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In the study*, Self-Regulated Music Practice: Microanalysis as a Data Collection Technique and Inspiration for Pedagogical Intervention,* Miksza et al (year), selected three college musicians and studied their practice habits through a series of observations, data journals, and video data. The purpose of the study was to record and identify self-regulation practices in musicians. Their secondary purpose was to investigate if informed intervention was beneficial to those who participated in the study. The authors used five types of data collection: (a) entrance interviews, (b) daily practice efficacy ratings on a scale from 1-7, (c) data analysis from pre-test and post-test practice sessions, (d) detailed behavioral analysis of practice videos, and (e) a focus group exit interview to allow for collaboration among all three subjects.

Self-regulated practice, as defined by the authors, is a construct that is multifaceted, social, and psychological (Miksza et al, 2018). This type of practice requires much focus allowing musicians to define specific goals, attain the goals, and reflect on the goals to set new ones. Miksza et al set the subjects up to carry out the tasks by using forethought, performance, and self-reflection. The purpose of each of these phases was to enhance the pre-learning stage, engage in the learning stage, and reflect to improve abilities and skills attainment.

Self-regulated practice can be complex and affect approaches that the subjects used in identifying and correcting problems while practicing (Miksza et al, 2018). Miksza and his team assessed this through the study. They also pinpointed several issues and used the intervention technique to discuss methods with the subjects.

It was reported that students with a better sense of self-regulation in practice methods produced higher musical results and musicianship (Miksza et al, 2018). They can be more self-efficacious, proactive, and strategic in the ways that they practice, identify, and approach mistakes or musical problems. The authors compared this approach to that of athletes allowing showing how a self-efficacy approach is used in other practice situations. They found that self-efficacy can be applied to psychological and metacognitive attributes from motivation, self-confidence, mental toughness, anxiety, resilience, and focus. The difference between the two types of individuals is that athletes are provided a form of training in practice, whereas musicians are usually expected to know how to use this methodology.

Each of the three individuals who participated in the study were required to keep detailed practice journals that identified their goals, productivity ratings for each practice sessions, and questionnaire answers (Miksza et al, 2018). This was a practice that was used to help the individuals engage in the self-regulation process. The journals cataloged the learning principles used and practice behaviors that were used in a 20-minute practice session allowing researchers a glance at the differences in motivation and resolutions from each participant. The findings showed that musicians took on a cyclical process of the three phases: forethought, performance, and self-reflection.

Microanalysis was used in the process to help regulate the study and the results (citation goes here). It was structured in interviews which involved strategy and coordination in the way that the process was administered (Miksza et al, 2018). This was a way for the team to identify the way individuals think, were motivated, and how they engaged in learning. Using context-specific questions, which were linked to the three phases, allowed the authors to track the results. The team used a checklist to help identify the data. re The data that were used from the open-ended questions may identify additional themes for future study.

Miksza’s (2018) team reported that each of the three participants had similar approaches to how they analyzed their specific practice techniques. Differences included being proactive and emphasizing a higher order of thinking, whereas another was reactive and relying on what she already knew and held practice goals that were not highly detailed. This demonstrated a much less structured practice environment allowing the researchers to use the intervention interview to be used for recommendations or question leading to other methods. The team worked towards an expansion of a current study using two different approaches: (a) by pinpointing findings from microanalysis of behavioral observations and interview, and (b) through an examination of pedagogical intervention.

The procedure that was used in this study was structured simply but formally enough to present a demonstration of a solid case (citation goes here). The team selected three individuals and studied them over a 15-day period. During this time, everyone had an entrance interview, daily video recordings, and daily practice journal entries. The journal entries were structured prompts that asked: (a) How will you approach your practice today? Provide ratings to indicate your prediction and (b) How effective was your practice today? Provide ratings to indicate your progress (pg. 301). A pretest was administered on day three of the study and a posttest on day thirteen. The intervention was administered after each subject had four consecutive days of practice. After the study, the three subjects were brought together for an exit interview where they were allowed to collaborate and discuss what they discovered.

The team found that the participants enjoyed practice for its overall value, importance, enjoyment, and usefulness (Miksza et al, 2018). The open-minded items offered the individuals to demonstrate confidence in their ability to practice effectively. Although the ratings were similar, the actual goals of each were very different.

Responses to the open-ended question about performance during the warm-up phase were similar to the prior findings (citation goes here). However, one participant demonstrated greater flexibility in the ability to adjust and adapt technique in comparison to the others. This allowed this individual to better target and strategically approach a musical problem and overcome it quickly, showing a deeper sense of self-regulating practice.

Self-reflection showed that one individual was more focused and target-oriented during the practice session in comparison to the others (citation). Each participant expressed similar thoughts on many items in the journal work, although there was a report from the subjects that they had an unstable and less-focused mindset during this period. The authors reported that those with a mastery-oriented mindset were better equipped with more strategies and techniques and had a larger toolkit.

Upon exiting when, the participants were brought together for collaboration and an exit interview, each reported that the intervention meeting helped them to reflect and put ideas into perspective (citation). They also reported that the findings were informative and helpful for improvements in practice and further study.

The open-ended microanalysis questions which helped the team to assess the forethought process proved informative (citation). Each subject reported different levels of success, however only one subject showed clarity and focus. This same individual showed a great deal of adaptability in their work through their practice sessions, proving that larger amounts of information or problems were overcome in the practice period.

While the 3 subjects participated for 15 consecutive days, completing daily practice journals, daily practice video recordings, multiple interviews, and interventions, the process showed that each individual had different processes in the way that they practiced, addressed problems, and overcame the problems, only one truly showed a large sense of growth in their projected progress, in the way that they paid close attention to detail, clarity, and focused on these items (citation needed). Miksza and his team present a great case, and leaves the study open to further research in the future as they progress the nature of this study.
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