, as cited by Jellen & White, 1980, p. xlv).

Jellen and Verduin (1986) expanded Ward’s definition of Differential Education for the Gifted by describing a descriptive and a prescriptive treatment for differentiation. A descriptive treatment meets the learner’s academic and developmental needs and a prescriptive treatment prepares gifted learners for the adult roles they will assume in various fields as “knowledge producers” (p. 49). These early definitions and recommendations for gifted learners focused on the dual role of differentiation: meeting the learning needs of the gifted and developing their innate abilities to enable them to contribute to a body of knowledge as adults.

In 1972, the Marland Report described three characteristics of a differentiated program for gifted students: a) promotes higher cognitive processes, b) provides instructional strategies that accommodate both curriculum content and the learning styles of gifted and talented children, and c) uses special grouping practices appropriate to particular children. This definition focused on the process outcomes of cognitive ability, appropriate instructional strategies, and environmental arrangements that accommodate the needs of gifted learners. Also in the 1970s, the U.S. Office of Education (as cited by Maker, 1982) defined differentiation as “the process of instruction which is capable of being integrated into the school program and is adaptable to varying levels of individual learning response in the education of the gifted and talented” (p. 4). This definition focused on integrating the concept of differentiation for gifted learners into the existing school program as an instructional process that embodies “high level of cognitive and affective concepts and processes beyond those normally provided in the regular
classroom” (p. 4). This understanding of differentiation highlighted the instructional strategies and processes as a way to meet the needs of gifted students.

In 1974, Kaplan (as cited by Maker 1982) described differentiation as related to “(1) procedures for presenting learning opportunities, (2) nature of the input, and (3) expectancies for learning outcomes” (p. 5). By the end of the 1970s, this and other earlier definitions had been transformed by the National/State Leadership Training Institute for Gifted and Talented into twelve principles that defined a differentiated curriculum for the gifted/talented (Kaplan, 1979). These principles included: a) interdisciplinary study; b) in-depth learning of content; c) independent study; d) including complex or higher-level thinking skills; e) developing research skills; f) development of new and creative products; g) development of self-understanding; and h) evaluating student learning outcomes using appropriate assessments (Kaplan).

These twelve principles have since been condensed into smaller categories to describe the concept of differentiation. Kaplan (as cited by Coleman, 1985) described differentiation as relating to content, process, product, and affect. Passow (as cited by Hertzog, 1998) connected differentiation to the regular curriculum and defined it as a process that matched curriculum to a student’s learning needs, abilities and styles in an effort to elicit “learner responses” that were equal to the student’s aptitude (p. 215). Maker (1982) reemphasized Ward’s rationale that gifted learners are inherently different and therefore require a qualitatively different curriculum that can be modified in the areas of content, process, product, and learning environment. Maker (1993) later stated that “any one change in the curriculum, by itself, does not constitute the qualitatively different
curriculum that gifted students need," therefore describing a programmatic approach to differentiation (p. 110).

Gallagher (1985) suggested schools adapt curriculum and instruction for gifted learners in terms of content, special skills, and the learning environment. Coleman (1985) summarized the many preceding definitions of differentiation as describing "the attributes they believe should be distinguished between curricula for the gifted and non-gifted" (p. 315). However, Coleman questioned whether the rationale for differentiation should be based upon the understanding that the gifted are qualitatively different, as had been the previous rationale, or quantitatively different, i.e. gifted learners possess the same attributes and abilities as non-gifted but to a greater degree or extent.

The definition of differentiation has continued to expand to encompass the growing definitions of giftedness and the shift in the field of gifted education towards a focus on talent development. In 1998, Dinnocenti stated that the concept of differentiation had grown to include the teacher's role, evaluation methods, and goals of differentiation as aspects of the definition. Renzulli (as cited by Dinnocenti, 1998) has emphasized five aspects of differentiation in the Schoolwide Enrichment Model: content, process, product, classroom, and teacher. In this definition, content emphasizes depth, process responds to students' learning styles, product provides opportunity for student expression and to improve cognitive development, classroom entails rearrangement of the environment for comfort, and the teacher shares personal knowledge and interests through "artistic modifications" (p. 3).

Tomlinson and Allan (2000) defined differentiation "as a teacher's reacting responsively to a learner's needs" and stated that the "goal of differentiated classroom is
maximum student growth and individual success” (p. 4). This definition does not focus solely on the needs of gifted learners and demonstrates an expansion of the concept to include learners of all abilities and a process that is suited to meet the needs of all students. According to Tomlinson (2001), principles of differentiation include a flexible classroom, ongoing assessment of learner needs, and flexible grouping. The elements of curriculum that can be differentiated are still content, process, and product. However, similar to the earliest definitions mentioned above, Tomlinson (1999, 2001) articulates that teachers can also differentiate for student characteristics in terms of their readiness (i.e. level of difficulty), interest, and learning profile (which includes learning styles, talent, or intelligence). This definition also reflects a shift in curriculum paradigms toward a more constructivist perspective which is centered on the student (Brooks & Brooks, 1999).

The definition of differentiation has evolved from a focus on the natural abilities of gifted learners to a modification of curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of all students. However, the concept of differentiation has maintained a focus on certain elements of the teaching and learning process: modification of content, focus on student interest, grouping of students, and instructional strategies or process skills. The various definitions of differentiation described above have lead to much rhetoric about what differentiation should be, look like, and achieve.

In 1995, Coleman and Gallagher presented twelve guidelines based on theory, research, and experience that, when used in combination, represent appropriate differentiated service options. The guidelines began by recognizing that gifted students, as a group, are diverse and require a range of services, learn at a faster rate, and think
with more complexity and abstraction. They assert that these students have unique social needs and need to be with others like them. The guidelines stated that teachers need to receive training to work appropriately with this population and that gifted students do not thrive without an appropriately differentiated education. Therefore, additional support may need to be provided for underachieving gifted learners. Finally, the guidelines recommended that differentiated curriculum be part of an overall excellent educational program that seeks to serve younger gifted, recognizes that the need for differentiation may change over the lifespan, and to works toward identifying traditionally underrepresented populations.

Montgomery (2001) defines two types of differentiation models. The first is a structural model where students are physically regrouped, i.e. ability grouping or pull-out programs. The second is an integral model where the “teacher modifies the curriculum or teaching method” (p. 136). Montgomery (2001) also describes “developmental differentiation” where teaching methods are used to individualize the curriculum to meet the different levels of learning needs in a class (p. 270). She also uses a pyramid to illustrate seven types of curriculum differentiation which should be offered in every school: developmental differentiation, setting for some subjects, clubs and societies, mentoring, enrichment, acceleration, and distance learning. Montgomery argues that teachers’ training needs to extend beyond trained in differentiation techniques and packages of materials to use; teachers “need to understand the rationale behind the materials and the methods so that there is a transferability” and so that they will remain “intrinsically motivated professionals” (p. 278). These models also do not isolate differentiation as a modification that applies only to high ability students.
Tomlinson’s (2001) definition described earlier translates into a loosely structured model where “differentiation of instruction is a teacher’s response to learner’s needs, guided by general principles of differentiation such as flexible grouping and ongoing assessment and adjustment” through “content, process, and product according to student’s readiness, interests, and learning profile” (p. 3). Several publications on this model are available (e.g. Tomlinson, 2001; Tomlinson & Allen, 2001).

Another model defines differentiation of content, process, and product as incorporating acceleration, challenge, depth, complexity, and challenge (VanTassel-Baska, 2003; VanTassel-Baska & Stambaugh, 2006). Curriculum and instructional strategies modified through one of these strategies are based on the advanced cognitive and learning needs of the gifted (VanTassel-Baska, 2003; VanTassel-Baska & Little, 2003; VanTassel-Baska & Stambaugh, 2006).

Various other mini-models of differentiation primarily focus on only one aspect of the definition of differentiation as modification of content, process, or product. In terms of content differentiation, Kettler and Curliss (2003) suggest a tiered-objectives approach to differentiate mathematics instruction in a mixed-ability classroom. Renzulli and Reis (1998) propose using curriculum compacting as a method to differentiate in content. Winebrenner (1992) has created a “how to” guide for differentiating curriculum and instruction for gifted students in the regular classroom. Others advise that addressing content differentiation through concept-based curriculum appeals more to student readiness (Tomlinson, 1998; VanTassel-Baska & Little, 2003). One very popular product model is the use of independent study as a method to allow self-initiated learning in student interest areas (Reis & Schack, 1993).
The most prevalent interpretation of differentiation incorporates a modification of process. The Schoolwide Enrichment Model relies primarily on student interest to influence student choice of process-based activities (Reis & Renzulli, 1992; Renzulli & Reis, 1998). A curriculum program by Rule and Lord (2003) integrates Bloom’s taxonomy with Gardner’s multiple intelligences to provide differentiated activities that elicit higher-level cognitive processing. Processes are scaffolded in complexity to allow for learner differences in combination with advanced content in the Integrated Curriculum Model (VanTassel-Baska & Little, 2003). Concepts are addressed with increasing depth and in connection with the processes of writing, literary analysis, and reading (VanTassel-Baska & Little, 2003). In addition, Moon, Callahan, Brighton, and Tomlinson (2002) created differentiated performance assessment tasks for middle school classrooms to serve as an alternative assessment to standardized tests and to then be used to plan curriculum and differentiation of process for the targeted students.

With the expansion of the definition of differentiation has come criticism from both inside and outside of the field of gifted education. Delisle (2000) has stated that the “differentiation bandwagon is getting off track” and that the increased use of differentiation with all students may mean that gifted students are not getting the modifications that they need (p. 36). Opposition to differentiation as a method used with the gifted and talented has also been a part of the anti-tracking movement (Oakes, 1985; Sapon-Shevin, 1994). Still others have claimed that focusing on qualitative differences of gifted creates a class of children who learn that they are entitled to a “privileged life” and that this focus ignores the “students’ real differences from other students,” those of academic performance (Pendarvis & Howley, 1995, p. 85-86). These opponents assert
that differentiated practices set up and perpetuate power structure and class differences related to intellectual ability. However, recognition of individual differences is the primary reason for differentiated instruction. Research on differentiation reflects this focus and demonstrates a need for further development of models of differentiation.

Each of the definitions and models described above share an emphasis on matching curriculum and instruction to the needs of gifted and talented learners both individually and as a group (Coleman & Gallagher, 1995; Montgomery, 2001; Tomlinson, 1999). The way in which the curriculum and instruction is modified for gifted and talented learners can be accomplished in several ways, including addressing higher-level thinking and cognitive processes (i.e., Marland, 1972; Kaplan, 1979), implementing student choice of learning activity through interest (i.e., Renzulli & Reis, 1998; Tomlinson, 1999), or adapting the content of a course or subject area (i.e., Gallagher, 1985; Kettler & Curliss, 2003; Renzulli & Reis, 1998; VanTassel-Baska, 2003). The current emphasis on differentiation as a way to maximize student growth and individual success (Tomlinson & Allan, 2000) does not differ much in theory from earlier definitions focused on meeting needs and preparing students for future roles (Jellen & Verduin, 1986; Ward, 1980). The concept of differentiation has continued to emphasize the modification of content, learning processes or activities, student interest, and learning environment (Kaplan, 1979; Maker, 1982; Tomlinson, 1999; VanTassel-Baska, 2003; Ward, 1980).

*Research on differentiated instructional practices for gifted and talented learners.*

The research on differentiation began with the studies of Terman and Hollingworth and their descriptions of the natural needs and abilities of gifted learners.
(Silverman, 1996; Ward, 1980). Other researchers have focused on the development of
gifted learners in specific domains (Bloom, 1985) and in terms of advanced content
instruction in a specific domain ((Lubinski & Benbow, 1994).

Several more recent studies have examined the use and nature of differentiation in
a variety of classroom settings. Archambault, Westberg, Brown, Hallmark, Zhang, and
Emmons (1993) addressed differentiation through a survey of the modifications in
curriculum and instruction that teachers used in the regular, mixed-ability classroom. The
findings indicated that teachers made only minor modifications in the regular curriculum
for gifted learners and differentiation most often meant modification of thinking and
questioning activities. A replication of this study (Westberg & Daoust, 2003) a decade
resulted in similar findings. Tomlinson, Tomchin, Callahan, Adams, Pizzat-Tinnin, and
Cunningham, et al. (1994) examined the perceptions and practices of preservice teachers.
The findings suggest that preservice teachers enter their first year of teaching with
preconceived ideas of the teaching-learning process from their observations and
memories as students and that these understandings do not support differentiation of
instruction.

Gentry, Rizza, and Owen (2002) suggested that teacher and student observations
of challenge and choice do not always correlate and that they have different perceptions
about what happens in the class. The researchers suggested that students may not be
challenged enough in the regular school classroom and may not perceive having enough
choice there either. The authors also caution that there needs to be a balance because
students may not always choose challenge.
In a case study of a middle school as it incorporated a mandate of differentiation, Tomlinson (1995) described factors that interfered with or assisted the teachers’ use of appropriately differentiated classrooms. The definition of differentiation adopted by the middle school related to modified “content, process, and/or products in response to learning readiness and interest” of students (p. 80). Teachers’ responses indicated that they needed more support and modeling of differentiation practices to help them understand what differentiation looked like in practice. This study suggests that after 30 or more years of discussion about and definitions of differentiation, teachers are still unsure of what to do with it and how it works.

In 1997, Tomlinson, Moon, and Callahan conducted a survey with a stratified representative random sample of almost 2,000 middle school principals and teachers of core subjects. The survey items were constructed to discover beliefs and practices of teachers and administrators related to, among other concepts, how educators understand and act upon concept of differentiation according to learner readiness, interest, and learning profile, and the degree to which middle schools employ effective differentiation strategies. Results indicated that half of teacher respondents and over one third of administrators saw no need to differentiate instruction and cited lack of time and materials as inhibitors to differentiation. Fifty-two percent of teachers reported that they never or rarely used preassessment of student knowledge, 41% never or rarely used flexible pacing, and 49% reported that they never or rarely used tiered assignments. Less than 20% reported that they used recommended instructional strategies to differentiate content, process, or product.
Ehlers and Montgomery (1999) described how teachers believe they adapt curriculum for gifted learners and how they perceive these students should be taught. The results of their study indicated that the teachers hold one of three beliefs regarding developing curriculum for students who are gifted: a) differentiation according to student academic needs, b) differentiation according to teaching practices, and c) differentiation according to process ideas. The results also suggested that some teachers are motivated to differentiate learning and evaluation for gifted students, that some rely on instructional practices to meet the needs of gifted students, and that others believe that students are and can be more responsible for choosing appropriate learning situations from those offered in the classroom. The concept of differentiation in practice, therefore, focuses on meeting student academic needs through either instructional strategies manipulated by the teacher or through student choice of learning activities and situations that meet their needs.

Johnsen, Haensly, Ryser, and Ford (2002) examined what factors would support changing teachers' use of differentiation practices in the regular classroom. In this study, differentiation was defined as "how teachers organize their classrooms in adapting for learner differences in content, rate, preference, and environment," reflecting the earlier definitions of differentiation as modification of content, process, learner preference, and context or environment (p. 48). On the observation instrument used, the continuum for each aspect of differentiation moved from organization around a uniform schedule of curriculum materials to student choice and learning needs. Therefore, differentiation was described as more student choice or student-oriented practices. Results indicated that students responded positively to changes in rate or content differentiation and that teachers changed their practices when they were given simulated training experiences,
had ownership in setting goals, and strong administrative support. Other studies have suggested that staff development can change teacher practice related to differentiating (Reis & Westberg, 1994).

The previous studies sought to describe how differentiation is used in the regular classroom and to examine what factors inhibit or can change teacher implementation of differentiation practices. When differentiation is studied for its effectiveness in the classroom, it is most often related to process modification. Friedman and Lee (1996) used a multiple baseline design to evaluate the effect of three gifted education models on the cognitive level of questions used by teachers and related student responses. The findings indicated that a concentrated or highly structured process model as an intervention improves the cognitive level of student and teacher question/response interaction.

Hertzog (1998) examined the use of open-ended activities as a way to differentiate instruction in a qualitative study. The study used a definition of differentiation as whatever elicited learner responses commensurate with ability. The researcher did not find any qualitative differences in learner responses of gifted and nongifted. The most important finding of this study related to fidelity of implementation of a sound instructional design and how it could affect student performance---i.e. what may be intended to differentiate could get diffused by teacher influence either consciously or subconsciously. This study focused on a modification of process and incorporated aspects of student choice. Therefore, student choice in selection of group may have affected their performance or judged level of their product. This definition of differentiation also suggests that whatever differentiates for one student may not differentiate for another.
Several studies have implemented an integrated approach to differentiation through advanced content, higher order processes, and concept dimensions (VanTassel-Baska, J., Avery, Little, & Hughes, 2000; VanTassel-Baska, Bass, Ries, Poland, & Avery, 1998; VanTassel-Baska, Johnson, Hughes, & Boyce, 1996; VanTassel-Baska, Zuo, Avery, & Little, 2002). Based on the Integrated Curriculum Model [ICM] (VanTassel-Baska, 1986), these studies implemented curriculum units in language arts and science with gifted learners.

Using the Integrated Curriculum Model framework and graphic organizers that promote higher level thinking in the language arts, students in the control and experimental classrooms were assessed pre and post treatment using performance-based assessments in writing, grammar, and literary analysis. The students in the experimental group significantly improved in all three dimensions of the assessment and outperformed the control group (VanTassel-Baska, Johnson, Hughes, & Boyce, 1996). Another study assessed the growth of over 1,000 6th grader students on integrated science process skills after being taught a 20-36 hour science unit based on the ICM. Results indicate small, but significant gains for students in integrated science process skills when compared to equally able students not using the units (VanTassel-Baska, Bass, Ries, Poland, & Avery, 1998). Follow-up studies using focus groups, interviews, documents, and classroom observations of schools using curriculum units based on the ICM found that students, teachers, parents, and administrators observed increased student engagement in class, enhanced reasoning skills, and the improvement of habits of mind such as metacognition (VanTassel-Baska, Avery, Little, & Hughes, 2000; VanTassel-Baska, Zuo, Avery, & Little, 2002). Differentiation through structured curriculum integrating advanced content,
higher-level processes, and conceptual understanding supported student growth in key language arts and science content and skills.

Diezmann and Watters (2002) sought to explore the support that is required by mathematically gifted students as they are engaged in challenging tasks. This non-random experimental case study compared three combinations of task and environment in terms of the students’ responses and perceptions. Their findings suggest that students require challenging tasks to elicit behaviors associated with mathematically gifted learners.

Instructional approaches may also be influenced by culture. A recent cross-cultural study of teaching practices and learning patterns in secondary gifted classrooms in Singapore and the United States (VanTassel-Baska & Feng, 2006), found that the teachers in Singapore were more trained in gifted education practices and demonstrated more effective use of instructional approaches than teachers in the United States. These teachers also agree that exemplary teachers should be willing to try new teaching methods and be flexible in their use of instructional methods for different students. The teachers also shared similar views about general differentiation practices and engaging students in the work of the content area through inquiry or project work. Both groups of teachers agreed that teachers need to be content experts and able to meet individual student needs through instructional practices such as differentiation.

Summary

Overall, research on differentiation indicates that the implementation of differentiated practices is limited (Archambault et al., 1993) and that the concept of differentiation is either misunderstood or not widely embraced (Tomlinson, Tomchin et al., 1994; Tomlinson, Moon, & Callahan, 1997). When differentiation is employed to
some degree, students are generally not challenged appropriately (Diezmann & Watters, 2002; Gentry et al., 2002; Hertzog, 1998). Some models of differentiation do result in appropriate uses of differentiation, such as the use of student choice, differentiated instructional strategies, or content-based differentiated curriculum (Ehlers & Montgomery, 1999; Friedman & Lee, 1996; VanTassel-Baska et al., 2002). In general, most teachers and administrators require more support to effectively implement differentiated strategies (Johnsen et al., 2002; Reis & Westberg, 1994; Tomlinson, 1995). Training in differentiation strategies does help change teacher practice (Johnsen et al., 2002; Reis & Westberg, 1994).
Table 6

Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Differentiated Instruction in Gifted Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward (1980)</td>
<td>Presents an argument that the author began in the 1950s for different services for intellectually gifted learners based on innate abilities and the potential contributions they might make in their future societal roles. A “differential education for the gifted” would be a plan for meeting individual differences and would include instruction modified in terms of difficulty, student interest, quantity and quality of content, or context of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellen &amp; Verduin (1986)</td>
<td>Differentiation described as both a descriptive treatment to meet academic and developmental needs of gifted learners and a prescriptive treatment to prepare gifted learners for their future careers as producers of knowledge in various fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marland (1972)</td>
<td>Differentiated programs a) promote higher cognitive processes, b) provide instructional strategies that accommodate curriculum content and learning styles of gifted and talented students, and c) use grouping for instruction as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Synopsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan (1979)</td>
<td>The National/State Leadership Training Institute for Gifted and Talented developed twelve principles for differentiated curriculum, including a) interdisciplinary study, b) in-depth learning of content, c) independent study, d) complex or higher-level thinking skills, e) research skills, f) development of new and creative products, g) development of self-understanding, and h) evaluating student outcomes using appropriate assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker (1982)</td>
<td>Gifted learners are inherently different and require a qualitatively different curriculum modified in the areas of content, process, product, and learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher (1985)</td>
<td>Schools should adapt curriculum and instruction for gifted learners in terms of content, special skills, and the learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman (1985)</td>
<td>Questions the rationale for differentiation by asking if gifted learners are qualitatively different or quantitatively different, i.e., possessing attributes and abilities to a greater degree than their non-identified age peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnocenti (1998)</td>
<td>Differentiation includes the teacher's role, evaluation methods, and the purpose of the differentiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Synopsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomlinson &amp; Allan (2000)</td>
<td>Differentiation is a teacher’s response to learner’s needs and that the goal of differentiation is maximum student growth and individual success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomlinson (1999, 2001)</td>
<td>Principles of differentiation include a flexible classroom, ongoing assessment of learner needs, and flexible grouping. Differentiation represents a philosophy of thinking about instruction, not a set of strategies. Differentiation is adjustment of learning experiences in terms of student readiness, interest, and learning profile through the modification of content, process, product, and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman &amp; Gallagher (1995)</td>
<td>Gifted students, as a group, are diverse and require a range of services to meet their needs. Differentiated curriculum should be part of an overall program for gifted learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery (2001)</td>
<td>Differentiation is both a structural model where students are physically regrouped and an integral model that relies on teacher modification of curriculum and instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 (continued)

**Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Differentiated Instruction in Gifted Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kettler &amp; Curliss (2003)</td>
<td>The authors describe a tiered objectives approach to differentiate mathematics instruction in a mixed ability classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renzulli &amp; Reis (1998)</td>
<td>A description of curriculum compacting as a way to eliminate previously mastered content for able students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reis &amp; Renzulli (1992); Renzulli &amp; Reis (1998)</td>
<td>The Schoolwide Enrichment Model uses student choice of process-based activities to differentiate curriculum and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Synopsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomlinson, A study of the perceptions and practices of preservice teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomchin, Callahan,</td>
<td>suggests that these teachers begin their career as teachers with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Pizzat-</td>
<td>preconceived ideas about the teaching-learning process based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinnan, &amp;</td>
<td>their observations and memories of their educational experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham et al. (1994)</td>
<td>Many of their own experiences did not address or support differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry, Rizza, &amp;</td>
<td>Teacher and student observations of challenge and choice in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen (2002)</td>
<td>classroom do not always correlate, reflecting different perceptions of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the classroom experience. Students may not be challenged enough in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom and they perceive more limited choices available to them in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomlinson (1995)</td>
<td>This case study of a middle school incorporating differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicates that teachers need more support and modeling of differentiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practices to support implementing differentiation in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomlinson, Moon, &amp;</td>
<td>Results of a survey of middle school principals and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Callahan (1997)</td>
<td>describe half of the teacher respondents and over one-third of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrator respondents as not perceiving a need to differentiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instruction. Respondents cited a lack of time and materials as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inhibitors to differentiation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (continued)

Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Differentiated Instruction in Gifted Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ehlers &amp; Montgomery (1999)</td>
<td>This study of how teachers adapt curriculum for gifted learners and teachers’ beliefs about the gifted indicate that teachers hold one of three beliefs about curriculum for gifted learners: a) differentiation according to student academic needs, b) differentiation according to teaching practices, and c) differentiation of process. Differentiation was mainly perceived as occurring in teacher modification of instructional strategies or in student choice of learning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsen, Haensly, Ryser, &amp; Ford (2002)</td>
<td>Results indicate that students respond positively to changes in rate or content differentiation and that teachers will change their practices when they are given stimulating training experiences, have ownership in setting goals, and receive strong administrative support for differentiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reis &amp; Westberg (1994)</td>
<td>Staff development activities can change teachers' differentiation practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman &amp; Lee (1996)</td>
<td>A highly structured process model can improve the cognitive level of student and teacher question/response interactions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 (continued)

**Synopsis of the Literature and Research on Differentiated Instruction in Gifted Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hertzog (1998)</td>
<td>A study of open-ended activities to differentiate for learner responses did not result in qualitative differences between gifted and non-identified gifted. Student selection of activity may have affected their performance due to a choice that was not challenging for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diezmann &amp; Watters (2002)</td>
<td>This case study compared three combinations of task and environment to create challenging tasks for mathematically gifted students. Findings suggest that students require challenging tasks to elicit behaviors associated with mathematically gifted learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanTassel-Baska, Johnson et al. (1996); VanTassel-Baska, Bass et al. (1998); VanTassel-Baska, Avery et al. (2000); VanTassel-Baska, Zuo et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Based on the Integrated Curriculum Model [ICM] (VanTassel-Baska, 1986), these studies suggest that differentiated curriculum centered on advanced content, higher-order skills, and conceptual understanding contribute to improvement in persuasive writing and literary analysis skills in language arts and in integrated science process skills when compared to equally able students not using the units. Data also suggest that curriculum based on the ICM leads to increased student engagement in class, enhanced reasoning skills, and the improvement of habits of mind such as metacognition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Differentiated instructional practices for artistically gifted and talented learners.

The literature and research explicitly connecting differentiation to instruction in the performing arts is scant. However, a few basic tenets of differentiation are reflected in instructional approaches often used in the performing arts. First, the use of auditions to place students in groups for rehearsals and performances reflects the practice of ability grouping used in the field of gifted education in recognition of individual differences and the advanced abilities of gifted learners (e.g., Kulik & Kulik, 1992, 1997; Rogers, 1991, 1998). Second, the corresponding adjustment of curriculum and instruction that often occurs in conjunction with ability grouping is also incorporated in the performing arts. Advanced ensembles are introduced to repertoire that is challenging, more complex, and which requires a more in-depth understanding of the arts area (e.g., VanTassel-Baska, 2003). Individuals are also accelerated based on their demonstrated proficiency on performance assessments such as technical excerpts, techniques, and previously mastered repertoire. These first two tenets of differentiation are also reflected in the National Standards for Arts Education (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). All four areas of the visual and performing arts standards at the secondary level indicate an achievement standard at the “proficient” and “advanced” levels. Each area of the arts also recognizes elements of creativity and the creative application of knowledge and skills in new ways through composition (e.g., music, plays, dance selections), improvisation, and interpretation of existing traditions and/or performances (e.g., reinterpretation of a classic tune, the restaging of Shakespeare in a non-traditional genre, new choreography for the Nutcracker).

A third tenet often included in differentiation, differentiation by choice, is seen in
the extra-curricular activities and opportunities available to students. However, the availability of these opportunities is limited by access, financial resources, and time (Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Oreck et al., 2000).

Finally, a recent study by the National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] (2002) of public elementary and secondary principals, music specialists, and visual arts specialists provides information on where and if arts instruction is offered but does not address the extent to which that instruction is modified for individual students or groups of students. While no research could be found applying the concept of differentiation to the performing arts, the foundation of differentiation, a recognition of individual differences, is recognized in the main traditions and strategies currently used by most arts educators, grouping and the modification of content and instruction employing acceleration, depth, complexity, challenge, and creativity (e.g., VanTassel-Baska, 2003). Several types of studies might begin to connect the concept and models of differentiation in the performing arts to document differentiated practices. Examples of studies might include observations of performing arts classrooms to document the use of differentiated practices. Other studies might inquire about the extent to which differentiated practices are implemented by performing arts teachers as part of a talent development process.

Special Schools for the Gifted and Talented

Specialized schools and programs have been recognized for over two decades as appropriate ways in which to provide for the needs of high ability students (Cox & Daniel, 1983; Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985). Organizing schools and programs by interest and ability has been recognized by some educators and policy makers as a way to encourage students to remain in school through graduation and to “keep up their
academic work” (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985, p. 110). The arts are often mentioned as a strategy to improve achievement for all students or to integrate districts or areas that are segregated by socioeconomic class, race, and/or culture (Jirtle, 2000; Wilson, 2001). Many magnet arts schools have been created for such a purpose and highlight this purpose in their mission and curriculum (Potter, 1995; Sherman, 1999). Forty-two elementary and secondary schools were identified by the Blue Ribbon Schools program in 1989-1991 as having exemplary programs in the arts (United States Department of Education, 1994). These schools were particularly identified for including a balance of arts areas as essential to the curriculum for all students but not focusing on specifically on the needs of students with above-average ability or interest in the arts. A comparative case study of successful performing arts schools focused on curriculum and instructional staff as only one factor that helped a school be successful (Dodson, 1993). Other success factors included funding, historical inception and development, support from the arts community, facilities, admission standards, and administrative leadership (Dodson, 1993).

Others see specialized programs as a way to meet the particular needs and interests of groups of students such as the artistically talented (Bash, 1991; Buchanan & Woerner, 2002; Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985). While several summer programs recognize and serve artistically talented students (see Bash, 1991; Wolfe, Mondschein, & Eicher, 1991), full-time specialized schools are identified as the gold standard for providing high-level instructional opportunities for high-ability students with intense motivation in specific domains such as the visual and performing arts (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985; Haroutounian, 2000a; Kolloff, 2002). A survey of secondary performing
arts schools indicated that the number of such schools increased from five schools in 1970 to 55 in 1980 and almost 100 schools in 1985 (Curtis, 1986). Of the 55 schools included in the survey, most indicated that they were located in urban areas because of the large number of potentially talented students and the cultural resources available to the school’s participants. These schools also shared an initial purpose of their creation to provide specialized arts training and/or to develop magnet schools related to integrating diverse racial and socio-economic populations (Curtis, 1986). These schools include traditional secondary academic subjects while providing a minimum of 10 hours per week of specialized training in the arts areas addressed by their mission.

The first high school to provide a free and public program in the arts, the High School of Music and Art in New York City, was founded in 1936 by then-mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia (LaGuardia Arts!). The purpose of the school was to provide gifted and talented public school students with the opportunity to complete their academic requirements while engaged in full-time instruction in music and art. Now known as LaGuardia Arts!, the Fiorella H. LaGuardia High School of Music & Art and the Performing Arts was one of four specialized high schools in New York City established by the New York State Legislature in 1972 (LaGuardia Arts!). The oldest state-wide residential program for secondary students in the arts is the North Carolina School of the Arts (NCSOA; Carpenter, 1987). Established in 1963 by an act of the NC General Assembly, the NCSOA was opened in 1965 in the city of Winston-Salem. In 1972, NCSOA became part of the University of North Carolina system. Several other specialized statewide and local schools were established in the 1970s, including the
Alabama School of Fine Arts and the High School for the Performing and Visual Arts in Houston, TX (Alabama School for Fine Arts, 1979; Nelson, 1987).

The four statewide residential schools and other local magnet or commuter programs for specialized training in the arts share certain characteristics as well as features appropriate for high-ability learners (Buechanan & Woerner, 2002; Kolloff, 2002). Many of the schools have been established to provide instruction for a population of students who both meet selection criteria and represent the state or local area for which the school is designated (Kolloff, 2002). Identification often involves a combination of objective and subjective assessment, including academic commitment, audition, and an interview (Kolloff, 2002; LaGuardia Arts!; Nelson, 1987). These schools seek professionals with experience in their fields as well as visiting artists to supplement the experiences of students (Kolloff, 2002). NCSOA faculty members are described as artist-faculty “chosen for excellence and professional standing in their fields” (Carpenter, 1987, p. 32). The faculty of ASFA is described as having worked as professional artists in their field. Each faculty member participates in the audition and selection process and serves as a career advisor (Nelson, 1987).

The success of such programs, while limited in scope and scientific methodology, does appear in the literature. Created in 1971 as a pilot project using a half-day release model, the Alabama School for Fine Arts [ASFA] boasted a graduating class in 1978 with 36, of which 27 were continuing their studies at institutions of higher education (Alabama School for Fine Arts, 1979; Churchwell, 1981; Nelson, 1987). Graduates are listed as participating in the American Ballet Theatre, Manhattan School of Music, the Kansas City Art Institute, and Chicago’s Goodman School of Drama. The school
describes its program as providing "pre-professional training in the visual and performing arts" with admissions criteria including previous academic performance, an audition, and an interview (AFSA, 1979, p. 549). The NCSOA also boasts a list of alumni spanning the professional fields of theater, dance, classical music, theater design and production, and the media arts (Carpenter, 1987).

These specialized schools also mirror the suggested program elements found in the field of gifted education (Daniel & Cox, 1985). Internships, mentor programs, college course credit and study are a few of the curricular elements that address the needs of gifted and talented students in the arts (Daniel & Cox, 1985; VanTassel-Baska, 2005). Many of these schools also share a clearly articulated vision and a mission focused on the needs of their student population and provide pre-professional career advisement in addition to artistic training (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985). These schools share similar challenges, such as the claim that they require students to focus on choosing a career too early, that they drain the talented and high-achieving students from other schools in the area or state, and that such schools foster elitism (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985).

However, these schools clearly provide the opportunity for students to capitalize on their interest within a small school setting, building a community of learners that incorporates real-world connections and community involvement, alternative assessments appropriate to the curriculum, and teachers that are instructional guides (Buchanan & Woerner, 2002).

**Synthesis of Literature Review Strands**

Teachers and their instructional decisions play an important role in the development of talent in general (Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi et al., 1993; Feldhusen...
& Goh, 1995; Hollingworth, as cited by Morelock & Feldman, 1997; Lubinski & Benbow, 1994) and in the artistic fields (Adams, 2002; Clark & Zimmerman, 1988; Freeman, 1999; Oreck, Baum, & McCartney, 2000; Renfrow, 1983; Scripp & Davidson, 1994; Wilson & Clark, 2000; Zimmerman, 2004). Lack of access to trained teachers or quality instructional opportunities can interfere with the development of artistic talent (Clark & Zimmerman, 1988; Oreck, Baum, & McCartney, 2000; Zimmerman, 1995).

Recent reviews of the research literature in education describe and develop characteristics and skills of effective teachers to improve student achievement, such as establishing an appropriate learning environment, use of a variety of teaching styles, and monitoring student progress (Harris, 1998; Strange, 2002). The field of gifted education also has a literature and research base that addresses what makes an effective teacher of gifted and talented learners (Buttermore, 1979; Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002; Feldhusen, 1985; Heath, 1997; Joffe, 2001; Maker, 1975; Rejskind, 2000; Rogers, 1989; Seeley, 1979; Sisk, 1975; Story, 1985; Westberg & Archambault, 1997). Such characteristics and behaviors include flexibility, knowledgeable and intelligent, focused on individual student needs, and modification of curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of learners. However, this collection of research and literature does not explicitly address the domain of the performing arts nor the particular needs of artistically talented students.

In addition to certain personal characteristics and general teaching behavior such as behavior management and organizational skills, effective teachers know and use a variety of instructional resources strategies that contribute to student success and achievement (Harris, 2002; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, & James, 2002; Strange,
Effective teachers of the gifted also incorporate a variety of materials and strategies in their implementation of curriculum and instruction (Ford & Trotman, 2001; Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; Nelson & Prindle, 1992; Story, 1985; Westberg & Archambault, 1997). Specifically, differentiated instruction is cited as an approach that meets the needs of gifted and talented learners (Archambault et al., 1993; Coleman & Gallagher, 1995; Gallagher, 1985; Jellen & Verduin, 1986; Maker, 1982; Renzulli & Reis, 1998; Tomlinson, 1999; VanTassel-Baska et al., 2002; Ward, 1980).

Some examples of differentiated practices in arts classes have been described (Tomlinson, 1999; Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005), but the research examining the differentiated practices of arts teachers is nonexistent. The use of differentiation in the development of artistic talent by effective art teachers has also not been addressed in the research. Questions remain as to the degree to which the literature on effective teachers in the field of gifted education extends to the artistic fields and the ways in which differentiated practices and instructional strategies are articulated within the fields of the performing arts.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the teacher characteristics and behaviors that contribute to working successfully with artistically talented students at the secondary level as indicated by arts teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts. This study also examined the instructional strategies and differentiated teaching behaviors implemented by these teachers and compared these to the literature and research on teacher effectiveness and differentiated instruction in the academic fields of gifted education.

Research Questions

1. What are the perceptions of arts teachers in specialized secondary schools for the performing arts regarding the characteristics and teaching behaviors that make teachers effective in working with talented students in the performing arts?
2. How do the descriptions of characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers working with talented students in the performing arts differ by arts area?
3. What instructional strategies do teachers of talented students in the performing arts use to develop the talent of their students? How is the success of these strategies assessed?
4. How do arts teachers in selected specialized schools for the performing arts rate themselves on an instrument reflecting differentiated instructional behaviors?

Research Design

The field of educational research uses the traditions and perspectives of a range of disciplines to understand and improve the people and processes involved in teaching and
learning (Creswell, 2002; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 1998). The use of and advocacy for mixed method research designs has increased in the past few decades (Creswell, 1994, 2002). Mixed methods approaches often address the problem of interest using open- and closed-ended questions in the form of quantitative and qualitative data, and employs practices from both qualitative and quantitative research traditions (Creswell, 2003). Three general strategies are used in mixed methods research, differing in their approach to combining qualitative and quantitative data. This dissertation study used a design similar to a sequential mixed method design in which the researcher “may begin with a quantitative method... to be followed by a qualitative method involving detailed exploration with a few cases or individuals” (Creswell, 2003, p. 16).

The first stage of this study involved a questionnaire with mostly forced-choice items administered to teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts. The data were tallied and reported using descriptive statistics and frequency counts. Several teachers and administrators were interviewed and documents from the selected sites were reviewed. The data from this second stage were analyzed with indigenous and interpretive coding and, in combination with the data from the first stage, were used to identify themes of importance. The data from this study were then be compared to the literature in the field of gifted education related to characteristics and skills of effective teachers, differentiated instruction, and the teacher’s role in the talent development process.

This study was also similar to a phenomenological study in that it focused on a non-representative purposive sample and it utilized qualitative data generation and collection strategies (Patton, 2002). The design of this study also reflects the pragmatist
approach to educational research and its emphasis on identifying, describing, and solving problems using a mixture of research methods (Creswell, 2003). Pragmatism also recognizes the social, historical, and political context of educational research that reflects the social justice aims of qualitative research (Creswell, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). This study incorporated data source triangulation through the use of multiple participants for the questionnaires and interviews, as well as the use of document review (Patton, 2002).

Sample

The sample for this study included teachers from five specialized schools for the performing arts of music, dance, and theater, serving secondary age students. Three schools were residential programs and two were commuter programs in metropolitan areas. Seven schools were initially selected to represent institutions with established public programs focused on talented students in the performing arts and with the assumption that they have the potential to attract and retain performing arts teachers with extensive knowledge of or experience in their artistic domains. Two of the initial seven schools did not respond to requests for participation.

A letter of request for teacher and administrator participation was sent to the lead administrator or their designee for each school (Appendix F). Table 7 describes the sample of performing arts teachers from the five selected schools by arts area that participated in the questionnaire stage of this study. Twenty-five teachers completed the questionnaire with the largest percentage (36%) indicating their content area was theater. This disproportionate representation of theater teachers, double the invited percentage of their representation in the invited sample, 18%, is attributed to two factors. The majority
of the theater teacher participants were from one school that only had a program in theater and dance. The administrator from this school was very responsive to participating in the study and very helpful in improving the response rate during the first follow-up request. The second factor is that another school which had only a music program for talented students accounted for 41 of the 49 teachers in the invited sample of music teachers. Only six of the 41 music teachers from this school, participated in the study. The administrator from this school was initially reluctant to participate in the study and did not seem as responsive to requests for assistance with the follow-up letters.

Table 7

_Homogeneity of Responses: Participants by Content Area_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performing Arts Area</th>
<th>Invited Sample</th>
<th>Actual Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five theater teachers, five music teachers, and two dance teachers from the questionnaire sample participated in the teacher interview. All three dance teachers were invited to participate in the interview process. Based on information received from one of the participating schools, two other dance teachers were asked to participate in the interview and questionnaire portions of the study; both of these teachers declined to participate in
the study. The music and theater teachers were selected at random from the participants of the questionnaire stage of the study. Five potential participants and two alternates for each area were recorded in the order they were selected. Two of the theater teachers declined to participate in the interview process due to time constraints and job responsibilities. The two alternate theater teachers were contacted and agreed to participate in the interview.

Instrumentation

Teacher questionnaire.

A questionnaire (Appendix A) comprised of three forced-choice items and five supply-response items was used to gather initial information about the performing arts teachers and their perspectives related to the main foci of this study. The first section asked participants to select the characteristics and skills required to work successfully with talented students in the performing arts. A third item asked participants to identify the instructional strategies that they use in their teaching. An open-response item directed the participants to describe a teacher from their experience that exemplifies effective teaching in the performing arts.

The items for the first section of the questionnaire were selected from the literature on effective teachers in the field of general education, gifted education, and the arts. Tables 8, 9, and 10 indicate the construct validity for items 1, 2, and 3, specifying the origin of the item in the corresponding literature. The three items were divided into categories of personal characteristics, skills/behaviors, and instructional strategies. Characteristics were defined as personality traits, dispositions, and background or preparation. Skills and behaviors reflect actions taken related to instruction or planning or
instruction (Stronge, 2002). Instructional strategies represent types of activities that might be used in the process of teaching or facilitating learning.

The second section of the teacher questionnaire addresses demographic information, educational background, and career experience within education and within the performing arts area.

Table 8

Table of Specifications for the Teacher Questionnaire: Item 1, Teacher Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility, willingness to</td>
<td>Buttermore (1979), Chan (2001), Maker, (1975), Story (1985), Westberg &amp;</td>
<td>1H, 1K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embrace change</td>
<td>Archambault (1997)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative, imaginative</td>
<td>Buttermore (1979), Chan (2001), Maker (1975)</td>
<td>1L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8, continued

*Table of Specifications for the Teacher Questionnaire: Item 1, Teacher Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad general knowledge or high intelligence</td>
<td>Buttermore (1979), Chan (2001), Maker (1975), Stronge (2002)</td>
<td>1N, 1I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad sense of humor</td>
<td>Eyre, Coats, Fitzpatrick et al. (2002)</td>
<td>1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced knowledge of their content area</td>
<td>Stronge (2002)</td>
<td>1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered, care for students</td>
<td>Buttermore (1979), Chan (2001), Maker (1975), Minor et al. (2002)</td>
<td>1F, 1O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes individual differences, abilities</td>
<td>Abel &amp; Karnes (1994), Buttermore (1979), Chan (2001), Maker (1975)</td>
<td>1F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Specifications for the Teacher Questionnaire: Item 2, Teacher Behaviors and Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
<th>SurveyItem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a positive and secure learning environment</td>
<td>Eyre et al. (2002), Ford &amp; Trotman (2001), NCATE (n.d.), Stronge (2002), Walls et al. (2002)</td>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate to plan instruction</td>
<td>NCATE (n.d.), Westberg &amp; Archambault (1997)</td>
<td>2K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate clear focus on</td>
<td>NCATE (n.d.), Starko &amp; Schack (1989), Stronge (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction and improved student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

*Table of Specifications for the Teacher Questionnaire: Item 3, Instructional Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A. Opportunities for group learning, such as small ensembles, chamber ensembles, scene study</td>
<td>Adams (1992), Westberg &amp; Archambault (1997),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B. Individualized instruction, such as private studio lessons, tutoring, coaching</td>
<td>Bloom (1985), Scripp &amp; Davidson (1994), Story (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D. Independent study, such as preparing for a recital</td>
<td>Bloom (1985), Nelson &amp; Prindle (1992), Starko &amp; Schack (1989), Story (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table of Specifications for the Teacher Questionnaire: Item 3, Instructional Strategies

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3H. Individual or group assessments on specific parts, techniques, choreography, etc.</strong></td>
<td>(Assessment) Hansen &amp; Feldhusen (1994), NCATE (n.d.), Tomlinson (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3I. Improvisational activities using newly learned knowledge or skill, such as a fingering, a technique, a vocalise, etc.</strong></td>
<td>(Creativity) Nelson &amp; Prindle (1992), Starko &amp; Schack (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3K. Lecture presentation</strong></td>
<td>Stronge (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3L. Other:</strong></td>
<td>These cells are left blank in an effort to uncover other instructional strategies that might be used by the participants and contribute to the literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3M. Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3N. Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Piloting of teacher questionnaire.**

The teacher questionnaire was piloted at a regional specialized secondary school for the performing arts in the researcher’s state. Seven pilot participants in dance, music, and theater were asked to make recommendations for improving the questionnaire. The pilot participants were introduced to the study by the researcher in person and they were asked to return the completed instruments through the mail to the researcher. Pilot participants were informed of their role in the study and completed an informed consent form (Appendix J). Two pilot responses were received, one from a dance teacher and one from a theater teacher. Two follow-up communications, an email and a phone call, through the administrator at the pilot school did not result in additional data from pilot participants. The feedback from the two pilot teachers was used to make minor modifications to the directions of the teacher questionnaire.

**Teacher self-report.**

The Classroom Observation Scale – Revised [COS-R] (VanTassel-Baska, Avery, Struck, Feng, Bracken, Drummond et al., 2003) was developed as a classroom observation tool to identify the extent to which teachers incorporate differentiated instructional strategies in classrooms with gifted learners (VanTassel-Baska, Feng, & Quek, 2005). While initially developed for classroom observations at the elementary level and for language arts instruction, appendices of indicators for the COS-R have been developed for its use in mathematics, social studies, science, and second language classrooms at the elementary and secondary levels. The scale has been developed, piloted, and revised over the past 10 years. With a lack of student outcome data in gifted
education programs and in arts programs, focusing on instruction is one way in which to
gauge the effectiveness of the learning experience (VanTassel-Baska, 2004).

The scale consists of two sections reflective of the literature on effective teachers
in general and gifted education, General Teaching Behaviors and Differentiated Teaching
Behaviors. The second section consists of five clusters of behaviors that reflect a model
of differentiated instruction using accelerated content, challenge, depth, complexity, and
creativity (VanTassel-Baska & Stambaugh, 2006). These five sets of behaviors are
entitled: Accommodations for Individual Differences, Problem Solving, Critical
Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Research Strategies.

The rating scale consists of three levels of effectiveness with a rubric description
of each level. A rating of 1 indicates ineffective implementation of the behavior while a
rating of 3 reflects a highly effective implementation of the behavior. A fourth level, N/O
or Not Observed, is viewed as neither positive or negative. This rating is used when the
behavior is not demonstrated during the time of observation. The internal consistency of
the scale used for observations with two observers is reported between 0.65 and 0.94 for
all scales, and overall reliability of 0.91-0.93. The inter-rater reliability is reported as
ranging from 0.87 to 0.89 across multiple implementations. The content validity was
established by a team of outside experts in the field from both the K-12 gifted
administration perspective and the researcher or scholarly perspective. The content
validity is reported as 0.86 for the importance of the items and 0.99 for the clarity of the
language used (VanTassel-Baska, Feng, & Quek, 2005). The COS-R is currently being
used in five content areas at the secondary level to judge effective teaching in a cross-
cultural context (VanTassel-Baska, Feng, & Quek, 2005; VanTassel-Baska & Feng, 2006).

For this study, participants were asked to complete the COS-R as a self-report instrument (see Appendix B). This instrument was used to pilot an appendix of indicators for the performing arts areas and to provide information about how performing arts teachers perceive their abilities to implement differentiated instructional approaches from the field of gifted education in the performing arts classroom or studio setting.

*External review of the self report indicators.*

The self-report indicators for the performing arts were reviewed by five external reviewers identified as professionals with experience in working with talented arts students, teaching in the performing arts, or formal training in the performing arts. All five reviewers had taught in one of the three performing arts areas and had received graduate training in gifted education. All three performing arts areas were represented by the reviewers. Reviewer comments were used to modify the list of performing arts indicators for the COS-R.

*Teacher interview protocol.*

The interview protocol (see Appendix C for a preliminary list of interview questions) was designed to parallel the questions in the Administrator Interview Protocol (Appendix D). The first question aligned with the first research question, asking the participant to describe the characteristics and skills that they see in themselves and their colleagues that contribute to working successfully with the students in their program (Chan, 2001; Heath, 1997; Nelson & Prindle, 1992). The second question aligned with the first and third research questions. This question asked the participant about their
understanding of the concept of differentiation and how it applies to his or her instruction and the program in which they teach (e.g., Archambault et al., 1993; Marland, 1972; NCATE; Tomlinson, 1999; Ward, 1980). The third question aligned with the third research question and addressed how the participant and their colleagues determine the success or effectiveness of the instructional strategies that they use (e.g., NCATE; Stronge, 2002; VanTassel-Baska, 2004).

Administrator interview protocol.

The protocol (Appendix D) of the administrator interview paralleled the structure and content of the Teacher Interview Protocol described above, addressing characteristics and skills of teachers successful in working with talented students in the performing arts, application of the concept of differentiation to teacher instruction in their school, and understanding how the administrator determines the success or effectiveness of the instructional strategies that are used in their program.

Procedures for Data Collection

After initial contacts with school personnel and an agreement to have some of their teachers participate in this study, packets were sent to each participating school to be distributed by the participating administrator/site coordinator. The packets included: a) a letter explaining the study, b) two copies of the teacher consent form (Appendix G), c) the questionnaire, d) the self-report, e) a postage-paid and addressed return envelope, f) a postcard to return separately from the return envelope to enter the participant in a drawing, and g) two $1 bills as an immediate incentive to participate. Each participant packet was assigned a participant code number by the researcher. Participants were asked to complete and return the questionnaire within three weeks of the receiving the...
participant packet. The master list of participant names and codes was only seen by the researcher and will be destroyed at the end of the study to ensure questionnaire participant anonymity and confidentiality.

The first return deadline occurred during the beginning of the winter holiday break of all of the participating schools. The first mailing resulted in 13 completed surveys and two surveys that were not completed. The respondents for the uncompleted surveys cited busy schedules or non-interest as reasons for not completing the surveys. The first follow-up letter and a second distribution of the participant packets were distributed immediately following the winter holiday break with a request for their completion 10 days after their receipt. The second mailing resulted in an additional 11 completed surveys, one uncompleted survey, and one envelope containing the $2 incentive included in the participant packet.

Two days after the second deadline, a second follow-up letter was sent with a new deadline of ten days. This second follow-up letter was sent as an attachment via e-mail to the site administrator to distribute. The second follow-up request resulted in 1 uncompleted packets returned through the mail and 33 packets returned by the site coordinators. A third and final follow-up letter was sent on the day of the last deadline as an attachment via e-mail to the site administrator to distribute. The final follow-up effort resulted in 3 packets returned by the site coordinators, three envelopes containing the $2 incentive, and one email from a teacher describing why s/he did not participate in the study (Appendix L).

In total, 25 packets were returned completed with an overall completion rate of 35.2%. An additional 8.4% were accounted for through uncompleted surveys returned in
the mail. A total of 36 or 50.7% of the packets were eventually returned by the site coordinators. Two site coordinators with low participation rates for their sites were asked for insight into why the teachers did not respond to multiple requests. One of these site coordinators responded with three reasons: a) that s/he was unable to require participation of the teachers, b) that many of the performing arts teachers were part-time faculty and only on campus for part of the week, and c) that three teachers had international backgrounds that might have resulted in language or cultural barriers that inhibited their participation. The other site coordinator indicated that the teachers at his/her school would be unlikely to participate in the study due to a lack of interest in the study or to the busy rehearsal and performance schedules of professional artists.

Procedures for the teacher and administrator interviews.

Teachers from each of the three performing arts content areas were randomly selected from all questionnaire respondents by the researcher to participate in a brief interview. Seven of the teacher interviews were conducted via telephone. Five of the teacher interviews were conducted via email due to the complicated rehearsal and performance schedules of the interviewees. Five music and five theater teachers participated in the interview. All three dance teacher participants were selected for the interview. The participating site coordinators were asked to provide contact information for additional dance teachers to participate in the interview and to complete the questionnaire electronically. Three dance teachers were contacted but did not respond to two requests for their participation.

All administrators were informed of their role in the study and asked to complete an informed consent form (Appendix H). Four of the five administrators participated in
the interview process. Three requests for an interview with the fifth administrator were unsuccessful. One administrator requested an email interview due to a busy schedule that included two weeks of travel for recruitment during the second stage of the study.

All telephone interviews were audiotaped. All interview participants were asked to check their corresponding interview summary for accuracy according to established guidelines for qualitative inquiry and to support the credibility of the research findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002).

In response to the second question of the Interview Protocol, several participants indicated that they did not understand the term “differentiation”. In this event, the researcher provided the participant with this definition of differentiation: “Differentiation is a term used in the field of education. It generally means that teachers adapt instruction to meet the individual needs of their students.”
Procedures for document review.

Participating administrators were asked for documents related to the selection of teachers and their role within the school program. The Document Review Guidelines (Appendix E) were used to gather information about the criteria used to select teachers for the program, their responsibilities within the program, and how they are evaluated for their success in working with students. The corresponding administrator or administrators were asked to clarify the documents as needed. This data was used to supplement the data related to characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers working with talented students in the performing arts.

Study Participant Compensation

Two dollars were attached to each participant packet as an initial incentive for participation. Each participant that returned a completed questionnaire and self-report was also entered into a drawing for 20 $10 gift cards from one of three selected retail stores identified for their appeal to teachers. Administrators that completed interviews, teachers that participated in the interview, and the contact person at each school received a $5 gift card in appreciation for their assistance and their time. All participants and participating schools will be offered the opportunity to receive a 5-10 page summary of the study and its findings.
Table 11

*Research Questions with Corresponding Data Collection and Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the perceptions of arts teachers in specialized secondary</td>
<td>-Teacher Questionnaire</td>
<td>- Descriptive statistics (frequency counts, percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools for the performing arts regarding the characteristics and</td>
<td>-Teacher Interviews</td>
<td>- categorical coding and thematic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching behaviors that make teachers effective in working with talented</td>
<td>-Administrator Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students in the performing arts?</td>
<td>-Document Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do the descriptions of characteristics and behaviors of effective</td>
<td>-Teacher Questionnaire</td>
<td>- Descriptive statistics (frequency counts, percentages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers working with talented students in the performing arts differ</td>
<td>-Teacher Interviews</td>
<td>- categorical coding and thematic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by arts area?</td>
<td>-Administrator Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11 (continued)

Research Questions with Corresponding Data Collection and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. What instructional strategies do teachers of talented students in the performing arts use to develop the talent of their students? How is the success of these strategies assessed?</td>
<td>Teacher Questionnaire, Interviews, and Document Review</td>
<td>- Teacher Descriptive statistics (frequency counts, percentages) - Administrator Interviews analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do arts teachers in selected specialized schools for the performing arts rate themselves on an instrument reflecting differentiated instructional behaviors?</td>
<td>Teacher Self-Report, Interviews, and Document Review</td>
<td>- Teacher Descriptive statistics (frequency counts, percentages) - Administrator Interviews analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

The categorical data from the teacher questionnaire and self-report instruments and the document review guidelines were compiled and reported using frequencies, percentages, and descriptive statistics where appropriate. The remaining data from the open-ended questionnaire item, interview questions, and document analysis were coded, using both indigenous and researcher-generated interpretive categories and themes derived from the study questions.

Inductive analysis procedures incorporating both open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and interpretive coding, or sensitizing concepts, (Patton, 2002) were used to analyze the responses received from the open-response item on the teacher questionnaire. Categorical analysis is the first step in an inductive analytical approach and uses "key phrases, terms, and practices" referenced by the participants (indigenous categories) in developing an inventory or codebook for content analysis (Patton, 2002, p. 453). Both the emic and etic perspectives were used to understand the practices of performing arts education and to align these practices with terms and concepts used in K-12 general and gifted education.

Codes were then listed on index cards for each data type (i.e., open-response questionnaire item, teacher interview) and by question (i.e., teacher interview question one, teacher interview question two, etc.) The descriptive codes for the responses were separated into characteristics or behaviors of teachers. The codes were then assigned to categories (i.e., communication skills, relating to students) under the headings of characteristics and behaviors of teachers.
This study reflects many of the major elements of the qualitative research tradition. In addition to previously mentioned standards of trustworthiness, this study employed an audit trail and researcher journal to support the dependability and confirmability of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The audit trail included all correspondence, school and program documents, and all data and instrumentation. The purpose of the researcher journal was to record thoughts and actions related to the study. Because of the researcher’s experiences and professional training in the performing arts, the researcher journal also ensured that the interpretation of the data is based on the data collected and not on the researcher’s beliefs and expectations. The triangulation of data through multiple participants for the questionnaire and interview, the two types of interviews, and the document analysis supports the credibility of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher journal and purposive sampling of the participants supports the transferability or applicability of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Ethical Considerations

In accordance with the policies of the College of William and Mary Protection of Human Subjects Committee, the researcher completed the Responsible Conduct of Research and Human Subjects Training Programs. The risk to the participants in this study was minimal. All participants were fully informed of their role in the study, the intended use of the research data, and the data collection procedures in which they were involved. Informed consent was collected from each individual. Participants were informed of their right to discontinue their participation at any time in the study both during the questionnaire phase and if they were selected for the interview phase. Participants’ identities, including school names and profiles, were coded and all
responses will remain confidential. All documents linking participants' identities with their coded responses were destroyed once the dissertation was completed. Because of the exploratory nature of the study, deception is not a concern. Participants were also given the opportunity of receiving a brief report summarizing the study and its findings.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that affect the generalizability of the findings. The questionnaire used in this study was sent to performing arts teachers at five specialized schools for the performing arts that serve students in grades 9-12. The size of the performing arts faculty at each school varied, with most schools having more music and theater faculty than dance faculty available to participate.

The findings of this study are limited to the sample of participants due to the low response rate to the questionnaire (35%). The response rate was affected by several contextual factors, including the cooperation of the administrator from each school and the complexity of the professional schedules of the targeted teachers. The targeted teachers are practicing professional artists as well as arts teachers and have rehearsals, performances, and classes to teach. Two schools were also involved in recruitment tours during the period of this study that further complicated the schedules of teachers and administrators. The response rate may also have been affected by the attitudes of the targeted teachers toward educational research. One non-respondent specifically stated his/her negative opinions about survey and interview research.

Another limitation relates to the manner in which the interviews were conducted. Seven teacher interviews and three administrator interviews were conducted via telephone. The remaining interviews were conducted via email. Follow-up questions and
probing for more information were more successful via telephone and provided the researcher with the opportunity to explain the concept of differentiation during the interview protocol.

A third limitation relates to the analysis procedures used to code and categorize the interview responses, open-response questionnaire item, and the documents that were received. The researcher was the only person to review the data, thus limiting the reliability of the coding and thematic analysis. The researcher is a professionally trained musician and holds degrees in music education and educational psychology. With experience in musical theater, too, the researcher holds a perspective that may allow certain biases into the practices and traditions of arts educators.

A fourth limitation relates to the lack of homogeneity of the participating schools. Four of the participating institutions were statewide or regional schools while the fifth was primarily regional or local. Two of the schools also served post-secondary level students. The five schools also varied in the extent to which the participating administrator had training and experience in the arts.
Chapter Four

Analysis of Results

This study was completed during the winter of 2005-2006 using questionnaire data, follow-up interviews with randomly selected teacher participants, administrator interviews, and document analysis. The questionnaire data were collected through a mailing distributed by site coordinators at the five participating schools. The interviews were conducted both over the telephone and via e-mail correspondence. Content analysis of relevant documents related to teacher selection and evaluation was also used. Quantitative data from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics and the remaining data were addressed using inductive and interpretive coding and thematic content analysis (e.g., Creswell, 2003; Patton, 2002; Rossman & Rallis, 1998).

Teachers from five schools with programs in the performing arts (music, dance, and theater) targeting students in grades 9-12 participated in this study. Seventy-one questionnaires were distributed to the five schools according to the potential samples identified by the administrator serving as a site coordinator. The site coordinator had agreed to distribute the questionnaire packets to the potential participants. A second mailing of packets and two follow-up reminders resulted in a 35% return rate (N=25). Six participant packets were received uncompleted, and one teacher corresponded by email to provide a reason for not participating in this study (see Appendix L). Additional information from two site coordinators indicated various circumstances that contributed to teachers' non-participation in this study.

Report of Findings

This chapter presents the results of this study organized by data source and then
by research question. First, the schools will be described briefly to provide contextual information while maintaining the confidentiality of the programs and the participants from each school. Second, the sample will be described by their responses to the demographic section of the questionnaire. Third, the findings will be described for each data source. Finally, the findings related to each research question will be stated.

The Schools

The participants for this study were drawn from five schools that have specialized programs in the performing arts serving secondary level students in grades 9-12. All five schools share several common attributes. First, students are selected for the programs using performance-based auditions which are conducted by performing arts professionals from the corresponding arts area. Second, the programs are intended to be more advanced and in-depth than the typical performing arts courses and activities available at a comprehensive high school. Third, the faculty members at these schools bring professional career experience in their arts area to their work with the students. Most of these practicing professional artists do not indicate formal training in the field of education. Finally, all of the programs provide full-time experiences for students during the academic school year. The majority of the schools indicate that they provide advanced performing arts training in addition to coursework necessary to meet the requirements for a comprehensive high school diploma in their state.

The schools that participated in this study are also very unique in the structure and history of their programs. Some of the schools have over a decade of experience of providing full-time targeted performing arts instruction during the academic year. Other schools began as half-day commuter or summer residential programs before becoming
academic year programs. Some of the performing arts programs within the schools provide instruction to students in grades 9-12 while other arts areas target students in Grades 11 and 12 or only Grade 12. Three of the schools are residential programs and two attract a majority of students from the surrounding metropolitan area.

Participant Information

Teaching responsibilities.

Table 12 provides an overview of the teaching responsibilities of the participants that completed the questionnaire. The sample of participants that completed the questionnaire (N=25) included 13 teachers reporting their primary teaching area as music (52%), nine reporting their area as theater (36%), and three reporting their area as dance (12%). Three of the participants identified as theater teachers were also responsible for courses that were interdisciplinary in nature, incorporating multiple performing arts areas, such as theater movement or singing for actors. However, since they primarily worked with actors and were housed in the theater department of their school, their designation as theater teachers was maintained.
Table 12

*Participant Characteristics: Teaching Responsibilities by Grade Level and Content Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Responsibility by Content Area</th>
<th>% of participant responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Responsibility by Grade Level</th>
<th>% of participant responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students not in grades 9-12</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the teachers reported working with upper secondary level students in grades 11 and 12. Seventy-two percent (N=18) reported working with students in grade 11 and all respondents reported working with students in twelfth grade. Eleven participants or 44% of the respondents indicated responsibility for teaching students in ninth grade. Fifty-two percent (N=13) reported teaching students in tenth grade. Over half of all respondents (N=17) or 68% indicated that they were also responsible for working with students at the undergraduate, graduate and/or middle school level.
Formal education and training.

Two participants reported receiving a two-year degree and 19 (76%) participants reported receiving a bachelor’s degree. One participant specifically noted the highest level of formal education received was a high school diploma. Of the five that did not indicate receiving a bachelor’s degree, two indicated completing a doctorate and one indicated completing a master’s degree. Overall, fifteen participants (60%) reported completing a master’s degree, and three participants reported completing a doctoral degree. Twelve participants described other certifications or training they have received, such as professional experiences in the United States and in Europe. Two of these participants reported that they were currently pursuing national teacher certification in their area.

Teaching experience.

The mean number of years of teaching experience represented by the participants (N=25) is 19.2 years, with a mean of 13.3 years at the secondary level. The mean number of years at a specialized secondary school for the arts is 10.8. The mean for the current position at a specialized secondary school is 11.4. Of the 25 participants, the range for teaching experience was from three to 40 years. In the space provided for other comments about teaching experience, one participant reported founding a small jazz school outside of Chicago. Another participant indicated that s/he teaches part-time and maintains a private practice as a psychotherapist. Table 13 provides a summary of the teaching experience of the questionnaire participants.
Table 13

*Participants’ teaching experience in years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience at secondary level</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience at specialized secondary school</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in current position</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Career experiences.*

All participants reported previous experience or current involvement as a professional in their performing arts area. Table 14 describes the participants’ career experiences in the performing arts. All three of the teachers of dance report ensemble performance experience in professional dance companies. One of the teachers in dance also reported professional experience on Broadway. Two of the teachers of theater report Broadway experience and four report Off-Broadway professional experience. Seven of the music teachers report experience giving solo recitals. The information provided about the various performance experiences of the participants indicates that all respondents were experienced, practicing professionals in the performing arts.
Table 14

*Career Experiences of the Questionnaire Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Experience Descriptor</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>% of participants indicating this career experience*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Broadway</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dance Company</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soloist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Tour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Repertory Theater Circuit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony Orchestra or Chorus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Chorale or Ensemble</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soloist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo Recitals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Commercials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Experience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total % greater than 100 because participants were able to select all career experiences that applied.
Questionnaire Data

Teacher characteristics.

The first section of the questionnaire asked the participants to rate the importance of several teacher characteristics when working with talented students in the performing arts. The participants were asked to assign a rating using the following scale: (1) highly uncharacteristic of an effective teacher, (2) usually uncharacteristic of an effective teacher, (3) usually characteristic of an effective teacher, (4) highly characteristic of an effective teacher.

All 25 participants answered 12 of the 15 items for teacher characteristics. Only 24 participants responded to the items for “knowledge of the needs of talented students”, “is highly intelligent”, and “displays confidence and possesses a well-developed self-concept”. One item, “enthusiastic for his/her content area”, was ranked as highly characteristic of an effective teacher by all participants (N=25). The responses for ten items ranged between “usually characteristic” and “highly characteristic” of an effective teacher. The responses for the remaining four items ranged between “usually uncharacteristic” to “highly characteristic” of an effective teacher. Table 15 provides a ranking of the characteristics by mean score. Ranking the means for each item provides a summary of the participants’ responses as a group and the extent of consensus among the participants about the teacher characteristics.

All of the teacher characteristics received a mean rating in the range of “usually characteristic” (3) and “highly characteristic” (4) of an effective teacher. Ten items received a mean rating greater than 3.50 and 14 of the 15 items have a standard deviation below 0.6, indicating little variability between the participants’ responses. The outlying
item, "is flexible in general or in the use of time in the classroom", received a mean rating of 3.36 but had the greatest variability of the teacher characteristic items with SD=0.638. The lowest rated item, "has a good sense of humor", also demonstrated low variability with SD=0.374. The second lowest rated item, "is highly intelligent", received a mean rating of 3.29 with a SD of 0.464. Other items that received a mean rating less than 3.50 were "has received advanced training in his/her content area" and "responds well to change".
Table 15

*Ratings for Teacher Characteristics Ranked by Mean*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic for his/her content area</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is creative or imaginative</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays confidence and possesses a well-developed self-concept</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced knowledge of his/her content area</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares about his/her students</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the needs of talented students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages students, is supportive</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays a broad general knowledge</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains high expectations for all students</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes individual differences</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has received advanced training in his/her content area</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds well to change</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is flexible in general or in their use of time in the classroom</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is highly intelligent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a good sense of humor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher behaviors.

The second section of the questionnaire asked the participants to rate the importance of several teacher behaviors when working with talented students in the performing arts. The participants were asked to assign a rating using the following scale: (1) highly uncharacteristic of an effective teacher, (2) usually uncharacteristic of an effective teacher, (3) usually characteristic of an effective teacher, (4) highly characteristic of an effective teacher.

Table 16 provides a ranking of the behaviors by mean score. The mean scores for teaching behaviors were lower overall than the mean scores for teacher characteristics. The mean scores for teaching behaviors also indicated less consensus among the respondents about the behaviors of an effective teacher with the greater variability and standard deviations ranging from 0.436 to 0.920. The respondents’ ratings of “usually characteristic” and “highly characteristic” indicate consensus among this sample for four teacher behaviors related to creating a positive classroom environment (M=3.76, SD=.436), responding to individual student needs (M=3.68, SD=.476), providing constructive feedback on student performance (M=3.64, SD=.490), and optimizing instructional time (M=3.64, SD=.490). Eight items have a variability ranging from 0.651 to 0.920. The lowest rated item, “designs and uses assessment instruments (e.g., tests, rubrics, checklists) to track student performance ability” received a mean rating of 2.59, SD=0.908. The item with the second largest variability received the third lowest mean rating, 3.13, SD=0.920. The second lowest rated item, “collaborates with other teachers to plan learning experiences”, received a mean rating of 3.08, SD=0.702, indicating greater consensus among the participants on this item.
Table 16
*Ratings for Teacher Behaviors Ranked by Mean*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creates a positive and supportive learning environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to individual student needs and problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides constructive and prompt feedback on student performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizes instructional time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects on work to improve student learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts content of course to meet individual student needs (i.e., repertoire, techniques, assignments)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps students develop a positive self-concept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts pacing of instruction to meet individual students’ needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of instructional strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts instructional content based on individual student needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses routines to organize class time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborates with other teachers to plan learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designs and uses assessment instruments (e.g., tests, rubrics, checklists) to track student performance ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five items received a full range of ratings from “highly uncharacteristic of an effective teacher” (1) to “highly characteristic of an effective teacher” (4). Four items received ratings ranging from “usually uncharacteristic of an effective teacher” (2) to “highly characteristic of an effective teacher” (4). Teacher behaviors that had a greater variability in their ratings relate to using routines to organize class time (M= 3.13, SD=.920), collaborating with other teachers to plan learning experiences (M=3.08, SD=.702), and designing and using assessments to track student performance ability (M=2.59, SD=.908).

Table 17 provides demonstrates the mean ratings of the items with the widest variability, SD>0.500. The variability demonstrates the shift from consensus from the item for “reflects on work to improve student learning”, with responses split between “usually characteristic” and “highly characteristic” of an effective teacher, to the greater variability of the responses for the item “designs and uses assessment instruments”. The latter item has an overall greater variability but the responses are clustered in the middle, divided almost equally between “usually uncharacteristic” and “usually characteristic” of an effective teacher. The second lowest rated item, “collaborates with other teachers”, has a mean rating of 3.08 and SD of 0.702, with a majority of the respondents (13) indicating that this item is “usually characteristic” of an effective teacher.
Table 17

*Frequency distribution of Responses for Teacher Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Ratings (Frequency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects on work to improve student learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts content of course to meet individual student needs (i.e., repertoire, techniques, assignments)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps students develop a positive self-concept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts pacing of instruction to meet individual students’ needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of instructional strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts instructional content based on individual student needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses routines to organize class time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborates with other teachers to plan learning experiences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designs and uses assessment instruments (e.g., tests, rubrics, checklists) to track student performance ability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional strategies.

The third section of the teacher questionnaire asked participants to indicate the instructional strategies that they use to develop the artistic talent of their students. The participants were asked to select all that applied and were provided with the opportunity to list additional strategies that they employ. Table 18 provides the frequencies for the instructional strategies as indicated by all of the participants.

A majority of the respondents indicated that they use seven of the ten instructional strategies listed in the questionnaire item. Less than half of the participants indicated using lecture presentation (44%) or high-level thinking and metacognitive models (48%). Other instructional strategies they reported using included: student performance, field trips, written and performed technique drills, scene study, student instructors or peer mentoring, guest artists, guest artist lectures, reading assignments, participation in other arts domains, and composition assignments. While 72% of the participants indicate using individual or group assessments, the item from the list of teacher behaviors related to designing and using assessment instruments to track student performance received the lowest composite rating (M=2.59) of all the teacher behaviors.
Table 18

*Instructional Strategies Used by the Participants (N=25)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for group learning, such as small ensembles, chamber</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensembles, scene study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to recordings or watch performances and critique them using</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the performances of students or student groups from the</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school using specific criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisational activities using newly learned knowledge or skill,</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as a fingering, a technique, a vocalise, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized instruction, such as private studio lessons, tutoring,</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socratic questioning to encourage students to clarify thoughts and</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumptions with reasoning and evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual or group assessments on specific parts, techniques,</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choreography, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study, such as preparing for a recital</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research projects related to their arts area</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-level thinking and metacognitive models</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture presentation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The fourth section of the questionnaire provided an opportunity for the participants to respond to a question designed to elicit further responses regarding characteristics and behaviors of teachers who are effective in working with talented students in the performing arts. Twenty-one of the 25 participants responded to this item. Inductive analysis procedures incorporating both open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and interpretive coding, or sensitizing concepts, (Patton, 2002) were used to analyze the responses received from the open-response item on the teacher questionnaire. Both the emic and etic perspectives were used to understand the practices of performing arts education and to align these practices with terms and concepts used in K-12 general and gifted education. The descriptive categories for the responses were separated into characteristics or behaviors of teachers. The responses varied greatly, and the categories were then put into groups to describe types of characteristics or behaviors to identify similarities in the responses. Appendix J contains the responses to this questionnaire item. Appendix K provides an example of the analysis and coding of a response to this questionnaire item.

Teacher characteristics highlighted in the open-response question address the teacher’s maturity as a person, emotional responses, ability to relate to students, communication skills, and ability within the artistic field. Two themes emerged from the responses to this questionnaire item. First, effective teachers in the performing arts positively interact with and relate to their students. Secondly, the responses suggest that effectiveness in teaching the performing arts comes more from the teacher as a person
than specific abilities as an artist and a teacher. Table 19 provides an overview of the categories as they relate to the two themes.

Table 19

*Themes for Open-Response Questionnaire Item*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>% of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effective teachers positively interact with and relate to their students.</td>
<td>Emotional Responses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relate to students</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effectiveness in teaching the performing arts comes more from the teacher as a person</td>
<td>Teacher as a person</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher modeling artistic life</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching ability in the arts</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the first theme, positive relations with students, effective teachers were described as “organized”, “disciplined”, self-confident, self-regulated, and humble. Participant O205 stated that “a sense of security…with the subject matter is essential”. Participant M107 indicated that effective teachers need to “have an organized, achievable plan to move [students] to the next level”. Participant M108 described self-confidence as
“willing to admit not knowing something” and a teacher as “humble and still curious, willing to learn”.

Emotionally, effective teachers were “patient” and “caring”. The terms most often used to describe care for students were “compassionate”, “concerned”, and “caring”. Teachers were most often described as supporting or “encouraging” students. O127 stated, “Students quickly sense if a teacher is genuinely interested in their performing.” Participant L110 shared, “An effective teacher encourages students to find ways to address weakness and deficiency while still enjoying the pursuit of excellence.”

Participant M103 shared, “many ineffective teachers seem to have forgotten what it’s like to not know how to do something”. Nurturing artistic ability, respecting students, and inspiring students were listed as important characteristics. Participant L110 stated, “Students should be inspired to desire and pursue the highest quality performance”.

Participant M108 described it as “[treating] students as people and not as children”. “The teachers who have inspired me in the past related to me more as a peer”, shared Participant P140.

Honesty and good communication skills were also seen as essential to effective teaching. Participant O204 shared, “I think an effective teacher needs to strive always to be the best listener in the world. It is only by really listening to students’ verbal and non-verbal communication that a teacher ‘can get inside their world’ to truly help the student move forward”. Participant O205 stated, “…a sense of humor with the subject matter is essential” and “I think the real talent in teaching is being able to communicate with each individual”. Participant P128 declared, “Honest and clear instruction starts with helping a student to be responsible to their goals…”. 
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The second theme, effectiveness in teaching the performing arts comes from the teacher as a person than specific abilities as an artist and a teacher, is represented by the disproportionate number of comments addressing teaching skills and behaviors. Thirty-one comments were made about teaching behaviors and 19 comments addressed the teacher as artist but 68 comments were categorized in the theme for effective teachers as able to relate to students.

The teacher’s knowledge and experience within their performing arts area, as well as their high expectations and standards for performance, were essential to their ability to model how to be an artist. Participant L103 stated, “First and foremost, thorough knowledge and ability in area of specialization.” Participant O137 shared that an effective teacher “must be a good performer to demonstrate techniques & musicality”. Responses revolve around the teacher serving as a model within the performing arts area through a career and active participation in the arts. Through an active artistic life, the teacher helps students relate to the process and content of the performing arts. The teaching behaviors of modeling for and guiding the student are linked to their professional performing experience.

The teacher also demonstrates balance between the artistry and technique of their area. Participant L104 shared that two influential teachers “modeled what they taught….they performed regularly, and let the studio observe their own creative process...”. Participant L110 described it as the teacher sharing the “journey with her students”. Another said, “Effective teachers in the arts are those who are actively contributing in their fields as performers” (Appendix JP108, emphasis in original). One participant (M103) offered a different point of view by stating, “Some of the most
talented musicians are terrible teachers because they have lost sight of how difficult certain things are”.

Related to this modeling of the artistic life, the teacher behaviors identified in the open-response question also relate to the teacher as practicing artist and the teacher’s instructional practices. The categories center on the teacher meeting students at their current level of ability, providing skills for the next level within the arts area, and teaching students how to teach themselves. Participant P119 stated, “An effective teacher...is one who provides the student with the experiences that will help them proceed to their next level”. Participant L110 shared, “...the student artist, with the help of a good teacher, becomes his own best teacher”. And Participant M107 said that effective teachers “need to meet the students at their current level of ability”.

COS-R Self-Report Data

For this study, participants were asked to complete the COS-R as a self-report instrument (Appendix B). This instrument was used to pilot an appendix of indicators for the performing arts areas and to provide information about how performing arts teachers perceive their abilities to implement differentiated instructional approaches from the field of gifted education in the performing arts classroom or studio setting. Twenty-four or 25 participants responded to each item. Responses included ratings of “ineffective”, “somewhat effective”, and “effective”, indications that the item was not applicable to the teacher, and no response to the item. Tables J thru O provide a summary of the responses for the teacher self-report. The number of respondents (N) reported in each row of the table refers to the number of participants that selected a rating (1, 2, or 3) for that item. This is the N used to calculate the mean score for that particular item.
Table 20 provides a summary of the responses for the Curriculum Planning and Delivery (CPD) section of the COS-R. For Curriculum Planning and Delivery, the item that received the fewest responses (N=21) addresses engaging students in planning, monitoring and assessing their learning. The three highest-rated items addressed high expectations for student performance, encouraging students to express their thoughts, and incorporating activities for students to apply new knowledge. Two participants provided narrative comments for the CPD section. One comment described an instructional strategy that involved evaluation of performances attended by the students. The other comment indicated that the teacher was part-time and that “some opportunities are not open to me”.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 20

Participant Self-Ratings for the COS-R: Curriculum Planning and Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Item Rating</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set high expectations for student performance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated activities for students to apply new knowledge</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged students in planning, monitoring, and assessing their learning</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged students to express their thoughts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had students reflect on what they had learned</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Ineffective 2=Somewhat Effective 3=Effective

Table 21 provides a summary of the responses for the Accommodations for Individual Differences (AID) section of the COS-R. The item that received the highest composite rating for this section (N=21, M=2.62) addresses providing opportunities for individual or group learning to promote depth in understanding content. One participant did not respond to this item and three indicated that this item was not applicable to them. The item that received the lowest number of responses addresses accommodating...
individual or subgroup differences (N=19, M=2.58). Five participants indicated that this item was not applicable to them.

Two narrative comments addressed this section of the COS-R. One indicated, "I teach technique classes—the structure of the lesson does not encompass #8 and #9". These items relate to encouraging multiple interpretations of events or situations and allowing students to discover key ideas through structured activities or questions. The other comment provided examples of how the teacher accommodates for individual differences in private lessons, ensembles, and in academic arts classes.
Table 21

*Participant Self-Ratings for the COS-R: Accommodations for Individual Differences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided opportunities for independent or group learning to promote depth in understanding content</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodated individual or subgroup differences</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged multiple interpretations of events and situations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed students to discover key ideas individually through structured activities and/or questions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Ineffective 2=Somewhat Effective 3=Effective

Table 22 provides a summary of the responses for the Problem Solving (PS) section of the COS-R. The item that received the highest rating (N=22, M=2.90) addresses engaging students in problem identification and definition. Three participants indicated that this item was not applicable to them. The item with the lowest rating and lowest response (N=19, M=2.21) addresses employing brainstorming techniques. Six
participants indicated that this item was not applicable to them, two rated themselves as ineffective, and only six rated themselves as effective. Two comments were received for this section of the COS-R, but only one was unambiguous and comprehensible. This participant stated, “In choir, I will often ask them what they heard—problems, if any, and how they would address them.”

Table 22

*Participant Self-Ratings for the COS-R: Problem Solving*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed brainstorming techniques</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged students in problem identification and definition</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged students in solution-finding activities and comprehensive solution articulation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 provides a summary of the responses for the Critical Thinking section of the COS-R. Three items in this section received five or more indications that this item was not applicable to the participant. The item with the highest rating received the most responses (N=22, M=2.91) and addressed encouraging students to judge or evaluate situations, problems, or issues. The item with the lowest rating (N=17, M=2.59)
addresses providing opportunities for students to generalize from concrete data or information to the abstract.

Five narrative comments related to the Critical Thinking section of the COS-R. One comment indicated that the participant did not understand Item 16, encouraging student synthesis or summary of information within or across disciplines. Another commented that the students are asked to demonstrate the principles of the course within themselves but not to judge themselves or others. A third comment indicated that critical thinking occurs in the class but is not necessarily planned. The fourth and fifth comments provided examples of how the section applied to their instruction.
Table 23

*Participant Self-Ratings for the COS-R: Critical Thinking*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged students to judge or evaluate situations, problems, or issues</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged students in comparing and contrasting ideas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided opportunities for students to generalize from concrete data or information to the abstract</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged student synthesis or summary of information within or across disciplines</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 provides a summary of the responses for the Creative Thinking section of the COS-R. The number of responses in this section indicating that the item was not-applicable ranged from three to six. The item with the highest rating and highest response (N=22, M=2.86) addressed encouraging students to demonstrate open-mindedness, and tolerance of imaginative, sometimes playful solutions to problems. The item with the
lowest rating (N=20, M=2.65) addresses engaging students in the exploration of diverse points of view to reframe ideas. The item with the lowest response rate (N=19, M=2.79) addresses soliciting many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas.

Four narrative comments addressed this section of the COS-R, but only three were comprehensible. One dance teacher indicated that Item 19, encouraging students to demonstrate open-mindedness and tolerance, etc., “is the only statement that would be extrapolated to address the format of a dance class (ballet)”. Another ensemble director stated, “I feel it necessary to drive rehearsals and classes more than I would like to [in order] to keep the students focused” (emphasis in original statement). The last comment stated, “Creative thinking is encouraged and employed through listening exercises or composition class.”
Table 24

*Participant Self-Ratings for the COS-R: Creative Thinking*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicited many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged students in the exploration of diverse points of view to reframe ideas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged students to demonstrate open-mindedness and tolerance of imaginative, sometimes playful solutions to problems</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided opportunities for students to develop and elaborate on their ideas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 provides a summary of the responses for the Research Strategies section of the COS-R. The section of the COS-R received the lowest response rate with only 44
to 68% of the participants responding to these items. Eight or more participants indicated that the items in this section were not applicable to them.

Table 25

*Participant Self-Ratings for the COS-R: Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>N/</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required students to gather evidence from multiple sources through research-based techniques</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided opportunities for students to analyze data and represent it in appropriate charts, graphs, or tables</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked questions to assist students in making inferences from data and drawing conclusions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged students to determine implications and consequences of findings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided time for students to communicate research study findings to relevant audiences in a formal report and/or presentation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NR: No Response*
The item that received the lowest response rate and lowest rating (N=11, M=2.18, SD=0.936) addresses providing opportunities for students to analyze data and represent it in appropriate charts, graphs, or tables. This item also received the most ratings of "not applicable". The narrative comments below explain why several of the participants did not see this item as applicable to their work. The item with the second lowest response rate (N=14, M=2.29; SD=.700) addresses providing time for students to communicate research study findings to relevant audiences in a formal report and/or presentation.

Six narrative comments addressed the items in the Research section of the COS-R. One dance teacher stated, "This happens in dance history but not technique classes." Three other comments indicated that research was not appropriate to the course or that it was not possible in the time constraints of the course that they teach. Two comments from music teachers were similar but varied, based on their interpretation of the items. One music teacher indicated that the items "seem an awkward match for applied performance instruction" and that rephrasing the items "might capture the investigative aspects of performance education, e.g., listening to multiple recordings, examining diverse music editions, etc." The other music teacher provided an example of how the items could be used in an applied performance situation. One example included doing "through research using many sources" and preparing "program notes for each piece" that is included in a recital program. These ratings and comments suggest that these teachers define research differently than the definition used for the COS-R, a definition based on issues or problem-based social-science research.
Teacher Interview Data

*Characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers.*

Inductive analysis procedures incorporating both open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and interpretive coding (Patton, 2002) were used to analyze the responses received from the twelve interviews with teachers. The responses were analyzed and assigned codes for each thought or idea expressed. Descriptive categories for the responses were separated into characteristics or behaviors of teachers and then the categories were then put into groups to describe types of characteristics or behaviors to identify similarities in the responses. Four theater teachers, five music teachers, and two dance teachers participated in the teacher interviews. Seven interviews were completed on the telephone and five were completed via e-mail. Interview participants were offered the opportunity to select their own pseudonym. If they did not reply to two requests for a pseudonym, the researcher selected one at random from a list of favorite television characters. Four pseudonyms chosen by participants were deemed to betray the participant’s identity and had to be modified to protect the participant’s anonymity. All participants’ responses were summarized and sent to them individually to check for accuracy.

The responses to the interview question on teacher characteristics were diverse. Appendix M contains the teacher’s interview responses. Appendix N provides the key words and ideas stated in response to the first interview question on characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers. Appendix R contains an example of the coding of the interview data.

Teacher characteristics described by the interview participants can be described as relating to teacher qualifications in the arts area, personal qualities, and the ability to
relate to students. Many of the participants identified that they and their colleagues were well-trained as artists. Anastasia said, "I am totally and thoroughly knowledgeable about my subject area", and Lee said, "I have been through the training that my students experience and this helps me be a successful teacher". Leonard shared, "I'm very trained, I've had tons of training in the areas in which I teach."

Other responses noted a passion for the performing arts, creativity within the arts area, and the teacher serving as a model practicing artist. The interview participant known as F.A. described his/her colleagues as "highly-trained artist teachers" who "continue to develop their own musical abilities". Another interviewee, D.B., described the effective teacher as "modeling behavior both as a performer and as a teacher". Leonard described his colleagues as "very creative" and having a "sense of freedom in their person". Tim described his colleagues as having a "passion for what they do".

Effective teachers were also described as possessing a variety of personal qualities. These characteristics included caring and compassion for students, self-confidence, motivation, creativity, organization, and flexibility. Similarly, the teacher's ability to relate to or connect with students was identified as important by several participants. Tim described the effective teacher as "connecting with students and remembering their own training....teachers who worked to connect with them in their experiences". C.G. attributed his/her success to the "big singer personality" that attracts students and his/her ability to communicate "on a level that students understand". Leonard described his colleagues as "giving people", giving of their time and energy to students, and John described his colleagues as "completely dedicated to the students....they want to see the students succeed".
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Teacher behaviors described by the interview participants were also diverse. Behaviors identified address teachers’ communication skills and instructional skills. Tim identified communication skills important in his own work and in his colleagues’ work. C.G. shared that he/she “communicates well”, especially using a “large singer vocabulary” in his/her teaching. Donna mentioned “reflective listening” and Lee stated that teachers need to “speak truth to students”.

The three instructional behaviors mentioned by several participants were: the teacher’s high expectations for students within the arts area, the teacher’s recognition of and response to their students as individuals, and using long and short-term goals to plan instruction. John shared that he has “a passionate desire to perform quality music” and Charles stated he sets goals at a “high level”. Lee described successful teachers as setting “high standards” and Donna described “a desire for individual excellence with a standard that is not one-size-fits-all”. D.B. responded that effective teaching is “using creative descriptions tailored to individual students to convey concepts” and C.G. described being able to “explain it in a very creative fashion for each student”. In relation to planning for instruction, Anastasia stated, “I have to ability to see where the student is and their immediate goals as well as their long-term goals”. Donna described her colleagues as having “a strong sense of the plan for learning, both class to class and as a semester”.

**Differentiation.**

The second teacher interview question asked: What is your understanding of the concept of differentiation? How do you believe differentiation applies to specialized schools and programs for the performing arts? Nine of the 11 teacher interviewees were unfamiliar with the term differentiation within an educational context. Most of these were
able to describe how they believed differentiation to apply to their schools and programs. The other participants requested a definition of differentiation before applying the concept to their work. Two of these were unable to apply the definition of differentiation to their school. One specifically stated an objection to using educational terms to describe his/her work with students.

In response to the question on differentiation, Tim stated, “I have no idea what that means”. When he was provided with a definition of differentiation as a term used in the field of education that describes teachers as responding to the individual needs of learners, Tim shared, “I don’t speak in those [educational] terms or even accept them”. His further comments indicated that teaching skills can be developed but not taught and that “one’s communicative skills.....is the only thing that’s needed” to be an effective teacher. Leonard response was, “I don’t know that term. I really don’t know what you mean by differentiation.” After he was provided with the same definition of differentiation, his response was, “I don’t know educational terms.”

After hearing the definition of differentiation, John shared, “I think you’d find the artist faculty here do not have education backgrounds, on purpose. I’ve never had an education course in my entire life.....so, that concept to me is foreign”. C.J. responded, “Differentiation is not a terminology I am familiar with in describing arts education”.

Of the teachers that did apply the concept of differentiation to their school, a majority of them described differentiation as tailoring instruction to each student. Four teachers stated that this included meeting students’ needs and interests. Without receiving a definition of differentiation, D.B. described differentiation as “the ability to tailor the lesson plan to each student based on background, ability, and rate of progress”. F.A. also
did not need a definition of differentiation and described “matching instructional approaches to the needs and interests of each student”. Charles described differentiation as “designing your teaching to create different learning experiences for different students”.

After hearing the definition of differentiation, Anastasia responded, “I recognize that we do it all the time….we do not treat all students the same”. Lee shared, “I agree that teachers need to adapt instruction to meet the needs of individual students….I adjust what I do for each student”. C.G. stated that “students have their own way of learning and their own pace of learning”.

Two other teachers described an example or two of differentiation but then stated that differentiation either did not apply to working with musical ensembles or were unsure how the term could apply to musical ensembles. John shared, “We clip ahead at a very fast pace and tailoring the instruction to individual needs is important for private lessons, but in a group situation we have to understand that we teach to the highest common denominator”. Charles said, “Instruction must be designed to cater to all different levels, especially in the area of individual instruction. I’m not convinced that it applies to the ensemble setting, where we tend to set one performance level for the entire group”.

Determining the success of instruction.

The third interview question asked: How do you determine the success of your instruction? Success of instruction was indicated by successful performance by students by five of the twelve interview participants. Five responses also indicated that the teacher can see the growth in the student. D. B. shared, “For a music teacher, successful
performance is an easy gauge of successful teaching”. Lee mentioned, “I’m not sure how I measure success of my instruction, but I know that I look at their growth...during their time in the program as well as during a course”. Charles described this as “measurement of improvement” and “amount of personal growth”.

Remaining responses indicated a variety of ways in which instruction was determined to be successful, including informal and formal assessment of skills. The only standardized assessment mentioned was the Advanced Placement Music Theory test available from the College Board. Informal assessment involved students demonstrating understanding of the concepts taught, students reaching individual goals, and students moving to the next level of training, such as undergraduate or graduate study or a professional career in the performing arts. C.G. shared, “I hear it in their text” and that she sees it in their “facial expression”, and Anastasia noted, “It is both in the moment and in their future accomplishments...when they go on to prestigious universities or dance companies”. F.A. described his/her approach as using a “lesson sheet...that outlines my response to their performance in lesson that day, and assignments for the next week. Their grade depends on how closely they met the outlined goals from the week prior”.

Instruction was also determined to be successful based on the ability of students to think critically in their arts area by three participants. F. A. shared, “When students can hear critically what they have produced, and evaluate it accurately and with maturity...we have mastered a step beyond mere execution of a good performance”. Continued student engagement in the arts was also important to two participants. D.B. stated, “Ultimately helping students to think critically and be engaged in the arts on whatever level they choose beyond school is success”. The level of material performed
and invitations to prestigious events and competitions were also described as indicators of
successful instruction. John stated, “For performance, success is judged by the quality of
the performance and being invited to perform at prestigious events”.

Summaries of Teacher Interviews

The following are the summaries of the individual interviews that were sent to
each participant for their review and correction to support the accuracy of the analysis.
These vignettes are presented here to illustrate the individual teacher perceptions related
to the interview questions regarding effective teachers in the performing arts,
differentiation in specialized schools for the performing arts, and monitoring the success
of instruction in the participating schools. Quotations are used to identify the participants’
own words in the interview summaries.

“DB”, music.

You see in yourself and others several characteristics and skills that contribute to
success in working with the students in your school, including organization and planning,
caring about students, motivation to work in the arts, and the ability to foresee the needs
of students. Modeling behavior as a performer and a teacher and the use of descriptive
language to communicate concepts to students are also important to being successful with
students in your school.

The term “differentiation” and its definition are unfamiliar to you. However, you
interpret it as applying to your teaching as the ability to adapt instruction to individual
students according to their prior experience, facility with the instrument, and
demonstrated improvement. The majority of your work is in an instrumental studio
setting and you emphasize teaching students how to teach themselves. You also
recognize that using different strategies or language for different students is an appropriate form of instruction. Instructional experiences vary with each student.

Successful performance is one way of assessing success of instruction. You also state that there are other ways to assess instruction based on the level of student. For high school students it is success in their auditions for college, for college students it is a successful graduate school audition or the transition to working as a musician, and for graduate students it is transitioning to work as a musician. An ultimate goal of your work is to help students think critically and engage in the arts beyond school to a level according to their wishes.

"CJ", dance.

The legacy passed on to you by your teachers in the arts is the most essential characteristic of your teaching. Respect of this legacy contributes to students’ learning through their trust and discipline. Differentiation is a term that is unfamiliar to you as an arts educator. The arts are an example of a career with specific training but it is important that artists reflect society. Artists must keep themselves free from judgments within this society. You gauge the success of your instruction through the ability of your students to support themselves professionally and thoughtfully guide others in the arts. Not all your students will enter the professional arena but you hope that through arts education you will thoughtfully guide others in any professional life they may enter.

"Tim", theater.

You believe that your ability to communicate with students helps you to connect with them and to be successful in your teaching. You also draw upon your own training and experiences with your teachers to help you communicate with students. You
recognize that the ability of your colleagues to communicate with students helps them be successful in their teaching. These colleagues also possess a passion for their work that contributes to their success.

You are unfamiliar with the term of differentiation. You do not use educational terms to describe your work. You believe that good communication is at the heart of teaching and that the ability to communicate well and relate to students comes through experience and examples that were set by your own teachers. Teaching is about being able to establish relationships.

Judging the success of your teaching does not always happen in the final performance or students’ ability to deliver. You know you are successful when you see in them “an understanding of a concept or the ability to restate an idea” back to you in their own terms.

“FA”, music.

Your training as an artist and in education as well as your experiences in teaching help you be successful in your work. Your personality also supports your success through your ability to share your musical gift with others and to reveal others’ gifts. You are able to identify problems and suggest solutions that are effective. You are encouraging and celebrate students’ successes. Your colleagues are also highly-trained artists that continue to study and develop their abilities. They enjoy working with their students and as a group you offer mutual encouragement that supports your success individually and as a team.

Differentiation is the “matching of instructional strategies to the needs and interests of individual students”. Your work as a private studio teacher allows you to
differentiate fully for each student. In classroom situations, you recognize students’
different backgrounds and experiences as a reason to differentiate experiences.

You use informal and formal assessments. Students have a log from each lesson
that provides goals and assignments for the next week and they receive a grade for
achieving these goals. Ensembles perform in the community and engage in evaluations of
their performances. Students demonstrate their learning by listening critically and
providing accurate evaluations of their performances.

“CG”, music.

The characteristic that you have that helps you be successful is the “big singer
personality that attracts students” to you and allows you to communicate with them. You
also believe that you have the ability to communicate in a variety of ways, using a large
vocabulary for singers, because this vocabulary is different for each instrument. You can
communicate with students on a level that they understand. Your colleagues also
communicate well. They are well-thought-out communicators with broad knowledge and
intellect.

You are unfamiliar with the concept of differentiation. However, you interpret
that it means that each artist has their own way of understanding what you are trying to
get them to do. This is especially true for singers because their instrument is their body,
and each individual instrument is affected by an individual brain and physicality. So you
do a lot of observation of what the singers do naturally and healthfully. You try to
“recognize what it is and encourage that until it carries over into their singing production
more consistently”. All students have their own way of learning and their own pace of
learning. Unfortunately, the conservatory system does not always allow teachers to make
adaptations for students who may be innately talented as artists but not yet ready to conceptualize in certain areas of their study. Sometimes the artists get weeded out. The concept of differentiation is that this person cannot accept this new information right now. You believe the “brain is not ready to conceptualize these things” and “the system does not allow the time” students might need to succeed.

You can see the success of my instruction in the performance of my students, as you watch them stand up and perform. You can “hear them anywhere in the Opera house” because of the good training they have received. They “sing with vocal freedom, artistry, and confidence”. You watch them balance acting and singing and “they do an amazing job for singers of their age”.

"Leonard", theater.

You believe the characteristics that you have that allow me to be a successful teacher are patience and the ability to walk in and engage with a group of people. You also think you are perceptive of students’ needs. You think these characteristics seem to work for you and tend to make you good at what you do. You are very trained in the areas in which you teach. Your colleagues “are very generous with themselves; they give of themselves, they give of their time”. They tend to not have rules about formalities, even down to “call me whatever you are comfortable calling me”. They are “grounded people, psychologically grounded in reality”. They are very creative and have a sense of freedom in their person. “They’re very smart people. They are intelligent and smart and sharp in intellect”.

You are very unfamiliar with the term differentiation. You know that your teaching is successful through the feedback you get and by the results that you see in your
students. The direct feedback from the students and also what you see and "what they see as the changes". These changes in them have "some kind of visible or audible measure; the results are definitely measurable and represent a measure that is of significant impact".

"John", music.

You think first and foremost that you have a passionate desire to perform quality music. Secondly you have to be very organized because your schedule is very rigorous. Your colleagues are completely dedicated to the students. You've noticed that your colleagues are really "hard workers" and "are passionate about what they do". They really "want to see the students succeed".

You don't know if you have an understanding of what differentiation is. After you heard the explanation of this term, you think visitors would find that the artist faculty at your school do not have education backgrounds and that your school is looking "for people actually in the field as practicing artists". So, that concept is foreign to you. You believe that you move ahead at a very fast pace and in a group situation you have to understand that you teach to the highest common denominator. Tailoring the instruction to individual needs is important for private lessons. The philosophy, for certain teachers, would be that if there is a student that is falling behind that you certainly want to help them in every way, but that is not a term that you are normally familiar with as a teacher.

You teach a variety of courses. For your music theory course the success would be first and foremost that they have an understanding of the way music works. You also look at the fact that your "school was ranked among the highest in the world for AP theory test results for a school of its size". For your performing ensembles, success is
judged by the quality of the performance and being invited to perform at prestigious events. For example, you’ve been broadcast on statewide public radio, public television, and the [NAME] festival. So, “prestigious invitations, quality choral music and quality performance are certainly indicators of success”.

“Anastasia”, dance.

You are totally and thoroughly knowledgeable about my subject area and you have “a certain degree of empathy for your students”. You have the ability “to see where the student is and their immediate goals as well as their long term goals”. You also recognize that “students may have good days and bad days” and that you are able to respond to them with emotional stability and a certain level of detachment when needed. Your colleagues are able to relate to the kids on their level and take them to the next level in their training. They are also able to work together, to cooperate in the department and to work as a team. They also “respond to students’ needs with compassion”.

You are not familiar with the term differentiation. However, once it is explained you recognize that you “do it all the time”. You look at students’ personalities, their stated and unstated goals. You “do not treat all students the same”. On a technical level, there is differentiation between a clean technique and knowledge of technique or the lack thereof; this is knowing what students can do and where their limits are at this time.

When you can see that they are improving you know that your instruction has been successful. It is both “in the moment and in their future accomplishments”. In the long term, it is when they go on to prestigious universities or dance companies. You teach students “the conceptual base for the technical movements and connect the classical
technique” to other styles. Most of them come to you “with only the knowledge of steps” so this is an example of how you can see that they improve.

“Lee”, theater.

You have “been through the training that my students are experiencing” and this helps you be a successful teacher. You also believe that successful teachers must be themselves. Teachers need to “get to know their students, build trust, and speak truth to students regardless”. Successful teachers set high standards, have an understanding of the creative process, and have “a reasonably good mind or intellect”. Your colleagues demonstrate these characteristics, too. Finally, a successful teacher needs to be able to recognize if their students are doing good work.

You are unfamiliar with the educational term differentiation. You agree that teachers need “to adapt instruction to meet the needs of individual students”. Differentiation is part of everything you do---you “teach the students, not the subject”. You adjust what you do for each student. Differentiation is an “incredibly important part” of what you do in your program. You believe it is “your response to their needs” and you “have to look at each student differently”.

You are not sure how you measure success of your instruction, but you know that you look at their growth. You look at students both for their growth “during their time in the program” as well “during a course from the beginning to the end”. You recognize the abilities of your students but then focus on the skills that they lack. This process of growth is “not a linear process” and growth cannot be guaranteed. Knowledge in this artistic area is not cumulative. Your work is based on “looking at the artistic process” and
“applying skills and principles throughout the process regardless of where one is in life or a career”.

“Donna”, theater.

Characteristics and skills that help you and your colleagues be successful with your students are: “patience; tolerance; flexibility; a good sense of humor; a desire for individual excellence with a standard that is not one size fits all; the intuitive capacity to guide students; a sense of discipline; compassion; joyfulness; reflective listening; the ability to see beyond the personality of students and to unconditionally accept students where they are in their lives; the ability to ask a lot of questions and to foster inquiry; and a love of teenagers”. You also recognize in your colleagues: “an ability to see students holistically as human beings; steadiness; the ability to foster and build resilience; a strong sense of the plan for learning, both class to class (the trees) and as a semester (the forest); flexibility within this plan for learning; an ability to see into the personal lives of students and to recognize their needs; the ability to guide students in their application of their training; and the ability to balance students’ needs and the integrity of the program”.

You are unfamiliar with the educational term differentiation. However, you see that you differentiate in many ways for your students. Some of your arts students are gifted academically and in the arts and others are not. Some students have learning difficulties. For example, “a student actor with difficulty in reading may not do well with cold readings but would be able to learn and rehearse and perform competently”. You also recognize that some “students have qualities that do not match the requirements of their chosen field” and you and your colleagues need to help them find “an appropriate match for their strengths”. Other students learn quickly and work very hard to learn. You
want to prepare them “to be able to succeed in their arts discipline whether they are a triple threat” or not. You foster students in what they do well and at the same time help them develop and strengthen their weaknesses. You and your colleagues work best when you do not compare individuals with each other.

You use several methods of determining the success of instruction. You use “Socratic questioning to develop students’ learning of the fundamental principles” of the area you are studying. You don’t want them “to parrot what you said but to learn to think for themselves”. You hope to “light a fire of interest under them so they would continue learning” even if you were not there. You ask students to evaluate their own learning about midway through the semester. The content of their learning does not have to be exactly what you’ve studied---you are “more concerned that they are continuously learning how to learn”. Some students “learn more content and others may not learn as much”. You ask students what they need from you to help them learn and understand the material. Success of instruction is also “seen in students’ ability to move beyond their training and the cerebral side of training to a full expression of themselves while they are performing”. You intend to foster freedom and a full range of expression for all students.

“Dresser”, theater.

The skill you possess that makes me work well with students is the empathy you hold for their individual situations. Students have different backgrounds, experiences, and levels of talent and you recognize these different needs. Your colleagues also respect their students and treat them like young adults with expectations and levels of responsibility.
You had no idea what differentiation meant before you researched the term. It is “very necessary in the arts to have specific goals for each student as no two snowflakes are the same”. Most of the students that you are directly responsible for advising have a specialized goal. You review with the student at the beginning of the year regarding “what you want to see them accomplish and listen to their personal goals”. However, “this type of specialization in a small environment can be that certain skill areas are ignored in order to make progress on specific goals”. There must be a “solid curriculum base within which the student can work, otherwise, students may use the idea of differentiation to avoid subjects and skills that may not be their areas of strength”.

When a student “works on projects and acts like a professional”, you know that your instruction has been successful. Your goal as a teacher is to train people you “want to work with in the future”.

Administrator Interview Data

Characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers.

The same procedures used with the open-ended questionnaire item and teacher interview responses were used to analyze the administrator interview responses. One administrator from four of the five participating sites participated in the administrator interview. Three of the interviews were conducted via telephone and one was completed via e-mail due to scheduling difficulties. Appendix O contains the administrator interview responses and Appendix P contains the researcher summaries of these responses. Appendix Q provides a listing of the categories for personal qualities and skills assigned to the administrator interview data. Appendix R contains an example of the coding of the interview data.
The characteristic identified by all of the participants was that effective teachers must be experienced and highly-trained performing artists. Webern stated, “The ideal faculty will be practicing performing artists (and composers)”, and Elle shared that effective teachers need to be “a strong artist themselves, skilled in their own art form”. Annabelle stated, “They need to be content specialists”. Toby described his school as “a professional actor’s conservatory” and the purpose of the school as “training people for careers in the profession”; therefore, his teachers “all come from the professional world”.

Other responses addressed the teacher’s knowledge within the arts area, such as “techniques of effective practice”, “knowledge of repertoire”, knowledge of techniques in the arts area, use of good teaching methodologies, and a record of training students in their arts area. Webern described an effective teacher as being “able to inspire the student as well as guide each one in a unique development curve that recognizes their individual skills and needs”. Webern also stated that faculty needed “experience and a proven record of success with training students”. Elle described effective teachers as thinking “how do I make it work for this child” and thinking “creatively and positively about options for the student”.

The remaining responses were diverse and addressed various personal qualities and skills of effective teachers. Annabelle described effective teachers as “creative, open-minded, hardworking practicing artists” and “well-rounded and well-read”. Elle described effective teachers as “bright and imaginative” and understanding the “high school student mindset”.

Differentiation.
The second administrator interview question asked: What is your understanding of the concept of differentiation? How do you believe differentiation applies to the instruction and program in your school? Two of the administrators were familiar with the term differentiation and described the concept as responding to individual needs of students. Annabelle responded, “Differentiation is working with students at their own level...and helping all students to improve using different methods, different ideas”. Elle described differentiation as “different ways of learning, different learning styles...different backgrounds”.

Two administrators were unfamiliar with the term differentiation as a concept applying to education. These two administrators were provided with a definition of differentiation as an educational term that generally means that teachers adapt instruction to meet the individual needs of their students, and then asked to apply this definition to their school. Webem, the administrator that responded via email, did not reply to the communication providing the definition of differentiation. However, his original response stated, “A great deal of our instruction is individual and geared toward meeting the needs of unique individuals”. The other administrator, Toby, stated, “You train the people in front of you. The curriculum is adapted to the needs of the students”. Responses by all of the administrators described differentiation in terms of recognizing that students have different levels of experience and knowledge within the arts area.

Success of Instruction.

A variety of responses were given in response to the third interview question: How do you determine the success of the instruction in your school? The responses reflected the diversity of the schools participating in the study and the different focus on
the performing arts within each school. Two responses related to student performance or jury review of performance skills. Webern identified success as the ability to recruit highly qualified students to the program and Elle and Webern shared that success was determined by effective participation in external competitions. Elle also shared that scholarship money obtained by students, attendance rates, and Advanced Placement test scores for Music Theory are indicators of success. Other responses indicated that success was determined by being able to see student growth and improvement or the students' excitement from being in the program. Toby shared, "We gauge the success of our program by the ability of the students to do each of the skills required of an actor better".

Annabelle reported a unique system to determine instructional success using a variety of different measures. She shared that this system includes: ongoing informal assessments by teachers; self-evaluation of teaching; state-mandated teacher evaluations; and annual stakeholder surveys for all courses and department. This school also documents student growth by individually evaluating a student's senior project in comparison to his/her entrance audition or portfolio. In addition to these tools, the teachers also have bi-weekly meetings with groups of students in which they receive feedback about instruction and the program.

Document Review Data

Three of the four administrators that participated in the interview provided documents for review. Two sets of documents were announcements of faculty positions for those schools. The third administrator provided a brief paragraph describing the criteria for selection of personnel for that school. Table T1 provides an overview of the

185

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
documents received and Appendix S contains two examples of documents received: a job posting and an administrator’s statement.

The document review guidelines (Appendix E) included three questions, of which the first and second address characteristics and behaviors of teachers. The documents were reviewed in light of their ability to address the review guidelines. Key words and phrases were identified and similar concepts were combined to create categories related to teacher characteristics and skills.

The first question of the document review guidelines focused on the specified the responsibilities of performing arts teachers in the school’s program. Specific responsibilities include participating as a member of the faculty and collaborating with other faculty in the designated performing arts area. Potential faculty members are also responsible for teaching specified courses and working with productions or ensembles in their arts area. The documents from one school specified that the teacher is responsible for being an active performing artist and for recruiting high quality students.

The second question of the document review guidelines addressed the criteria used to select individuals as teachers in the performing arts program as well as the steps of the selection process. The criteria shared by the three schools address the teacher as a performing artist. The documents specify a terminal degree or the equivalent professional experience, demonstrated success as a teacher, and knowledge and ability within the content area. Two schools specify the ability to collaborate or to work with others of diverse backgrounds. One school again specifies demonstrated success in recruiting qualified students as well as the ability to provide an artistic model for students. Another
school identifies that the ability to work with high school aged students as particularly important, in addition to their artistic achievement and success as a scholar.

Two of the schools that provided documents also provide instruction to undergraduate and graduate students; therefore, these announcements mirrored those used in higher education with specifications for qualifications, duties, and the documents required to apply for the position indicated. Specific information about the selection process was not included in any of the documents.

Success of instruction.

The third document review question addressed teacher effectiveness: How are performing arts teachers evaluated for their effectiveness in this program? The documents were reviewed in light of their ability to address this guiding question. No information in the documents provided was found to address this review question.

Summary of Findings for Research Question One

Research Question One asked: What are the perceptions of arts teachers in specialized secondary schools for the performing arts regarding the characteristics and teaching behaviors that make teachers effective in working with talented students in the performing arts? The data to respond to this question included the teacher questionnaire, teacher and administrator interviews, and document review.

The highest rated items (M≥3.76) for teacher characteristics on the questionnaire were: a) enthusiastic for his/her content area, b) is creative or imaginative, c) displays confidence and possesses a well-developed self-concept, d) advanced knowledge of his/her content area, e) cares about his/her students, f) knowledge of the needs of talented students, and g) encourages students/is supportive. The two themes from the open-
response questionnaire data identify that effective teachers in the performing arts positively interact with and relate to their students but that effectiveness in teaching the performing arts comes more from the teacher as a person than specific abilities as an artist and a teacher, conflicting with the ratings of characteristics and behaviors and the teacher interview data.

The characteristics most often identified as important for teachers relate to their qualifications as experienced or highly-trained performing artists and the personal qualities that allow them to be successful in working with secondary level students. Effective teachers are described as having received advanced training in their content area or as having the professional experience that provides the knowledge and skills they need to work with developing artists. The idea of the performing arts teacher as a model performer or model artist is supported by the responses to the open-ended questionnaire item, the teacher and administrator interviews, and the document review.

Effective teachers are also described by a variety of personal characteristics that allow them to relate to their students. These teachers are caring, compassionate, and well-adjusted in their level of emotional stability and maturity. Personal qualities are specifically mentioned in the questionnaire and interview data but they are not addressed in the documents provided.

The highest rated items (M≥3.56) for teacher behaviors on the questionnaire were: a) creates a positive and supportive learning environment, b) responds well to individual student needs and problems, c) provides constructive and prompt feedback on student performance, d) optimizes instructional time, e) reflects on work to improve student learning, and f) adapts content of course to meet individual student needs.
Effective teachers are identified across the data as able to provide instruction in their content area. For some but not all of the open-response questionnaire item data and teacher interview data, the behavior of effective teachers also relates to their ability to provide instruction to students that recognizes individual differences where appropriate and creates an environment that supports student growth.

Comparison of Teacher Characteristics and Behaviors by Arts Area

Research Question Two asked: How do the descriptions of characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers working with talented students in the performing arts differ by arts area? This question was designed to describe and compare the differences between the responses of the participants by the content area in which they teach. The overall number of participants (N=25) and the number of participants of each performing arts area, Music (N=12), Theater (N=9), and Dance (N=3) does not provide for statistical comparison of the questionnaire responses. The questionnaire data are reported in Table 26 and Table 27 using the overall mean rating and the mean rating by content area for descriptive purposes only. The tables illustrate the extent to which the ratings for each performing arts area differ from the overall rating for each item.
Table 26

*Means by Content Area and Overall for Teacher Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic for his/her content area</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the needs of talented students</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced knowledge of his/her content area</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a good sense of humor</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages students, is supportive</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes individual differences</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has received advanced training in his/her content area</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds well to change</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is highly intelligent</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains high expectations for all students</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is flexible in general or in their use of time in the</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is creative or imaginative</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays confidence and possesses a well-developed self-</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays a broad general knowledge</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares about his/her students</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 27

**Means by Content Area and Overall for Teacher Behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Dance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a positive and supportive learning environment</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides constructive and prompt feedback on student performance</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to individual student needs and problems</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts pacing of instruction to meet individual students’ needs</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a variety of instructional strategies</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts content of course to meet individual student needs (i.e., repertoire, techniques, assignments)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps students develop a positive self-concept</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizes instructional time</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designs and uses assessment instruments (e.g., tests, rubrics, checklists) to track student performance ability</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts instructional content based on individual student needs</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborates with other teachers to plan learning</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects on work to improve student learning</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses routines to organize class time</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The differences illustrated by the descriptive statistics suggest possible areas of disagreement between the performing arts areas. Specifically, differences between music and theater can be addressed due to similar sample size. Clear differences between the two sub-samples are seen in the item, “recognizes individual differences”, with the mean rating for music teachers at 3.38, or “usually characteristic of an effective teacher”, and the mean rating for theater teachers at 2.78, closer to “usually uncharacteristic of an effective teacher”. Two other items with a greater than 0.3 difference between the mean ratings are “responds well to change” and “is flexible in general or in their use of time in the classroom”. For both of these items, the theater teachers provided higher mean ratings than the music teachers.

In the teacher interviews, training in the arts area was listed as important for all three performing arts. Compassion and the ability to relate to and understand students were also mentioned across the arts areas. Communication skills were stated as important for both music and theater but were not mentioned by the dance teachers. One dance teacher interview participant described her role as conveying “the legacy passed on by my teachers in the arts”. The other dance teacher interview participant described a focus on students’ needs and having a “certain degree of empathy” for her students as a teacher. The remaining interview responses are diverse and represent a broad view of effective teaching across the three areas of the performing arts.

Responses from the administrators did not indicate characteristics or behaviors that were important for specific performing arts areas. The administrators indicated that effective teachers need to be “strong artists”, “practicing performing artists”, “content specialists”, or have professional experience in their arts area.
Thematic content analysis of both the questionnaire data and teacher interviews provide limited findings by performing arts area for this sample of participants. Several responses indicate possible differences in the emphasis that the three performing arts fields place on various teacher characteristics and behaviors. For example, the theater teachers rate eleven of the thirteen items for teacher behaviors higher or slightly higher than the music teachers. The interview data suggest that the differences between these content areas are smaller than the differences of the perspectives within the specific arts areas for this sample of participants.

*Instructional Strategies Used by the Participants*

Research Question Three asked: What instructional strategies do teachers of talented students in the performing arts use to develop the talent of their students? How is the success of these strategies assessed? The first part of this question was addressed through the teacher questionnaire. The second part of this research question was addressed in the teacher and administrator interviews and the document review.

Overall, the participants reported using a variety of instructional strategies. All questionnaire participants reported using four or more instructional strategies. Three instructional strategies were selected by 84% (N=21) of the participants: a) opportunities for group learning, b) listen to recordings or watch performances and critique them using specific criteria, and c) analyze the performances of students or student groups from the school using specific criteria. Two of these instructional strategies involve analysis of performance. Two instructional strategies were selected by less than half of the participants: a) higher-level thinking and metacognitive models (N=12, 48%) and b) lecture presentation (N=11, 44%).
Information about how instruction is assessed was diverse across schools and across the responses of the interview participants. The primary indicator of successful instruction is successful performance or application of the requisite knowledge or skill. A few participants identified tools and strategies used to assess student growth and learning in addition to performance. Information about any relationship between successful instruction and teacher effectiveness was not included in the documents provided by the schools.

Implementation of Differentiated Instructional Behaviors

Research Question Four asked: How do arts teachers in selected specialized schools for the performing arts rate themselves on an instrument reflecting differentiated instructional behaviors? This research question was addressed by the Classroom Observation Scales-Revised (VanTassel-Baska, Avery, Struck, Feng, Bracken, Drummond et al., 2003) self-report data and the second interview question for teachers and administrators.

The participants' mean ratings for their implementation of the differentiated instructional behaviors specified in the COS-R range from 2.18 to 2.92. The five items with the highest mean ratings relate to curriculum planning and delivery, (2.90, 2.91, and 2.92), problem solving (2.90), and critical thinking (2.91). The five items with the lowest mean ratings are in the research (2.18, 2.29, 2.50), problem solving (2.21), and accommodations for individual differences (2.35) sections of the COS-R.

Responses to the teacher and administrator interview question related to differentiation indicate that many of the participants are unfamiliar with the term differentiation. When applying their understanding of the term or when given a definition
of differentiation to apply to their school, the participants related the concept to
differences in students' abilities and interests within their arts area. Differences in the
application of differentiation appear to relate to the nature of the instructional content
(individual vs. ensemble/group) and the traditions of the arts area (e.g., dance techniques
class, musical ensemble).
Chapter Five

The purpose of this study was to examine the teacher characteristics and behaviors that contribute to working successfully with talented students in the performing arts at the secondary level as indicated by arts teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts. This study also was designed to examine the instructional strategies and differentiated teaching behaviors implemented by these teachers and compare the findings to the literature and research on teacher effectiveness and differentiated instruction in the academic fields of gifted education.

This study was completed using questionnaire data from 25 participants, follow-up interviews with twelve randomly selected teacher participants, four administrator interviews, and documents from three of the five participating specialized secondary schools for the performing arts. The questionnaire asked participants to rate characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers for talented students in the performing arts as “highly uncharacteristic”, “usually uncharacteristic”, “usually characteristic”, or “highly characteristic” of effective teachers. The questionnaire also asked participants to describe an effective teacher for talented students in the performing arts and to indicate the instructional strategies that they use in their teaching.

The teacher interview protocol asked participants to describe the characteristics and skills that they had that made them effective in working with talented students in their schools as well as the characteristics and skills of their colleagues that allowed them to be successful teachers. The protocol also asked the participants to define the concept of differentiation and to describe how it applied to their school. The last question of the protocol asked participants to describe how they determined that their instruction was
successful. The administrator interview paralleled the teacher interview by addressing the characteristics and skills teachers need to be successful in the administrator’s school, the administrator’s understanding of the concept of differentiation and how it applies to his/her school, and how the administrator determines the success of the instruction in his/her school.

Documents were requested that addressed the criteria for selection and evaluation of teachers in the participating schools. Three of the five schools provided documents, two of which were job postings from previous or current faculty openings. The third school provided a statement from the administrator identifying the criteria used for selecting faculty members.

The three major strands of literature that provided the foundation for this study described characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers, differentiation of curriculum and instruction for gifted and talented learners, and talent development. The discussion portion of this chapter is organized by literature strand and emphasizes the relationship between the findings of this study by research question and the existing literature. The conclusion provides a synthesis of findings based on the research questions. Implications for practice, policy, and future research are also included.

Discussion

Effective Teachers

Educational research has aimed to describe and develop characteristics of effective teachers to improve student achievement (Harris, 1998; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, & James, 2002; Stronge, 2002; Walls, Nardi, von Minden, & Hoffman, 2002). Many in the field of gifted education have also written about the characteristics that make
certain teachers effective with gifted learners (Buttermore, 1979; Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002; Feldhusen, 1985, 1997; Ford & Trotman, 2001; Heath, 1997; Joffe, 2001; Maker, 1975; Nelson & Prindle, 1992; Rejskind, 2000; Rogers, 1989; Seeley, 1979; Sisk, 1975; Starko & Schack, 1989; Story, 1985; Westberg & Archambault, 1997; Whitlock & DuCette, 1989). The majority of these studies and reviews of research on effective teachers have either not addressed the performing arts as a field of study or have focused on the needs of students in the core academic or intellectual areas. This study supported many of the characteristics, skills, and behaviors of effective teachers found in the literature for general and gifted education as characteristic of effective teachers in the performing arts.

**Characteristics.**

Enthusiasm for teaching (Abel & Karnes, 1994; Chan, 2001; Heath, 1997; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, & James, 2002; Walls, Nardi, von Minden, & Hoffman, 2002; Whitlock & DuCette, 1989) was unanimously rated \((M=4.00)\) as highly characteristic of an effective teacher by the participants in the questionnaire phase of this study. The next highest rated item \((M=3.88)\), using a four-point scale from highly uncharacteristic \((1)\), to highly characteristic \((4)\) of an effective teacher, related to creativity and imagination (Buttermore, 1979; Chan, 2001; Maker, 1975; Rejskind, 2000; Starko & Schack, 1989). Teachers as creative or imaginative is a characteristic specifically identified in the literature on effective teachers for gifted education, a reflection of the precocity or advanced development of gifted learners and their need to move beyond the mastery level often associated with achievement measures linked to teacher effectiveness, as well as
their ability to handle complexity and challenge in curriculum and instruction (e.g., VanTassel-Baska & Stambaugh, 2006).

The third highest rated characteristic by the participants (M=3.83) in this study was displaying confidence and having a well-developed self-concept (Buttermore, 1979; Chan, 2001; Heath, 1997; Story, 1985; Whitlock & DuCette, 1989). This characteristic was specifically mentioned in the literature for effective teachers in gifted education and probably reflects the tendency of gifted learners to be precocious in ability and development in comparison to same-age peers (e.g., Colangelo et al., 2004), a characteristic that some teachers may find challenging if they are not secure in their own abilities or if they do not identify to some extent with gifted learners.

Several other characteristics also received mean ratings in the range of usually (3.0) and highly (4.0) characteristic of effective teachers. From the general education literature, effective teachers are expected to be well-prepared for teaching and knowledgeable about their subject area (Minor et al., 2002; Stronge, 2002). In the gifted education literature, effective teachers are expected to have advanced knowledge and training in their subject area (Clark & Gipe, 1989; Piirto, 1994; Westberg & Archambault, 1997; Yeats, 1980). The participants in this study were themselves highly-qualified performing artists with 76% indicating completion of a bachelor's degree, 60% (N=15) reporting completion of a master's degree, and 48% (N=12) reporting other certification or training in their arts area. Of the five respondents that did not indicate completing a bachelor's degree, two indicated completing a doctorate in the arts and one indicated completing a master's degree in their arts area. All participants indicated previous experience or current involvement as a professional in the performing arts.
Knowledge of the arts area, experience as a performing artist, and being able to serve as a model performing artist were also mentioned as important by the teacher interview participants. The characteristic of an effective teacher identified by all administrator interview participants was that s/he be an experienced and highly-trained performing artist.

With this information, it is interesting that the participants rated advanced knowledge of content area with a mean of 3.80 and advanced training in the content area as 3.44. A closer examination of the questionnaire data indicated that 80% of participants rated advanced content knowledge as highly characteristic and the remaining 20% rated it as usually characteristic. For advanced training in the content area, responses were split between the usually and highly characteristic ratings with 48% each with one outlier as “usually uncharacteristic of an effective teacher”. The number of participants from each performing arts area did not allow statistical comparison between arts areas for these two items. However, the means for advanced content knowledge range from the lowest of 3.77 for music (N=13) to the highest of 4.00 for dance (N=3). The means for advanced training range from the lowest of 3.33 for dance and the highest of 3.46 for music. The teachers in this sample may or may not differentiate between “knowledge” and “training” or may need these two items to be more detailed. Further examination of the differences between teachers in the performing arts is warranted with a larger sample from each of the three arts areas.

Participants indicated that effective teachers care about their students (M=3.80), reflecting the literature for general and gifted education (Buttermore, 1979; Chan, 2001; Minor et al., 2002; Stronge, 2002; Whitlock & Ducette, 1989). This study also supports
the literature on effective teachers as encouraging (Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002), having high expectations for all students (Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002), recognizing students as individuals (Buttermore, 1979; Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002; Stronge, 2002), and displaying a broad general knowledge (Buttermore, 1979; Story, 1985).

The four characteristics that received the lowest ratings (M=3.16, 3.29, 3.36, and 3.40) were still in the range of usually to highly characteristic of effective teachers: respond well to change (Westberg & Archambault, 1997), flexible (Buttermore, 1979; Maker, 1975; Story, 1985), highly intelligent (Heath, 1997; Maker, 1975), and has a good of humor (Story, 1985; Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002).

While the questionnaire data support the literature on characteristics of effective teachers in general and gifted education, the open-response questionnaire item and teacher and administrator interviews highlight several other important teacher characteristics. A teacher’s ability to relate to students emotionally was identified in the open-response item and repeated in the teacher interviews as an important characteristic of effective teaching. Effective teachers were described as caring, compassionate, emotionally mature, and patient. The effective teacher’s emotional characteristics were represented more in the teacher interviews than in the administrator interviews, and such personal characteristics were not mentioned at all in the documents reviewed for this study.
Skills and Behaviors of Effective Teachers

This study also supported the literature in general and gifted education regarding skills and behaviors of effective teachers (e.g., Archambault et al., 1993; Harris, 1998; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, & James, 2002; Stronge, 2002; Walls, Nardi, von Minden, & Hoffman, 2002; Westberg & Archambault, 1997). Overall, the mean ratings for teacher behaviors were lower than the mean ratings for teacher characteristics, with the highest rated behavior receiving a mean of 3.76 and the lowest rated behavior receiving a mean of 2.59. The dispersion of the scores was also greater for teacher behaviors, indicating less consensus among the participants in this study for teacher behaviors than teacher characteristics. The data from the open response item of the questionnaire also supports the inference that the participants place a stronger emphasis on the teacher as a person and their ability to interact with their students and do not highlight as much their instructional behaviors. This difference between teacher as a person and teaching behaviors may be related to the informal way in which pedagogy and teaching ability is passed down in the apprenticeship system of the performing arts (Kingsbury, 1988; Lakes, 2005; Persson, 2000; Van Rossum, 2004). Because a greater emphasis is on the teacher as performer (Kingsbury, 1988; Persson, 2000), the participants focus less on a teacher’s ability to help others learn the artistic craft and more on what the teacher brings with them to the learning experience. This tacit learning of teaching behaviors then perpetuates the dependence on the teacher’s expertise and judgment during evaluation of student learning and performance.

The section of the questionnaire addressing teacher behaviors consisted of 13 items addressing eight concepts from the literature in general and gifted education. The
highest rated (M=3.76) teacher behavior related to creating a supportive learning environment (Eyre, Coates, Fitzpatrick, Higgins, McClure, & Wilson et al., 2002; Ford & Trotman, 2001; Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; NCATE, n.d.; Stronge, 2002; Walls et al., 2002). This concept was addressed with one item (Appendix A, Item 2A). The concept of responding to individual needs and developing the individual student (Chan, 2001; Ford & Trotman, 2001; Maker, 1975; Minor et al., 2002; NCATE, n.d.; Stronge, 2002; Zimmerman, 1995) was addressed in two items (Appendix A, Item 2C and 2G).

"Responding to individual student needs and problems", the second highest rated teacher behavior, was rated higher (M=3.68) than helping students develop a positive self-concept (M=3.46). A few participants specifically indicated that they or their colleagues were dedicated to their students' success, supporting the overall finding that as a group, these participants are interested in student success.

Adapting and differentiating instruction, a concept essential to the field of gifted education (Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; Nelson & Prindle, 1992; Westberg & Archambault, 1997; Whitlock & DuCette, 1989), was addressed by three items (Appendix A, Items 2D, 2F, and 2J). Within this concept, adapting the content of a course to meet individual student needs received a mean rating of 3.56 and was rated sixth overall in teacher behaviors. Adapting pacing of instruction to meet individual students' needs received a mean rating of 3.44 and adapting instructional content based on individual student needs had a mean rating of 3.32. Further examination of the questionnaire data indicates the sample was almost evenly split for these items between "usually" and "highly characteristic", with two to three lower ratings for each item. Behaviors described by the interview participants included the teacher's ability to
recognize and respond to the individual needs of students. Two interview participants specifically noted that adapting to individual needs may not apply to music ensembles, where the focus is on group performance and group outcomes. Other interview participants recognized that adapting instruction to individual needs is compatible to the music studio environment where instruction is individualized. These concepts need to be examined in more depth to understand whether differences exist between or within the performing arts, and if differences exist between individual studio lessons and group instruction.

Using a variety of instructional strategies (Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; Harris, 1998; NCATE, n.d.; Nelson & Prindle, 1992; Story, 1985; Stronge, 2002; Westberg & Archambault, 1997) was addressed through one item and received a mean rating of 3.44 and ranked 9th overall in teacher behaviors. Examination of the data from Item 3 of the questionnaire, asking participants to mark the instructional strategies that they use in their teaching, indicates that these teachers use four or more of the 11 instructional strategies in their teaching. The average number of instructional strategies, including strategies listed by the participants in addition to the eleven indicated, was approximately eight.

The use of a variety of instructional methods (Harris, 1998; Stronge, 2002) is related to demonstrating a clear focus on instruction and improved student learning (NCATE, n.d.; Starko & Schack, 1989; Stronge, 2002), a concept addressed with Items 2H and 2M. Making the most of instructional time or “optimizes instructional time” received a mean rating of 3.64. Uses routines to organize class time received a mean rating of 3.13, the third lowest rated item in this section of the questionnaire. Examination of the mean ratings for “uses routines” reveals a lower rating by the music
teachers (2.92) and higher ratings by theater (3.29) and dance (3.67). The interview and open-response questionnaire data offer evidence that point to a focus on the teacher’s ability to model the artistic life and develop students’ artistic skills. The use of routines for instruction may be peculiar to general education and regular classroom instruction or the term “routines” may be interpreted differently by performing arts teachers, both issues that should be considered in future studies.

The item addressing collaboration to plan instruction, 2K (NCATE; Westberg & Archambault, 1997), reflects the gifted education literature and the service model of classroom teachers collaborating with each other or with resource specialists in gifted education to provide appropriate learning opportunities for academically or intellectually gifted learners. This item received a mean rating of 3.08 and was the second lowest rated item in the questionnaire section on teacher behaviors. Only one interview participant, a dance teacher, specifically mentioned collaboration between teachers. One document from Elle’s school indicated that the performing arts faculty needs to be able “to work with other arts educators and with diverse constituencies and cultures”; however, the statement did not indicate that teachers work together to plan instruction or learning experiences. This teacher behavior either is not required of the participants in their current work or it is not seen as being of value to the participants. However, several participants and non-respondents indicated that they were currently working with students to rehearse for an upcoming performance within their arts area. While many performances in the performing arts include interaction between teachers or teachers in different arts areas, these experiences may not be recognized as formal “learning experiences” that require planning related to instruction. Further examination of the
concept of collaboration of teachers in the performing arts should be modified to address these considerations.

The teacher as a reflective practitioner (Harris, 1998; Minor et al., 2002; Stronge, 2002) was addressed in Item 2L, "reflects on work to improve student learning". This item received a mean rating of 3.60 and was the 5th highest rated item in this section of the questionnaire. This concept was not addressed directly in the teacher or administrator interviews or the document review. Overall, the teacher interview comments are too diverse to conclude whether the participants do or do not have a strong focus on improved student learning.

The teacher's communication skills were mentioned frequently in both the open-response questionnaire item responses and the teacher interview data. While this is not explicitly mentioned in the gifted education literature, strong verbal skills mentioned in the general education literature are a characteristic of an effective teacher (Stronge, 2002).

The lowest rated item, Item 2I, "designs and uses assessment instruments to track student performance ability", received an overall mean rating of 2.59 and was viewed by over 40% of the participants as not indicating effectiveness in a teacher for talented students in the performing arts. Item 2I, combined with Item 2B, relate to the concept of using assessment in a variety of ways (NCATE, n.d.; Renzulli & Reis, 1998; Stronge, 2002; Tomlinson, 1999; Westberg & Archambault, 1997). Item 2B, "provides constructive and prompt feedback on student performance", received an overall mean rating of 3.64. The dissimilarity in rating between these two items suggests that informal assessment that results in constructive feedback is deemed as useful and important by the
participants; more formalized assessments, described in Item 21 with the examples of tests, rubrics, and checklists, are not associated with teacher effectiveness in the performing arts. The reliance upon informal assessments by the arts teacher reflects the subjective nature of the arts, each with their own rules and norms, as well as the potential for teachers serving as gatekeepers to further development of talent (Kingsbury, 1988; Lakes, 2005; Persson, 2000; Van Rossum, 2004). The limited articulation of how teachers assess the success of their instruction, beyond artistic performance, suggests that these performing artists lack the craft knowledge and skills associated with effective teachers in general education related to targeting and achieving specific outcomes related to student learning (e.g., Marzano et al., 2001).

Differentiation of Curriculum and Instruction

Differentiation is a central focus of the field of gifted education (Silverman, 1996; Ward, 1980), despite criticism from various sources (Coleman & Gallagher, 1995; Oakes, 1985; Sapon-Shevin, 1994). The definition of differentiation most often cited is that of Maker (1982) where it is defined as a qualitatively different curriculum modified in the areas of content, process, product, and learning environment. Overall, research on differentiation indicates that the implementation of differentiated practices is limited (Archambault et al., 1993) and that the concept of differentiation is either misunderstood or not widely embraced (Tomlinson, Tomchin et al., 1994; Tomlinson, Moon, & Callahan, 1997). When differentiation is employed to some degree, students are generally not challenged appropriately (Diezmann & Watters, 2002; Gentry et al., 2002; Hertzog, 1998). Some models of differentiation do result in appropriate uses of differentiation, such as the use of student choice, differentiated instructional strategies, or content-based
differentiated curriculum (Ehlers & Montgomery, 1999; Friedman & Lee, 1996; VanTassel-Baska et al., 2002). In general, most teachers and administrators require more support to effectively implement differentiated strategies (Johnsen et al., 2002; Reis & Westberg, 1994; Tomlinson, 1995).

Given the limited implementation of differentiation within general education and the even more limited effective implementation of differentiation, the results of the teacher and administrator interviews related to differentiation are not unexpected. Many teacher interview participants and half of the administrator interview participants were unfamiliar with a formal definition for differentiation within an educational context. However, the participants that completed the self-report on the COS-R, an assessment of differentiated classroom practices, ranked themselves as “somewhat effective” and “effective” on most of the sections and items. Several items specifically support previous findings from the questionnaire and interview data.

Five questionnaire participants indicated that the COS-R item “accommodated individual or subgroup differences” was not applicable to their teaching (see Appendix B). The recognition and accommodation of individual differences is central to the concept of differentiation. The remaining participants provided a mean rating of 2.58 for the implementation of this item. While the majority of the participants (N=19) could apply this concept to their teaching, 20% did not find it appropriate to accommodate individual differences. This finding supports the research that indicates the concept of differentiation is either misunderstood or not widely embraced (Tomlinson, Tomchin et al., 1994; Tomlinson, Moon, & Callahan, 1997).
Two items in the section on problem-solving also received five or more responses of “not applicable”. The item on brainstorming techniques received six “not applicable” responses and a mean rating from the rest of the participants of 2.21. The item on solution-finding activities and comprehensive solution articulation received five “not applicable” responses and a mean rating of 2.65 from the remaining participants. Twenty percent or more either did not find the use of problem-solving strategies applicable to teaching in the performing arts or they did not make the connection between the items for problem-solving and what they currently do in their instruction.

There is the possibility that the appendix of descriptors that accompanies the COS-R for the performing arts does not accurately reflect the application of problem-solving strategies to the performing arts. The appendix describes problem identification and definition as “asked students to identify the central problem of a performance, piece, or scene using proof from the selection” and “asked questions such as ‘What is the central/underlying problem and how do you know?’”. While the concept of problem-finding and solution articulation has been examined in the visual arts (Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1976; Wilson & Clark, 2000; Zimmerman, 2004), this concept has not been addressed in the performing arts heretofore. Those that did respond to this item may have misinterpreted “problem” as an obstacle to excellence in performance and not as an artistic issue to be addressed.

Three of the four items in the critical thinking section of the COS-R received five or more ratings of “not applicable” by the participants. While the ratings for these items was still fairly high, ranging from a mean of 2.59 for generalizing from the concrete to the abstract to a mean of 2.79 for comparing and contrasting ideas, 20% or more did not
find these behaviors applicable to their instructional practice. Again, these participants might not have connected the strategies to their existing practice or they do not believe that these strategies apply to their work in the performing arts. These three items also reflect recent reviews of the research on effective instructional strategies that improve student achievement, identifying similarities and differences and summarization and note taking (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001); however, the existing research may not address the traditional aims and purposes of instruction in the performing arts.

The 20% or more participants that did not find these items applicable to their teaching practice may also reflect the apprenticeship model of teaching and learning within the performing arts (Kingsbury, 1988; Lakes, 2005; Persson, 2000; Van Rossum, 2004). This model values the tradition of the art form passed down from teacher to student without question. Students are taught to interpret the content or skill in the same way in which the teacher learned to interpret the content or skill. This tradition also reflects a model as the teacher as content expert and performer with little emphasis on pedagogical skill (Kingsbury, 1988; Persson, 2000). Pedagogy is viewed as tacit knowledge that is inferred but not explicitly analyzed and evaluated. The items for the Critical Thinking section of the COS-R focus on pedagogical skills that involve inquiry, discussion, and explicit articulation of understanding rather than replication or interpretation of performance skills. The teachers who did not find this section applicable to their teaching may see no need or use for such pedagogical strategies within their understanding of teaching in their arts area. More research on the definition of critical thinking within the performing arts, as well as examples of existing definitions to the performing arts, is warranted.
The term "creative process" was mentioned several times in the teacher interviews and the open-response questionnaire item. On the COS-R, three to six participants indicated that the four items in the creative thinking section did not apply to their instructional practice. The highest rated item, encouraged students to demonstrate open-mindedness, etc., (M=2.86) reflects the overall positive rating from the questionnaire for creating a supportive classroom environment. While six participants indicated "solicited many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas" was not applicable to their instructional practice, the remaining participants gave themselves a mean rating of 2.79 on this item. The 24% of the participants that did not consider this item applicable to their work may also reflect the rules and norms of artistic systems that regard the expertise and authority of the teacher over the perspectives of the students (Kingsbury; 1988; Lakes, 2005; Persson; 2000; Van Rossum, 2004).

Finally, 32% or more of the participants did not find the five items in the research section to be applicable to their instructional practice. The lowest rated item with the highest percentage of "not applicable" responses (56%) related to analyzing and representing data. The participants clearly did not believe that this item was applicable to their work in the performing arts. These findings are not unexpected given the emphasis on performance using artistic skills and knowledge within each of the performing arts. The use of social science instructional strategies related to issue-based research would not be as appropriate as historical research of technique and practice, a type of research that relies more heavily on qualitative data and which would not be analyzed using charts, graphs, or tables. This different interpretation of research within the performing arts needs to be understood by those without an arts background, especially if "research..."
skills” is a criterion for evaluating performing arts instruction. This finding also has implications for defining “analysis” for research in the performing arts. If students are engaged in artistic research that relies less on quantitative analysis, then they need to learn strategies to analyze other types of resources and information such as the historical research practice mentioned above.

*Talent Development*

The field of gifted education has shifted from defining giftedness to studying how the potential of natural gifts is developed to high levels of productivity and problem-solving within a domain (Assouline & Lupkowski-Shoplik, 1997; Renzulli, 1977; Sternberg, 1985). Gagné’s Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (DMGT; 1991, 1993, 1995, 2000) provides a systemic view of talent development where the development of gifts into a talent is facilitated by interpersonal and environmental catalysts. Interpersonal catalysts include motivation, temperament (a hereditary trait), and personality characteristics and attitudes. Environmental catalysts are macroscopic (i.e., geographic and sociological environment), microscopic (i.e., family, parenting style, socioeconomic status), and include the people, events, and systematic educational experiences of one’s environment. Gagné’s (2000) model for understanding and studying the process of talent development reflects the shift in the field of education in the late 20th century to a systemic view of education and the context of learning and development (Fullan, 1993; Wheatley, 1994). The DMGT (Gagné, 2000) also provides a framework for examining the interaction of the elements in this system within the lives of gifted and talented individuals and groups.
While the visual and performing arts have been included in landmark studies of talent development (e.g., Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, & Whalen, 1993) much remains to be known about the arts as an area of talent development in a field that has emphasized identifying and developing general intellectual or traditional academic abilities for the majority of its history (Clark & Zimmerman, 1998, 2004; Haroutounian, 2000b, 2002; Oreck, Baum, & McCartney, 2000; Piirto, 1994; Winner & Martino, 1993, 2000). This study focused on environmental catalysts in the talent development process through the study of persons, specifically, teachers, and the educational provisions for which they are directly responsible, specifically defined as teachers' instructional behaviors and instructional strategies.

The findings from this study suggest that the fields of gifted education and performing arts education are disconnected in their understanding of the nature and role of effective teachers for talented students. While the characteristics of effective teachers from the literature were supported by the participants in this study as indicative of an effective teacher in the performing arts, the behaviors of effective teachers from the gifted education literature received lower ratings and reflected greater variability among the participants' ratings. The lower ratings of the teacher behaviors and the limited focus on the teacher's instructional behaviors in the interviews and school documents suggest that the participating teachers have a different perception of the skills and behaviors required to be effective in working with talented students in the performing arts. The focus of the participants in this study is more on the teacher as a person through the teacher's qualifications and personal qualities and less on the educational provisions provided by the teacher in the talent development process.
The participants may view their role in the talent development process in different ways than reflected in the literature on talent development. Bloom (1985) specifically notes that there may be a certain type of teacher appropriate for students at different stages in the talent development process. The first stage of talent development requires support and encouragement, rather than skill development (Bloom, 1985). The second stage focuses on the development of specific skills and technique in the talent area and teachers tend to hold higher expectations and demand more attention and commitment from the students in their area of study. The third stage focuses on developing an individual style, perfecting performance skills, and developing a depth of understanding of the domain and the content or repertoire of the area of study (Bloom, 1985).

The findings from this study suggest that the participating teachers of talented students in the performing arts lack an understanding of the concept of differentiation and its purpose in instruction for the artistically gifted and talented. With a lack of understanding of differentiation and its role in educational provisions for gifted and talented students, the participants would be less likely to recognize the developmental needs of their students according to Bloom’s three-stage framework. The participating teachers may not recognize the different needs of their students according to their stage in the talent development process: enjoyment, technical proficiency, or mastery. A teacher with the characteristics of a master teacher suited for the third stage of the talent development process might not recognize the needs of a student who is just beginning to develop the technical skills upon which mastery is based. This disconnect reflects the potential of the performing arts teacher to serve as a gatekeeper in the talent development
process similar to their potential to serve as a gatekeeper to innovation within an artistic domain (Kingsbury; 1988; Lakes, 2005; Persson; 2000; Van Rossum, 2004).

A recent cross-cultural study of teaching practices and learning patterns in secondary gifted classrooms in academic domains in Singapore and the United States indicates that the teachers from both cultures believe that an exemplary teacher must be a content expert, a model of content mastery for students, must be able to meet individual student needs, and have positive personal qualities (VanTassel-Baska & Feng, 2006). This connection between content expertise and instructional skills that address the needs of individual students suggests that effective teachers need strong pedagogical skills in addition to content knowledge. The ratings and responses of participants in this study reflected a stronger emphasis on content knowledge and expertise than on instruction within the content area or general instructional skills. This finding is not unexpected considering that secondary programs for gifted education and talent development are often minimized (NAGC, 2005; US Department of Education, 1993) and that implementation of differentiated instructional practices is limited at all levels (e.g., Archambault et al., 1993; Westberg & Daoust, 2003).

The findings from this study also reflect current debate within general education on the role of content knowledge and instructional skills within the movement for improving teacher quality (Lasley, Siedentop, & Yinger, 2006; Porter-Magee, 2004). The literature on effective teachers emphasizes the importance of instructional skills within all content areas (e.g., Harris, 1998; Stronge, 2002; Walls et al., 2002). The limited emphasis on instructional skills or the limited extent to which the participants in this study were able to articulate instructional strategies and behaviors indicates that specialized schools...
for the performing arts are not aligned with the field of general education regarding the instructional skills of effective teachers. This lack of alignment is due to either the lack of a common language between arts education and general education related to pedagogy and instruction, or to a different perspective of instructional pedagogy that is effective in the performing arts.

Conclusion

Overall, this study supports the research on teacher characteristics and behaviors from general and gifted education as applying to arts teachers who work with talented students in the performing arts in specialized secondary schools. According to the participants in this study, effective teachers in the performing arts are enthusiastic, creative, confident, practicing artists who care about their students. The characteristics that did not rate as high as the others, but were still described as characteristic of an effective teacher in the performing arts, were flexibility, the ability to adapt to changes, high intelligence, and a good sense of humor.

This study also supports certain behaviors shared by effective teachers although teacher behaviors received lower ratings overall than teacher characteristics. Effective teachers create a supportive learning environment, respond to individual student’s needs, provide constructive feedback, and optimize instructional time. Two related concepts were included in the top three lowest ratings: designing and using assessment instruments to track student performance and using routines to organize class time. Collaboration between teachers was also one of the three lowest rated teacher behaviors.

The participating teachers rated themselves as “somewhat effective” to “effective” on a measure of differentiated classroom practices, but the term
differentiation was not recognizable to over half of the teacher interview participants or to half of the administrator interview participants. Several items on the self-report version of the COS-R were described as not applicable to an average of 20% of the questionnaire participants. The implementation of the concept of differentiation in the field of general and academic gifted education is limited; therefore, the participants of this study have either over-rated their ability to implement the differentiated classroom practices, or performing arts teachers may be more inclined to implement differentiated classroom practices than their colleagues in the non-arts classrooms.

While the findings from this study support the assumption that the best teachers for talented students in the arts are highly-trained and experienced performing artists, most of the teachers do not have a background in the field of education and therefore may have a different understanding of effective pedagogy and educational practices. The limited importance of formal assessment instruments points to the lack of connection between arts education and the accountability movement within general education. This disconnect is supported by the limited articulation of outcomes for arts education and the responses of a majority of the interview participants about the ways in which they assess the success of instruction.

Finally, there should be concern about the understanding and use of differentiated practices in the performing arts. While some of the interview participants recognized that differentiation relates to the recognition of individual differences, the ability to adapt content or instruction to the needs of individuals was not unanimously rated as highly characteristic of an effective teacher in the performing arts. Similarly, 20% of the
participants did not believe that accommodating individual differences applied to their instructional practice.

Implications for Practice

While the response rate limits the generalizability of this study to other arts teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts, a few implications for such schools can be pulled from the findings of this study. First, there is strong agreement for the performing arts teacher to have extensive training and expertise in his or her performing arts area. Therefore, teacher selection criteria must include evidence of training and performance experience in the performing arts.

Second, while a few of the schools do require their teachers to have experience and success in working with students in their arts area, the requirements should be more clearly delineated according to teacher characteristics, behaviors, and skills. Teacher selection criteria should include measures of the teacher's ability to relate to and communicate with the targeted students. These criteria should also include assessment of a teacher's philosophy about individual differences and their role in adapting content and instruction to meet the needs of their students.

These schools should also include specific criteria related to instructional behaviors and classroom practices. How do the teacher candidates plan instruction? How do the candidates assess instruction? How do the candidates assess student learning? Teacher candidates should provide a demonstration of their teaching ability with students in the school. Teacher candidates should also be able to discuss and articulate their teaching philosophy and the strategies they use in their instruction.
Beyond candidates for performing arts faculty members, existing teachers should be aware of their own strengths and weaknesses related to teacher characteristics, skills and behaviors. The concept of differentiation should be introduced and used as a framework for discussing and meeting the needs of the students in the development of their artistic abilities.

Implications for practice beyond the participating specialized schools for the performing arts can also be identified. The extent to which this study’s findings support the literature on effective teachers indicates that there is disagreement between the field of education and specialized secondary schools for the performing arts regarding instructional behaviors that make teachers effective. Specifically, designing and using assessments (e.g., tests, rubrics, checklists) to track student performance was viewed by over 40% of the participants as not indicating effectiveness in a teacher for talented students in the performing arts. Using assessments in a variety of ways (NCATE, n.d.; Renzulli & Reis, 1998; Stronge, 2002; Tomlinson, 1999; Westberg & Archambault, 1997) is an important part of determining student learning and improvement (NCATE, n.d.; Starko & Schack, 1989; Stronge, 2002). The study suggests that arts teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts have a limited awareness and understanding of the variety of assessment instruments that can be used to track student learning and improvement. Training for these teachers should include descriptions of informal and formal assessments, their role in the assessment of learning, their role in the planning of instruction, and guidance for developing a range of assessments that can be used by the teachers to track student performance.
This study also suggests that arts teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts do not share a view of talent development consistent with the field of gifted education (e.g., Bloom, 1985; Gagné, 2000). If specialized secondary schools in any content area are identified and cited as a service delivery model for gifted and talented students (e.g., Kolloff, 2002), then they need to develop a shared conception of talent development. Local and national gifted personnel should begin conversations about the purpose of gifted education and talent development with arts education personnel. The historical exclusion of the arts as an area of talent development needs to be mended through exposure and awareness of the arts as areas of talent development.

The findings of this study also have implications for the implementation of the National Arts Education Standards in specialized secondary schools for the performing arts (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). Although these schools focus on performance, a characteristic that was supported by several teacher and administrator comments in this study, the National Arts Education Standards for the performing arts encompass various areas of knowledge and skills in addition to artistic performance. For example, of the nine standards in music, four standards relate to performing, improvising or reading musical notation. The remaining standards address composition, listening and analysis, evaluation of performance, and understanding relationships between music and other disciplines and in relation to history and culture. While these non-performance standards can be incorporated into successful performance, they indicate knowledge and skills that may not be readily assessed through performance. These standards can also serve as a basis for articulating student outcomes and evaluating student growth and learning. For example, one school in this study described a method...
for evaluating the individual growth of students between their audition for the program and their senior project at the conclusion of the program. This same structure could be implemented in relation to performance objectives related to each of the national arts standards in each of the performing arts areas.

The benefit of a broadened approach to the instruction in these schools is that students are then prepared for a variety of roles in the performing arts in addition to performance. Limiting preparation of students to performance skills minimizes the interaction between different facets of the artistic domain in the development of a successful artist. Assessing students only through performance minimizes the value of the other knowledge, skills, and dispositions that contribute to success as a performing artist.

**Implications for Policy**

Although these findings cannot be generalized beyond the participants and their schools, several implications can also be suggested for educational policy. In the present era of accountability with a strong focus on highly-qualified teachers, specialized secondary schools for the performing arts often recruit and hire teachers with more performing experience and less pedagogical experience or experience within the field of education. Provisional and special certifications for artist-teachers have been suggested previously (Yeatts, 1980) to provide talented students with high-quality teachers that also implement best practices in the fields of the performing arts and education. Such certification should be implemented and require evidence of knowledge and skills of effective teachers. The training should include: basic developmental theory and needs of K-12 students; designing and implementing quality curriculum and instruction; and designing and using a variety of assessment strategies. Training for teachers in
specialized schools for gifted and talented students in all domains should include academic and affective characteristics and needs of gifted and talented students and the teacher’s role in the talent development process. Policies for minimal training of artist-teachers are reasonable considering the current movement for high quality teachers in all areas (Lasley, Siedentop, & Yinger, 2006; NCATE, n.d.; Porter-Magee, 2004).

This study also demonstrates the lack of connection between the field of gifted education and these specialized schools for talented students in the performing arts. Specialized secondary schools for the visual and performing arts and other content areas are often identified as a service delivery model for gifted and talented students (e.g., Kolloff, 2002). According to the recent State of the States Report (National Association for Gifted Children [NAGC], 2005), seven states indicated having a statewide school for the fine and performing arts. However, many of the participants in this study, representing three states included in that report as having a specialized school for the arts, did not recognize the concept of differentiation, a cornerstone of gifted education practices; few participants were able to articulate how differentiation applied to their program. If the field of gifted education wishes to claim these specialized schools and programs as part of a continuum of services for gifted and talented students in the performing arts, then more effort should be made to understand how instructional and programmatic practices from the field of gifted education apply to the various content areas addressed by specialized schools.

The State of the States Report also indicates that 20 of 47 reporting states identify the visual and performing arts as an area of giftedness addressed in the state definition. Twenty-two states report the arts addressed in the state rules and regulations. (NAGC,
Information about the extent of programs for the visual and performing arts at the state and local level is conspicuously absent from the literature and research in the field of gifted education. The discussion of developing talent in the performing arts is also absent in the literature of the major arts education organizations (i.e., MENC: The National Association for Music Education, American Alliance for Theater and Education), where the focus has shifted to arts education for all students. The national arts education standards for music, dance, and theater include proficient and advanced achievement standards for students at the secondary level (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994). State and local level gifted education programs can use these standards to build programs for the artistically talented students that extend the existing arts education programs. Policies for programs for the artistically gifted should also include training for arts educators about the needs of artistically talented students and appropriate instructional strategies and practices that can be used to meet the needs of these students in the regular arts education program.

Another implication for policy relates to the primary national organization for the field of gifted education, the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC). With the expansion of the conception of giftedness and models of talent development to include the arts, NAGC can also support policy development initiatives that aim to develop relationships with arts educators and arts education organizations to recognize and develop artistic talent in all arts areas. The overview of the most recent State of the States Report begins with a clear acknowledgement of the existence of academically gifted and talented students nationwide yet barely addresses identification, programs and services for the artistically gifted and talented. The historical exclusion of the arts as a talent
domain from the field of gifted education needs to be addressed through partnerships and collaboration at the national level. An agenda for such collaboration should begin with discussions and sharing of information about how the various arts areas overlap with gifted and talented programs.

Implications for Future Research

There are several implications for future research related to this study. A follow-up study with a larger sample and a better response rate would verify or modify the findings of this study. A more in-depth study of several findings is also warranted. The questionnaire and self-report sections of this study could be divided into two separate studies with one focusing on describing and analyzing performing arts teachers and their practices. The other study would compare the self-report ratings with observations of the participating teachers to examine the extent to which the identified behaviors are implemented during instruction.

Future research also needs to compare teachers in various domains of giftedness and talent on characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers. What similarities exist between teachers in various content areas? What differences exist between these teachers and what is the rationale for these differences? A recent cross-cultural study of teaching practices and learning patterns in secondary gifted classrooms in Singapore and the United States (VanTassel-Baska & Feng, 2006), found that the teachers in Singapore were more trained in gifted education practices and demonstrated more effective use of instructional approaches than teachers in the United States. Future research could compare the perceptions and practices of teachers for gifted learners in multiple content
areas and across cultures. Other studies could address perspectives on talent development and the role of the teacher in the talent development process across cultures.

Another study should address differences between the performing arts and the prevailing understanding that each discipline has its own traditions and requirements for success. For example, the difference between instrumental and vocal performance was indicated in the response of one teacher interview participant, C.G.: “each artist has their own way of understanding...especially singers because the instrument is inside their body”. Research should examine the constraints of the performing arts ensemble and how instruction in a group differs from that of the individual studio instruction.

Future research should also address differences within the performing arts, specifically between the “applied” and “performance” areas such as technical theater vs. acting or music composition vs. music performance. One participant noted an existing prejudice with the field of music between “performers” and “educators”: “Effective teachers in the arts are those who are actively contributing in their fields as performers. They are trained not as music educators, but as performers. They learned how to teach through applied study, not ‘music ed’ based curricula which seems out of touch” (Participant P108). What are the perceived differences between performers and educators? What is the origin of this difference and how does it impact the students that work with either “performers” or “educators”? Similarly, why do some performing artists serving as artist-teachers hold great disdain for the field of education?

Finally, future research should ask current and former secondary students what makes a teacher effective in the performing arts. What characteristics and behaviors
contribute to their success as performing artists? What role do they believe teachers play in the development of their individual abilities?

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to expand the literature in the field of gifted education regarding the characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers for talented secondary students in the performing arts. The arts are an area of talent development that continues to be admired and praised for accomplishments but which lacks sufficient research that describes and examines the talent development process. This lack of research also endangers the needs of these students by potentially overlooking effective ways to develop their talents. Teachers play an important role in the development of talent in all areas, including the performing arts. While this study supports the literature on effective teachers for gifted and talented students, more research is needed to address providing artist-teachers in the areas of music, theater, and dance with the knowledge and skills that further support the talent development of artistically talented students.
References


228

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


231

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(ERIC Document Services No. ED455657)


(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED448544)


Heath, W. J. (1997). *What are the most effective characteristics of teachers of the gifted?* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED411665)


236

Maker, C. J. (1982). *Curriculum development for the gifted.* Austin, TX: PRO-ED.


Subotnik and K. D. Arnold (Eds.), Beyond Terman: Contemporary longitudinal studies of giftedness and talent (pp. 186-211).


248

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix A</th>
<th>Teacher Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>Teacher Self-Report using the COS-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>Teacher Interview Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>Administrator Interview Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E</td>
<td>Document Review Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F</td>
<td>Request for Participation Letter to School Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix G</td>
<td>Overview Letter and Informed Consent: Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix H</td>
<td>Overview Letter and Informed Consent: Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix I</td>
<td>Letter to External Reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix J</td>
<td>Teacher Questionnaire Data: Open-Ended Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix K</td>
<td>Example of Coding for Open-Ended Questionnaire Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix L</td>
<td>Comments from one Non-respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix M</td>
<td>Teacher Interview Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix N</td>
<td>Teacher Interview Data: Coding Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix O</td>
<td>Administrator Interview Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix P</td>
<td>Administrator Interview Data: Summaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix Q</td>
<td>Administrator Interview Data: Coding Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix R</td>
<td>Example of Coding for Interview Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix S</td>
<td>Overview of Documents Reviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Teacher Questionnaire
Teachers: Thank you for participating in this dissertation study. Your time and assistance are truly appreciated! The information you provide will be kept confidential and your responses will be used only for modifying the questionnaire to make it more effective in the dissertation study. You are being assigned a participant number to enable the researcher to contact you if there are specific questions about comments or suggestions that you contribute to the questionnaire.

Directions: Complete each item of this questionnaire to the best of your ability. If you need extra space, please attach additional sheets of paper, clearly indicating the question that is being answered.

Section I: Effective Teachers of Talented Students in the Performing Arts

1. Please help define the importance of various teacher characteristics when working with talented students in the performing arts. For each of these items, please assign a rating using the following system by circling the corresponding number:
   (1) Highly uncharacteristic of an effective teacher
   (2) Usually uncharacteristic of an effective teacher
   (3) Usually characteristic of an effective teacher
   (4) Highly characteristic of an effective teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Circle your rating choice for each item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Enthusiastic for his/her content area.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Knowledge of the needs of talented students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Advanced knowledge of his/her content area.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has a good sense of humor.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Encourages students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Recognizes individual differences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Has received advanced training in their content area.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Responds well to change</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Is highly intelligent.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Maintains high expectations for all students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Is flexible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Is creative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Displays confidence and possess a well-developed self-concept.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Displays a broad general knowledge.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Cares about his/her students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What behaviors are characteristic of teachers who work effectively with talented students in the performing arts? For each of these items, please assign a rating using the following system by circling the corresponding number:

(1) Highly uncharacteristic of an effective teacher
(2) Usually uncharacteristic of an effective teacher
(3) Usually characteristic of an effective teacher
(4) Highly characteristic of an effective teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Circle your rating choice for each item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Creates a positive and supportive learning environment.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Provides constructive and prompt feedback on student performance</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Responds to individual student needs and problems</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Adapts pacing of instruction to meet individual students’ needs.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Uses a variety of instructional strategies</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Adapts content of course to meet individual student needs (i.e., repertoire, techniques, assignments)</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Helps students develop a positive self-concept</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Optimizes instructional time</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Designs and uses assessment instruments (e.g., tests, rubrics, checklists) to track student performance ability.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Adapts instructional content based on individual student needs.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Collaborates with other teachers to plan learning experiences.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Reflects on work to improve student learning</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Uses routines to organize class time</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What instructional strategies do you use to develop the artistic talent of your students? Mark all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select Here</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select Here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Opportunities for group learning, such as small ensembles, chamber ensembles, scene study</td>
<td></td>
<td>I. Improvisational activities using newly learned knowledge or skill, such as a fingering, a technique, a vocalise, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Individualized instruction, such as private studio lessons, tutoring, coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Higher-level thinking and metacognitive models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Socratic questioning to encourage students to clarify thoughts and assumptions with reasoning and evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>K. Lecture presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Independent study, such as preparing for a recital</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Research projects related to their arts area</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Listen to recordings or watch performances and critique them using specific criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Analyze the performances of students or student groups from the school using specific criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>O. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Individual or group assessments on specific parts, techniques, choreography, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Describe a teacher from your experience and training that you believe is an example of an effective teacher working with talented students in the performing arts. How did this person contribute to developing your talent as a performing artist?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please attach additional sheets of paper if more space is needed.
Section II: Participant Information

5. What is the content area of your primary teaching responsibility? (Check only one answer.)
   - Music  ___  Dance  ___  Theater
   - Other (please specify): _________________________________________
   Indicate any secondary teaching content areas or teaching responsibilities here:

6. What grade levels do you teach? (Mark all that apply.)
   - Grade 9  ___  Grade 11
   - Grade 10  ___  Grade 12
   - Other (please specify): ________________________________

7. What level(s) of formal education that you have completed? (Mark all that apply.)
   - Two year or associate's degree
     Describe: _____________________________________________________
     Institution: __________________________________________________
   - Bachelor's degree (4-year program or equivalent)
     Describe: _____________________________________________________
     Institution: __________________________________________________
   - Master's degree
     Describe: _____________________________________________________
     Institution: __________________________________________________
   - Doctoral degree
     Describe: _____________________________________________________
     Institution: __________________________________________________
   - Additional Degrees and Certifications
     Describe: _____________________________________________________

b) Other information about your formal education experience:

8. Career in Education (Complete each item.)
   How many years have you been in the field of education? ________________
   How long have you been teaching at the high school level? ________________
   How long have you been teaching at a specialized secondary school for the arts? ________________
   How long have you been in your current position? ________________
   Other Information you would like to share for this set of questions: ________________________________
9. Career Experience in Performance Area

Indicate your experience as a performer in your area. (Select all that apply.)

____ Broadway - Describe: __________________________________________________________

____ Off-Broadway - Describe: ______________________________________________________

____ Professional Dance Companies (i.e., paid gigs) – Describe: _________________________

____ Soloist
____ Swing
____ Principal
____ Ensemble

National tours - Describe: ___________________________________________________________

____ Regional Repertory, Regional Repertory Circuit - Describe: _________________________

____ Symphony Orchestra, Symphony Chorus - Describe: ________________________________

____ Principal, Concertmaster, etc. – Describe: _______________________________________

____ Professional Chorale, Chorus, or Ensemble - Describe: _____________________________

____ Section-Leader
____ Featured Soloist

____ Opera Chorus - Describe: _______________________________________________________

____ Solo Recitals, Tours – Describe: ________________________________________________

____ Film - Describe: ______________________________________________________________

____ TV - Describe: _________________________________________________________________

____ TV Commercials - Describe: ____________________________________________________

____ Other – Describe: ______________________________________________________________
Appendix B

Teacher Self-Report
TEACHER SELF-REPORT FORM

Participant Number: _________________________________

Directions: Please complete the COS-R as a self-report of your use of the indicated instructional strategies. Use the Performing Arts Indicators (starting on page 5) as a guide to interpreting these behaviors within the context of the performing arts. Your self-report will be used to identify those strategies that are frequently used by teachers in specialized schools and programs for talented students in the performing arts.
The William and Mary Classroom Observation Scales, Revised

Developed by:
Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Ed.D., Linda Avery, Ph.D., Jeanne Struck, Ph.D.,
Annie Feng, Ed.D., Bruce Bracken, Ph.D., Dianne Drummond, M.Ed.,
Tamra Stambaugh, M.Ed., and Chwee Quek, Ph.D.

Directions: Please employ the following scale as you rate each of the checklist items. Rate each item according to how well you believe you employ the characteristic or behavior during a typical instructional activity. Each item is judged on an individual, self-contained basis, regardless of its relationship to an overall set of behaviors relevant to the cluster heading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3=Effective</th>
<th>2=Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>1=Ineffective</th>
<th>N/O = Not Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher evidenced careful planning and classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting many appropriate student responses. The teacher was clear, and sustained focus on the purposes of learning.</td>
<td>The teacher evidenced some planning and/or classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting some appropriate student responses. The teacher was sometimes clear and focused on the purposes of learning.</td>
<td>The teacher evidenced little or no planning and/or classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting minimal appropriate student responses. The teacher was unclear and unfocused regarding the purpose of learning.</td>
<td>The listed behavior is not demonstrated. (NOTE: There must be an obvious attempt made for the certain behavior to be rated &quot;ineffective&quot; instead of &quot;not observed&quot;.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Teaching Behaviors**

**Curriculum Planning and Delivery**

The teacher...
1. set high expectations for student performance.
2. incorporated activities for students to apply new knowledge.
3. engaged students in planning, monitoring or assessing their learning.
4. encouraged students to express their thoughts.
5. had students reflect on what they had learned.

Comments:

**Differentiated Teaching Behaviors**

**Accommodations for Individual Differences**

The teacher...
6. provided opportunities for independent or group learning to promote depth in understanding content.
7. accommodated individual or subgroup differences (e.g., through individual conferencing, student or teacher choice in material selection and task assignments.)
8. encouraged multiple interpretations of events and situations.
9. allowed students to discover key ideas individually through structured activities and/or questions.

Comments:
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### Problem Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher...</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. employed brainstorming techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. engaged students in problem identification and definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. engaged students in solution-finding activities and comprehensive solution articulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

### Critical Thinking Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher...</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. encouraged students to judge or evaluate situations, problems, or issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. engaged students in comparing and contrasting ideas (e.g., analyze generated ideas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. provided opportunities for students to generalize from concrete data or information to the abstract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. encouraged student synthesis or summary of information within or across disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

### Creative Thinking Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher...</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. solicited many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. engaged students in the exploration of diverse points of view to reframe ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. encouraged students to demonstrate open-mindedness and tolerance of imaginative, sometimes playful solutions to problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. provided opportunities for students to develop and elaborate on their ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
Research Strategies

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(It is atypical for these to be observed in one session. Some teachers, however, may use Items #21-25 within a single period to illustrate the full research process to students. Please note those observations in the comments section.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The teacher...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. required students to gather evidence from multiple sources through research-based techniques (e.g., print, non-print, internet, self-investigation via surveys, interviews, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. provided opportunities for students to analyze data and represent it in appropriate charts, graphs, or tables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. asked questions to assist students in making inferences from data and drawing conclusions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. encouraged students to determine implications and consequences of findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. provided time for students to communicate research study findings to relevant audiences in a formal report and/or presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
The following examples serve as an indicator of potential classroom practices that might be observed. The examples are not inclusive but included only to help clarify the listed behavior as it pertains to second language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Behavior</th>
<th>Observable Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRICULUM PLANNING AND DELIVERY</strong></td>
<td>The teacher...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 Set high expectations for student performance | ✓ Analyze examples of appropriate and/or inappropriate performances, products  
✓ provide rubric descriptions for performances and/or sample products  
✓ articulate explicit steps to meet expectations set  
✓ verbal expression of expectations for final product/performance |
| 2 Incorporated activities for students to apply new knowledge | ✓ allow time for students to practice a skill or concept (singing, playing, dancing, performing...)  
✓ structure an application activity to illustrate an idea or theme being studied (i.e., harmony, point/counterpoint, depth of staging, balance/symmetry, asymmetry, etc.)  
✓ created a new performance product using a new concept, skill, or knowledge |
| 3 Engaged students in planning, monitoring, or assessing their learning | ✓ encouraged students to peer-edit/self-edit compositions, dictations, scenes, choreographed pieces given a specific standard or rubric  
✓ required students to complete a self-assessment form prior to submitting projects  
✓ reminded students of deadlines or checks on progress of long-term projects |
| 4 Encouraged students to express their thoughts | ✓ solicited input from multiple students  
✓ solicited students to “add on” to ideas shared  
✓ asked follow-up questions to probe student ideas and responses  
✓ created a classroom climate that is conducive to student sharing |
| 5 Had students reflect on what they had learned | ✓ put in place a framework for reflection either in class or out-of-class, such as journaling, “Think-pair-share”, reflection through practicing parts  
✓ asked higher level questions that help students make connections to previous learning and consider new learning  
✓ required students to make cross curricular/temporal connections |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMMODATIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES</th>
<th>The teacher…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Provided opportunities for independent or group learning to promote depth in understanding content</td>
<td>✓ allowed time for a variety of options that allowed students to pursue personal study &lt;br&gt; ✓ assigned group work that deepened understanding of a skill or idea such as sectionals, small group scenes, pairs of dancers/musicians, characters working together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Accommodated individual or subgroup differences</td>
<td>✓ provided choices for student-selected assignments such as research projects, repertoire study, recitals, monologues, solos &lt;br&gt; ✓ adjusted pacing for varied students &lt;br&gt; ✓ grouped according to interest or ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Encouraged multiple interpretations of events and situations</td>
<td>✓ solicited varied student comments about ideas and interpretations of performance examples &lt;br&gt; ✓ asked students to work in small groups to discuss their interpretation of performance examples &lt;br&gt; ✓ provided tools such as graphic organizers, evaluation rubrics for students to consider performance style, skill, theme, tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Allowed students to discover key ideas individually through structured activities and/or questions</td>
<td>✓ used deliberate strategies such as graphic organizers, worksheets, outline, etc., to help students organize thoughts and/or performance skills around central themes or ideas &lt;br&gt; ✓ used open-ended questions to solicit responses &lt;br&gt; ✓ used multiple performance examples to help students discover themes and patterns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM-SOLVING STRATEGIES</th>
<th>The teacher…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Employed brainstorming techniques</td>
<td>✓ solicited a variety of responses using brainstorming strategies &lt;br&gt; ✓ asked students to work in groups to come up with ideas on a topic for a specified length of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Engaged students in problem identification and definition</td>
<td>✓ asked students to identify the central problem of a performance, piece, or scene using proof from the selection &lt;br&gt; ✓ asked questions such as “What is the central/underlying problem and how do you know?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Engaged students in solution-finding activities and comprehensive solution articulation</td>
<td>✓ required students to develop and use specific criteria (whether given or self-generated) to come up with a solution to a problem in a performance or scene &lt;br&gt; ✓ asked students to apply criteria to find a solution to a given situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL THINKING STRATEGIES</td>
<td>The teacher...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13 Encouraged students to judge or evaluate situations, problems, or issues | ✓ asked questions about an author, composer, or choreographer’s purpose and assumptions  
✓ asked questions about the implications or consequences of a situation within a performance  
✓ asked students to evaluate a performance from multiple perspectives (i.e., performer, director, audience, critique, etc.) |
| 14 Engaged students in comparing and contrasting ideas | ✓ used a Venn Diagram, T-chart or other model to help students compare or contrast ideas from a performance or multiple performances  
✓ asked students to analyze a situation from two different perspectives within the topic studied  
✓ asks students to compare one cultural response to another |
| 15 Provided opportunities for students to generalize from concrete data | ✓ encouraged connections to various themes of relevant compositions or performances using evidence from a performance example  
✓ engaged student to develop generalizations based on their observations and evaluations  
✓ required answers to questions such as “what do you conclude about... based on the data provided”  
✓ asked students to write up conclusions to a given situation studied |
| 16 Encouraged student synthesis or summary of information within or across disciplines | ✓ asked questions relating a given time period and/or culture that required synthesizing information  
✓ asked students to relate themes within and across performing arts areas  
✓ asked students to write a summary of a class discussion just held |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREATIVE THINKING STRATEGIES</th>
<th>The teacher...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17 Solicited many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas | ✓ asked questions such as “Did anyone have a different idea?” or “How else would we think about this question?”  
✓ encouraged students to provide varied ideas, examples, or scenarios |
| 18 Engaged students in the exploration of diverse points of view to reframe ideas | ✓ asked questions about perspective or point of view and how the context of a performance selection may be different, given a different perspective  
✓ used examples and/or excerpts from a performance as a basis to analyze different perspectives |
| 19 Encouraged students to demonstrate open-mindedness and tolerance of imaginative, sometimes playful solutions to problems | ✓ made positive comments when given an unusual idea during discussion  
✓ allowed students to present ideas in multiple modes (i.e., visual, kinesthetic, auditory) |
|   | 20 Provided opportunities for students to develop and elaborate on their ideas | ✓ allowed time for students to write extended responses to share their point of view or idea  
✓ asked students to clarify their thinking in oral or written forms  
✓ asked “why” students thought as they did  

RESEARCH STRATEGIES* | The teacher…  
|   | 21 Required students to gather evidence from multiple sources through research-based techniques | ✓ asked students to read multiple sources (print, non-print) on a specific issue in the performing arts (i.e., censorship, attendance at cultural events, artistic intellectual property and the Internet)  
✓ asked students to come up with questions for research, create surveys or interview questions, and gather empirical evidence  

|   | 22 Provided opportunities for students to analyze data and represent it in appropriate charts, graphs, or tables | ✓ asked students to create a meaningful way to represent findings from research  
✓ provided instruction in graphing results, chart construction, etc.  

|   | 23 Asked questions to assist students in making inferences from data and drawing conclusions | ✓ required answers to questions such as “what do you conclude about... based on the data provided”  
✓ asked students to write up conclusions to a given situation studied  

|   | 24 Encouraged students to determine implications and consequences of findings | ✓ required answers to questions such as “how will your findings affect...” or “what are the consequences of...”  
✓ asked students to determine short and long term effects of a character’s action  

|   | 25 Provided time for students to communicate research study findings to relevant audiences in a formal report and/or presentation | ✓ provided time for students to give a power point (or other formal) presentation on a research study conducted  
✓ provided the opportunity for students to field questions  
✓ required a written research report on a given topic to share with others  

* This cluster of behaviors may not be seen in all performing arts classrooms.
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Teacher Interview Protocol
Teacher Interview Protocol

1. What characteristics and skills do you possess that allow you to be successful in working with the students in your school? What characteristics and skills do you recognize in your colleagues that allow them to be successful teachers?

2. What is your understanding of the concept of differentiation? How do you believe differentiation applies to specialized schools and programs for the performing arts?

3. How do you determine the success of your instruction?
Appendix D

Administrative Interview Protocol
Administrator Interview Protocol

1. What are characteristics of teachers who are effective in working with the students in your school? What knowledge and skills must these teachers possess to be successful in your program?

2. What is your understanding of the concept of differentiation? How do you believe differentiation applies to the instruction and program in your school?

3. How do you determine the success of the instruction in your school?
Appendix E

Document Review Guidelines
1. What are the specified responsibilities of performing arts teachers in this program?

2. What criteria are used to select individuals as teachers in the performing arts program? What steps are included in the selection process? (i.e., certification, degrees, demonstrated competencies, etc.)

3. How are performing arts teachers evaluated for their effectiveness in this program?
Appendix F

Request to Schools for Participation
Dear ADMINISTRATOR:

My name is Bess Worley and I am a doctoral candidate in the Educational Leadership program, with an emphasis in gifted education, at the College of William and Mary. I am planning a dissertation to study the characteristics and skills of teachers who work effectively with talented students in the performing arts in specialized high schools like [NAME OF SCHOOL]. I am writing to inquire if you and your performing arts faculty would be willing to participate in this study.

Participation for teachers would involve completion of a questionnaire and self-report form. A sample of teachers from all selected schools would then be selected for a follow-up interview by the researcher. A lead administrator from your school would also participate in an one hour interview. The questionnaire would need to be completed between December 1, 2005 and January 1, 2006. The interviews with the teachers and administrators would occur in January or early February 2006.

Please consider participating in this research study. This study will provide a collection of characteristics and skills that be used to select and develop teachers in specialized schools and programs for the performing arts. This study will also provide insight into the strategies and approaches used by these teachers in schools with a strong tradition of providing quality educational opportunities for artistically talented students. As a former middle school choir teacher and a professionally trained performer and musician, I appreciate the value of your faculty’s time and expertise. The participation of your faculty and administrative staff will benefit your program as well as the programs of other schools and communities in your state and across the nation.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns: bbworl@wm.edu or (757) 229-5211. Please indicate your willingness to participate in this study by contacting me at the e-mail address or phone number printed above by __________, 2005.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bess B Worley II, M.S.Ed.
bbworl@wm.edu
3955 Strawberry Plains Road
Williamsburg, VA 23188
Appendix G

Letter for Participation and Informed Consent: Teachers
Dear TEACHER:

My name is Bess Worley and I am a doctoral candidate in the Educational Leadership program at the College of William and Mary with an emphasis in gifted education. Thank you for agreeing to participate in a dissertation to study the characteristics and skills of teachers who work effectively with talented students in the performing arts in specialized high schools like [NAME OF SCHOOL].

Participation will involve completion of the attached questionnaire and self-report forms. A sample of teachers from each performing arts area (dance, music, theater) across the participating schools will also be selected for a follow-up interview by the researcher. The questionnaire will need to be completed by December _____, 2005. The interviews with the teachers will be scheduled in January to occur in late January and early February 2006. The interview will consist of approximately five questions and will last for approximately one hour. The interview can be scheduled to occur in person or over the telephone. Each participant that completes a questionnaire and self-report will be entered into a drawing for one of 20 $10 gift cards to one of three selected retail stores.

Your identity and any responses you provide will remain confidential. The identity of your school will also be modified to protect those participating in the study. You have the right to discontinue participation at any time. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions asked of you. Your full cooperation, however, would be greatly appreciated and would insure the optimum applicability of the study's findings.

This study will provide a collection of characteristics and skills that be used to select and develop teachers in specialized schools and programs for the performing arts. This study will also provide insight into the strategies and approaches used by teachers to provide quality educational opportunities for artistically talented students. As a former middle school choir teacher and a professionally trained performer and musician, I appreciate the value of your time and expertise. Your participation will benefit your program as well as the programs of other schools and communities in your state and across the nation.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns at bbworl@wm.edu. Please complete the enclosed forms by December _____, 2005.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Bess B. Worley II, M.S.Ed.
College of William and Mary
bbworl@wm.edu

Form Checklist:
____ Teacher Consent Form
____ Teacher Questionnaire
____ Teacher Questionnaire
____ Postcard mailed separately for the gift card drawing
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TEACHER CONSENT FORM
DISSERTATION STUDY BY B. WORLEY
Participant Copy – Please Keep for Your Records

I, _______________________________________, agree to participate in a study to describe characteristics and skills of effective teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts. The purpose of the study is to inquire about these characteristics from professional artists and musicians teaching at specialized secondary schools for artistically talented students. I understand that the researcher has selected specific schools with a tradition of specialized instruction in the performing arts. I also understand that the researcher will focus on the characteristics and behaviors of effective teachers, the instructional strategies used by performing arts teachers to develop artistic talent, and how instructional success is assessed by the faculty or school. The researcher is conducting this study as part of a doctoral dissertation at the College of William and Mary.

I understand I will be expected to complete a questionnaire and self-report instrument and return the items through the mail in the envelope provided. I understand that I may be selected to participate in one face-to-face or telephone interview of approximately one hour in length related to the study’s purpose articulated above. If selected for the interview, I agree that I will read and review a summary of the information that is generated during the interviews via email to check and correct it for accuracy.

I have been informed that any information obtained from me for this study will be connected with a participant code that will allow only the researchers to determine my identity. At the conclusion of this study, the key linking me with the code will be destroyed. I also acknowledge that individual discussions will be audiotaped to ensure the accuracy of the data transcriptions. At the conclusion of the study, the tapes will be erased or destroyed and will no longer be available for use. All efforts will be made to conceal my identity in the study's report of results and to keep my personal information confidential.

I understand that I can choose not to answer any question to which I would rather not respond and that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time during any stage of the study. My decision to participate or not participate will not affect my relationships with my school, colleagues, administration, the researcher, or with the College of William and Mary. My signature below signifies my voluntary participation in this project, and that I have received a copy of this consent form.

If I have any questions or problems that arise in connection with my participation in this study, I should contact Bess Worley, the principal researcher, at bbworl@wm.edu, Dr. Joyce VanTassel-Baska, the Dissertation Committee Chair, at 757-221-2347, or Dr. Michael Deschenes, the chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William and Mary, at 757-221-2778.

Date _______________________________ Signature of Participant _______________________________

Date _______________________________ Signature of Investigator _______________________________

THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3901) ON 2005-11-22 AND EXPIRES ON 2006-11-14
Appendix H

Letter for Participation and Informed Consent: Administrators

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Dear PARTICPATING ADMINISTRATOR:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in a dissertation to study the characteristics and skills of teachers who work effectively with talented students in the performing arts in specialized high schools like [NAME OF SCHOOL].

Your participation in this study will involve an interview consisting of approximately five questions and which will last for approximately one hour. You will also be asked to help provide or direct the researcher to documents that describe your school’s selection of teachers for your school and their responsibilities in your school.

Your identity and any responses you provide will remain confidential. The identity of your school will also be modified to protect those participating in the study. You have the right to discontinue participation at any time. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions asked of you. Your full cooperation, however, would be greatly appreciated and would insure the optimum applicability of the study’s findings.

This study will provide a collection of characteristics and skills that be used to select and develop teachers in specialized schools and programs for the performing arts. This study will also provide insight into the strategies and approaches used by teachers to provide quality educational opportunities for artistically talented students. As a former middle school choir teacher and a professionally trained performer and musician, I appreciate the value of your time and expertise. Your participation will benefit your program as well as the programs of other schools and communities in your state and across the nation.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns at bbworl@wm.edu. Please complete the enclosed consent form indicating your willingness to participate in this study and return it in the envelope provided by ____________, 2005.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bess B. Worley II, M.S.Ed.
College of William and Mary
bbworl@wm.edu
Administrator Consent Form  
Dissertation Study by B. Worley  
Participant Copy – Please Keep for Your Records

I,---------------------------------------------------, agree to participate in a study to describe characteristics and skills of effective teachers in specialized schools for the performing arts. The purpose of the study is to inquire about these characteristics from professional artists and musicians teaching at specialized secondary schools for artistically talented students. I understand that the researcher has selected specific schools with a tradition of specialized instruction in the performing arts. I also understand that the researcher will focus on instructional strategies used to develop artistic talent and how instructional success is assessed by the faculty or school. The researcher is conducting this study as part of a doctoral dissertation at the College of William and Mary.

I understand I will be expected to participate in one face-to-face or telephone interview of approximately one hour in length related to the study's purpose articulated above. I agree that I will read and review summaries via email of the information that is generated during the interviews to check and correct them for accuracy. I also understand that I be asked to provide or direct the researcher to documents that describe the criteria used at my school related to the selection and training of teachers in my school.

I have been informed that any information obtained from me for this study will be connected with a participant code that will allow only the researchers to determine my identity. At the conclusion of this study, the key linking me with the code will be destroyed. I also acknowledge that individual discussions will be audiotaped to ensure the accuracy of the data transcriptions. At the conclusion of the study, the tapes will be erased or destroyed and will no longer be available for use. All efforts will be made to conceal my identity in the study's report of results and to keep my personal information confidential.

I understand that I can choose not to answer any question to which I would rather not respond and that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time during any stage of the study. My decision to participate or not participate will not affect my relationships with my school, colleagues, administration, the researcher, or with the College of William and Mary. My signature below signifies my voluntary participation in this project, and that I have received a copy of this consent form.

If I have any questions or problems that arise in connection with my participation in this study, I should contact Bess Worley, the principal researcher, at bbworl@wm.edu, Dr. Joyce VanTassel-Baska, the Dissertation Committee Chair, at 757-221-2347, or Dr. Michael Deschenes, the chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William and Mary, at 757-221-2778.

Date Signature of Participant
Date Signature of Investigator

THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3901) ON 2005-11-22 AND EXPIRES ON 2006-11-14.
Appendix I

Letter to External Reviewers
Dear EXTERNAL REVIEWER:

My name is Bess Worley and I am a doctoral candidate in the Educational Leadership program, with an emphasis in gifted education, at the College of William and Mary. I am planning a dissertation to study the characteristics and skills of teachers who work effectively with talented students in the performing arts in specialized high schools. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study as a reviewer of one of the instrument that will be used in this study.

The self-report form for this study is based on the William and Mary Classroom Observation Scales-Revised (COS-R). Several sets of indicators have recently been developed to translate the targeted behaviors included on the COS-R for secondary level science, mathematics, social studies, foreign language, and English courses. I have developed a set of indicators for secondary performing arts courses. The participants in this study will be asked to complete the COS-R as a self-report using the set of indicators for the performing arts. I ask that you review the indicators in the context of the COS-R for their accuracy in reflecting a theater or drama course, making suggestions or critiques along the way, and then send your comments and any edits/notations that you have made back to me. I will need your review by ________________.

Please consider participating in this. This study will provide a collection of characteristics and skills that can be used to select and develop teachers in specialized schools and programs for the performing arts. This study will also provide insight into the strategies and approaches used by these teachers in schools with a strong tradition of providing quality educational opportunities for artistically talented students. As a future educational research in the field of gifted education, I appreciate the value of your time and expertise. Your participation would add tremendously to this study and to the field of gifted education.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns: bbworl@wm.edu or (757) 229-5211.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bess B Worley II, M.S.Ed.
bbworl@wm.edu
3955 Strawberry Plains Road
Williamsburg, VA 23188
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Teacher Questionnaire Data: Open-Response Question

“Describe a teacher from your experience and training that you believe is an example of an effective teacher working with talented students in the performing arts. How did this person contribute to developing your talent as a performing artist?”

N=21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O127 | Caring, Nurturing, Concern  
Students quickly sense if a teacher is genuinely interested in their performing.  
A supportive enthusiastic studio environment is essential.  
The student is ultimately their own teacher six days a week, so teaching critical thinking and listening skills in the lesson is as important as demonstrating or correcting mistakes that the student can hear as well.  
Use of recording and video technology is a valuable tool for teaching students how to self-assess their performance.  
The teacher really is more of a mentor or guide who allows the student to explore his/her talent. |
| P119 | An effective teacher of students in my area of the performing arts is one who provides the student with the experiences that will help them proceed to their next level [sic]. They should empower the student with the skills needed to continue their education in a more directed track towards their goal. For example, if a student wants to be a lighting designer, then he needs to know about the basics of lighting, plus have the working skills like how to hang and focus the lights, plus the organizational skills to collaborate and work with others. Or if a student wants to be a costumer, they should know not only how to sew but how to read and interpret a script, juggle tasks with deadlines, plus develop rendering skills. Theatre is a learn by doing sort of art and I believe that to be properly educating a student for a life in the theatre they need to have “project” based learning combined with classes. I am also a firm believer in apprenticeships for older students. I frequently farm out students to work with local groups in order to let them see how different theatres work. To be a theatre person is to be a lifelong student and the students must know that their future education may not be packaged neatly and presented by a professional educator. They need to see “real world” scenarios. |
| O201 | The most effective teacher I ever had did everything she could to keep me from studying with her. She never asked me to continue and constantly questioned my motivation and intention in wishing to study with her. She never once in the twenty years I studied with her gave me the answers I sought. She only put me in positions and situations where I was forced to learn on my own. When she passed away, I began work with her son, who |
has never once complimented me or encouraged me in the work. On the contrary, he has even more forcefully questioned my ability to meet the demands of the work and each time I work with him, points out another amazing shortcoming I would never have seen without his sharp eye. Because of their honesty and NEVER ONCE TELLING ME I COULDN’T DO IT, I am a master teacher of my art as well as a competent performer able to hold my own with the best practitioners of theater games in the country. It has also made me an honest as well as compassionate teacher.

| M107 | In order to be an effective teacher working with students in the performing arts, you need to meet the students at their current level of ability, and have an organized, achievable plan to move them to the next level. (Be that performance level or academic level). Gifted students respond very well to specific long term & short term goals if you give them a way to “get there from here”. Nothing disheartens a gifted artistic student faster than feeling they are just “treading water”. They need the tools & guidance to begin making small steps. And they need to be able to identify these small steps and see where they are in the bigger picture. Nothing is more exciting than a student who is excited about learning because they know where they are going and how to get there. |
| O204 | I think an effective teacher needs to strive always to be the best listener in the world. It is only by really listening to students’ verbal and non-verbal communication that a teacher can “get inside their world” to truly help the student move toward & advance. The more gifted, talented the student, the more aware & present the teacher needs to be. Also, an effective teacher needs to not be pushy & needs to not get anxious over producing results with gifted students. An effective teacher knows from personal experience that rigorous attention to process will produce the results. |
| M103 | personal characteristics: patience; nurturing, but w/o becoming a therapist; long memory—many ineffective teachers seem to have forgotten what it’s like to not know how to do something. Some of the most talented musicians are terrible teachers because they have lost sight of how difficult certain things are; clear understanding of “why teach? And why teach/learn about art?” curricular characteristics: organized—but flexible—method of achieving long-term goals by reaching many short-term goals; balance of different areas—technique, style, etc.; adaptability to different learning styles; Important: ability to inspire a student and simultaneously (and consistently) help a student develop and sustain his or her own momentum |
| P140 | The teachers who have inspired me in the past related to me more as a peer; respected & encouraged them to draw on their own experiences; taught me how to creatively research and apply experience to roles; taught me to push myself; instilled passion for discipline “as an actor don’t try to make an audience think you might catch fire...dare them to believe you aren’t going to catch fire despite whatever they can do to prevent it.” walk a mile in everyone’s shoes |
find identification with everyone you can
let the role play you
open yourself to the possibility that you can connect with a universal power
and truth in the moment-to-moment you perform

L104 Of the teachers in my past, two have most significantly influenced my artistic
development. Musically, they challenged me to always unite technique with
musicianship because technique is merely the means to artistic expression. It
is not the sole reason for playing the piano. Additionally, they both
challenged me to find ways to relate the music to myself yet respect the
composer’s intention. They asked me to consider every marking in the
score—why did a composer choose certain dynamics, articulations, and
textures? This lead me to intelligent yet personal interpretations. Both
teachers were also incredibly supportive. They created environments in which
standards were always upheld, but we were all there to teach each other and
learn from everyone’s mistakes. They cared about my personal life but they
did not meddle. Perhaps most importantly, they modeled what they taught.
They performed regularly, and they let the studio observe their own creative
process by playing for us at all levels of preparation leading up to
performances.

O201 I studied with several outstanding teachers in Russia. They helped me with
encouraging me to repeat doing what I have done right.

O202 My acting teacher [NAME] was the first teacher to show me the importance
of the MOMENT. His integrity was high and his sense of the actor’s truth (or
lack of it) keen. He gave plenty of instruction, spoke to each student in their
own idiom, but became impatient when one wasn’t absorbing the teaching.
That impatience—while frightening many in the class, showed me his
standards, his drawing out excellence and even his realization that not all
people are cut out to be actors. In my own teaching I may use impatience
when students are distracted, late, undisciplined, lazy, or sloppy—for the
same reason: to teach students what is required of them to make a living as an
actor. With the attentive learner [NAME] could show infinite patience—to
keep one step ahead and help the student progress and grow at the student’s
optimum pace. I don’t remember receiving praise; instead, support for what
came out of me that was authentic, spontaneous, vital and alive. When those
things didn’t emerge, he might say something like, “It’s hard,” “It takes years
to learn” and so we’d know that learning was progressive and NOT instant
(lke brewed coffee).

O206 Effective teachers evaluate the students and then set about to meet their
needs. They care about their art form and lead their students.

P127 Please refer to a book called “The Art Spirit” by Robert Henri

M108 The primary requirement is the teacher’s knowledge of the field---
experiential knowledge not theory; Then the theoretically can be applied
when appropriate.
Characteristics: compassionate and firm; willing to admit not knowing
something; treats students as people and not as children; is honest---humble
and still curious---willing to learn
| O140 | In addition to items in questions 1 & 2: patience, self-regulation, active arts career, collaborative, communicative, articulate, thoughtful |
| O205 | I believe that a behavior showing true love, respect, and discipline in the knowledge and execution of the teacher is the most effective teaching behavior. I think a sense of security and a sense of humor with the subject matter is essential. I think the real talent in teaching is being able to communicate with each individual, specifically addressing their approach to the subject, guiding them to discover the goal for themselves. In this, truth is established as a whole or all witness the progress of the individual, thus in the group. The love, respect and discipline are thus reciprocated and the teacher who started it all is challenged to continue the enthusiasm, based on their love of the subject and their need to communicate the teaching. |
| O138 | Teaching creatively often comes from early childhood imagination development. In vocal study—one easily recognizes that each individual body creates its own unique sound as a result of the physiology of the instrument itself. However, teaching each of these unique instruments with respect to their individuality in artistic temperament and innate artistic instincts take a constant free flowing imaginative thought process by the teacher. When a child is encouraged to explore & “play out” their emotions and complexities within the framework of say—a drama, that release of emotion, that working-through process & recognition of the delivery force—their passion can free them—not only as artists, but as individuals with creative thought processes for a lifetime |
| L110 | Effective teachers in the arts should be specialists on recognizing and encouraging individual gifts while also teaching the “ensemble” to work together as a whole. I like to say that the student artist, with the help of a good teacher, becomes his own best teacher. An effective teacher encourages educated critique and discourages artistic snobbery. An artist should be shown how to fully develop their own gifts while appreciating and encouraging the gifts of others. An effective teacher encourages students to find ways to address weakness & deficiency while still enjoying the pursuit of excellence. Students should be inspired to desire & pursue the highest quality performance, but should also be taught how to deal with disappointing situations without being discouraged. An effective teacher shows herself to her students to be a learner and a performer. The teacher will show the “journey” with her students and thereby gain respect and confidence. |
| P108 | Effective teachers in the arts are those who are actively contributing in their fields as performers. They are trained not as music educators, but as performers. They learned how to teach through applied study, not “music ed” based curricula which seems out of touch. My learning as a teacher came from observing other great master teachers—not from a text book. |
| O137 | Must be a good performer to demonstrate techniques & musicality. Has to
understand the student & what they need & not invalidate their efforts but encourage and lead. They should have some historical & theoretical knowledge. More important is a knowledge of style & musicality. They should be predictable.

L103  First and foremost, thorough knowledge and ability in area of specialization. Capacity to integrate arts instruction holistically with core academic and myriad other “life experiences”.
   Ability to operate “on-the-fly” in creative problem solving.
   Strong work ethic, emphasis on self-disciplined approach to practice and learning.
   Uncompromising standard of artistic integrity.
   Humility.
   Generosity, inspirit of sharing and giving artistically.

P128  Each performing artist has strengths that will help develop talented students. Teachers in the arts have the sometimes difficult task of assessing how a student best learns the given material while creating structure and discipline in the art form.
   I remember my teachers in the performing arts as being incredible motivated, passionate and confident in approach. When confronted with opportunities to enlist supportive theories to prove the knowledge they possessed, I always remembered being in awe of their abilities to teach by example. I remember seeing that it is not what you do, but who you are.
   Supportive, constructive feedback is essential to a student’s growth. Honest and clear instruction starts with helping a student to be responsible to their goals and the world they live in.
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Example of Coding for the Open-Response Questionnaire Item

Coding for Participant O137 [CODING IN BRACKETS]

Must be a good performer to demonstrate techniques & musicality. [TEACHER AS PERFORMING ARTIST, TEACHER AS MODEL]

Has to understand the student & what they need [UNDERSTAND STUDENT NEEDS] & not invalidate their efforts but encourage and [ENCOURAGE STUDENTS] lead. [TEACHER AS LEADER]

They should have some historical & theoretical knowledge. [CONTENT KNOWLEDGE]

More important is a knowledge of style & musicality. [PERFORMANCE KNOWLEDGE]

They should be predictable. [MATURE/STABLE]
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Comments from One Non-Respondent

I am returning to you today the research material that [SITE COORDINATOR’S NAME] had passed on to me.

I did not fill out any of the questionnaires because I didn't want to add to the huge amount of reviews and interview material on teaching that has already been accumulated over the decades. Despite, or perhaps because of, the increasing numbers of statistics and numbers about teaching, our educational system has been gradually deteriorating. In its attempt to stuff the brains of our children with an increasing amount of information as if they were some computer hard drive it fails to allow the young to develop into attentive, creative and unafraid people.

Has anyone ever noticed that most of the successfully innovative people in the US are and have been high school drop-outs?

I am very interested and willing to discuss educational philosophy. However I don't intend to answer questions, which are based on a certain premise that I don't share. Respectfully,

[RESPONDENT’S NAME]
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Teacher Interview Data

Question One: What characteristics and skills do you possess that allow you to be successful in working with the students in your school? What characteristics and skills do you recognize in your colleagues that allow them to be successful teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“DB” music</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION, FLEXIBILITY, CARING, MOTIVATION, FORSIGHT AND PLANNING, MODELING BEHAVIOR BOTH AS A PERFORMER AND AS A TEACHER, USING CREATIVE DESCRIPTIONS TAILORED TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS TO CONVEY CONCEPTS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“CJ” dance</td>
<td>The characteristic I feel that is most essential in my teaching and that allows me to be successful in working with students is the legacy past on by my teachers in the arts. My students understand that the wisdom brought forth has many years of experience, an inheritance that has continued throughout generations. This respect of what has been and what will be guarantees trust and discipline in learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tim” theater</td>
<td>Communicative skills, connecting with students and remembering their own training—remembers teachers who worked to connect with them in their experiences communication, passion for what they do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“FA” music</td>
<td>I am what some call a “highly-trained artist teacher.” I have an undergraduate degree in vocal performance and a master of education degree. I have been teaching in some capacity since I was a teenager. My parents are both teachers, and my personality lends itself well to success in working with others, and specifically—students. I enjoy sharing my musical gifts and bringing out the strengths of others’ gifts. I have the ability to diagnose problem areas and prescribe solutions that are understandable and that work. I am an encourager, and regularly celebrate student success. The colleagues I work most closely with in the music department here are also highly-trained artist teachers who not only continue to develop their own musical abilities, but enjoy working with young people. We encourage one another, and that makes us more effective individually and collectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“CG” music</td>
<td>A-characteristics: big singer personality—-attracts students; most singers who are successful on the stage have a personality that is bigger than life; they have it when they are young, sometimes you have to bring it out of them; skills: communicates well and on a level that the students understand; gives them both imagination and literal pedagogy of muscles, names, actions; so I can explain it in a very creative fashion for each student; they are attracted to the big personality because I’m always free to be me; I don’t ever apologize for who I am; I think that my skills are that I communicate very well; B-in many ways, the skills are the same—the ability to communicate in a variety of ways; having a large singer vocabulary at your disposal, and I say singer vocabulary because it is very different for each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| "Leonard" | I believe the characteristics that I have that allow me to be a successful teacher are patience, the ability to walk in and engage with a group of people, I'm an extrovert; I think I'm perceptive. I think the characteristics seem to work for me and tend to make me good at what I do. I'm very trained, I've had tons of training in the areas in which I teach. My colleagues tend to be giving people. They are very generous with themselves, they give of themselves, they give of their time; they are generous as people; they tend to not have rules about formalities, even down to call me whatever you are comfortable calling me. They are grounded people, psychologically grounded in reality. They are very creative and have a sense of freedom in their person. They're very smart people, they aren't slow in any way, they are intelligent and smart and sharp in intellect. |
| theater | "John" | I think first and foremost I have a passionate desire to perform quality music. I've learned that youngsters can sniff out things that are not up to snuff; secondly I have to be very organized because our schedule is very rigorous. I have to stay ahead of the kids because they are very bright and they'll catch you if you're not totally prepared. My colleagues are completely dedicated to the students. I've noticed that my colleagues are really hard workers and are passionate about what they do, they really want to see the students succeed. |
| music | "Anastasia" | I am totally and thoroughly knowledgeable about my subject area and that I have a certain degree of empathy for my students. I have the ability to see where the student is and their immediate goals as well as their long term goals. I also recognize that students may have good days and bad days and that I am able to respond to them with emotional stability and a certain level of detachment when needed. My colleagues are able to relate to the kids on their level and take them to the next level in their training. They are also able to work together, to cooperate in the department and to work as a team. They also respond to students' needs with compassion. |
| dance | "Charles" | Genuine desire to see the students succeed. Sharing a common interest. Goals set at a high level. |
| music | "Lee" | I have been through the training that my students are experiencing and this helps me be a successful teacher. I also believe that successful teachers must be themselves. Teachers need to get to know their students, build trust, and speak truth to students regardless. Successful teachers set high standards, have an understanding of the creative process, and have a reasonably good mind or intellect. My colleagues demonstrate these characteristics, too. Finally, a successful teacher |
needs to be able to recognize if their students are doing good work.

Characteristics and skills that help me and my colleagues be successful with our students are: patience; tolerance; flexibility; a good sense of humor; a desire for individual excellence with a standard that is not one size fits all; the intuitive capacity to guide students; a sense of discipline; compassion; joyfulness; reflective listening; the ability to see beyond the personality of students and to unconditionally accept students where they are in their life; the ability to ask a lot of questions and to foster inquiry; and a love of teenagers. I also recognize in my colleagues: an ability to see students holistically as human beings; steadiness; the ability to foster and build resilience; a strong sense of the plan for learning, both class to class and as a semester; flexibility within this plan for learning; an ability to see into the personal lives of students and recognition of their needs; the ability to guide students in their application of their training; and the ability to balance students’ needs and the integrity of the program.

The one skill I possess that makes me work well with students is the empathy I hold for their individual situations. Art isn't the same for each student, some it comes to easy, so they usually need direction and boundaries, others have to strive, but will make discoveries greater than others because they have to work harder at learning. I guess that is the same for all subjects. How does it apply specifically to arts? Well, student A is a bright talented student who has been told all of his life that he is great at what he does by family members, teachers, friends, etc. Nine times out of ten, this student has up to the point been self taught, or guided by their own intuition. Reigning in this type of talent is difficult and requires a good bit of discussion concerning what their goals are and how they can use instruction to achieve these goals. This type of approach involves waiting through a bit of emotional journeys and sometimes years to get them to see how honing their craft is necessary. I was one of these students as a teenager.

Student B is the opposite to A, they don't have the training or the obvious talent at this point in their lives to be an outstanding artist. What they do have is the aspiration and the inspiration to use art and the artistic process as a journey to self fulfillment. There is also a bit of emotional element to this as well, when you have to stress that the project isn't about their lives, but what they learn from the act of exploration of the art. These students may not be on Broadway or get large scholarships from prestigious Universities, but they usually improve gradually and find happiness working in the field of arts in some capacity.

The trait that I see in my co-workers that makes them successful is the respect that they give the students. Each one of these kids is a young.
adult and if treated like a child, they will act accordingly; however when given responsibility to make decisions and have their decisions reinforced as one on a job or workplace they respond accordingly. Many are eager to take control and make things their own.
**Question Two:** What is your understanding of the concept of differentiation? How do you believe differentiation applies to specialized schools and programs for the performing arts?

| “DB” | Although I am unfamiliar with the clinical or scholarly definition of the term “differentiation” in the academic description of teaching, for my purposes I will describe it as the ability to tailor the lesson plan to each student based on background, ability, and rate of progress. As a teacher who primarily deals with individual instrument instruction, it is important to teach the students how to teach themselves and use whatever language or style of lesson which will reach each student. No two lessons are ever the same. |
| “CJ” | Differentiation is not a terminology I am familiar with in describing arts education. I understand that the arts are a specialized career that is specific in its training or nature. But I think this applies to any profession. While I know that we have arts conservatories and institutions, also believe it is important for artists to be exposed to many aspects of the world they live in. Their “job” is to reflect the society and world they live in. Artists should be mindful of their surroundings yet, keep themselves free from judgments. |
| “Tim” | A-I have no idea what that means….(explanation of it as a term in education)…then I don’t believe in it at all.  
B-I just don’t understand the question, I’m sorry. I don’t speak in those terms or even accept them.  
I think it pinpoints a term…it’s good for education to use this term but I disagree totally. I think that’s the problem with education. You get this far and this far and this far and then you’re worthy of teaching and I think that has nothing to do with what the true aspect of a teacher is. I think one’s communicative skills within what they’re teaching, being able to relate to someone and pass it on, can lead them to the understanding of a technique, is the only thing that’s needed. And I think that that comes through experience, examples that were set for them by teachers of theirs, and not through a degree. I think studying it, it can be led to it but I still think that that comes from a true genuine passion. Like I don’t think you can teach talent, I think you can develop talent, but the talent’s either there or not, teaching skills are the same way.  
from own experiences, being able to establish relationships |
| “FA” | My understanding of differentiation is matching instructional approaches to the needs and interests of each student. The students in our department are auditioned in, proclaiming at the outset that they have a deep interest in pursuing music. As a private voice teacher, I teach one-on-one, the highest level of differentiation. In my music classrooms, I often must deal with the |
different backgrounds and levels of preparation between students trained in piano, strings, woodwinds, percussion, etc. Their reading skills and level of musicality factor into their level of understanding and processing.

"CG" music

that’s very strange, could you say that again? Well, I’m going to interpret that what I think, I’m not sure what you’re looking for...so, each artist has their own way of understanding images and things that you are trying to get them to do, especially singers because the instrument is inside their body; if you can’t communicate to their brain, then the body will not respond appropriately with the best most beautiful more incredible healthy vocal sound; each instrument is different, its in an individual body, each brain is in an individual body which is an individual instrument; and the way one student may support their vocal breath another student may do it a different way; when you talk about the voice, you’re talking about an instrument that is based upon the physicality and physiology which it is born into; so my communication skill has to do with my observation of what they do naturally; so we do a lot of exercises to observe what we do naturally and try to carry that over; each student has a natural way of supporting a vocal sound that’s innate to them; so my job as a teacher is not only to observe it but to recognize what it is and to encourage that until it can do its job freely

B-all students have their own way of learning and their own pace of learning; unfortunately, because we consider the arts to be a highly competitive field, often those other courses get in the way; for example, certain schools like Montessori...believe that each function of your brain is going to develop when its going to develop, and if you are forced to understand or learn something that you are not ready to accept or even conceive of, something as abstract as math, then you struggle with things that are related to that to that function; I feel like sometimes other courses like theory or musical history or ear training, or things that have a concept involved before they can be applied; if you are trying to teach someone who is a great artist innately, you know as I say touched by the hand of God with talent and motivation and beauty of grace and music and tone...when they cannot function in the analytical world...sometimes the artist gets weeded out; the concept of differentiation that this person cannot accept this material right now; the system doesn’t allow this; I believe their brain is not ready to conceptualize these things but the system doesn’t allow the time they might need.

inference: these courses don’t adapt to what these students need her: the system is set up to weed them out

"Leonard" theater

Nothing comes up....I don’t know that term. I really don’t know what you mean by differentiation. (give differentiation) I don’t know educational terms.

"John" music

I don’t know if I have an understanding of what that is. (explanation). After I heard the explanation of this term, I think you’d find the artist faculty here do not have education backgrounds, on purpose. I’ve never
had an education course in my entire life, but I think the school is looking for people actually in the field, perhaps on a collegiate bound track. So, that concept to me is foreign because we do clip ahead at a very fast pace and tailoring the instruction to individual needs is important for private lessons, but in a group situation we have to understand that we teach to the highest common denominator. And maybe the philosophy would be for certain teachers that if there is a student that is falling behind we certainly want to help them in every way, but that is not a term that I am normally familiar with as a teacher. (asked to elaborate)
I think I've answered the way I feel about it personally.

| “Anastasia” dance | I am not familiar with the term differentiation. However, once it is explained I recognize that we do it all the time. We look at students’ personalities, their stated and unstated goals. We do not treat all students the same. On a technical level, there is differentiation between a clean technique and knowledge of technique or the lack thereof; this is knowing what students can do and where their limits are at this time. |
| “Charles” music | Designing your teaching to create different learning experiences for different students. Students certainly arrive and leave performing arts schools at different level, and at our school the range is from lower high school to graduate level. Instruction must be designed to cater to all different levels, especially in the area of individual instruction (private lessons). I'm not convinced that it applies to the ensemble (group) setting, where we tend to set one performance level for the entire group. |
| “Lee” theater | I am not totally unfamiliar with the educational term differentiation. I agree that teachers need to adapt instruction to meet the needs of individual students. Differentiation is part of everything I do—I teach the students, not the subject. I adjust what I do for each student. Differentiation is an incredibly important part of what we do in my program. I believe it is our response to their needs and we have to look at each student differently. |
| “Donna” theater | I am unfamiliar with the educational term differentiation. However, I see that we differentiate in many ways for our students. Some of our students are not gifted academically and in the arts and others are not. Some students have learning difficulties. For example, a student with difficulty in reading may not do well with cold readings but are able to learn and rehearse and perform competently. I also recognize that some students have qualities that do not match the requirements of their chosen field and we need to help them find an appropriate match for their strengths. Other students learn quickly and work very hard to learn. This also relates to finding students’ strengths for their professional life whether they are a “triple threat” or not. We foster students in what they do well and build on their weaknesses while at the same time we do not compare individuals with each other. |
| “Dresser” | Ok, I had to research this because I had no idea what |
**theater**

Differentiation meant. Yes, it is very necessary in the arts to have specific goals for each student as no two snowflakes are the same. Most of the students that I am directly responsible for advising have a specialized goal. I review with the student at the beginning of the year about what I want to see them accomplish and listen to their personal goals.

The downside of this type of specialization in a small environment can be that large chunks of skills are left on the wayside too quickly for the benefit of progress for progress sake. Plus, there must be a solid curriculum base for the student to work within, otherwise, you will have some outrageous suggestion from students who see differentiation as a way to avoid subjects and skills they may not be stellar at doing, ie. Actors working on tech crews or tech students skipping out on scene study.

**Question Three: How do you determine the success of your instruction?**

| “DB” | FOR A MUSIC TEACHER, SUCCESSFUL PERFORMANCE IS AN EASY GAUGE OF SUCCESSFUL TEACHING, HOWEVER IN THE LARGER PICTURE HELPING STUDENTS TO REACH THEIR GOALS, WHATEVER THEY MAY BE, MEANS SUCCESS. FOR MY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, A SUCCESSFUL COLLEGE AUDITION IS A GOOD MEASURE. FOR THE COLLEGE STUDENTS EITHER MOVING ON TO GRADUATE SCHOOL OR ENTERING THE WORK FORCE AS A MUSICIAN, AND FOR THE GRADUATE STUDENTS, FINDING A JOB OR CREATING A SET OF JOBS TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES WOULD BE GOOD INDICATORS. ULTIMATELY HELPING STUDENTS TO THINK CRITICALLY AND BE ENGAGED IN THE ARTS ON WHATEVER LEVEL THEY CHOOSE BEYOND SCHOOL IS SUCCESS. |
| “CJ” | The success of my work is determined by my student’s ability to be able to think in ways that support them getting professional work where they can guide and manage others. |
| “Tim” | Hmmm (big pause) It’s not always in their final performance or their ability to deliver. I think it’s seeing in them an understanding of what I’m talking about. Seeing the understanding of what I’m teaching, not the execution of what I’m teaching, because I think that comes in time. It can be a gleam in the eye, or the ability to replicate an idea back to me in their own terms. To restate an analogy or an illusion in their own terms. |
| “FA” | I assess, informally and formally, each time I meet with the students. The vocalists receive a “lesson sheet” after each lesson that outlines my response to their performance in lesson that day, and assignments for the next week. Their grade depends on how closely they met the outlined goals from the week prior. The performing ensembles are called upon regularly to perform for community events and outreach. We assess performances together. When the students can hear critically what they have produced, and evaluate it accurately and with maturity, I feel we have mastered a step beyond mere execution of a good performance. |
| “CG” | Teacher paybacks—every day, minute, hour, every lifetime; every time I watch...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>music</th>
<th>them stand up and do what I do better than I could ever conceive; can see and hear them no matter where I am in the Opera house because of good training and resonance and breath; when I watch them balance acting and singing and doing an amazing job for their age; I hear it in their text, facial expression; they make it look easy; they are &quot;better singers than I am&quot; I enjoy my work; I have brilliant students; so much grace under pressure; I can come back and share my success and my learning; I can share that with them... singers are a different breed of musicians, we understand each other; I have brilliant students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Leonard” theater</td>
<td>By the feedback I get and by the results that I see in my students. The direct feedback from them and also what I see and what they see as the changes. And the changes in them do have some kind of visible or audible measure to it. Like it is very clear that you could measure, the results are definitely measurable, and meet a measure that is of significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “John” music | I teach a variety of course. For my music theory course the success would be first and foremost that they have an understanding, a grasp, of the way music works, and then secondly our school was ranked among the highest in the world for AP theory test results for a school of its size.  
For performance, success is judged by the quality of the performance and being invited to perform at prestigious events. For example, we’ve been broadcast on statewide public radio, public television, and a [NAMED] festival. So, prestigious invitations, quality choral music and quality performance are certainly indicators of success. |
| “Anastasia” dance | When I can see that they are improving. It is both in the moment and in their future accomplishments. In the long term, it is when they go on to prestigious universities or dance companies. We teach students the conceptual base for the technical movements and connect the classical technique to other styles. Most of them come to us with only the knowledge of steps so this is an example of how we can see that they improve. |
| “Charles” music | Measurement of improvement; amount of personal growth and maturity. |
| “Lee” theater | I’m not sure how I measure success of my instruction, but I know that I look at their growth. I look at students both for their growth during their time in the program as well during a course from the beginning to the end. I recognize the abilities of my students but then focus on the skills that they lack. This process of growth is not a linear process and growth cannot be guaranteed. Knowledge in this artistic area is not cumulative. My work is based on looking at the artistic process and applying skills and principles throughout the process regardless of where one is in life or a career. |
| “Donna” theater | I use several methods of determining the success of instruction. I use Socratic methods to examine students' learning of the fundamental principles of the area we are studying. I ask students to evaluate their own learning about midway through the semester. The content of their learning does not have to be exactly what we’ve studied—I am more concerned that they are continuously learning new things. Some students learn more and others may not learn as much. I ask students |
what they need from me to help them learn. Success of instruction is also seen in students’ ability to move beyond their training and the cerebral side of training to a full expression of themselves while they are performing. I intend to foster freedom and a full range of expression for all students.

| “Dresser” theater | How do I determine my success? When a student works on projects and acts like a professional. My goal as a teacher is to train people I want to work with in the future. |
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Teacher Interview Coding Categories for Characteristics and Behaviors of Effective Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Characteristics</th>
<th>Key Words and Ideas in Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Area: Understand creative process in arts, Training in arts area, Conveys tradition in arts area, Passion for arts area, Creative in arts area, Teacher as a model performing artist, Continues study of arts area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Qualities: Caring, empathy, compassion, Encourage students, Tolerance, Emotionally mature, Joyfulness, Patient, Collaborate, Intelligent/smart, Self-confident, Hard-working, Motivated, Organized, Flexible, honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relate to students: Connect with students, dedicated to students, enjoys working with teens, extroverted personality, sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Behaviors</td>
<td>Communication Skills: communication skills, reflective listening Instruction: foster inquiry, tailor instruction to individuals, teacher as a guide, invested in student success, see a big picture for learning, see and meet individual needs, high standards/high expectations, celebrate student success, recognize quality of student work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O

Administrator Interview Data
Question 1: What are characteristics of teachers who are effective in working with the students in your school? What knowledge and skills must these teachers possess to be successful in your program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Webern”</td>
<td>The ideal faculty will be practicing performing artists (and composers) who have experience and a proven record of success with training students. Knowledge of all performing techniques in their particular area of expertise is essential but not sufficient. Knowledge of the full range of repertoire is also essential, as well as knowledge of techniques of effective practice. The instructor must be able to inspire the student as well as guide each one in a unique development curve that recognizes their individual skills and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Elle”</td>
<td>A strong artists themselves; skilled in their own art form; they have to be bright and imaginative—to be able to think out of the box—how do I make it work for this child; tailored to each child; need to see how what they do fits into the rest of the school—a comprehensive HS that gives a regular diploma; relates to the total picture for the student; think creatively and positively about options for the student; the child’s future may or may not be in performance, giving the child all those tools; able to work with children independently as well as within groups; have to understand the high school student mindset—so some experience with teaching is needed; the students are skilled but still children; developmental stages and good teaching methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Annabelle”</td>
<td>Teachers need to be creative, open-minded, hard-working, practicing artists. The knowledge and skills that they need varies by content area, but they need to be content specialists as well as well-rounded and well-read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Toby”</td>
<td>Our school is a professional actor’s conservatory with a 12th grade class attached to that conservatory. Our teachers all come from the professional world. Our focus is training people for careers in the profession, so they are less academic than they are people who have already had careers in the profession and who have the skills necessary for a professional career. In academic theater, some could not have professional careers and understand the rigors and expectations of the industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: What is your understanding of the concept of differentiation? How do you believe differentiation applies to the instruction and program in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webern</td>
<td>Differentiation is an extremely broad concept; I suppose it is a term of music education jargon that I don't fully appreciate. Please understand that I am not a music educator in that sense, nor do we offer a major program of study in teacher training. As stated above, a great deal of our instruction is individual and geared toward meeting the needs of unique individuals. If you'd care to define &quot;differentiation&quot; in the context you intend, I could perhaps respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle</td>
<td>occurs in a lot of ways; in terms of special education and special needs—one thing about the performing arts, it is a great equalizer; it is okay for students to watch one another to learn; in math, you can’t look on another student’s paper; it is okay to watch and learn; you will see students you didn’t expect to excel, excel because they can learn a different way and you will see students who already excel push themselves further because they can see ways within that to go the next step. Differentiation comes in a lot of forms—it is not just your IQ. It is different ways of learning, different learning styles; it is different backgrounds. When they come to us in their JR year, they come in with different backgrounds. Each student has an individual lesson every week...they are seen one on one and it allows them to really shine in their own way and get a fair assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Annabelle&quot;</td>
<td>Differentiation is working with students at their own level from where they are and helping all students to improve using different methods, different ideas. All students receive individual instruction, including learning contracts to extend their learning as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Toby&quot;</td>
<td>I am not familiar with the term differentiation. However, once I hear the definition, I recognize that teachers do this instinctively, particularly in the arts. You train the people in front of you. The curriculum is adapted to the needs of the students while considering what they need to be able to do. For example, a freshman college class may come into the program with more advanced skills than the class above them. For the 12th grade class, we do not really train them for professional careers. We focus more on making them aware of what the expectations are for them in a professional career and the next level of training that they will receive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3: How do you determine the success of the instruction in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Webern&quot;</td>
<td>Success is measured in several stages: recruitment of a full studio of highly qualified students in the major area (instrument or voice); support for steady growth of skills and artistry in each student, as measured by periodic jury reviews; and preparation of students to participate effectively in ensembles and solo competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Elle&quot;</td>
<td>a number of ways: look at tangible evidence of quantifiable things---90 students got $9 million in scholarships; dance won JR Grand Prix; AP Music Theory test scores---best school with AP scores; qualitative way---watching students perform, seeing in them, the glimmer in their eye, the excitement for being here; attendance is so high because they want to be in class; rarely an excused absence; watching the growth---certain amount that you have to see to understand it;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Annabelle&quot;</td>
<td>We maintain all students’ audition tapes or portfolios and every student must do a senior project in their specialty. A faculty board then reviews all senior projects compared to the audition items, similar to a pre-post assessment. Teachers continually evaluate their own teaching. There are state-mandated evaluations of teachers. There are annual surveys school-wide, by grade level and specialty, and by class. Teachers are also conducting informal assessments on an ongoing basis. There are also bi-weekly meetings where teachers serve as mentors and where students give feedback on anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Toby&quot;</td>
<td>We gauge the success of our program by the ability of the students to do each of the skills required of an actor better. To do what they do and do it well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Administrator Interview Data: Summaries

“Webern”
To be successful in your program, faculty members should be practicing artists and composers who have a record of success with training students. Faculty must have knowledge of performing techniques, extensive knowledge of repertoire, and knowledge of effective practicing techniques. Finally, faculty must also be able to relate to and inspire students, recognizing a student’s individual skill and needs for instruction.

Differentiation is an educational term with which you are unfamiliar. However, in applying it to your setting you recognize that the term relates to the mission of your school in providing for and meeting the individual needs of students.

Success of the instruction in your school is determined by the recruitment of highly qualified students to study in the various music studios, the level of support for each student in his/her growth as an artist, through the jury review system (at the end of each semester?), and the successful participation of students in solo and ensemble competitions (such as NATS, opera auditions, scholarship competitions, etc.).

“Elle”

Our teachers need to be strong artists, skilled in their art form first. They also need to be bright and imaginative, able to think about how what they do fits into the rest of the school. They need to see how what they do relates to the total picture for the student and think creatively and positively about future options for the student. They need to be able to work with students individually as well as within groups and to understand the mindset and developmental needs of high school students.

Differentiation occurs in a lot of ways. In the arts it is okay for students to watch and learn, making the learning more accessible. Students you didn’t expect to excel, excel because they can learn a different way and you will see students who already excel push themselves further because they can see ways within that to go the next step.

Differentiation comes in a lot of forms. It is not just your IQ. It is different ways of learning, different learning styles; it is different backgrounds. When they come to us in their junior year, they come in with different backgrounds. Each student has an individual lesson every week...they are seen one on one and it allows them to really shine in their own way and get a fair assessment of their abilities and their improvement.

We can assess the success of our instruction several ways. Quantifiable ways include the amount of scholarship money awarded to our students each year, the awards won by various departments, and the scores of music students on the AP music theory test. We also see the success of our instruction by watching our students perform, seeing the glimmer in their eye and their excitement from being in the program. School attendance is high because they enjoy being here. We watch their growth while they are here, too.
“Annabelle”

Teachers need to be creative, open-minded, hard-working, practicing artists. The knowledge and skills that they need varies by content area, but they need to be content specialists as well as well-rounded and well-read.

Differentiation is working with students at their own level from where they are, and helping all students to improve using different methods, different ideas. At our school, all students receive individual instruction, including learning contracts, to extend their learning as needed.

We assess the success of instruction several ways. We maintain all students’ audition tapes or portfolios and every student must do a senior project in their specialty. A faculty board then reviews all senior projects compared to the audition items, similar to a pre-post assessment.

Teachers continually evaluate their own teaching. There are state-mandated evaluations of teachers. There are annual surveys school-wide, by grade level and specialty, and by class. Teachers are also conducting informal assessments on an ongoing basis. There are also bi-weekly meetings where teachers serve as mentors and where students give feedback on anything.

“Toby”

Our school is a professional actor’s conservatory with a 12th grade class attached to that conservatory. Our teachers all come from the professional world. Our focus is training people for careers in the profession, so they are less academic than they are people who have already had careers in the profession and who have the skills necessary for a professional career. In academic theater, few of them could go have professional careers.

I am not familiar with the term differentiation. However, once I hear the definition, I recognize that teachers do this instinctively, particularly in the arts. You train the people in front of you. The curriculum is adapted to the needs of the students while considering what they need to be able to do. For example, a freshman college class may come into the program with more advanced skills than the class above them. For the 12th grade class, we do not really train them for professional careers. We focus more on making them aware of what the expectations are for them in a professional career and the next level of training that they will receive.

We gauge the success of our program by the ability of the students to do each of the skills required of an actor better.
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**Administrator Interview Coding Categories: Personal Qualities and Skills of Effective Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Qualities</th>
<th>Key Words and Ideas in Administrator Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to inspire, understand teenagers, bright, creative, open-minded, hard-working, imaginative, well-read, well-rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Teacher as a guide, meet individual needs, recognize individual needs, see the big picture for each student, work with students in groups and individually,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Example of Coding for Interview Data

Coding for “FA”, music teacher [CODING IN BRACKETS]

My understanding of differentiation is matching instructional approaches to the needs and interests of each student. [SEE AND MEET INDIVIDUAL NEEDS, TAILOR INSTRUCTION TO INDIVIDUALS]

The students in our department are auditioned in, proclaiming at the outset that they have a deep interest in pursing music. As a private voice teacher, I teach one-on-one, the highest level of differentiation. In my music classrooms, I often must deal with the different backgrounds and levels of preparation between students trained in piano, strings, woodwinds, percussion, etc. Their reading skills and level of musicality factor into their level of understanding and processing. [SEE AND MEET INDIVIDUAL NEEDS, TAILOR INSTRUCTION TO INDIVIDUALS]
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### Overview of Documents Reviewed

Table S1

*Documents Promised and Received by Participating Administrator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Administrator</th>
<th>Documents Promised</th>
<th>Documents Received</th>
<th>Description of Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annabelle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Paragraph statement from the administrator about criteria for selecting teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toby</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Two job postings from winter/spring 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Three current job postings from winter/spring 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator #5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of Job Posting Received from Webem:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FACULTY POSITION
Full-time Artist/Teacher of Viola

PROFILE [Name of school] seeks an outstanding artist/teacher with an established performing career to guide students and provide an artistic model in a performing arts conservatory setting.

DUTIES Recruit, teach, and advise a studio of 10 or more highly qualified viola majors. Teach weekly master classes and orchestral repertoire classes; organize and coach chamber ensembles. Maintain an active performing career and participate in faculty performances. Maintain an extensive presence on campus, including full participation in faculty meetings and committees. Other duties assigned by the dean.

QUALIFICATIONS Master of Music or equivalent professional experience required. Demonstrated effectiveness in recruiting and teaching. Record of significant, ongoing accomplishment as a performer.

SALARY Benefits-eligible full-time position; salary commensurate with experience and qualifications.

APPLY Letter of application, curriculum vitae, contact information for at least five references, and one or more representative recordings, including a recent live performance, should be sent to the address below.

[ADDRESS]

Other materials, including transcripts, may be requested at a later time.

DEADLINE For full consideration, application materials should be received by December 1, 2005.

INFORMATION [on the school]

Statement received from Elle:
In order for faculty to be considered for a teaching position here, they must have a terminal degree (comparable professional experience is considered) with at least 5 years of proven successful teaching experience at the secondary or post-secondary level, recognized success as a scholar, demonstrated knowledge and interpersonal skills to teach high school students in a residential setting, who have shown strong artistic achievement and potential - the ability to work with other arts educators and with diverse constituencies and cultures.